

DEHN FUNCTIONS OF SUBGROUPS OF PRODUCTS OF FREE GROUPS: 3-FACTOR CASE, F_{n-1} CASE, AND BRIDSON–DISON GROUP

DARIO ASCARI, FEDERICA BERLOTTI, GIOVANNI ITALIANO,
CLAUDIO LLOSA ISENRIK, AND MATTEO MIGLIORINI

ABSTRACT. Subgroups of direct products of finitely many finitely generated free groups form a natural class that plays an important role in geometric group theory. Its members include fundamental examples, such as the Stallings–Bieri groups. This raises the problem of understanding their geometric invariants. We prove that finitely presented subgroups of direct products of three free groups, as well as subgroups of finiteness type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} in a direct product of n free groups, have Dehn function bounded above by N^9 . This gives a positive answer to a question of Dison within these important subclasses and provides new insights in the context of Bridson’s conjecture that finitely presented subgroups of direct products of free groups have polynomially bounded Dehn function. We also give the first precise computation of a superquadratic Dehn function of a finitely presented subgroup of a direct product of finitely many free groups: we show that the Bridson–Dison group is a subgroup of a direct product of three free groups with Dehn function N^4 . To prove our results we generalise techniques for “pushing fillings” into normal subgroups and define a new invariant for obtaining optimal lower bounds on Dehn functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

A natural problem in group theory is to understand the geometry of subgroups of direct products of groups and, in particular, of subgroups of direct products of free groups. Dehn functions provide an important and classical geometric invariant of finitely presented groups. In this work we prove:

Theorem A. The Dehn function of every finitely presented subgroup of a direct product of three free groups is bounded above by a polynomial of degree nine.

Theorem B. The kernel of the morphism $F_2 \times F_2 \times F_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ which is surjective on every factor has quartic Dehn function.

We will now motivate these results, place them in context, and explain further main results of our work.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F65 (20F05, 20F67, 20F69, 57M07).

Key words and phrases. Dehn function, direct product of free groups, residually free groups.

1.1. The geometry of subgroups of direct products of free groups. Free groups are the universal objects in group theory and as such play a distinguished role. Some of the most basic constructions of new groups from old groups are free and direct products. Free products of free groups are free and by the Nielsen–Schreier Theorem the same is true for all of their subgroups. This raises the question whether direct products of free groups and their subgroups are similarly rigid. It is well-known that this is not the case. In fact, subgroups of direct products of free groups (short: SPFs) have been the source of many interesting examples in group theory. Baumslag and Roseblade [BR84] proved that there are uncountably many isomorphism classes of subgroups of $F_2 \times F_2$ and Mihailova [Mih68] proved that there is a finitely generated subgroup $K \leq F_2 \times F_2$ for which the membership problem is unsolvable. Moreover, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ the first examples of groups of finiteness type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} and not \mathcal{F}_n , constructed by Stallings ($n = 3$) [Sta63] and Bieri ($n \geq 4$) [Bie81], are subgroups of direct products of n free groups; here we call a group G of type \mathcal{F}_n if it admits a $K(G, 1)$ with finite n -skeleton.

On the other hand, if $K \leq F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n}$ is of type \mathcal{F}_n for $n \geq 2$ Baumslag and Roseblade ($n = 2$) [BR84] and Bridson, Howie, Miller and Short [BHMS09, BHMS13] ($n \geq 3$) proved that G is virtually a direct product of finitely generated free groups, giving a version of the Nielsen–Schreier Theorem under the additional assumption of strong enough finiteness properties. More generally, Bridson, Howie, Miller and Short [BHMS13] classified finitely presented SPFs in terms of their higher finiteness properties. In particular, they proved that all finitely presented SPFs can be constructed from direct products of free groups by taking finitely many fibre products over finitely generated nilpotent groups. Moreover, SPFs with high enough finiteness properties in relation to the number of factors are *virtually coabelian* [Kuc14, Corollary 3.5] (see also [Koc10]), that is, $K \cong \ker(\psi: F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r)$ for some product of free groups and a surjective homomorphism ψ . We call r the corank of K .

These results exhibit that finitely presented SPFs form a natural and rich class that played a pivotal role in our understanding of finiteness properties of groups and thus in geometric group theory. This naturally raises the interest in their finer geometric invariants.

1.2. Dehn functions of SPFs and residually free groups. Dehn functions quantify finite presentability by measuring the number $\delta_G(N)$ of conjugates of relations required to determine if a word of length N in the generators of G represents the trivial element in G , where G is a group given by a finite presentation. Motivated by the fact that finitely presented SPFs are constructed using iterated fibre products from free groups and nilpotent groups, both of which have polynomially bounded Dehn function, Bridson conjectured:

Conjecture 1.1 (Bridson). *Every finitely presented subgroup of a direct product of free groups has polynomially bounded Dehn function.*

More generally, Bridson conjectured that residually free groups have polynomially bounded Dehn function, due to similarities in their structure theory (see [BHMS09, BHMS13]). Here a group G is called *residually free* if for every $g \in G \setminus \{1\}$ there is a homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow F_2$ with $\phi(g) \neq 1$.

Conjecture 1.2 (Bridson). *Every finitely presented residually free group has polynomially bounded Dehn function.*

We prove:

Theorem C. Conjecture 1.2 holds if and only if Conjecture 1.1 holds.

This provides further impetus towards understanding Dehn functions of SPFs. In his thesis [Dis08b] Dison raised these conjectures as questions and conducted the first systematic study of Dehn functions of finitely presented SPFs. Predating Dison's work, a longstanding open problem was determining the precise Dehn functions of the Stallings–Bieri groups $SB(n)$. Their Dehn function was first bounded by Gersten [Ger95] in 1995 by N^5 and Bridson [Bri99] asserted in 1999 that it is in fact quadratic. While Bridson's proof only gave a cubic upper bound, his intuition was confirmed by Dison, Elder, Riley and Young [DERY09] in 2009 for $n = 3$ and by Carter and Forester [CF17] in 2017 for all n .

In his thesis Dison proves that subgroups of $F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n}$ of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} satisfy a polynomial isoperimetric function, giving a positive answer to Conjecture 1.1 for this class of groups, which includes all finitely presented subgroups of a direct product of 3 free groups. As we will explain, these groups are all either direct products of finitely many finitely generated free groups or commensurable to a class of groups that he denotes by $K_m^n(r)$ for integers m, n, r with $r \leq m$, defined as kernels of morphisms $\psi : F_m \times \cdots \times F_m \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ from a direct product of n free groups of rank m whose restriction to each factor is surjective. More precisely, Dison proved that $\delta_{K_m^n(r)}(N) \preceq N^{2r+2}$ and for $n \geq \max\{3, 2r\}$ he even attained a stronger bound of N^5 .

1.3. Uniform upper bounds. Considering that Dison's upper bounds only depend on r if the number of factors is small compared to the rank of the free abelian quotient, it is natural to ask if this is merely a relic of his techniques and if maybe it is even possible to obtain uniform upper bounds on Dehn functions of interesting classes of SPFs. Dison asked the strongest possible version of this question, which is a key motivation for our work.

Question 1.3 (Dison [Dis08b]). Is there a uniform polynomial p such that for every finitely presented SPF K we have $\delta_K(N) \preceq p(N)$?

Dison [Dis09] and Bridson [Bri] proved that the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$ is at least cubic; we will refer to $K_2^3(2)$ as the *Bridson–Dison group*. This shows that we can certainly not hope for a quadratic upper bound in general. Subsequently, in [LIT20] Tessera and the fourth author gave a negative answer to Question 1.3 by constructing for every natural number $n \geq 3$ a subgroup of a direct product of n

free groups with Dehn function $\asymp N^n$. In conjunction with Dison's results for the class $K_m^n(r)$ this naturally leads to the following restricted versions of Question 1.3, the first of which is a slight variation of [LIT20, Question 3].

Question 1.4. For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$, is there a uniform polynomial $p(N)$ such that every finitely presented SPF K in a direct product of n free groups satisfies $\delta_K(N) \preceq p(N)$?

Question 1.5. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ and $k \in \{2, \dots, n-1\}$, is there a uniform polynomial $p(N)$ such that every SPF of type \mathcal{F}_k in a direct product of n free groups satisfies $\delta_G(N) \preceq p(N)$?

We will prove that both questions have a positive answer in two important cases, showing that the number of factors and the finiteness properties may play a key role in understanding the Dehn functions of SPFS. Indeed, Theorem A gives a positive answer to Question 1.4 for the three factor case, while the following more general result gives a positive answer to Question 1.5 for $k = n - 1$.

Theorem D. If $K \leq F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n}$ is a finitely presented subgroup of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} , then the Dehn function of K is bounded above by a polynomial of degree d , where $d = 9$ for $n \leq 3$, $d = 5$ for $n = 4$, and $d = 4$ for $n \geq 5$.

Note that Theorem D can be generalised to the case where the factors are limit groups (see Corollary 4.8).

To prove Theorems A and D we first reduce to showing the result for $K_r^n(r)$, by observing that all subgroups satisfying the assumptions are virtually coabelian and then that they are commensurable with one of the $K_r^n(r)$. To obtain upper bounds on the Dehn functions of $K_r^n(r)$ we generalise a known strategy for obtaining upper bounds on Dehn functions of kernels of homomorphisms to \mathbb{Z} which is known as “pushing fillings”. The term “pushing fillings” was coined by Abrams, Brady, Dani, Duchin and Young [ABD⁺13] and some of the underlying ideas already appeared in Gersten–Short’s proof [GS02] that kernels of homomorphisms from hyperbolic groups onto free groups have polynomially bounded Dehn function (see [LI24] for a generalization of Gersten–Short’s result to free abelian quotients). The idea of pushing fillings is that, given a finitely presented kernel K of a surjective homomorphism $\psi: G \rightarrow Q$ and an area-radius pair for G , one fills a null-homotopic word in a generating set of K by first choosing a van Kampen diagram for this word in G that is minimal for the area-radius pair. One then pushes it down to a filling in K . This comes at the expense of replacing the original relations by larger van Kampen diagrams. However, if one manages to carefully control the area of these van Kampen diagrams, then this provides an upper bound on the Dehn function of K . When applying this technique, the main challenge lies in carefully choosing presentations for K and G , as well as a pushing map that enables us to attain strong bounds.

A well-known example where pushing fillings leads to very good bounds on Dehn functions are Bestvina–Brady groups [Dis08a, ABD⁺13]. Dison’s proofs in [Dis08b]

also rely on pushing fillings. However, he pushes them one dimension of \mathbb{Z}^r at a time, which comes at the expense of an upper bound that depends on r . In contrast, we reveal presentations together with a pushing map that allow us to simultaneously reduce the height in all directions, thus leading to uniform bounds.

Since our proofs of Theorems A and D rely on the fact that we know that all SPFs satisfying the assumptions are coabelian (see [Kuc14, Corollary 3.5]), our work also provides positive evidence towards the following question of Tessera and the fourth author [LIT20, Question 4].

Question 1.6. Is there a uniform polynomial $p(N)$ such that for all coabelian SPFs K we have $\delta_K(N) \preceq p(N)$?

1.4. Determining precise Dehn functions. Attaining a full understanding of the geometry of SPFs will require us to determine their precise Dehn functions, a feat that turns out to be even harder than bounding them from above by a polynomial. This is because beyond bounding the Dehn function from above, it requires finding invariants that can be used to prove optimal lower bounds. When calculating Dehn functions this is often one of the main challenges and our situation seems to be no exception in this respect.

The only situation in which we can avoid finding lower bounds is when we can prove that the Dehn function is bounded above by N^2 . This is because every SPF that is not free contains \mathbb{Z}^2 and is thus not hyperbolic, meaning that its Dehn function is $\succ N^2$. Generalising the computation of the Dehn function of Stallings–Bieri groups by Carter and Forester [CF17], Kropholler and the fourth author proved for large classes of SPFs that they have quadratic Dehn function. Here we generalise their results in the case of subgroups of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} in a direct product of n free groups:

Theorem E. Let n, r be integers with $n \geq r + 2 \geq 4$ and let K be an SPF that is virtually coabelian of corank r in a direct product of n free groups. Then $\delta_K(N) \asymp N^2$.

Note that [KLI22, Theorem 1.5] proves this result for the cases when $\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil \leq \frac{n}{4}$. Interestingly, if one thinks about Dehn functions of coabelian SPFs in terms of the geometric approach pursued by Carter and Forester in [CF17], then it amounts to pushing a filling for a loop in a direct product of n trees into the level set under a ψ -equivariant height map $T_{m_1} \times \cdots \times T_{m_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$. These level sets are simply connected precisely when $n \geq r + 2$. This raises the question if Theorem E is optimal.

Question 1.7. If K is an SPF which is virtually coabelian of corank $r > n - 2$ in a direct product of n non-abelian free groups, is then necessarily $\delta_K(N) \succ N^2$?

This brings us back to the more challenging problem of determining the precise Dehn functions of SPFs in cases when it is not quadratic. A natural candidate for this is the Bridson–Dison group $K_2^3(2)$, as this is the first and simplest example of an SPF for which we know that its Dehn function is not quadratic. As mentioned above, Dison [Dis08b, Dis09] and Bridson [Bri] proved that $N^3 \preceq \delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^6$.

Best upper bounds						Best lower bounds					
$r \backslash n$	3	4	5	6	...	$r \backslash n$	3	4	5	6	...
2	N^4	N^2	N^2	N^2	...	2	N^4	N^2	N^2	N^2	...
3	N^8	N^5	N^2	N^2	...	3	N^4	N^2	N^2	N^2	...
4	N^9	N^5	N^4	N^2	...	4	N^4	N^2	N^2	N^2	...
5	N^9	N^5	N^4	N^4	...	5	N^4	N^2	N^2	N^2	...
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots

TABLE 1. The best known upper and lower bounds for $K_r^n(r)$. In the table we have highlighted the cases where the two bounds coincide and give a precise computation of the Dehn function.

Theorem B shows that neither the upper nor the lower bound are optimal and that in fact $K_2^3(2)$ has quartic Dehn function.

Both the upper and lower bounds in Theorem B involve new ideas in comparison to the proofs of the aforementioned results, which may be of independent interest. For the upper bound, instead of pushing with respect to the surjective homomorphism $F_2 \times F_2 \times F_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ with kernel $K_2^3(2)$, our strategy is to interpret $K_2^3(2)$ as a kernel of a morphism from the Stallings–Bieri group $SB(3)$ to \mathbb{Z} and apply the pushing argument to this group, using that it admits (N^2, N) as an area-radius pair.

The main innovation in our proof of Theorem B is however the lower bound, which relies on an obstruction that to us seems to be completely novel. Our strategy here is to introduce a new invariant on the set of null-homotopic words W in a suitable generating set of $K_2^3(2)$, which we call the *braid-invariant*. The braid-invariant induces lower area bounds on null-homotopic words and we apply it to show that there is a family of such words with quartic area growth in terms of their word length. To define the braid-invariant, we consider the pure braid group PB_3 on three strands, interpreted as the fundamental group of the ordered configuration space of three points on the plane; then we construct a homomorphism from W to PB_3 for every suitable choice of base points on the plane. Roughly speaking this map is defined by a certain kind of braiding of words described by a well-chosen generating set $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$ of $K_2^3(2)$; here the set $\{x_1, x_2\}$ (resp. $\{y_1, y_2\}$) diagonally generates the kernel of the restriction of ψ to the first and third factor (resp. second and third factor). The braiding happens between the words in the first pair of generators and the words in the second pair of generators. The braid-invariant counts the number of choices of base points that produce a non-trivial braid, and we prove that its growth can be quartic for a suitably chosen family of words.

We can summarise the results from Theorems B, D and E as in Table 1.

We conclude by observing that Theorem B gives a negative answer to the original version of [LIT20, Question 3], which asked if the Dehn function of every finitely presented SPF in a direct product of n free groups is bounded above by N^r . However, this is just a rephrasing of the non-optimality of Dison and Bridson's lower bound that we already observed and suggests that Question 1.4 is the better phrasing of this question. It would be interesting to know if Question 1.4 also has a positive answer for more than 3 factors (maybe under the additional assumption that the subgroup is coabelian) and, if it does, what the asymptotic behaviour of the optimal upper bound is.

Structure. The paper is structured as follows.

- In Section 2 we fix some notation and recall the definition of area and Dehn function of a group. Moreover, we give a precise formulation of the push-down strategy that will be used throughout the paper.
- In Section 3 we will describe how to obtain Theorems A and D using the push-down strategy. The proof is based on what we call *doubling technique*, which allows us to estimate the area of a large family of words with some symmetric properties. The whole section relies on several computations, which we postpone to the appendix.
- In Section 4 we prove Theorem C, which follows from a more general result that bounds Dehn functions of subgroups of direct products of groups in terms of those of the factors and those of subgroups of direct products of free groups.
- In Section 5 we prove Theorem E, by defining a normal form and performing some word manipulations. This does not rely on the push-down argument.
- In Section 6 we prove Theorem B, by using the braid-invariant for the lower bound, and a more refined push-down argument for the upper bound.
- Finally, in Appendices A to C we prove the technical lemmas required for Theorems A and D.

Guide for the reader. Section 2 is required for understanding the rest of the paper, as it fixes notation and describes the pushing argument, which is used many times thereafter.

Sections 3 to 6 are fairly independent to one another, so the reader interested in only one of the main theorems can jump directly from Section 2 to the relevant section, with the caveat that Section 5 requires the reader to be familiar with the presentation described in Section 3.1.

Finally, the appendix does not provide additional insight, it is computation-heavy, and it should only be read after Sections 2 and 3.

Acknowledgements. The first author was supported by the Basque Government grant IT1483-22. The second author was partially supported by the INdAM GN-SAGA Project, CUP E55F22000270001, and would like to thank Karlsruhe Institute of Technology for the hospitality. The third author gratefully acknowledges support

from the Royal Society through the Newton International Fellowship (award number: NIF\R1\231857). The fourth author would like to thank Robert Kropholler and Romain Tessera for many discussions about the topics of this work. The fourth and the fifth author gratefully acknowledge funding by the DFG 281869850 (RTG 2229).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	10
2.1. Free groups and homomorphisms	10
2.2. Area in free groups	10
2.3. The free group over a subset of a group	11
2.4. Dehn function of a group	11
2.5. Area-radius pairs for a group	12
2.6. Push-down map	12
3. Kernels in products of free groups	16
3.1. Candidate presentation	17
3.2. The push-down map	20
3.3. Doubling maps	20
3.4. Power maps	23
3.5. Thick relations	23
3.6. Conclusion	24
4. Generalisations to other SPFs and residually free groups	25
4.1. Free groups of different ranks	25
4.2. Free abelian groups of different ranks	27
4.3. Proof of Theorems A and D	28
4.4. Reduction from residually free groups to SPFs	28
5. Quadratic Dehn function	31
5.1. Normal form	32
5.2. Quadratic upper bound	35
6. The Dehn function of the Bridson-Dison group	41
6.1. Upper bound	42
6.2. Lower bound	45
Appendix A. Three factors	53
Appendix B. Five factors or more	65
Appendix C. Four factors	71
References	76

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the whole paper, if G is a group, to write the inverse of $g \in G$ we use interchangeably the notations \bar{g} and g^{-1} . The commutator of $g, h \in G$ is denoted by $[g, h] = gh\bar{g}h$.

2.1. Free groups and homomorphisms. Given a set S , we denote by $F(S)$ the free group with basis S . Every element $w \in F(S)$ can be represented by a unique reduced word in the alphabet $S \sqcup S^{-1}$ (the alphabet given by S and by the formal inverses of elements of S). We define the *length* $|w|_S$ to be the number of letters of the reduced word representing w .

Suppose we are given a finite ordered tuple $S = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ and an element $w = w(s_1, \dots, s_n) \in F(S)$. Let T be any other set and let $u_1, \dots, u_n \in F(T)$. Consider the unique homomorphism $\theta: F(S) \rightarrow F(T)$ satisfying $\theta(s_i) = u_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Throughout the paper, we denote $w(u_1, \dots, u_n) := \theta(w)$.

Definition 2.1. Given a homomorphism $\phi: F(S) \rightarrow F(T)$, with S finite, define

$$\|\phi\|_{S,T} := \max\{|\phi(s)|_T \mid s \in S\}.$$

We have $|\phi(w)|_T \leq \|\phi\|_{S,T}|w|_S$ for all $w \in F(S)$. In what follows, we write $\|\phi\|$ and $|w|$, omitting the dependence on S, T when it is clear from the context.

2.2. Area in free groups. Let F be a free group. Given a subset $\mathcal{R} \subseteq F$ and an element $w \in F$, we define the *area* of w as

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) = \inf \left\{ M \in \mathbb{N} \mid w = \prod_{i=1}^M \bar{u}_i R_i u_i, u_i \in F, R_i \in \mathcal{R} \right\}.$$

and in particular we set $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) = +\infty$ if w does not belong to the normal subgroup generated by \mathcal{R} . For a subset $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq F$ we define

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{Q}) = \sup\{\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) \mid w \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Lemma 2.2. For $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{R}'' \subseteq F$ we have

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathcal{R}) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathcal{R}') \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathcal{R}).$$

Proof. Take an element $R'' \in \mathcal{R}''$. We can write $R'' = \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_i R'_i u_i$ for some $u_i \in F, R'_i \in \mathcal{R}'$ and $k \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathcal{R}'')$. But for $i = 1, \dots, k$ we can write $R'_i = \prod_{j=1}^{h_i} \bar{v}_{ij} R_{ij} v_{ij}$ for some $v_{ij} \in F, R_{ij} \in \mathcal{R}$ and $h_i \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{R}')$. It follows that $R'' = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^{h_i} \bar{u}_i \bar{v}_{ij} R_{ij} v_{ij} u_i$ and thus R'' can be written using at most $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\mathcal{R}') \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\mathcal{R})$ conjugates of elements of \mathcal{R} . \square

Lemma 2.3. Let $\phi: F \rightarrow F'$ be a homomorphism between free groups and let $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Q} \subseteq F$. Then we have

$$\text{Area}_{\phi(\mathcal{R})}(\phi(\mathcal{Q})) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{Q})$$

Proof. Given $w' \in \phi(\mathcal{Q})$ we write $w' = \phi(w)$ for $w \in \mathcal{Q}$, and we find an identity $w = \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_i R_i u_i$ with $w, u_1, \dots, u_k \in F$ and $R_1, \dots, R_k \in \mathcal{R} \cup \{1\}$ and $k \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{Q})$. We apply the homomorphism ϕ to obtain the identity $\phi(w) = \prod_{i=1}^k \phi(u_i)^{-1} \phi(R_i) \phi(u_i)$ with $\phi(R_i) \in \phi(\mathcal{R})$ and $k \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{Q})$. The conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 2.4. *Let $\phi: F \rightarrow F'$, $\psi: F' \rightarrow F''$ be homomorphisms between free groups and let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq F, \mathcal{R}' \subseteq F', \mathcal{R}'' \subseteq F''$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\psi(\phi(\mathcal{R}))) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}''}(\psi(\mathcal{R}')) \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}'}(\phi(\mathcal{R})).$$

2.3. The free group over a subset of a group. Let G be a group and let $S \subseteq G$ be a subset (not necessarily a generating set). Then we have a natural homomorphism

$$F(S) \rightarrow G$$

that sends each element of the basis S to the corresponding element of G . Such map is surjective if and only if the set S generates the group G . Given two elements $u, w \in F(S)$ we write $u =_G w$ if u and w project to the same element of G . Moreover, for $g \in G$, we denote with $|g|_S$ the minimal length of an element $w \in F(S)$ projecting on g . We set $|g|_S = +\infty$ if g does not belong to the subgroup generated by S . If S is a finite generating set for G , then $|g|_S$ coincides with the distance of g from the origin in the Cayley graph $\text{Cay}_S(G)$.

2.4. Dehn function of a group. Let G be a group with a generating set S and let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq F(S)$ be a set of elements such that $R =_G 1$ for every $R \in \mathcal{R}$. It follows immediately from the definitions that, for every $w \in F(S)$, if $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) < +\infty$ then $w =_G 1$.

Lemma 2.5. *We have that $\langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is a presentation for the group G if and only if $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) < +\infty$ for every $w \in F(S)$ with $w =_G 1$.*

Proof. We have that $\langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is a presentation if and only if for every $w \in F(S)$ with $w =_G 1$ we can write w as a product of conjugates of elements of \mathcal{R} . This happens if and only if for every $w \in F(S)$ with $w =_G 1$ we have $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) < +\infty$. \square

Remark 2.6. We will employ Lemma 2.5 to find a presentation of $K_r^n(r)$, for $n \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$: in Section 3.1 we consider a *candidate presentation* for the kernel, and use it to compute an upper bound for the area of all words representing the trivial element. This strategy will both compute an upper bound for the Dehn function of $K_r^n(r)$ and imply *a posteriori* that the candidate presentation is indeed a presentation. A more direct algorithm for computing a presentation of $K_r^n(r)$ can be found in [Dis08b, BHMS13].

Given a finite presentation $G = \langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$, where $S \subseteq G$ is a finite set of generators and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq F(S)$ is a finite set, we define the *Dehn function* $\delta_{G,S,\mathcal{R}}: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as

$$\delta_{G,S,\mathcal{R}}(N) = \max\{\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(w) \mid w \in F(S), |w|_S \leq N, w =_G 1\}.$$

Given $f, g: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we write $f \preceq g$, whenever there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $f(N) \leq Cg(CN + C) + CN + C$ for every integer $N > 0$; we write $f \asymp g$ if $f \preceq g$ and $f \succeq g$. This is an equivalence relation on the set of all functions from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{N} .

Two different finite presentations $G = \langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle \cong \langle S' \mid \mathcal{R}' \rangle$ give equivalent Dehn functions $\delta_{G,S,\mathcal{R}} \asymp \delta_{G,S',\mathcal{R}'}$. We define the *Dehn function* δ_G to be the equivalence class of the functions $\delta_{G,S,\mathcal{R}}$ up to the equivalence relation \asymp . With an abuse of notation, we will sometimes denote by $\delta_G: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a function in the equivalence class.

2.5. Area-radius pairs for a group. Let $G = \langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ be a finitely presented group. A pair (α, ρ) of functions $\alpha, \rho: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an **area-radius pair** for the presentation if, for every $w \in F(S)$ such that $w =_G 1$, it is possible to write $w = \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_i R_i u_i$ for some $u_1, \dots, u_k \in F(S)$ and $R_1, \dots, R_k \in \mathcal{R}$ satisfying $k \leq \alpha(|w|)$ and $|u_1|, \dots, |u_k| \leq \rho(|w|)$. This means that we are interested in controlling at the same time the number of relations used to fill w (i.e. the area of w) and the length of the translations u_i needed in order to write the identity $w = \prod_{i=1}^k \bar{u}_i R_i u_i$.

Note that the radius function ρ in an area radius pair (α, ρ) provides an upper bound on the so-called extrinsic diameter of null-homotopic words. There is also the notion of an intrinsic filling diameter, which in general is different. We refer to [BR09] for further details, including definitions and examples showing that they are different.

Suppose we are given two different presentations $G = \langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle \cong \langle S' \mid \mathcal{R}' \rangle$ for the same group: if (α, ρ) is an area-radius pair for G with respect to the presentation $\langle S \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$, then there is an area-radius pair (α', ρ') for G with respect to the presentation $\langle S' \mid \mathcal{R}' \rangle$ satisfying $\alpha' \asymp \alpha$ and $\rho' \asymp \rho$. If (α, ρ) is an area radius pair for G (with respect to some presentation), then we have $\alpha \succeq \delta_G$.

Proposition 2.7 (Papasoglu [Pap96]). *Let G be a finitely presented group and suppose that $\delta_G(N) \asymp N^2$. Then there is an area-radius pair (α_G, ρ_G) for G with $\alpha_G(N) \asymp N^2$ and $\rho_G(N) \asymp N$.*

Proof. This is proved in [Pap96] on page 799. □

2.6. Push-down map. In this section we generalize the *push-down* argument for fillings in kernels. Arguments of this kind were used by Gersten and Short [GS02] to prove that finitely presented kernels of homomorphisms from hyperbolic groups onto free groups have polynomially bounded Dehn function. They have subsequently been generalised and used in different contexts, including to bound Dehn functions of Bestvina–Brady groups [Dis08a, ABD⁺13] and of subgroups of direct products of free groups [Dis08b]. Here we will generalise these techniques to arbitrary quotient groups Q . In Section 3 we will employ our results to estimate the Dehn functions of the groups $K_r^n(r)$, defined as kernels of homomorphisms onto $Q = \mathbb{Z}^r$.




FIGURE 1. The push down map sends the boundary of every relation of G to a word representing the trivial element of K ; controlling its area in K yields an upper bound for δ_K .

Consider the following short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{\iota} G \xrightarrow{\psi} Q \rightarrow 1,$$

where $G = \langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{C} \rangle$ is finitely presented, and $K = \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ is finitely generated. We also fix a lift $\tilde{\iota}: F(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{A})$ that makes the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F(\mathcal{X}) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\iota}} & F(\mathcal{A}) & & & & \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \searrow \tilde{\psi} & & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{\iota} & G & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Q \longrightarrow 1, \end{array}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}: F(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow Q$ is defined by composition.

The general strategy is the following: given $w \in F(\mathcal{X})$ representing the trivial element of K , we can consider its image $\tilde{w} = \tilde{\iota}(w)$ as a word in the generators \mathcal{A} that represents the trivial element of G . We can therefore find a disk in the Cayley complex of G that bounds \tilde{w} , and whose area is controlled by δ_G . Then, we push this filling inside the Cayley complex of K via some *push-down map*, to obtain a filling for the original word w . This filling is tessellated via the images of the relations R appearing in the filling in G ; if we can bound the area of these tiles, we get an upper bound for δ_K (see Fig. 1).

Definition 2.8. A *push-down map* is a map (not necessarily a group homomorphism)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}: Q \times F(\mathcal{A}) &\longrightarrow F(\mathcal{X}) \\ (\mathbf{q}, w) &\longmapsto \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w) \end{aligned}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(1) For every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $w, w' \in F(\mathcal{A})$ we have

$$\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w \cdot w') = \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w) \cdot \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(w)}(w').$$

(2) For every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{\iota}(x)) =_K x$.

Lemma 2.9. A *push-down map* satisfies $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(1) = 1$ and

$$\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(\bar{w}) = \left(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(\bar{w})}(w) \right)^{-1}$$

for every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. The first statement follows by using the first property with $w = w' = 1$. The second statement follows again by applying the first property to $\bar{w} \cdot w$. \square

Lemma 2.10. For every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$, choose $u_{\mathbf{q}} \in F(\mathcal{A})$ with $\tilde{\psi}(u_{\mathbf{q}}) = \mathbf{q}$; set $u_{\mathbf{1}_Q} = 1$. For every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, choose an element $z_{\mathbf{q},a} \in F(\mathcal{X})$ such that $\tilde{\iota}(z_{\mathbf{q},a}) =_G u_{\mathbf{q}} \cdot a \cdot \bar{u}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(a)}$. Then there is a unique *push-down map* $\text{push}: Q \times F(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X})$ satisfying $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a) = z_{\mathbf{q},a}$.

Proof. Given a word w' of length $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ in the letters $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$, we denote by $w'[i]$ the i -th letter of w' and by $w'[1 : i]$ the word given by the initial segment of the first i letters of w' , for $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.

For every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we set $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a) = z_{\mathbf{q},a}$ and $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(\bar{a}) = \bar{z}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(\bar{a}),a}$. For $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$, we choose a word w' in the letters $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ representing w , and we set

$$\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(w'[1:i-1])}(w'[i]),$$

Notice that for every $\mathbf{q} \in Q$ and $a \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ we have $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a) \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(a)}(\bar{a}) = 1$; it follows that a different choice of a word w' representing the element $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ gives the same value of $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w)$, and thus the map push is well-defined.

By direct check we have that $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w \cdot w') = \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w) \cdot \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(w)}(w')$. By induction on the length of the word representing $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$, we have that $\tilde{\iota}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w)) =_G u_{\mathbf{q}} \cdot w \cdot \bar{u}_{\mathbf{q} \cdot \tilde{\psi}(w)}$. In particular, for $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we obtain $\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{\iota}(x)) =_K x$. The conclusion follows. \square

Theorem 2.11. Suppose that we are given a short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K \rightarrow G \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 1$$

with $G = \langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{C} \rangle$ finitely presented and $K = \langle \mathcal{X} \rangle$ finitely generated. Let (α_G, ρ_G) be an area-radius pair for G . Let $\mathcal{R} \subset F(\mathcal{X})$ be a finite set of elements representing the trivial element of K . Let push be a push-down map for the sequence. Suppose that $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(x)) \cdot \bar{x}) < +\infty$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. Suppose that

$$\max_{C \in \mathcal{C}, |\mathbf{q}|_{\tilde{\psi}(\mathcal{A})} \leq N} \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(C)) \leq f(N)$$

for some function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Then K is finitely presented by $\langle \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ and its Dehn function satisfies

$$\delta_K(N) \preceq \alpha_G(N) \cdot f(\rho_G(N)).$$

Proof. Suppose that we are given $w \in F(\mathcal{X})$ representing the trivial element in K , and let $w = x_1 \dots x_N$ be the reduced word representing w , with $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$. Using the first property of Definition 2.8 we have that

$$\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(w)) = \prod_{i=1}^N \text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(x_i)).$$

In particular, if we set

$$A = \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(x)) \cdot \bar{x}),$$

then, by using at most $A|w| = AN$ relations in \mathcal{R} , we obtain $\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(w))$ from w . On the other hand, $\tilde{l}(w)$ is an element of $F(\mathcal{A})$ that represents the trivial element of G , so we can write

$$\tilde{l}(w) = \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_G(N)} u_i C_i \bar{u}_i,$$

with $u_i \in F(\mathcal{A})$, $|u_i| \leq \rho_G(\|\tilde{l}\| \cdot N)$, $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$, and thus also

$$\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(\tilde{l}(w)) = \prod_{i=1}^{\alpha_G(N)} \text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(u_i C_i \bar{u}_i).$$

By Lemma 2.9, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(u_i C_i \bar{u}_i) &= \text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(u_i) \cdot \text{push}_{\tilde{\psi}(u_i)}(C_i) \cdot \text{push}_{\tilde{\psi}(u_i)}(\bar{u}_i) \\ &= \text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(u_i) \cdot \text{push}_{\tilde{\psi}(u_i)}(C_i) \cdot \left(\text{push}_{\mathbf{1}_Q}(u_i)\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\left| \tilde{\psi}(u_i) \right|_{\tilde{\psi}(\mathcal{A})} \leq |u_i| \leq \rho_G(\|\tilde{l}\| \cdot N),$$

so, by hypothesis, we can fill $\text{push}_{\tilde{\psi}(u_i)}(C_i)$ with at most $f(\rho_G(\|\tilde{l}\| \cdot N))$ relations of \mathcal{R} .

Putting everything together, we obtain that we can fill w with at most $\alpha_G(N) \cdot f(\rho_G(\|\tilde{l}\| \cdot N)) + AN$ relations in \mathcal{R} . This proves that $\langle \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is a presentation for K by Lemma 2.5, and that $\delta_K(N) \preceq \alpha_G(N) \cdot f(\rho_G(N))$. \square

3. KERNELS IN PRODUCTS OF FREE GROUPS

Let $F_r^{(1)}, \dots, F_r^{(n)}$ denote $n \geq 3$ copies of the free group of rank $r \geq 2$. Given a homomorphism

$$\psi: F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$$

such that the restriction to each factor is surjective, we are going to prove that the Dehn function of the kernel

$$K_r^n(r) = \ker(\psi)$$

is bounded above by N^9 for $n = 3$, by N^5 for $n = 4$, and by N^4 for $n \geq 5$.

In this section we describe in detail the strategy of the proof, which is the same for all $n \geq 3$ and consists of defining a push-down map for the sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K_r^n(r) \rightarrow F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow 1$$

as in Section 2.6, and then proving that the area of the push-down of the relations of $F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}$ is bounded above by a polynomial; in this way we will be able to conclude via Theorem 2.11. To increase readability, we postpone some technical computations that depend on the number n of factors to Appendix A (for $n = 3$), Appendix B (for $n \geq 5$) and Appendix C (for $n = 4$); they are not important for understanding the main ideas of our proof and we recommend that the reader first reads this section, before looking at the appendices.

The strategy of the proof can be divided into the following steps:

- (1) **Candidate presentation:** we find a set \mathcal{X}_r^n of generators for the group $K_r^n(r)$, and we describe a family of relations \mathcal{R}_r^n . We claim that $\langle \mathcal{X}_r^n \mid \mathcal{R}_r^n \rangle$ gives a presentation for $K_r^n(r)$.
- (2) **Push-down map:** we define a push-down map for the exact sequence above as described in Section 2.6.
- (3) **Doubling maps:** a *doubling map* is a homomorphism of free groups that replaces each generator with a product of at most two generators (and which satisfies a certain symmetry condition, see Definition 3.2 below). We prove that \mathcal{R}_r^n is stable under doubling: if we apply a doubling map to a relation in \mathcal{R}_r^n , we obtain an element that still belongs to the normal subgroup generated by \mathcal{R}_r^n .
- (4) **Power maps:** for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a *N-power map* is a homomorphism that replaces each generator x with a power x^{N_x} for some $|N_x| \leq N$ (and which satisfies a certain symmetry condition, see Definition 3.2 below). We prove that the area of *N-power words*, obtained by applying a *N-power map* to relations in \mathcal{R}_r^n , is asymptotically bounded above by N^{d_n} (where $d_n = 7, 3, 2$ for $n = 3, n = 4, n \geq 5$ respectively).
- (5) **Thick relations:** applying to a relation in \mathcal{R}_r^n a sequence of doubling maps, followed by a single power map, we obtain what we call a *thick relation*. By employing Corollary 2.4 (which tells us how to estimate the area of the

composition of maps), we show that the area of these thick relations is also asymptotically bounded by N^{d_n} .

- (6) **Upper bound for the norm of the push-down map:** we prove that the push of the relations of $F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ may be filled in by a uniformly bounded number of thick relations, so the area of the push-down map is asymptotically bounded by N^{d_n} .
- (7) **Conclusion:** by employing Theorem 2.11, we prove that $\langle \mathcal{X}_r^n \mid \mathcal{R}_r^n \rangle$ is a finite presentation for $K_r^n(r)$, and that its Dehn function is asymptotically bounded by N^{d_n+2} .

3.1. Candidate presentation. Let $n \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$ be two integers. For $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we consider a nonabelian free group of rank r

$$F_r^{(\alpha)} = \langle a_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, a_r^{(\alpha)} \rangle;$$

we denote by $\mathcal{A}_r^{(\alpha)}$ the ordered tuple of generators

$$\mathcal{A}_r^{(\alpha)} = (a_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, a_r^{(\alpha)}).$$

Then we define

$$\mathcal{A}_r^n = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^n \mathcal{A}_r^{(\alpha)},$$

where, in the expression, we forget about the ordering.

We define

$$K_r^n(r) = \ker(\psi: F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r),$$

where ψ is the surjective morphism sending $a_j^{(\alpha)}$ to the j -th basis vector e_j . Note that a different choice of a map that is surjective on each factor produces a kernel isomorphic to $K_r^n(r)$ (see for example [Dis08b]).

Denote by

$$\text{pr}_r^{(\alpha)}: F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow F_r^{(\alpha)}$$

the projection onto the α -th factor. With a little abuse of notation, we also denote by $\text{pr}_r^{(\alpha)}$ the restriction $\text{pr}_r^{(\alpha)}: K_r^n(r) \rightarrow F_r^{(\alpha)}$ to the kernel. Moreover, in the following we often regard $F_r^{(\alpha)}$ as a subgroup of $F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ (with respect to the natural inclusion).

3.1.1. A generating set for $K_r^n(r)$. For $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we set

$$x_i^{(\alpha)} = a_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{a}_i^{(n)} \in K_r^n(r),$$

and we denote by $\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)}$ the ordered tuple

$$\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)} = (x_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, x_r^{(\alpha)}).$$

As stated in the next lemma, the elements in

$$\mathcal{X}_r^n = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)}$$

generate the group $K_r^n(r)$, where we forget about the ordering in $\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)}$ in this expression.

Lemma 3.1. *The set \mathcal{X}_r^n generates $K_r^n(r)$.*

Proof. Let us fix a lift

$$\tilde{\iota}: F(\mathcal{X}_r^n) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{A}_r^n)$$

of the canonical inclusion $\iota: K_r^n(r) \rightarrow F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ sending $x_i^{(\alpha)}$ to $a_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{a}_i^{(n)}$, and denote by

$$\mathbf{1}_r = (1, \dots, 1)$$

the ordered tuple containing r copies of the trivial element.

Fix an element $g \in K_r^n(r) \subset F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ and let $w = w(\mathcal{A}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_r^{(n)})$ be a word representing g . Set $w' = w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}, \mathbf{1}_r)$ and

$$v = v(\mathcal{A}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}) := w(\mathcal{A}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}) \cdot \tilde{\iota}\left(w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}, \mathbf{1}_r)^{-1}\right)$$

We have that v represents an element of $F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ whose projection to the first $(n-1)$ factors is trivial, and which belongs to the subgroup $K_r^n(r)$. It follows that v represents an element belonging to the commutator subgroup $[F_r^{(n)}, F_r^{(n)}]$. Therefore we can write

$$v =_{K_r^n(r)} \prod_{i=1}^m \bar{z}_i(\mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}) [a_{s_i}^{(n)}, a_{t_i}^{(n)}] z_i(\mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}),$$

where $1 \leq s_i, t_i \leq n$ and $z_i(\mathcal{A}_r^{(n)})$ are words in $F_r^{(n)}$.

The word

$$v' = \prod_{i=1}^m \bar{z}_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_r^{(1)}) [\bar{x}_{s_i}^{(1)}, \bar{x}_{t_i}^{(2)}] z_i(\bar{\mathcal{X}}_r^{(1)}),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_r^{(1)}$ denotes the tuple $(\bar{x}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(1)})$, represents the same element as v (as can be easily checked by projecting on each factor $F_r^{(\alpha)}$), and thus w represents the same elements as $v' \cdot w'$, that is a word written in the alphabet \mathcal{X}_r^n . This concludes the proof. \square

3.1.2. *Candidate relations.* Consider the following sets of relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i, y_i] \left| \begin{array}{l} x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_i = x_i^{(\beta)} \\ i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i, y_j \bar{z}_j] \left| \begin{array}{l} x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_i = x_i^{(\beta)}, z_i = x_i^{(\gamma)} \\ i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \text{ pairwise distinct} \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,3}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta] [x_j^\delta, y_i^\varepsilon] \left| \begin{array}{l} x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_i = x_i^{(\beta)} \\ i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\} \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,4}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i, [y_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]] \left| \begin{array}{l} x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_i = x_i^{(\beta)} \\ i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ pairwise distinct}, \\ \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\} \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,5}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [y_j^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau] \left| \begin{array}{l} x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_i = x_i^{(\beta)} \\ i, j, k, h \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ pairwise distinct}, \\ \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, \\ \varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\} \end{array} \right. \right\} \end{aligned}$$

For every $r \geq 2, n \geq 3$, all the words inside these sets represent the trivial element of $K_r^n(r)$. Note that for small values of n and r , some of these sets may be empty, due to the requirement that indices should be distinct (if $n = 3$ then $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n$ is empty, if $r = 2$ then $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,5}^n$ are empty, if $r = 3$ then $\mathcal{R}_{r,5}^n$ is empty). Moreover, some of these sets become redundant when n is big enough: when $n = 4$ the relations in $\mathcal{R}_{r,3}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,5}^n$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,4}^n$, and when $n \geq 5$ the relations in $\mathcal{R}_{r,3}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,4}^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,5}^n$ can be obtained from the relations in $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n$ and $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n$ (this will become clear later).

We sum up the relations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_r^3 &= \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^3 \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,3}^3 \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,4}^3 \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,5}^3 \\ \mathcal{R}_r^4 &= \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^4 \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^4 \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,4}^4 \\ \mathcal{R}_r^n &= \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n \end{aligned} \quad \text{for } n \geq 5.$$

We will prove that the group $K_r^n(r)$ is presented by

$$\langle \mathcal{X}_r^n \mid \mathcal{R}_r^n \rangle$$

for every integer $n \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$.

Notation 1. From now on until the end of the section we fix $n \geq 3$. This allows us to drop the superscript n , so that the symbols $\mathcal{A}_r, \mathcal{R}_r, \mathcal{R}_{r,i}$ will denote respectively $\mathcal{A}_r^n, \mathcal{R}_r^n, \mathcal{R}_{r,i}^n$, for any integer $r \geq 2$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$.

3.2. The push-down map. We define a *push-down map* for the sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow K_r^n(r) \longrightarrow F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r \longrightarrow 1$$

as described in Section 2.6, using the construction described by Lemma 2.10.

We start by defining

$$u_{\mathbf{q}} = \left(a_1^{(n)}\right)^{q_1} \dots \left(a_r^{(n)}\right)^{q_r} \in F(\mathcal{A}_r)$$

for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$.

For every $a = a_j^{(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{A}_r$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, we now define $z_{\mathbf{q},a} := \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a) \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ such that $\tilde{l}(z_{\mathbf{q},a})$ represents the element $u_{\mathbf{q}} a \bar{u}_{\mathbf{q},\tilde{\psi}(a)}$ by setting

$$z_{\mathbf{q},a} = \left(\bar{x}_1^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right)^{q_1} \dots \left(\bar{x}_{j-1}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right)^{q_{j-1}} \cdot x_j^{(\alpha)} \cdot \left(x_{j-1}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right)^{q_{j-1}} \dots \left(x_1^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right)^{q_1}$$

if $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, where $\sigma: \{1, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is a fixed fixed-point-free auxiliary map, and

$$z_{\mathbf{q},a} = \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)}\right)^{q_1} \dots \left(\bar{x}_r^{(2)}\right)^{q_r} \cdot \bar{x}_j^{(1)} \cdot \left(x_r^{(2)}\right)^{q_r} \dots \left(x_j^{(2)}\right)^{q_j} \cdot x_j^{(1)} \cdot \left(x_{j-1}^{(2)}\right)^{q_{j-1}} \dots \left(x_1^{(2)}\right)^{q_1}$$

if $\alpha = n$. Indeed, if $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, the $a_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$ commute with all the letters appearing in the expression $u_{\mathbf{q}} a \bar{u}_{\mathbf{q},\tilde{\psi}(a)}$ (since $\sigma(\alpha) \neq \alpha$) and we can employ the alphabet $\mathcal{A}_r^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$ to rewrite $u_{\mathbf{q}} a \bar{u}_{\mathbf{q},\tilde{\psi}(a)}$ as the above word in the letters $x_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))} = a_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{a}_i^{(n)}$, and a similar argument applies if $\alpha = n$.

By Lemma 2.10 there is a unique extension of such map to a push-down map $\text{push}: \mathbb{Z}^r \times F(\mathcal{A}_r) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{X}_r)$. This extension be computed, from the above definitions, using the property that $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w \cdot w') = \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(w) \cdot \text{push}_{\mathbf{q},\tilde{\psi}(w)}(w')$.

3.3. Doubling maps. We consider homomorphisms between the free groups $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ satisfying a certain symmetry condition (see Definition 3.2 below), related to the symmetry of our (candidate) presentation for $K_r^n(r)$. By applying these symmetric homomorphisms to the relations in \mathcal{R}_r we can get large families of elements of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$, which still belong to the normal subgroup generated by \mathcal{R}_r . In order to prove this, we first deal with homomorphisms of norm 1 (Proposition 3.3 below), then with homomorphisms of norm 2 (Proposition 3.6 below), and finally we provide a statement for generic homomorphisms (Proposition 3.7 below).

Recall that $F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ denotes the free group with basis ξ_1, \dots, ξ_k .

Definition 3.2. Let $r, r' \geq 1$ be two integers. Given a homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$, define the homomorphism

$$\hat{\phi}: F\left(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}\right) \rightarrow F\left(\mathcal{X}_{r'}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathcal{X}_{r'}^{(n-1)}\right)$$

as follows: for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, if $\phi(\xi_i) = w_i(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$, then we set

$$\widehat{\phi}\left(x_i^{(\alpha)}\right) = w_i\left(x_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, x_{r'}^{(\alpha)}\right).$$

Let us recall from Definition 2.1 that the norm $\|\phi\|$ of a homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ is the maximum of the lengths of the elements $\phi(\xi_1), \dots, \phi(\xi_r)$ as reduced words in $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'}$ (and their inverses). Notice that $\|\widehat{\phi}\| = \|\phi\|$.

Proposition 3.3. *There exists a constant $A_1 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all integers $r, r' \geq 1$ and every homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 1$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}\left(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r)\right) \leq A_1.$$

Proof. Follows from Propositions A.4, B.1 and C.3. \square

Proposition 3.4. *There exists a constant $A_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: for every integer $r \geq 1$, let $\rho_r: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+1})$ be the homomorphism given by $\rho_r(\xi_1) = \xi_1 \xi_2$ and $\rho_r(\xi_i) = \xi_{i+1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r+1}}(\widehat{\rho}(\mathcal{R}_r)) \leq A_2.$$

Proof. Follows from Propositions A.5, B.3 and C.4. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Consider the homomorphism $\theta: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_4) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_8)$ given by $\theta(\xi_i) = \xi_{2i-1} \xi_{2i}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_8}\left(\widehat{\theta}(\mathcal{R}_4)\right) \leq A_3$$

for some constant A_3 .

Proof. We can easily write

$$\theta = \mu_4 \circ \rho_7 \circ \mu_3 \circ \rho_6 \circ \mu_2 \circ \rho_5 \circ \mu_1 \circ \rho_4$$

where ρ_4, \dots, ρ_7 are the homomorphisms defined in Proposition 3.4 and μ_1, \dots, μ_4 are homomorphisms of norm 1. We use Corollary 2.4 and Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 to estimate

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_8}\left(\widehat{\theta}(\mathcal{R}_4)\right) = \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_8}(\widehat{\mu}_4 \widehat{\rho}_7 \widehat{\mu}_3 \widehat{\rho}_6 \widehat{\mu}_2 \widehat{\rho}_5 \widehat{\mu}_1 \widehat{\rho}_4(\mathcal{R}_4)) \leq A_3$$

for some constant A_3 . \square

Proposition 3.6 (Doubling). *Let $r, r' \geq 1$ be integers and let $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ be a homomorphism with $\|\phi\| \leq 2$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r)) \leq A$$

for some constant A independent of r, r', ϕ .

Proof. Let us first prove the result for the homomorphism

$$\psi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2r})$$

given by $\psi(\xi_i) = \xi_{2i-1}\xi_{2i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r$ and let $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r$ be the subscripts involved in the relation R , where $1 \leq k \leq 4$. Consider the morphism

$$\mu: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_4)$$

given by $\mu(\xi_{i_j}) = \xi_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $\mu(\xi_i) = 1$ for $i \neq i_1, \dots, i_k$; observe that $\|\mu\| \leq 1$. Consider the morphism

$$\lambda: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_8) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2r})$$

given by $\lambda(\xi_{2j-1}) = \xi_{2i_j-1}$ and $\lambda(\xi_{2j}) = \xi_{2i_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and $\lambda(\xi_i) = 1$ otherwise; observe that $\|\lambda\| \leq 1$. By definition, we have that

$$\widehat{\psi}(R) = \widehat{\lambda}\left(\widehat{\theta}(\widehat{\mu}(R))\right)$$

where $\theta: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_4) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_8)$ is the homomorphism of Lemma 3.5. Therefore, by Corollary 2.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{2r}}\left(\widehat{\psi}(R)\right) &\leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{2r}}\left(\widehat{\lambda}(\mathcal{R}_8)\right) \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_8}\left(\widehat{\theta}(\mathcal{R}_4)\right) \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_4}(\widehat{\mu}(\mathcal{R}_r)) \\ &\leq (A_1)^2 A_3 \end{aligned}$$

where A_1, A_3 are the constants given by Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.5 respectively. It follows that

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{2r}}\left(\widehat{\psi}(\mathcal{R}_r)\right) \leq (A_1)^2 A_3.$$

For the general case, it is enough to observe that we can decompose any homomorphism $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 2$ as a composition $\phi = \eta \circ \psi$ where $\psi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2r})$ is the homomorphism defined above and $\eta: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{2r}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ is a homomorphism with $\|\eta\| \leq 1$. Thus, by Corollary 2.4 we have

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}\left(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r)\right) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}(\widehat{\eta}(\mathcal{R}_{2r})) \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{2r}}\left(\widehat{\psi}(\mathcal{R}_r)\right) \leq (A_1)^3 A_3$$

(using Proposition 3.3 once again) and the conclusion follows. \square

As a consequence, we get an estimate of the area of a word obtained by applying any homomorphism ϕ to a relation in \mathcal{R}_r in terms of the norm $\|\phi\|$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $r, r' \geq 1$ be integers and consider a homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}\left(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r)\right) \leq B\|\phi\|^B,$$

for some constant B independent of r, r', ϕ .

Proof. Any homomorphism $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ can be decomposed as a composition of at most $\lceil \log_2(\|\phi\|) \rceil$ homomorphisms of norm 2 and a single homomorphism of norm 1 (thus of norm ≤ 2). We can then estimate $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r))$ by using Corollary 2.4 and Proposition 3.6:

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r)) \leq A^{\lceil \log_2(\|\phi\|) \rceil} \cdot A \leq A^2 A^{\log_2(\|\phi\|)} = A^2 \|\phi\|^{\log_2(A)}$$

where A is the constant of Proposition 3.6. The conclusion follows by setting $B = \max\{A^2, \log_2 A\}$. \square

3.4. Power maps. A N -power map is an endomorphism $\widehat{\phi}$ of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$, obtained as in Definition 3.2 from a morphism ϕ of $F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$, and sending each generator $x_i^{(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{X}_r$ to a power $(x_i^{(\alpha)})^{N_i}$, for some integer N_i with $|N_i| \leq N$. By applying a N -power map to a relation in \mathcal{R}_r we obtain another element of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$, which belongs to the normal subgroup generated by \mathcal{R}_r . By Proposition 3.7 we can immediately obtain a bound, polynomial in N , on the area of this new element. However, the resulting exponent is quite big, and thus we prefer to provide an independent and stronger bound here.

Proposition 3.8. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that the following happens: let $r \geq 2$ and N_1, \dots, N_r be integers, and consider the homomorphism*

$$\omega = \omega_{N_1, \dots, N_r}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

given by $\omega(\xi_i) = \xi_i^{N_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then,

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r}(\widehat{\omega}(\mathcal{R}_r)) \leq C(\max\{|N_1|, \dots, |N_r|\})^{d_n},$$

where $d_3 = 7$, $d_4 = 3$ and $d_n = 2$ for $n \geq 5$.

Proof. Follows from Propositions A.11, B.6 and C.5. \square

3.5. Thick relations. A *thick relation* is an element of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ obtained by applying a certain (symmetric) homomorphism to a relation in \mathcal{R}_r . Once again, thick relations are words belonging to the normal subgroup in $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ generated by \mathcal{R}_r . The reason why we are interested in these relations is that we can use them to estimate the area of the push of the relations of $F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}$ (see Proposition 3.12).

Definition 3.9. For $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_r)$, $\mathbf{q}' = (q'_1, \dots, q'_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, define the homomorphism

$$\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

given by $\xi_i \mapsto \xi_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\xi_{r+1} \mapsto \xi_1^{q_1} \dots \xi_r^{q_r}$ and $\xi_{r+2} \mapsto \xi_1^{q'_1} \dots \xi_r^{q'_r}$.

For $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ we denote by $|\mathbf{q}| = \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_r|\}$.

Definition 3.10 (Thick relations). For $m > 0$, we define

$$\mathcal{R}_r(m) := \bigcup_{\|\phi\| \leq 1} \bigcup_{|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{q}'| \leq m+1} \widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_{r+2}))$$

where we consider homomorphisms $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2})$ and tuples $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}^r$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let $n \geq 3$, $r \geq 2$, $m \geq 1$ be integers. Then, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r}(\mathcal{R}_r(m)) \leq D_r m^{d_n}$$

for some constant D_r depending on r (but independent of n, m) and for $d_3 = 7$, $d_4 = 3$ and $d_n = 2$ for $n \geq 5$.

Proof. We fix a morphism $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 1$, two tuples $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_r), \mathbf{q}' = (q'_1, \dots, q'_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and consider the homomorphism $\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ as in Definition 3.9. Let

$$\alpha: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{3r})$$

defined by $\alpha(\xi_i) = \xi_i$, for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $\alpha(\xi_{r+1}) = \xi_{r+1} \cdots \xi_{2r}$, and $\alpha(\xi_{r+2}) = \xi_{2r+1} \cdots \xi_{3r}$. Consider

$$\omega = \omega_{1, \dots, 1, q_1, \dots, q_r, q'_1, \dots, q'_r}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{3r}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{3r})$$

as in Proposition 3.8, that is, $\omega(\xi_i) = \xi_i$, $\omega(\xi_{r+i}) = \xi_{r+i}^{q_i}$ and $\omega(\xi_{2r+i}) = \xi_{2r+i}^{q'_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and

$$\beta: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{3r}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

given by $\beta(\xi_i) = \beta(\xi_{r+i}) = \beta(\xi_{2r+i}) = \xi_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

By direct check we have $\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'} \circ \phi = \beta \circ \omega \circ \alpha \circ \phi$, so by Corollary 2.4 we obtain, for every $R \in \mathcal{R}_r$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r}(\mathcal{R}_r(m)) &\leq A_1 \cdot C(\max\{1, |q_1|, \dots, |q_r|, |q'_1|, \dots, |q'_r|\})^{d_n} \cdot B \|\alpha\|^B \cdot A_1 \\ &\leq A_1^2 B C r^B (m+1)^{d_n} \end{aligned}$$

where A_1, B, C are the constants of Propositions 3.3, 3.7 and 3.8. The conclusion follows. \square

We are able to fill pushes of relations of $F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)}$ by using a uniformly bounded number of thick relations.

Proposition 3.12. *There is a constant E (independent of r) such that, for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq r$, we have the following:*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r(m)}\left(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)}\right]\right)\right) \leq E.$$

Proof. The assertion follows from Propositions A.17, B.9 and C.7. \square

3.6. Conclusion. We are finally able to give an upper bound to the Dehn function of $K_r^n(r)$. Note that it only depends on the constant d_n defined in Proposition 3.8.

Theorem 3.13. *The group $K_r^n(r)$ is presented by $\langle \mathcal{X}_r \mid \mathcal{R}_r \rangle$ and*

$$\delta_{K_r^n(r)}(N) \preceq N^{d_n+2}$$

where $d_3 = 7$, $d_4 = 3$ and $d_n = 2$ for $n \geq 5$.

Proof. Recall that for

$$\mathcal{C}_r = \left\{ \left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)} \right] \mid i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$$

$F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}$ is finitely presented by $\langle \mathcal{A}_r \mid \mathcal{C}_r \rangle$. By Corollary 2.4 we have, for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, that

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{C}_r)) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r}(\mathcal{R}_r(m)) \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{C}_r)) \leq E \cdot D_r m^{d_n},$$

where E, D_r, d_n are the constants given in Propositions 3.11 and 3.12.

But $\delta_{F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}}(N) \asymp N^2$, and thus by Proposition 2.7 we have that there is an area-radius pair (α, ρ) for $F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}$ with $\alpha(N) \asymp N^2$ and $\rho \asymp N$. The conclusion follows by Theorem 2.11. \square

Remark 3.14. For $K_2^3(2)$, resp. $K_3^3(3)$, Dison proved stronger upper bounds of N^6 , resp. N^8 , see [Dis08b, Theorem 13.3(2)]. For $K_2^3(2)$ we will prove that in fact the Dehn function is quartic (see Theorem B). Moreover, a careful analysis of our proof of Theorem 3.13 for the special case of $K_3^3(3)$ allows us to recover Dison's bound for this example, using the fact that one family of relations appearing in the proof of Theorem 3.13 is empty for $r = 3$.

4. GENERALISATIONS TO OTHER SPFS AND RESIDUALLY FREE GROUPS

In this section we will first explain how to generalise the upper bounds on the Dehn functions of the $K_r^n(r)$ from Section 3 to a larger class of SPFS by deducing inequalities between the Dehn functions of groups in this class. This will allow us to prove Theorems A and D. We will then explain how, more generally, Bridson's Conjecture 1.2 about residually free groups can be reduced to Bridson's Conjecture 1.1 about SPFS, proving Theorem C and highlighting the importance of understanding Dehn functions of SPFS.

4.1. Free groups of different ranks. Given two fixed positive integers $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$, we now consider the product of n free groups F_{m_1}, \dots, F_{m_n} , with possibly different ranks $m_i \geq r$. As before, let $\psi: F_{m_1} \times \dots \times F_{m_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ be a morphism which is surjective on each factor. Denote its kernel by

$$K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r) = \ker(\psi: F_{m_1} \times \dots \times F_{m_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r).$$

We are going to prove that the group $K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)$ has the same Dehn function as the group $K_r^n(r)$, for every positive integers $n \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$ and for any choice of m_1, \dots, m_n , with $m_i \geq r$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. In order to do that, we are going to prove two preliminary lemmas. The first one allows some comparisons when the ranks increase, and the second one gives a comparison bound when the ranks decrease.

Lemma 4.1. *There are infinitely many positive integers $m > r$ such that the Dehn function of the group $K_m^n(r)$ satisfies*

$$\delta_{K_m^n(r)}(N) \asymp \delta_{K_r^n(r)}(N).$$

Proof. Let H be an index k subgroup of F_r , then it is a well-known fact that H is isomorphic to a free group of rank $m = m_{k,r} = k(r-1) + 1$. The subgroup $H \times \cdots \times H < F_r \times \cdots \times F_r$ has finite index k^n . Let ψ' be the restriction of the morphism ψ to the subgroup $H \times \cdots \times H$, and denote by $K = \ker \psi'$ and $S = \text{im } \psi' < \mathbb{Z}^r$ the kernel and the image of ψ' .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} K & \hookrightarrow & H \times \cdots \times H & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & S \\ \downarrow \text{---} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K_r^n(r) & \hookrightarrow & F_r \times \cdots \times F_r & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathbb{Z}^r \end{array}$$

By standard diagram chasing, one can check that the kernel K is included in the kernel $K_r^n(r)$; in particular, $K = K_r^n(r) \cap (H \times \cdots \times H)$ has finite index in $K_r^n(r)$. Moreover, S is a finite index subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^r , and it is therefore isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^r itself. Combining this information with the fact that $H \cong F_m$, we deduce that K is isomorphic to the group $K_m^n(r)$.

In conclusion, we have found a finite index subgroup isomorphic to $K_m^n(r)$ inside $K_r^n(r)$, so these two groups share the same Dehn function. Different choices of k yield different values of m , thus the proposition is proved. \square

Recall that a morphism $r: G \rightarrow H$ of groups is called a retraction if there is an injective morphism $\iota: H \rightarrow G$ such that $r \circ \iota = \text{id}_H$. We will require the following well-known fact about Dehn functions and retractions:

Lemma 4.2. *Let $r: G \rightarrow H$ be a retraction of groups. Then*

$$\delta_H(N) \preceq \delta_G(N).$$

Lemma 4.3. *If m_1, \dots, m_n and m'_1, \dots, m'_n are two n -tuples of positive integers satisfying $m'_i \geq m_i \geq r$, then*

$$\delta_{K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)}(N) \preceq \delta_{K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_n}(r)}(N).$$

Proof. Since the morphism $\psi: F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ is surjective on every factor, we can suppose (up to a change of basis on the free groups) that for every $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the i -th generator $a_i^{(\alpha)}$ of F_{m_α} is mapped by ψ onto the i -th generator e_i of \mathbb{Z}^r when $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and onto the trivial element if $i \in \{r+1, \dots, m_\alpha\}$. Similarly, we can suppose that we have chosen a morphism $\psi': F_{m'_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m'_n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ that behaves the same way on the generators $a_j^{(\alpha)}$ of the $F_{m'_\alpha}$.

For every $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we define a retraction $F_{m'_\alpha} \rightarrow F_{m_\alpha}$ of the natural inclusion $F_{m_\alpha} \rightarrow F_{m'_\alpha}$ by mapping $a_i^{(\alpha)}$ to $a_i^{(\alpha)}$ if $i \leq m_\alpha$, and to 1 if $i > m_\alpha$. This induces a retraction $g: F_{m'_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m'_n} \rightarrow F_{m_1} \times \cdots \times F_{m_n}$ that fits into the commutative

diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
1 & \longrightarrow & K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_n}(r) & \hookrightarrow & F_{m'_1} \times \dots \times F_{m'_n} & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & \mathbb{Z}^r & \longrightarrow & 1 \\
& & \downarrow \bar{g} & & \downarrow g & & \uparrow = & & \\
1 & \longrightarrow & K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r) & \hookrightarrow & F_{m_1} \times \dots \times F_{m_n} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathbb{Z}^r & \longrightarrow & 1.
\end{array}$$

The commutativity of the diagram implies that the image of the restriction of the morphism g to the kernel $K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_n}(r)$ is precisely the kernel $K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)$; and therefore g restricts to a retraction $\bar{g}: K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_n}(r) \rightarrow K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)$. Thus, the assertion follows from Lemma 4.2. \square

Theorem 4.4. *The group $K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)$ has the same Dehn function as the group $K_r^n(r)$, for all integers $n \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$, and every n -tuple of integers m_1, \dots, m_n such that $m_i \geq r$ for each i .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, there exists an integer m such that $m \geq m_i$ for every i , and such that the group $K_m^n(r)$ has the same Dehn function as the group $K_r^n(r)$. By applying Lemma 4.3 twice, we get that

$$\delta_{K_r^n(r)}(N) \asymp \delta_{K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)}(N) \asymp \delta_{K_m^n(r)}(N).$$

Since the first and the last term are asymptotically equivalent by the assumption on m , these are all asymptotic equivalences, and the theorem is therefore proved. \square

4.2. Free abelian groups of different ranks. The goal of this section is to prove the following inequality if we change the rank of the free abelian quotient group. It shows that, for fixed n , the Dehn functions of the $K_r^n(r)$ are non-decreasing in r . In particular, in the 3-factor case it will imply that $\delta_{K_r^3(r)}(N) \gtrsim N^4$ for every $r \geq 2$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $n \geq 3$, $r' \geq r \geq 1$, $m_1, \dots, m_n \geq \max\{r, 2\}$ and $m'_1, \dots, m'_n \geq \max\{r', 2\}$ be integers. Then $\delta_{K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_n}(r')}(N) \gtrsim \delta_{K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)}(N)$.*

Proof. By [CF17] if $r = 1$ we have $\delta_{K_{m_1, \dots, m_n}(r)}(N) \asymp N^2$ and the statement is trivially true. Thus, we may assume that $r' \geq r \geq 2$ and, by Theorem 4.4, it then suffices to show that $\delta_{K_{r'}^n(r')}(N) \gtrsim \delta_{K_r^n(r)}(N)$.

This follows from Lemma 4.2 and the observation that the retractions $F_{r'}^{(\alpha)} \rightarrow F_r^{(\alpha)}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^{r'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$) of the natural inclusions $F_r^{(\alpha)} \hookrightarrow F_{r'}^{(\alpha)}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^r \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{r'}$) defined by $a_i^{(\alpha)} \mapsto a_i^{(\alpha)}$ if $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $a_i^{(\alpha)} \mapsto 1$ if $i > r$ (resp. $e_i \mapsto e_i$ if $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $e_i \mapsto 0$ if $i > r$) induce a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
1 & \longrightarrow & K_{r'}^n(r') & \hookrightarrow & F_{r'}^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_{r'}^{(n)} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^{r'} & \longrightarrow & 1 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
1 & \longrightarrow & K_r^n(r) & \hookrightarrow & F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^r & \longrightarrow & 1,
\end{array}$$

where the vertical maps are retractions. \square

4.3. Proof of Theorems A and D. We now have all ingredients to prove Theorems A and D.

For a direct product $G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$ of groups G_1, \dots, G_n and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n$ denote by $p_{i_1, \dots, i_k}: G_1 \times \dots \times G_n \rightarrow G_{i_1} \times \dots \times G_{i_k}$ the projection. We will often identify G_i with its corresponding subgroup in $G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$. For a subgroup $H \leq G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$ we say that

- H is *full* if $H \cap G_i \neq 1$, where we identify G_i with the corresponding subgroup of $G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$;
- H is *subdirect* if $p_i(H) = G_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$;
- H has the *VSP property* (*virtual surjection to pairs*) if $p_{i_1, i_2}(H) \leq G_{i_1} \times G_{i_2}$ has finite index for all $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n$.

Proof of Theorem A. Since a group is of type \mathcal{F}_2 if and only if it is finitely presented, Theorem A is a direct consequence of Theorem D. \square

We are left with proving Theorem D.

Proof of Theorem D. Let $G \leq F_{m_1} \times \dots \times F_{m_n}$ be a finitely presented subgroup of a direct product of free groups of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} . If G is of type \mathcal{F}_n , then [BHMS02, Theorem A] implies that G is virtually a direct product of at most n free groups. We may thus assume that G is not of type \mathcal{F}_n . Then $G \cap F_{m_i} \neq 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$; else the projection away from a factor with trivial intersection would define an embedding of G in a direct product with less factors and we could conclude as above.

After replacing the F_{m_i} by the finitely generated free groups $p_i(G)$ we may thus assume that $G \leq F_{m_1} \times \dots \times F_{m_n}$ is full subdirect. Moreover, we may assume that the F_{m_i} are non-abelian. Indeed, if this is not the case, then it follows from [Geo08, Thm. 7.2.21] and the fact that finitely generated abelian groups are of type \mathcal{F}_∞ that the projection of G to the direct product of the non-abelian factors is a full subdirect product of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} in a direct product of at most $n-1$ free groups and we can again conclude as above.

Finally, we can argue similar as in the proof of [KLI22, Theorem 5.1], by combining [Kuc14, Corollary 3.5] and [LI20, Corollary 5.4], that there is a finite index subgroup of G , which is isomorphic to $K_{m'_1, \dots, m'_r}(r)$ for some $m'_1, \dots, m'_r \geq 2$ and $r \geq 1$.

The assertion now follows from Theorem 3.13 if $r \geq 2$ and from [CF17, Corollary 4.3] if $r = 1$. This completes the proof. \square

4.4. Reduction from residually free groups to SPFs. In this section we generalise an unpublished argument by Tessera and the fourth author, which allows us to prove Theorem C.

Let $H \leq G_1 \times \dots \times G_n =: G$ be a full subdirect product of finitely presented groups $G_1 = \langle \mathcal{X}_1 \mid \mathcal{R}_1 \rangle, \dots, G_n = \langle \mathcal{X}_n \mid \mathcal{R}_n \rangle$, let $\Phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_n): F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \dots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n) \rightarrow G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$ be the canonical quotient homomorphism, and let $\tilde{H} := \Phi^{-1}(H) \leq$

$F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n)$. This is summarized by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H} & \hookrightarrow & F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n) \\ \downarrow \Phi & & \downarrow \Phi \\ H & \hookrightarrow & G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n. \end{array}$$

Clearly, \tilde{H} is full subdirect inside $F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n)$.

Lemma 4.6. *If H satisfies the VSP property, then \tilde{H} satisfies the VSP property.*

Proof. Assume that H satisfies the VSP property and let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq n$, say $i_1 = 1$ and $i_2 = 2$. Let (a_1, a_2) be an element of the finite index subgroup

$$(\phi_1, \phi_2)^{-1}(p_{1,2}(H)) \leq F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times F(\mathcal{X}_2).$$

Then there is an element $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in H$ with $(g_1, g_2) = (\phi_1(a_1), \phi_2(a_2))$. Since Φ is surjective this implies that we can complete a_1 and a_2 to an element (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) of \tilde{H} . Thus, \tilde{H} has the VSP property as a subgroup of $F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n)$. \square

Proposition 4.7. *If H satisfies the VSP property, then \tilde{H} is finitely presented and there is a finite presentation for H and a constant $C \geq 1$ for which H has Dehn function $\leq \delta_{\tilde{H}}(C \cdot \max\{N, (\delta_{G_1}(CN))^2, \dots, (\delta_{G_n}(CN))^2\})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, $\tilde{H} \leq F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ has the VSP property. It follows from [BHMS13, Theorem A] that H and \tilde{H} are finitely presented. Let $\tilde{H} = \langle \mathcal{Y} \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$ be a finite presentation for \tilde{H} . By definition of Φ , $\mathcal{R}_i \subset F(\mathcal{X}_i) \cap \tilde{H}$. Thus, for every $r_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$ there is a word $w_{r_i}(\mathcal{Y})$ that represents the element r_i of $F(\mathcal{X}_i)$.

Denote by $\mathcal{T}_i = \{w_{r_i}(\mathcal{Y}) \mid r_i \in \mathcal{R}_i\}$ and by $\mathcal{T} := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{T}_i$. Since $\tilde{H} \leq F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n)$ is subdirect, the normal subgroup $K_i := \langle \langle \mathcal{T}_i \rangle \rangle_{\tilde{H}}$ of \tilde{H} coincides with the normal subgroup $\langle \langle \mathcal{R}_i \rangle \rangle_{F(\mathcal{X}_i)}$ of $F(\mathcal{X}_i)$. In particular, $\ker(\Phi) = K := K_1 \times \cdots \times K_n = \langle \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle \rangle_{\tilde{H}}$ implying that $H = \langle \mathcal{Y} \mid \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T} \rangle$.

Let now $w(\mathcal{Y})$ be a word of length $\leq N$ that is null-homotopic in H . Then there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ (that only depends on our chosen presentation for \tilde{H}) and words $v_i(\mathcal{X}_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, of length $\leq C_1 \cdot N$ such that $v_i(\mathcal{X}_i) =_{F(\mathcal{X}_i)} p_i(w(\mathcal{Y}))$. Since $\phi_i(v_i) =_{G_i} 1$ we can freely write $v_i(\mathcal{X}_i)$ as a product $v_i(\mathcal{X}_i) = \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \bar{u}_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i) \cdot r_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i) \cdot u_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i)$ of at most $\delta_{G_i}(C_1 N)$ relations. A standard argument shows that, moreover, there is a constant $C_2 > 0$ that only depends on our chosen presentations for the G_i such that we may assume that the $u_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i)$ are words of length at most $C_2 \delta_{G_i}(C_1 N)$.

Using again the subdirectness of \tilde{H} and the definition of \mathcal{T}_i , we observe that there is a constant $C_3 > 0$ that only depends on our chosen presentations for \tilde{H} and the G_i such that for all i, j there is a word $\nu_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y})$ of length at most $C_3 |u_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i)|$ such that $\bar{u}_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i) \cdot r_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i) \cdot u_{i,j}(\mathcal{X}_i) =_{\tilde{H}} \bar{\nu}_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y}) w_{r_{i,j}}(\mathcal{Y}) \nu_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y})$; for this we observe that, for a suitable choice of C_3 , for every letter in $x_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$ there is a word in \mathcal{Y} of length at most C_3 whose projection to $F(\mathcal{X}_i)$ coincides with the group element represented

by x_i and then choose $\nu_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y})$ to be the concatenation of such words corresponding to the letters of $u_{i,j}$.

Let $\nu_i(\mathcal{Y}) := \prod_{j=1}^{k_i} \bar{\nu}_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y}) \cdot w_{r_{i,j}}(\mathcal{Y}) \cdot \nu_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y})$. Then $\nu_i(\mathcal{Y}) =_{\tilde{H}} v_i(\mathcal{X}_i)$ and the word length of ν_i is bounded above by

$$\delta_{G_i}(C_1 \cdot N) \cdot (C_4 + 2 \cdot C_2 \cdot C_3 \cdot \delta_{G_i}(C_1 \cdot N)),$$

where we denote by C_4 the maximum of the lengths of the words $w_{i,j}(\mathcal{Y})$.

By construction, the word $w(\mathcal{Y}) \cdot \bar{\nu}_1(\mathcal{Y}) \cdots \bar{\nu}_n(\mathcal{Y})$ is null-homotopic in \tilde{H} . Our above estimates then imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}_{\mathcal{S}}(w) &\leq \delta_{\tilde{H}} \left(N + \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{G_i}(C_1 \cdot N) \cdot (C_4 + 2 \cdot C_2 \cdot C_3 \cdot \delta_{G_i}(C_1 \cdot N)) \right) \\ &\leq \delta_{\tilde{H}} (C \cdot \max\{N, (\delta_{G_1}(CN))^2, \dots, (\delta_{G_n}(CN))^2\}), \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \max\{C_1, (n+1) \cdot (C_4 + 2 \cdot C_2 \cdot C_3)\}$. This completes the proof. \square

We can now prove Theorem C. For this recall that G is a limit group (or fully residually free group) if for every finite subset $S \subset G$ there is a homomorphism $\phi: G \rightarrow F_2$ such that $\phi|_S$ is injective. Residually free groups are the generalisation of this notion, where this property only needs to be satisfied for all 2-element sets S containing the neutral element.

Proof of Theorem C. Since subgroups of direct products of free groups are residually free, we only need to prove that Conjecture 1.1 implies Conjecture 1.2. By [BHMS13, Theorem D], it suffices to consider the case of a full subdirect product of a direct product of finitely many limit groups that has the VSP property. Since limit groups are CAT(0) by [AB06], they have quadratic Dehn function. The assertion then follows by combining Conjecture 1.1, Proposition 4.7 and the fact that compositions of polynomially bounded functions are polynomially bounded. \square

We can deduce the following generalisations of Theorems A and D.

Corollary 4.8. *Let $H \leq G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$ be a subgroup of a direct product of n limit groups of type \mathcal{F}_{n-1} . Then H has Dehn function bounded above by N^{2d_n+4} , where $d_n = 7$ if $n \leq 3$, $d_4 = 3$ and $d_n = 2$ if $n \geq 5$. In particular, every finitely presented subgroup of a direct product of at most three limit groups has Dehn function bounded above by N^{18} .*

Proof. We can use [BHMS09, Theorem A] and the fact that the arguments in the proof of [KLI22, Theorem 5.1] also apply to full subdirect products of limit groups (see [LI20, Remark 5.1]) to argue as in the proof of Theorem D that we may assume that $H \cong \ker(\psi)$ for some homomorphisms $\psi: G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$, with $r \geq 1$, which is surjective on factors. Then the subgroup $\tilde{H} \leq F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n)$ defined as above is the kernel of the composition $\psi \circ \Phi: F(\mathcal{X}_1) \times \cdots \times F(\mathcal{X}_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$, which is also surjective on factors. In particular, the conclusion of Theorem D applies to \tilde{H} . Thus, $\delta_{\tilde{H}}(N) \preceq N^{d_n+2}$ and the assertion follows from Proposition 4.7. \square

Remark 4.9. Since every finitely generated residually free group is a subgroup of a direct product of finitely many limit groups and conversely every subgroup of such a product is residually free, Corollary 4.8 shows that as a consequence of our work, we obtain a positive answer to Conjecture 1.2 for further classes of residually free groups.

5. QUADRATIC DEHN FUNCTION

In the previous sections, we have shown that the Dehn function has a uniform polynomial upper bound. The upper bound we produce is, however, always at least quartic: even if in some cases the area of the push of the relations is quadratic, by Theorem 2.11 the area of the push must be multiplied by the Dehn function of the ambient group to get an estimate for the Dehn function of the kernel. This estimate is indeed not sharp in many cases. Kropholler and the fourth author had proved that, whenever $\lceil \frac{r}{2} \rceil \leq \frac{n}{4}$, the Dehn function of $K_r^n(r)$ is quadratic [KLI22].

In this section, we aim to improve this result, and prove that $\delta_{K_r^n(r)}(N) \asymp N^2$ whenever $n \geq r + 2 \geq 4$. The proof strategy goes as follows: for every element $g \in K_r^n(r)$, we define a *normal form* associated with it, which is a word representing g canonically. By using this normal form, it is possible to subdivide the Van Kampen Diagram associated with a trivial word w into triangles similarly to what was done in [CF17, KLI22]. Then, by manipulating the normal form, we are able to prove that every such triangle may be filled in so that its area is bounded by a quadratic function of its perimeter. It will then follow that the total area of the Van Kampen diagram is bounded by a quadratic function in the length of the word w .

In what follows, we use the same notation as in Section 3.1, so $\mathcal{X}_r = \mathcal{X}_r^{(1)} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}$ denotes the generators of $K_r^n(r)$, where

$$\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)} = (x_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, x_r^{(\alpha)}).$$

We often need to consider the same word written in different alphabets as described in Section 2.1. Recall that, if $w \in F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_t)$, then $w(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t)$ is the element in $F(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t)$ obtained from w by substituting ξ_i with η_i .

In addition to the standard subsets of generators $\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)}$ we often employ a diagonal set $\Delta = (x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_r^{(r)})$. This is the key point where we use that $n \geq r + 2$: this assumption implies that Δ is well-defined, and moreover we have some leeway from the fact that $\mathcal{X}_r^{(r+1)}$ is also well-defined (i.e. $r + 1 \leq n - 1$) and is disjoint from Δ . This will be crucial in order to perform some word manipulations with a small number of relations.

Similarly, we define $\bar{\Delta} := (\bar{x}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)})$.

Lemma 5.1. *The subgroup of $K_r^n(r)$ represented by words written in the alphabet $\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}$ is a free group for $i \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$. The subgroup of $K_r^n(r)$ represented by words written in the alphabet Δ is a free group.*

Proof. Call $\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}$ (resp. D) the subgroup of K represented by words written in the alphabet $\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}$ (resp. Δ). The map $\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)} \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{A}_r^{(i)} \rangle$ (resp. $D \rightarrow \langle \mathcal{A}_r^{(n)} \rangle$) sending $x_j^{(i)}$ to $a_j^{(i)}$ (resp. $x_i^{(i)}$ to $a_j^{(n)}$) induces an injective homomorphism of groups. Now, the statement follows from the fact that $\langle \mathcal{A}_r^{(i)} \rangle$ is a free group for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. \square

Remark 5.2. In the lemma above, we proved that for some subsets S of the generators \mathcal{X}_r of $K_r^n(r)$, the subgroup $\langle S \rangle < K_r^n(r)$ is a free group with S as generating set. However, we should keep in mind the distinction between $\langle S \rangle < K_r^n(r)$, and the *abstract* free group $F(S)$ with generating set S , even if they are naturally isomorphic: the former is a subgroup of K , while the latter is naturally a subgroup of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$. In other words, elements of $\langle S \rangle$ are elements of K , while elements of $F(S)$ are formal words, up to free equivalence, in the alphabet $S \subseteq \mathcal{X}_r$.

For the same reason, we also keep two different symbols to denote $F_r^{(i)} \cong F(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$: the first should be thought of as a subgroup of $F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}$, while the second denotes words, up to free equivalence, in the letters $a_j^{(i)}$. This is particularly useful as we will be able to perform substitutions as described in Section 2.1.

Definition 5.3. Let $w \in F(S)$ be an element of a free group with generating set S , and let $s \in S$. We say that w is *s-balanced* if w is in the kernel of the homomorphism $F(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ that sends $s \mapsto 1$, and $s' \mapsto 0$ for all $s' \in S \setminus \{s\}$, or equivalently, if any word in the alphabet $S \cup S^{-1}$ that represents w contains an equal number of s and \bar{s} .

5.1. Normal form. In this section, we associate to each $g \in K$ a canonical element of $F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ representing it.

Definition 5.4. Let $g \in K_r^n(r)$. The *normal form* of g is an element $w_g \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ representing g that decomposes as

$$w_g = w_g^\Delta \cdot w_g^{(1)} \cdot w_g^{(2)} \dots w_g^{(n-1)},$$

where $w_g^{(i)} \in F(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)})$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and w_g^Δ belongs to the commutator subgroup $[F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$.

Lemma 5.5. *The element w_g^Δ represents an element in the subgroup*

$$\left[F_r^{(n)}, F_r^{(n)} \right] \subset K_r^n(r) \subset F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)}.$$

Proof. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, the projection $\text{pr}_r^{(i)} : F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow F_r^{(i)}$ sends $x_j^{(j)}$ to the trivial element for $i \neq j$, and to $\bar{a}_i^{(i)}$ for $i = j$. Since w_g^Δ belongs to the commutator subgroup, it is $x_i^{(i)}$ -balanced, so $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g^\Delta)$ is trivial.

Since the projection to every factor except the last is trivial, then w_g^Δ represents an element in $F_r^{(n)}$. However, since it is also an element of $K_r^n(r)$, it is contained in $F_r^{(n)} \cap K_r^n(r) = [F_r^{(n)}, F_r^{(n)}]$. \square

The following lemma assures that the normal form always exists and is unique.

Lemma 5.6. *For every g in $K_r^n(r)$, there exists a unique normal form. Moreover, for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the factor $w_g^{(i)} \in F(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)})$ is such that $w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$ represents the projection $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(g)$.*

Proof. We will first prove existence and then uniqueness.

Existence. For every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, denote by $g_i \in F_r^{(i)} = F(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$ the projection of g to the i -th factor. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we set $w_g^{(i)} = g_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \in F(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)})$: we have in particular that $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g^{(i)}) = g_i$. Moreover, we define

$$w_g^\Delta := g_n(\overline{\Delta}) \cdot (g_1(\Delta) \cdots g_{n-1}(\Delta))^{-1}.$$

We claim that the element w_g^Δ is in $[F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$. Indeed, if we project w_g^Δ to the i -th factor, for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we get

$$\left(a_i^{(i)}\right)^{\psi_i(g_n)} \cdot \left(\left(a_i^{(i)}\right)^{-\psi_i(g_1)} \cdots \left(a_i^{(i)}\right)^{-\psi_i(g_{n-1})}\right)^{-1}$$

where ψ_i is the i -th component of the map $\psi: F_r^{(1)} \times \cdots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$, while for $i \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$ the projection is trivial. Since g is represented by $g_1 \cdots g_n$ and $\psi(g) = 0$ as $g \in K_r^n(r)$, the above expression is trivial. So w_g^Δ is $x_i^{(i)}$ -balanced for all i , i.e. it belongs to the commutator subgroup $[F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$.

Thus, the word

$$w_g = w_g^\Delta \cdot w_g^{(1)} \cdot w_g^{(2)} \cdots w_g^{(n-1)} \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$$

satisfies the properties of the normal form. We just need to show that w_g represents g . It is enough to prove that the projection $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g)$ coincides with g_i , for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we observe that the projection $\text{pr}_r^{(j)}(w_g^{(i)})$ of $w_g^{(i)}$ satisfies:

$$\text{pr}_r^{(j)}(w_g^{(i)}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \notin \{i, n\}; \\ g_i(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)}) & \text{if } j = i; \\ g_i(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_r^{(n)}) & \text{if } j = n. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, $\text{pr}_r^{(j)}(w_g^\Delta)$ is nontrivial only if $j = n$ and in this case it is represented by the word

$$w_g^\Delta(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_r^{(n)}) = g_n(\mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}) \cdot \left(g_1(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_r^{(n)}) \cdots g_{n-1}(\overline{\mathcal{A}}_r^{(n)})\right)^{-1}.$$

Putting everything together, we obtain that

$$\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g) = g_i(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)}),$$

for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, as desired.

Uniqueness. Let

$$v_g = v_g^\Delta \cdot v_g^{(1)} \cdot v_g^{(2)} \cdots v_g^{(n-1)}$$

be another normal form for g and let w_g be as in the proof of the existence. Since v_g^Δ represents an element in $F_r^{(n)}$, its projection $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(v_g^\Delta)$ represents the trivial element whenever $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. It is also clear from the definition that $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(v_g^{(j)})$ is nontrivial only if $j = i$ or $j = n$. Therefore, for $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$,

$$\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(v_g^{(i)}) = \text{pr}_r^{(i)}(v_g) = \text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g) = \text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w_g^{(i)}),$$

so $v_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)}) = w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$, which implies $v_g^{(i)} = w_g^{(i)}$.

As the two elements of $F(\Delta)$

$$v_g^\Delta = v_g \cdot (v_g^{(1)} \cdot v_g^{(2)} \cdots v_g^{(n-1)})^{-1},$$

$$w_g^\Delta = w_g \cdot (w_g^{(1)} \cdot w_g^{(2)} \cdots w_g^{(n-1)})^{-1}$$

represent the same element in $K_r^n(r)$ (because of the previous computations) and the subgroup generated by Δ is free (Lemma 5.1), they coincide. We have therefore proven that the normal form is unique.

Finally, the fact that $w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$ represents the projection $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(g)$ follows from the construction shown in the existence part. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let $g \in K_r^n(r)$ and $w_g \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ be its normal form; then $|w_g| \leq 3 \cdot |g|_{\mathcal{X}_r}$.*

Proof. Let w_g be the normal form of g expressed as in Definition 5.4. Let $w \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ be any word representing g . By Lemma 5.6,

$$|w_g^{(i)}| = |w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})| = |\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(g)|_{\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)}},$$

where $w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{A}_r^{(i)})$ represents $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(g)$ (for $1 \leq i \leq g$). However, $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(g)$ is represented by $\text{pr}_r^{(i)}(w)$, and this projection is obtained from w by replacing the letters $x_j^{(i)}$ with $a_j^{(i)}$ and $x_j^{(k)}$ with 1, for all $j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $k \neq i$. Thus, $|w_g^{(i)}|$ is at most the number of letters in w belonging to the alphabet $\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}$. This is enough to prove that

$$(1) \quad |w_g^{(1)} \cdots w_g^{(n-1)}| \leq |w|.$$

For the same reason, we have that $\text{pr}_r^{(n)}(g)$ is obtained by replacing $x_j^{(i)}$ with $\bar{a}_j^{(n)}$, so we get that $|\text{pr}_r^{(n)}(g)|_{\mathcal{A}_r^{(n)}} \leq |w|$. On the other hand, $|w_g^\Delta| = |\text{pr}_r^{(n)}(w_g^\Delta)|$ since, by Lemma 5.1, the words written in the alphabet Δ generate K as a free group.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|w_g^\Delta| &= \left| \text{pr}_r^{(n)}(w_g^\Delta) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \text{pr}_r^{(n)}\left(w_g \cdot \left(w_g^{(1)} \cdots w_g^{(n-1)}\right)^{-1}\right) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \text{pr}_r^{(n)}(w_g) \right| + \left| \text{pr}_r^{(n)}\left(w_g^{(1)} \cdots w_g^{(n-1)}\right)^{-1} \right| \\
&\leq 2 \cdot |w|.
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (1), the fact that $\text{pr}_r^{(n)}(w_g) = \text{pr}_r^{(n)}(g)$ (as they both represent $\text{pr}_r^{(n)}(g)$ in the free group $F_r^{(n)}$) and the inequality $\left| \text{pr}_r^{(n)}(g) \right| \leq |w|$. \square

5.2. Quadratic upper bound. Throughout the whole section, we use the presentation described in Section 3.1, and all areas will be considered with respect to it. The aim of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $n \geq 4$ and $r \geq 2$ be natural numbers satisfying $n \geq r + 2$. There exists $C > 0$ such that, for all $g, h \in K_r^n(r)$, we have that*

$$\text{Area}(w_g w_h \bar{w}_{gh}) \leq C \cdot \max\{|w_g|^2, |w_h|^2\}.$$

where w_g, w_h, w_{gh} denote the normal forms of, respectively, g, h, gh .

In other words, this tells us that triangles in the Cayley graph whose sides represent words in normal form have quadratic area with respect to their perimeter. Given a word of length N , we can subdivide its Van Kampen diagram into such triangles as in Fig. 2, so that the estimate above yields a quadratic bound on the area of the whole diagram. Similar arguments already appeared in other places, including [GS02, CF17]; below we give a precise statement and proof.

Theorem 5.9. *Let $n \geq 4, r \geq 2$ be natural numbers with $n \geq r + 2$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $g \in K_r^n(r)$ and for any $w \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ that represents g*

$$\text{Area}(\bar{w}w_g) \leq C \cdot |w|^2$$

where $w_g \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ denotes the normal form of g .

Since the normal form of the trivial element is trivial, this implies directly Theorem E. We now prove how to recover Theorem 5.9 from Proposition 5.8.

Proof. Pick a constant $C > 0$ such that the statement holds for all w of length at most 12. We may also assume that C is bigger than the constant C' given by Proposition 5.8.

We claim that $\text{Area}(\bar{w}w_g) \leq C \cdot |w|^2$ holds for words of any length: we prove this by induction. To this end, let $N > 12$ and assume that the statement holds for every w with $|w| < N$.




FIGURE 2. Given a trivial word $w = g_1 \dots g_N$, we replace each generator g_i with its normal form w_{g_i} , and then we replace iteratively the product of two normal forms with the normal form of its product. This process can be represented by the Dehn diagram above: if one proves that the area of each triangle is quadratic in its perimeter, one gets a quadratic bound of the area of the whole diagram.

Let $w \in F(\mathcal{X}_r)$ representing g with $|w| = N$, and decompose it as $w = w_1 w_2$, so that, for $i = 1, 2$, the word w_i has length at most $N/2 + 1$ and represents some element $g_i \in K_r^n(r)$. By inductive hypothesis, we can replace w_1 and w_2 by w_{g_1} and w_{g_2} using at most $2 \cdot C(N/2 + 1)^2$ relations; then, we can rewrite the product $w_{g_1} w_{g_2}$ as $w_{g_1 g_2} = w_g$ using at most $C(N/2 + 1)^2$ relations by Proposition 5.8.

Thus, we are able to fill $\bar{w}w_g$ using at most

$$(2C + C) \cdot \left(\frac{N^2}{4} + N + 1 \right) < 3C \cdot \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \right) \cdot N^2 = C \cdot N^2$$

relations, where we used that $N + 1 < N^2/12$ for $N > 12$. This concludes the proof. \square

Let us delve into the proof of Proposition 5.8. We start with some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and $k \in \{r + 1, \dots, n - 1\}$. Then*

$$\left[x_i^{(k)} \bar{x}_i^{(i)}, x_j^{(j)} \right] = 1.$$

Proof. If $i \neq j$, then it is a relation. Otherwise, it is immediate by checking that projections are trivial in both cases $i = j$ and $i \neq j$. \square

Lemma 5.11. *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $k \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$, and let Δ' be the alphabet obtained from Δ by replacing $x_i^{(i)}$ with $x_i^{(k)}$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $w \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$ we have*

$$\text{Area}(w(\Delta)\bar{w}(\Delta')) \leq C \cdot |w|^2.$$

Proof. Replace in $w(\Delta)$ every $x_i^{(i)}$ with $(x_i^{(i)}\bar{x}_i^{(k)})x_i^{(k)}$. Since $x_i^{(i)}\bar{x}_i^{(k)}$ commutes with every letter of Δ by Lemma 5.10, and it also commutes with $x_i^{(k)}$, we can commute every $(x_i^{(i)}\bar{x}_i^{(k)})$ to the left. Since $w(\Delta)$ is $x_i^{(i)}$ -balanced, the resulting word is freely trivial. \square

Lemma 5.12. *Let $\sigma: \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ be injective, and denote by Δ' the alphabet $(x_1^{(\sigma(1))}, \dots, x_r^{(\sigma(r))})$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $w \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$ we have*

$$\text{Area}(w(\Delta)\bar{w}(\Delta')) \leq C \cdot |w|^2.$$

Proof. It follows by iterating Lemma 5.11. \square

Lemma 5.13. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ with the following property. For every $v, w \in F(\Delta)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that either $v \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$ or $i \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$ we have*

$$\text{Area}\left([w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}), v(\Delta)][w(\Delta), v(\Delta)]^{-1}\right) \leq C \cdot \max\{|w|^2, |v|^2\}.$$

Proof. First assume that $i \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$, say $i = n-1$. Then after simplifying, the statement is equivalent to computing the area of

$$w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)})v(\Delta)\bar{w}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)})w(\Delta)\bar{v}(\Delta)\bar{w}(\Delta).$$

Assume that $w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)})$ ends with the letter $x_k^{(n-1)}$. Now note that we can replace $x_k^{(n-1)}v(\Delta)\bar{x}_k^{(n-1)}$ with $x_k^{(k)}v(\Delta)\bar{x}_k^{(k)} =: v'(\Delta)$ using a linear number of relations, since $x_k^{(n-1)}\bar{x}_k^{(k)}$ commutes with every letter of Δ , and by iterating we conclude.

If $i \leq r$, since $v \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$, after permuting factors and using Lemma 5.12 we may assume $i = n-1 > r$, reducing to previous case. This completes the proof. \square

Now we note a purely algebraic lemma.

Lemma 5.14. *Let G be a finitely presented group, and let $s_i, t_i \in G$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $\mathcal{S} = (s_1, \dots, s_r)$, $\mathcal{T} = (t_1, \dots, t_r)$, and denote by $\bar{\mathcal{T}}\mathcal{S}$ the alphabet $(\bar{t}_1 s_1, \dots, \bar{t}_r s_r)$. Suppose that $[t_i, \bar{t}_j s_j] = 1$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.*

There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $w \in F(\mathcal{S})$ the element

$$\bar{w}(\mathcal{T}) \cdot w(\mathcal{S}) \cdot \bar{w}(\bar{\mathcal{T}}\mathcal{S}) \in F(\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{T})$$

represents the trivial element of G and has area bounded above by $C \cdot |w|^2$.

Proof. Let $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that $w(\mathcal{S}) = w'(\mathcal{S})s_j^\varepsilon$. Then we can rewrite the expression as

$$\bar{t}_j^\varepsilon \bar{w}'(\mathcal{T}) \cdot w'(\mathcal{S})s_j^\varepsilon \cdot (\bar{s}_j t_j)^\varepsilon \bar{w}'(\overline{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}).$$

We can then simplify the s_j (possibly after commuting it with t_j , if $\varepsilon = -1$) and commute t_j to the right with $|w'|$ relations, since t_j commutes with every letter of $w'(\overline{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}})$. So we get

$$\bar{t}_j^\varepsilon (\bar{w}'(\mathcal{T}) \cdot w'(\mathcal{S})\bar{w}'(\overline{\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}}))t_j^\varepsilon,$$

and by iterating the procedure we conclude. \square

Lemma 5.15. *Let $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $j \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for every $v, w \in F(\Delta)$, we have*

$$\text{Area} \left(\left[w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)}) \right] \left[w(\Delta), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)}) \right]^{-1} \right) \leq C \cdot \max\{|w|^2, |v|^2\}.$$

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality $i = 1$ and $j = n-1$. After simplifying $v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)})$, the expression becomes a conjugate of

$$(*) \quad \left[\bar{w}(\Delta)w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}) \right].$$

Note that, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, this expression is freely equivalent to

$$\left[\bar{w}(\Delta)(\bar{x}_1^{(1)})^k (x_1^{(1)})^k w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(n-1)}) \right],$$

so we may assume that both $w(\Delta)$ and $w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)})$ are $x_1^{(1)}$ -balanced.

Consider now the expression $\bar{w}(\Delta)w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)})$ on the left side of the commutator. By using Lemma 5.12, this can be rewritten as

$$\bar{w}\left(x_1^{(n-1)}, x_2^{(2)}, x_3^{(3)}, \dots, x_r^{(r)}\right)w\left(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}\right).$$

Then, by using Lemma 5.14 with $\mathcal{T} = (x_1^{(n-1)}, x_2^{(2)}, x_3^{(3)}, \dots, x_r^{(r)})$, $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}$, we obtain

$$w\left(\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)}x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)}x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)}x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)}x_r^{(1)}\right).$$

Since $x_2^{(2)}$ commutes with $\bar{x}_k^{(k)}x_k^{(1)}$, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and with $\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)}x_1^{(1)}$ (it can be seen by checking the projection for $k = 1, k = 2, k \geq 3$), we may commute every occurrence of $x_2^{(2)}$ to the left, obtaining

$$\left(x_2^{(2)}\right)^{-m} \cdot w\left(\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)}x_1^{(1)}, x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)}x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)}x_r^{(1)}\right),$$

where m is the number of times the second generator appears in w (counted with sign).

Now we apply again Lemma 5.14 with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &= \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)} x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)} x_r^{(1)} \right) \\ \mathcal{T} &= \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(n-1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)}, 1, \dots, 1 \right)\end{aligned}$$

and we get

$$\left(x_2^{(2)} \right)^{-m} \cdot \bar{w} \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(n-1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)}, 1, \dots, 1 \right) \cdot w \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)} x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)} x_r^{(1)} \right).$$

Apply Lemma 5.14 another time to the word \bar{w} with $\mathcal{S} = (\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)}, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathcal{T} = (\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)} x_1^{(1)}, 1, \dots, 1)$ obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}\left(x_2^{(2)} \right)^{-m} \cdot w \left(\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)} x_1^{(1)}, 1, \dots, 1 \right) \cdot \bar{w} \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)}, 1, \dots, 1 \right) \\ \cdot w \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)} x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)} x_r^{(1)} \right)\end{aligned}$$

where we also used the relations $[x_1^{(1)}, x_1^{(n-1)} \bar{x}_1^{(2)}]$ and $[x_1^{(2)}, x_1^{(n-1)}]$ at most $|w|$ times each.

Now $w(\bar{x}_1^{(n-1)} x_1^{(1)}, 1, \dots, 1)$ is freely trivial because w is balanced in the first generator, and since $x_2^{(3)}$ commutes with $\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}$ we can rearrange as

$$\left(\bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(3)} \right)^m \bar{w} \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(3)}, 1, \dots, 1 \right) w \left(\bar{x}_1^{(2)} x_1^{(1)}, \bar{x}_2^{(2)} x_2^{(1)}, \bar{x}_3^{(3)} x_3^{(1)}, \dots, \bar{x}_r^{(r)} x_r^{(1)} \right).$$

All these manipulations required a number of relations that is quadratic in the length of w ; in the end we have obtained an expression for $\bar{w}(\Delta)w(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)})$ in which all the pairs of letters commute with $x_k^{(n-1)}$, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. So the commutator $(*)$ can be filled with a quadratic number of relations in the length of w and v , as required. \square

Lemma 5.16. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ with $i \neq j$ and $u, v \in F(\Delta)$ we have*

$$\text{Area} \left([u(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)})] \cdot [u(\Delta), v(\Delta)]^{-1} \right) \leq C \max(|u|^2, |v|^2).$$

Proof. Up to permuting factors and using Lemma 5.12, we may assume that $i \in \{r+1, \dots, n-1\}$. By Lemma 5.15 we can rewrite $[u(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}), v(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)})]$ as $[u(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}), v(\Delta)]$. The assertion follows by applying Lemma 5.13. \square

Lemma 5.17. *There exists a constant C_n depending on n such that, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and for every $w \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$ with $|w| \leq N$ and all $w_1, \dots, w_{n-1} \in F(\Delta)$ with $|w_1|, \dots, |w_{n-1}| \leq N$, we have that*

$$\text{Area} \left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot w(\Delta) \cdot \left(w'(\Delta) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right)^{-1} \right) \leq C_{n-1} \cdot N^2,$$

where $w'(\Delta) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i(\Delta) \right) \cdot w(\Delta) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_i(\Delta) \right)^{-1}$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on $k \in \{0, \dots, n-2\}$, where $w_{k+1} = \dots = w_{n-1} = 1$, the case $k = 0$ being trivial. So assume there is a constant C_{k-1} such that the induction hypothesis for $k-1$ holds and assume that $w_{k+1} = \dots = w_{n-1} = 1$.

By Lemma 5.13 we have that

$$w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)})w(\Delta) = [w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)}), w(\Delta)]w(\Delta)w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)}) = [w_k(\Delta), w(\Delta)]w(\Delta)w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)})$$

using $C \cdot N^2$ relations for some constant $C > 0$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot w(\Delta) &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)}) \cdot w(\Delta) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot [w_k(\Delta), w(\Delta)] \cdot w(\Delta) \cdot w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)}) \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot w_k(\Delta)w(\Delta)\bar{w}_k(\Delta) \cdot w_k(\mathcal{X}_r^{(k)}) \\ &= w'(\Delta) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^k w_i(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the inductive hypothesis that uses at most $C_{k-1} \cdot (3N)^2$ relations. So by letting $C_k = 9C_{k-1} + C$ we conclude. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.8. We start from the product

$$w_g w_h = w_g^\Delta(\Delta) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot w_h^\Delta(\Delta) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_h^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right),$$

and we show that we can obtain the normal form w_{gh} of gh by using a quadratic amount of relations in the lengths of w_g and w_h .

By applying Lemma 5.17, we can rewrite the expression as

$$w_g^\Delta(\Delta) \cdot w'(\Delta) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_g^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} w_h^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \right)$$

for some $w' \in [F(\Delta), F(\Delta)]$ with a quadratic number of relations. By Lemma 5.16, we can replace $w_g^{(j)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)}) \cdot w_h^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)})$, where $j > i$, with

$$[w_g^{(j)}(\Delta), w_h^{(i)}(\Delta)] \cdot w_h^{(i)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(i)}) \cdot w_g^{(j)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(j)})$$

and use again Lemma 5.17 to move the commutator in the alphabet Δ to the beginning of the expression.

This allows us to rearrange the factors: after $\frac{(n-1)n}{2}$ of these operations, we obtain an expression of the form

$$w^\Delta(\Delta) \cdot w_g^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}) \cdot w_h^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(1)}) \cdots w_g^{(r)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(r)}) \cdot w_h^{(r)}(\mathcal{X}_r^{(r)})$$

that represents the element $gh \in K_r^n(r)$: by Lemma 5.6 this is the normal form w_{gh} of gh , so we conclude. \square

6. THE DEHN FUNCTION OF THE BRIDSON-DISON GROUP

We now focus our attention on the case $n = 3, r = 2$, so we consider the Bridson-Dison group $K_2^3(2)$, defined as the kernel of $F_2 \times F_2 \times F_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$.

This group was studied in detail in [Dis08b, Dis09], where it was proven that its Dehn function $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}$ satisfies $N^3 \preceq \delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^6$; the lower bound was already proven independently by Bridson [Bri]. It is finitely presented by

$$K_2^3(2) = \langle x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \mid [x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2], [x_1^{\varepsilon_1}, y_2^{\varepsilon_2}][x_2^{\varepsilon_2}, y_1^{\varepsilon_1}] \rangle,$$

where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$.

The presentation above can either be obtained from the one described in [Dis08b, Section 13.5], via the identification $\alpha_1 \mapsto x_1, \alpha_2 \mapsto y_1, \beta_1 \mapsto x_2, \beta_2 \mapsto y_2$, or by applying the results of Section 3: since the rank of the free groups is small, the only relations that appear in the presentation are $\mathcal{R}_{2,1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{2,3}$.

If we follow the same strategy of Section 3, we obtain that the area of the push is at most quartic, so we conclude that $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^6$, which is the same bound obtained via the pushing argument in [Dis08b]. This bound is however not sharp: in what follows we prove that $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \asymp N^4$.

Following the notation of the previous chapters, we take three copies of the free group with two generators, denoted by $F_2^{(a)}, F_2^{(b)}, F_2^{(c)}$, with generators denoted by $a_1, a_2; b_1, b_2; c_1, c_2$ respectively. Then we take the homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \psi: F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2 \\ a_i, b_i, c_i &\longmapsto e_i. \end{aligned}$$

The inclusion $K_2^3(2) \hookrightarrow F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$ is given by $x_i \mapsto a_i \bar{c}_i, y_i \mapsto b_i \bar{c}_i$.

Let W denote the group of elements of $F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$, up to free equivalence, that represent the trivial element in $K_2^3(2)$. In other words, we have an exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \longrightarrow K_2^3(2) \longrightarrow 1.$$

Remark 6.1 (Detecting trivial words). Given a word w in the letters x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 , there exists a simple algorithm to check whether w represents the trivial element in $K_2^3(2)$: since $K_2^3(2)$ is a subgroup of $F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$, the word w is trivial if and only if the projection of w on each of the three factors $F_2^{(a)}, F_2^{(b)}$ and $F_2^{(c)}$ is trivial.

By definition, the projection of w on $F_2^{(a)}$ is obtained by sending y_1, y_2 to 1 and x_1, x_2 to a_1, a_2 respectively; analogously, the projection of w on $F_2^{(b)}$ is obtained by sending x_1, x_2 to 1 and y_1, y_2 to b_1, b_2 respectively. The projection of w on $F_2^{(c)}$ is obtained by sending x_1, y_1 to \bar{c}_1 and x_2, y_2 to \bar{c}_2 .

Therefore, the word w is trivial in $K_2^3(2)$ if and only if for each of the following operations:

- deleting all occurrences of x_1, x_2 in w ,
- deleting all occurrences of y_1, y_2 in w ,
- replacing all occurrences of y_i with x_i (i.e. we consider x and y as the same letter),

the resulting word is trivial as an element of F_2 .

6.1. Upper bound. We start by proving the upper bound, i.e. that $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^4$. The proof is similar to the one given for the general case, except that instead of using $F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$ as ambient group for the push-down argument, we use the well-known Stallings' group $\text{SB}(3)$. Initially constructed by Stallings [Sta63], it was later described by Bieri [Bie81] as the kernel of the morphism $F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, that sends every generator a_i, b_i, c_i to the generator $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. It was proven in [CF17] that the Dehn function of $\text{SB}(3)$ is quadratic.

We have the natural inclusions given by the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 K_2^3(2) & & & & \\
 \downarrow & \searrow & & & \\
 \text{SB}(3) & \hookrightarrow & F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z} \\
 & & & \searrow & \uparrow \\
 & & & & \mathbb{Z}^2
 \end{array}$$

where the projection $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ sends the generators e_1 and e_2 to $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The group $\text{SB}(3)$ is generated by five elements x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s , where the first four are the image of the homonymous generators of $K_2^3(2)$. The inclusion $\text{SB}(3) \hookrightarrow F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$ is given by $x_i \mapsto a_i \bar{c}_i$, $y_i \mapsto b_i \bar{c}_i$, and $s \mapsto \bar{c}_1 c_2$.

A finite presentation is given by

$$\text{SB}(3) = \left\langle x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s \mid \begin{array}{l} [x_1, sy_2] = [y_1, sx_2] = [x_1, y_1] = [x_2, y_2] = 1 \\ \bar{x}_1 s x_1 = \bar{x}_2 s x_2 = \bar{y}_1 s y_1 = \bar{y}_2 s y_2 \end{array} \right\rangle.$$

Remark 6.2. The above presentation can be obtained from the presentation

$$\langle a, b, c, d, e \mid \bar{b}ab = \bar{c}ac = \bar{d}ad = \bar{e}ae, [c, d] = [d, b] = [e, c] = [e, b] = 1 \rangle$$

in [BBMS97] by identifying $a \mapsto s, b \mapsto x_1, c \mapsto sx_2, d \mapsto y_1, e \mapsto sy_2$. A sketch of proof that this is a presentation for $\text{SB}(3)$ can be found in [Ger95].

We define the *height function* to be the homomorphism

$$h: F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z},$$

defined by $h(s) = 1$, $h(x_1) = h(x_2) = h(y_1) = h(y_2) = 0$. In other words, $h(w)$ counts the number of s (with sign) appearing in a word representing $w \in F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s)$. We have the following short exact sequence:

$$1 \rightarrow K_2^3(2) \rightarrow \text{SB}(3) \xrightarrow{h} \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow 1.$$

We define the push-down function

$$\text{push}: \mathbb{Z} \times F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s) \rightarrow F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$$

as the unique function such that for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\text{push}_k(s) = 1,$$

$$\text{push}_k(x_i) = (y_1 \bar{y}_2)^k x_i (y_2 \bar{y}_1)^k,$$

$$\text{push}_k(y_i) = (x_1 \bar{x}_2)^k y_i (x_2 \bar{x}_1)^k,$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and

$$\text{push}_k(w_1 w_2) = \text{push}_k(w_1) \text{push}_{k+h(w_1)}(w_2)$$

for every $w_1, w_2 \in F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, s)$.

Lemma 6.3. *The map push_k is a well-defined push-down map as per Definition 2.8.*

Proof. The first property holds by construction. The second one also follows easily by noting that $\text{push}_0(x_i) = x_i$ and $\text{push}_0(y_i) = y_i$. The well-definedness then follows as in Lemma 2.10. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$. There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $w, v \in F_2$ with $|w|, |v| \leq m$, the word*

$$[v(y_1, y_2), w(x_1, x_2)^N] \overline{[v(x_1, x_2), w(y_1, y_2)^N]}$$

represents the trivial element of $K_2^3(2)$ and has area bounded by $C \cdot N^2$.

Proof. Let R be the word $[y_1, x_2^N] \overline{[x_1, y_2^N]}$. By Lemma A.13,(1), we know that $\text{Area}(R) \leq C' N^2$ for some constant $C' > 0$.

Define $\phi: F(\xi_1, \xi_2) \mapsto F(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ by sending $\xi_1 \mapsto v(\xi_1, \xi_2)$, $\xi_2 \mapsto w(\xi_1, \xi_2)$; in particular $\|\phi\| \leq m$. Then, by Definition 3.2, we have

$$\widehat{\phi}(R) = [v(y_1, y_2), w(x_1, x_2)^N] \overline{[v(x_1, x_2), w(y_1, y_2)^N]}$$

and by Proposition 3.7 we conclude that $\text{Area}(\widehat{\phi}(R)) \leq B \|\phi\|^B \cdot C' N^2 \leq C \cdot N^2$ for some constant C depending only on m . \square

Lemma 6.5. *There exists a constant C such that the following holds. Let R be a relation of $\text{SB}(3)$. Then $\text{push}_N(R)$ is an element of $F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$, whose area with respect to the presentation of $K_2^3(2)$ is bounded by $C N^2$.*

Proof. Let R be as above. To prove the statement, we start from $\text{push}_N(R)$, and at each step we either multiply by at most $O(N^2)$ conjugates of some relations belonging to the presentation of $K_2^3(2)$, or we apply Lemma 6.4, until we get the trivial element. Both types of transformations involve a quadratic amount of relations, so this will give the desired conclusion.

- We start with $\text{push}_N([x_1, y_1])$, which can be written as

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N x_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N \cdot y_1[\bar{y}_1, (x_1\bar{x}_2)^N] \cdot (y_1\bar{y}_2)^N \bar{x}_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N \cdot \bar{y}_1[y_1, (x_1\bar{x}_2)^N].$$

By applying Lemma 6.4 to the two commutators we get

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N x_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N \cdot y_1[\bar{x}_1, (y_1\bar{y}_2)^N] \cdot (y_1\bar{y}_2)^N \bar{x}_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N \cdot \bar{y}_1[x_1, (y_1\bar{y}_2)^N].$$

This simplifies to

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N x_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N y_1\bar{x}_1\bar{y}_1 x_1(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N \bar{x}_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N,$$

which is a conjugate of $[y_1, \bar{x}_1]$.

- Next consider $\text{push}_N([x_1, sy_2])$. It is freely equivalent to

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N x_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^N (x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1} (y_2\bar{y}_1) y_1 (x_2\bar{x}_1)^{N+1} \cdot (y_1\bar{y}_2)^{N+1} \bar{x}_1 (y_2\bar{y}_1)^{N+1} (x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1} \bar{y}_1 (y_1\bar{y}_2) (x_2\bar{x}_1)^{N+1},$$

which, after commuting $(y_2\bar{y}_1)$ with $(x_1\bar{x}_2)$ a linear amount of times, becomes

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N x_1(y_2\bar{y}_1)^{N+1} (x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1} y_1 (x_2\bar{x}_1)^{N+1} \cdot (y_1\bar{y}_2)^{N+1} \bar{x}_1 (y_2\bar{y}_1)^{N+1} (x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1} \bar{y}_1 (x_2\bar{x}_1)^{N+1} (y_1\bar{y}_2)$$

or, equivalently,

$$(y_2\bar{y}_1) \cdot \text{push}_{N+1}([x_1, y_1]) \cdot (y_1\bar{y}_2)$$

and we conclude as in the previous case.

- We now compute $\text{push}_N(\bar{x}_1 s x_1 \bar{y}_1 \bar{s} y_1)$, which is equal to

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N \bar{x}_1 (y_2\bar{y}_1)^N (y_1\bar{y}_2)^{N+1} x_1 (y_2\bar{y}_1)^{N+1} \cdot (x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1} \bar{y}_1 (x_2\bar{x}_1)^{N+1} (x_1\bar{x}_2)^N y_1 (x_2\bar{x}_1)^N.$$

This can be rewritten as

$$[(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N, \bar{x}_1][\bar{x}_1, (y_1\bar{y}_2)^{N+1}][(x_1\bar{x}_2)^{N+1}, \bar{y}_1][\bar{y}_1, (x_1\bar{x}_2)^N].$$

We apply Lemma 6.4 twice to conclude.

- Finally, we consider $\text{push}_N(\bar{x}_1 s x_1 \bar{x}_2 \bar{s} x_2)$, which can be freely reduced to

$$(y_1\bar{y}_2)^N \bar{x}_1 (y_1\bar{y}_2) x_1 \bar{x}_2 (y_2\bar{y}_1) x_2 (y_2\bar{y}_1)^N.$$

This is conjugate to $[y_1\bar{y}_2, x_1\bar{x}_2]$, so it has bounded area independent of N .

The proofs for all other relations are similar. \square

We are now ready to prove the upper bound.

Proposition 6.6. *The Dehn function of the group $K_2^3(2)$ satisfies $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^4$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.5, the area of the push of the relations of SB(3) is bounded by a quadratic function. Since SB(3) has quadratic Dehn function [CF17, Cor. 4.3], it has linear radius by Proposition 2.7. By applying Theorem 2.11 we thus get that $\delta_{K_2^3(2)}(N) \preceq N^4$, as desired. \square

6.2. Lower bound. We will now prove the lower bound. Our proof relies on a new invariant that we will call the braid-invariant. We will first introduce it and then show how it can be used to obtain a quartic lower bound on the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$.

6.2.1. The braid-invariant. We will associate to every $w \in W$ a loop inside the configuration space of two ordered points inside $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, denoted by $\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$. For this purpose, recall that the n -th configuration space $\text{Conf}_n(X)$ of a topological space X is the subset of X^n consisting of n -tuples whose coordinates are pairwise distinct:

$$\text{Conf}_n(X) = \{(p_1, \dots, p_n) \mid p_i \neq p_j \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}.$$

The space $\text{Conf}_n(X)$ is equipped with the induced topology as a subset of the product X^n .

Now we restrict ourselves to the case of $X = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. An element of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ can be described as a pair of paths (γ_x, γ_y) in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ in which $\gamma_x(0) = \gamma_x(1) = \hat{p}_x$, $\gamma_y(0) = \gamma_y(1) = \hat{p}_y$, and $\gamma_x(t) \neq \gamma_y(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. More intuitively, a representative of an element of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ can be thought of as two points moving inside $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ starting from the position \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y , without ever colliding and, at the end, coming back to \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y . The way we associate an element of $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}))$ to a word $w \in W$ is by prescribing how these two points should move; more precisely, the letters x_1, x_2 will command the first point to move right, respectively up by 1 unit, while the letters y_1, y_2 will command the second point to move left, respectively down by 1 unit; all the commands are processed one by one while reading the word w .

We will see that the commands given to the two points will make them come back to their starting position, because we are only considering words representing the trivial element in $K_2^3(2)$. Moreover, if the starting positions are chosen suitably (that is by requiring that their coordinates and the coordinates of their difference are not integral), then, whatever the word w is, the two points stay away from 0 and do not collide.

In this way, given suitable starting positions, we define a homomorphism from the set of trivial words W to the fundamental group $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$. We use this map to define an invariant, that we call *braid-invariant*, which we will use to provide a lower bound for the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$.

We will now formalize the above description. Consider two Gaussian integers $p_x, p_y \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ (i.e. complex numbers with integral real and imaginary part), and set

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}_x &= p_x - \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3}i\right), \\ \hat{p}_y &= p_y + \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3}i\right),\end{aligned}$$

so that \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y and $\hat{p}_x - \hat{p}_y$ are complex numbers with neither coordinate being integral.

Denote $F_4 = F(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$. Since a word $w \in W$ represents the trivial element in $F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$, every generator appears in w the same number of times as its inverse, indeed, x_i is the only generator that produces the letter a_i , and y_i is the only one that produces b_i . Therefore, w is an element of $[F_4, F_4]$, and we obtain an injective homomorphism $W \hookrightarrow [F_4, F_4]$.

We define a homomorphism

$$\tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} : [F_4, F_4] \rightarrow \pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)),$$

depending on p_x, p_y , that sends each element $g \in [F_4, F_4]$ to an element of the fundamental group $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ represented by a closed loop (γ_x, γ_y) in $\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ defined as follows: let w be a word representing g and let ℓ be the number of letters appearing in w . Set $\gamma_x(0) = \hat{p}_x$, $\gamma_y(0) = \hat{p}_y$. If the k -th letter of w is x_1^δ (resp. x_2^δ), for some $\delta \in \{\pm 1\}$, then, the path $\gamma_x|_{[(k-1)/\ell, k/\ell]}$ is the straight line from $\gamma_x((k-1)/\ell)$ to $\gamma_x((k-1)/\ell) + \delta$ (resp. $\gamma_x((k-1)/\ell) + i \cdot \delta$), while it is the trivial path if the k -th letter is y_1^δ or y_2^δ . Analogously, if the k -th letter of w is y_1^δ (resp. y_2^δ), then the path $\gamma_y|_{[(k-1)/\ell, k/\ell]}$ is the straight line from $\gamma_y((k-1)/\ell)$ to $\gamma_y((k-1)/\ell) - \delta$ (resp. $\gamma_y((k-1)/\ell) - i \cdot \delta$), while it is the trivial path if the k -th letter is x_1^δ or x_2^δ .

Lemma 6.7. *The map \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} is well-defined for all Gaussian integers p_x, p_y .*

Proof. Let $g \in [F_4, F_4]$, w a representative of g and (γ_x, γ_y) be as in the definition of I_{p_x, p_y} . Because none of the coordinates of the three complex numbers \hat{p}_x , \hat{p}_y and $\hat{p}_x - \hat{p}_y$ is integral, and $\gamma_x(k/\ell)$ (resp. $\gamma_y(k/\ell)$) is obtained by adding to \hat{p}_x (resp. \hat{p}_y) a Gaussian integer, the coordinates of $\gamma_x(k/\ell)$, $\gamma_y(k/\ell)$ and $\gamma_x(k/\ell) - \gamma_y(k/\ell)$ are also not integral for any $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$. As one of the two paths $\gamma_x|_{[(k-1)/\ell, k/\ell]}$ and $\gamma_y|_{[(k-1)/\ell, k/\ell]}$ is constant, and the other is parallel to the real or to the imaginary axis, the three points 0 , $\gamma_x(t)$ and $\gamma_y(t)$ are pairwise distinct for every $t \in [0, 1]$. This proves that (γ_x, γ_y) is a path in $\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$.

Moreover, since w is a word representing an element in $[F_4, F_4]$, each generator appears the same number of times as its inverse. Thus, $\gamma_x(1) = \gamma_x(0)$, $\gamma_y(1) = \gamma_y(0)$ and (γ_x, γ_y) is, indeed, a loop in $\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ based at (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y) .

Finally, as the presentation of F_4 that we are considering has no relations, if two words represent the same element in $[F_4, F_4]$, then one can be obtained from the other by adding/removing a finite number of “ $q\bar{q}$ ”, where q is a generator of the group. Then the corresponding loops are obtained from each other by removing/adding

backtracking paths (paths that go in a direction and then go back right after), so without modifying the homotopy type of the loop. This proves that the map \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} does not depend on the chosen word w representing g and so the map is well-defined. \square

We then define $I_{p_x, p_y}: W \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ as the composition of the two maps $W \hookrightarrow [F_4, F_4]$ and \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} .

Let q be one of the three letters a, b, c and consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & & & 1 \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow \\
 1 & \longrightarrow & W & \hookrightarrow & [F_4, F_4] & \longrightarrow & K_2^3(2) \longrightarrow 1 \\
 & & \downarrow I_{p_x, p_y} & \swarrow \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} & \downarrow \phi^{(q)} & & \downarrow \\
 & & \pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) & & [F_2^{(q)}, F_2^{(q)}] & & F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)} \\
 & & \downarrow \psi_*^{(q)} & \swarrow I_{p_x, p_y}^{(q)} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & \pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus 0, \psi^{(q)}(\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) & & F_2^{(q)} & \longleftarrow & \mathbb{Z}^2 \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & & & 1,
 \end{array}$$

where

- the map $\psi_*^{(q)}: \pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \psi^{(q)}(\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ is induced by the projection $\psi^{(q)}: \text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ defined by

$$\psi^{(a)}(p_x, p_y) = p_x, \quad \psi^{(b)}(p_x, p_y) = -p_y, \quad \psi^{(c)}(p_x, p_y) = p_y - p_x;$$

- the map $\phi^{(q)}: [F_4, F_4] \rightarrow [F_2^{(q)}, F_2^{(q)}]$ is the restriction of the projection $F_4 \rightarrow F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)} \rightarrow F_2^{(q)}$ to the commutator subgroup;
- the map $I_{p_x, p_y}^{(q)}: [F_2^{(q)}, F_2^{(q)}] \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \psi^{(q)}(\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ is defined

similarly to I_{p_x, p_y} : to a word representing an element in $[F_2^{(q)}, F_2^{(q)}]$ we associate a loop γ_w based at $\psi^{(q)}(\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)$ and obtained by concatenating several paths, one for every letter in w ; more precisely, the generator q_1 (\bar{q}_1 , q_2 , resp. \bar{q}_2 ,) in w corresponds to a straight line of length 1 going right (left, up, resp. down).

Lemma 6.8. *The diagram described above commutes.*

Proof. The left triangle and the right pentagon commute by definition. We only need to prove that the left square commutes. If g is an element in $[F_4, F_4]$ represented by the word w , then both the element $\psi_*^{(q)} \circ \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y}(g)$ and $I_{p_x, p_y}^{(q)} \circ \phi^{(q)}(g)$ are represented by loops in \mathbb{C} defined piecewise, and each piece correspond to a generator in the

word w . Therefore, it is enough to check that every generator of F_4 induces the same path inside the two loops.

Let (γ_x, γ_y) be a pair of loops in \mathbb{C} given as in the definition of $\tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y}(g)$. Then the generator x_1 corresponds to a segment in γ_x of length 1, parallel to the real axis and with the same orientation, while it corresponds to a constant path in γ_y . By composing with $\psi^{(q)}$, this path is sent to a segment that goes from a point $z \in \mathbb{C}$ to the point $z + 1$, z , $z - 1$ respectively when q is a , b , or c . Since $x_1 = a_1 \bar{c}_1$, we have that $\phi^{(a)}(x_1) = a_1$, $\phi^{(b)}(x_1) = 1$, $\phi^{(c)}(x_1) = \bar{c}_1$. After composing with $I_{p_x, p_y}^{(q)}$, we obtain that the corresponding path is a segment that goes from a point z to $z + 1$, z , $z - 1$ respectively, in the same way as above.

The check for x_2 is completely analogous. For y_1 and y_2 it is also similar, but one has to be careful that both \tilde{I}_{p_x, p_y} and $\psi_*(q)$ invert the sign, so the composition of the two maps ends up having the same sign. \square

Lemma 6.9. *Let $w \in W$ be a word representing the trivial element of $K_2^3(2)$. Then $\psi_*^{(q)}(I_{p_x, p_y}(w)) = 1$ for all Gaussian integers p_x, p_y .*

Proof. The image of w inside $F_2^{(a)} \times F_2^{(b)} \times F_2^{(c)}$ is trivial, since the top row is exact; as the diagram commutes $\phi^{(q)}(w)$ is trivial. Using again that the diagram commutes, implies the assertion. \square

Summing up, given two Gaussian integers p_x, p_y , we can associate to every word $w \in W$ an element $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$ belonging to $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$. We are interested in understanding for which p_x, p_y a word w is sent to a (non)trivial element of $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus 0), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$.

Recall that the fundamental group of $\text{Conf}_k(\mathbb{C})$ with base points $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathbb{C}$ is isomorphic to the pure braid group PB_k on k strands (see, e.g., [Art50]).

Remark 6.10. This isomorphism would be canonical if $p_1 < \dots < p_k$ were lying on the real axis; otherwise, one would have to choose a path that moves the base points to the canonical ones. We can still think of elements of the fundamental group as pure braids, in the sense that they are naturally k -uples of strands in $\mathbb{C} \times [0, 1]$, up to isotopy, where the i -th strand has fixed endpoints $p_i \times 0$ and $p_i \times 1$.

We observe that $\text{Conf}_k(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\})$ is a deformation retract of $\text{Conf}_{k+1}(\mathbb{C})$, so I_{p_x, p_y} defines a morphism

$$W \rightarrow \pi_1(\text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C}), (O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$$

in which a word w is sent to the pure braid on three strands based in O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y . The first strand is the constant one based in the origin O of the complex plane \mathbb{C} ; the other two strands are represented by γ_x, γ_y as in the definition of $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$.

This can be summarized by the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
W \xrightarrow{I_{p_x, p_y}} \pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), (\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \pi_1(\text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C}), (O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) \\
& \downarrow \psi_*^{(a)} & \downarrow \tilde{\psi}_*^{(a)} \\
& \pi_1(\text{Conf}_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}), \psi^{(a)}(\hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \pi_1(\text{Conf}_2(\mathbb{C}), \tilde{\psi}^{(a)}(O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))
\end{array}$$

where the horizontal isomorphisms are given by adding the constant strand based at O , and $\tilde{\psi}^{(a)}: \text{Conf}_3 \rightarrow \text{Conf}_2$ is the map that forgets about one of the three points: more precisely, $\tilde{\psi}^{(a)}$, $\tilde{\psi}^{(b)}$, $\tilde{\psi}^{(c)}$ forgets about the second, third, and first point respectively.

Given a Gaussian integer $p \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$, we denote by $\|p\|_\infty = \max\{|\text{Re } p|, |\text{Im } p|\}$.

Lemma 6.11. *Suppose $w \in W$ is a word of length ℓ and let p_x, p_y be two Gaussian integers. If $\max\{\|p_x\|_\infty, \|p_y\|_\infty\} > \ell$, then $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$ is trivial.*

Proof. We prove the statement only in the case $\text{Re}(p_x) > \ell$, the other cases are analogous.

Let γ_x, γ_y be the two loops in the definition of $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$. By hypothesis, these two loops have length at most ℓ . Thus

$$|\text{Re}(\gamma_x(t) - \gamma_x(t'))|, |\text{Re}(\gamma_y(t) - \gamma_y(t'))| \leq \ell/2$$

for all t, t' . Thus, we can find a vertical line between the origin and p_x , which does not intersect any of γ_x and γ_y . In particular, if we consider the braid of $\pi_1(\text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C}), (O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y))$ defined by $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$, then the strand based in p_y can be knotted with at most one of the other two strands, say with the one based in O . More precisely, we can isotope the braid such that the strand based in p_x is vertical, i.e. γ_x is constant, and γ_y stays inside a (topological) ball that contains the origin and does not intersect γ_x .

However, the braid $\tilde{\psi}^{(b)}(I_{p_x, p_y}(w))$, obtained by forgetting the strand based in p_x , is trivial by Lemma 6.9, implying that the strand based in p_y and the one based in O are unknotted. So we conclude that $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$ is trivial. \square

We denote by $\theta_x: F_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[i]$ the homomorphism sending $x_1 \mapsto 1$, $x_2 \mapsto i$, and $y_1, y_2 \mapsto 0$. Similarly, we denote by $\theta_y: F_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[i]$ the homomorphism that sends $y_1 \mapsto -1$, $y_2 \mapsto -i$, and $x_1, x_2 \mapsto 0$.

Lemma 6.12. *Let $\alpha = \alpha(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2) \in F_4$ be any word, $w \in W$ be a word representing the trivial element of $K_2^3(2)$, and p_x, p_y two Gaussian integers. Then $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$ is trivial if and only if $I_{p_x + \theta_x(\alpha), p_y + \theta_y(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}w\alpha)$ is.*

Proof. By definition, the two loops representing the element $I_{p_x, p_y}(w)$ and the element $I_{p_x + \theta_x(\alpha), p_y + \theta_y(\alpha)}(\bar{\alpha}w\alpha)$ are obtained from each other by conjugating by some path. Thus, if one of the two is trivial, so is the other. \square

Definition 6.13. For every $w \in W$, define the *braid-invariant* of w as

$$I(w) := \#\{(p_x, p_y) \in \mathbb{Z}[i]^2 \mid I_{p_x, p_y}(w) \text{ is nontrivial}\}.$$



FIGURE 3. Paths representing the elements σ_1 and σ_2 .

The following are useful properties of the braid-invariant.

Lemma 6.14. *If $w_1, w_2 \in W$ and $\alpha(x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2)$ is any word in F_4 , then*

- (1) $I(w_1)$ is finite;
- (2) $I(\bar{\alpha}w_1\alpha) = I(w_1)$;
- (3) $I(w_1w_2) \leq I(w_1) + I(w_2)$.

Proof. The first item follows from Lemma 6.11, while the second is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.12. The third item is due to the fact that I_{p_x, p_y} is a homomorphism: if $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_1)$ and $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_2)$ are trivial for some Gaussian integers p_x, p_y , then $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_1w_2)$ is also trivial. \square

6.2.2. *Braid invariant and Dehn function.* Let

$$w_n = [x_1^n, y_2^n][x_2^n, y_1^n].$$

In this section we show that $I(w_n)$ has quartic growth in n , while, clearly, the number of letters in w_n grows linearly in n . By the end of this subsection we will show that this is enough to prove that the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$ is at least quartic (see Proposition 6.16).

In order to compute $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_n)$ explicitly, we fix an isomorphism

$$\pi_1(\text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C}), (O, \hat{p}_x, \hat{p}_y)) \cong \text{PB}_3$$

by projecting the braids, seen as paths inside $\mathbb{C} \times [0, 1]$, to $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$, while keeping the information about over- and under-crossings.

Since PB_3 is a finite-index subgroup of B_3 , we may canonically embed the fundamental group of $\text{Conf}_3(\mathbb{C})$ into B_3 , which has the following finite presentation:

$$\langle \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \mid \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2 \rangle,$$

where σ_i exchanges the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th strand, as in Fig. 3.

Lemma 6.15. *If*

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \text{Re}(p_y - p_x), \text{Im}(p_y - p_x) < n, \\ \text{Re}(p_x), \text{Im}(p_x) \leq 0, \\ \text{Re}(p_y), \text{Im}(p_y) \geq 0, \end{cases}$$




FIGURE 4. The braid $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_n)$ inside $\mathbb{C} \times [0, 1]$, seen from two different points of view: on the left, its projection to \mathbb{C} , where arrows denote the direction where the strands go down; on the right, the projection to $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$.

then, by using the notation just introduced for $PB_3 \subset B_3$, we get that

$$I_{p_x, p_y}(w_n) = \sigma_1 \sigma_2^2 \bar{\sigma}_1 \sigma_2 \bar{\sigma}_1^2 \bar{\sigma}_2$$

is a non-trivial element of PB_3 .

Proof. When computing $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_n)$ as described in Section 6.2.1, one obtains the braid represented in Fig. 4, which coincides with the expression above. It is easy to check that this is a nontrivial element in B_3 : e.g., by closing the braid [Lic97, Chapter 1], one obtains a nontrivial link called *Borromean rings* [LZ91], [Nan93]. \square

Now we are ready to prove that the braid invariant constitutes a lower bound for the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$.

Proposition 6.16. *Let $w \in W$ be a word representing the trivial element of $K_2^3(2)$. Then $\text{Area}(w) \geq C \cdot I(w)$ for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on the presentation.*

Proof. Set

$$C' = \max\{I(r) \mid r \in W \text{ relation of } K_2^3(2)\}.$$

By Lemma 6.14, the constant C' is finite and only depends on the lengths of the relations. Using that w_1 is a relation of $K_2^3(2)$, and considering $p_x = p_y = 0$ in Lemma 6.15, one obtains that $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_1)$ is nontrivial and so both $I(w_1)$ and C' are positive.

If $w \in W$ is any word representing the trivial word in $K_2^3(2)$, then, by applying the second and third item of Lemma 6.14, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I(w) &= I\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\text{Area}(w)} \overline{\alpha_i} r_i \alpha_i\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Area}(w)} I(\overline{\alpha_i} r_i \alpha_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\text{Area}(w)} I(r_i) \\ &\leq C' \cdot \text{Area}(w), \end{aligned}$$

and one concludes by letting $C = 1/C'$. \square

We are finally ready to prove that the Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$ is at least quartic.

Proposition 6.17. *The Dehn function of $K_2^3(2)$ is at least N^4 .*

Proof. By Lemma 6.15, whenever p_x, p_y are two Gaussian integers such that

$$-p_x, p_y \in [0, n/2) \times [0, n/2) \subset \mathbb{C},$$

the element $I_{p_x, p_y}(w_n)$ is nontrivial in PB_3 . As there are at least $\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)^4$ pairs of Gaussian integers (p_x, p_y) satisfying this condition, the invariant $I(w_n)$ grows at least as a polynomial of degree 4 in n . The assertion now follows from Proposition 6.16. \square

Proof of Theorem B. The assertion is an immediate consequence of Propositions 6.6 and 6.17. \square

Let us end by mentioning that as a consequence of Proposition 6.17 and Theorem 4.5 we also obtain lower bounds on the Dehn functions of $K_r^3(r)$ for $r \geq 2$.

Corollary 6.18. *For $r \geq 2$ the Dehn function of $K_r^3(r)$ is bounded below by N^4 .*

APPENDIX A. THREE FACTORS

In this appendix we prove Propositions 3.3, 3.4 and 3.8 for $K_r^3(r)$. Recall from Section 3 that $K_r^3(r)$ is generated by

$$\mathcal{X}_r^3 = \{x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_r\},$$

where we have set $x_i = x_i^{(1)}$ and $y_j = x_j^{(2)}$,

We consider the set of trivial words

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{r,1} &:= \{[x_i, y_i] \mid i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,3} &:= \left\{ \left[x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta \right] \left[x_j^\delta, y_i^\varepsilon \right] \mid i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\} \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,4} &:= \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} x_i, [y_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta] \\ y_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta] \end{array} \right] \mid i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ pairwise distinct,} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\} \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,5} &:= \left\{ \left[\left[x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta \right], [y_j^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau] \right] \mid i, j, k, h \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ pairwise distinct,} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and we claim

$$K_r^3(r) = \langle \mathcal{X}_r^3 \mid \mathcal{R}_r^3 \rangle.$$

for $\mathcal{R}_r^3 = \mathcal{R}_{r,1} \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,3} \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,4} \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,5}$.

Remark A.1. In most of the proofs, we assume that all the exponents involved are equal to 1, in order to ease notation. The other cases are analogous, and often they can be deduced directly by applying the automorphism of $K_r^3(r)$ that sends x_i, y_i to \bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_i for some chosen $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and fixes x_j, y_j for $j \neq i$.

Remark A.2. A lot of computations that follow make silent use of the algebraic identities $[uv, w] = u[v, w]\bar{u}[u, w]$, $[u, vw] = [u, v]v[u, w]\bar{v}$ and $[wu\bar{w}, v] = w[u, \bar{w}v\bar{w}]\bar{w}$.

A.1. Useful trivial words. We start by proving the following result, which says that if in each set of relations we remove the hypothesis that all the indices are distinct, we get an equivalent presentation. We also prove that some variants of the relations are trivial.

Lemma A.3. *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that for all $i, j, k, l \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ (not necessarily distinct) and $\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta][x_j^\delta, y_i^\varepsilon]) \leq C;$
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_j^\delta \bar{y}_j^\delta][x_j^\delta, x_i^\varepsilon \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon]) \leq C;$
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i^\varepsilon, x_j^\delta \bar{y}_j^\delta][y_j^\delta, x_i^\varepsilon \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon]) \leq C;$
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i, [y_j^\varepsilon, y_k^\delta \bar{x}_k^\delta]]) \leq C;$
- (5) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]]) \leq C;$
- (6) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [y_j^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C;$
- (7) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_k^\sigma \bar{y}_k^\sigma, [x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta]]) \leq C;$

- (8) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [x_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C;$
(9) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [y_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C.$

Proof. We prove each item separately.

- (1) If $i \neq j$, the expression is a relation. If $i = j$, the conclusion follows since $[x_i, y_i] \in \mathcal{R}_r^3$.
(2) Assume $\varepsilon = \delta = 1$ (see Remark A.1). We observe that using the relation $[\bar{y}_j, \bar{x}_i][\bar{y}_i, \bar{x}_j]$ we obtain

$$[x_i, x_j \bar{y}_j][x_j, x_i \bar{y}_i] = x_i x_j [\bar{y}_j, \bar{x}_i] \bar{y}_i \bar{x}_j y_i \bar{x}_i = x_i x_j [\bar{x}_j, \bar{y}_i] \bar{y}_i \bar{x}_j y_i \bar{x}_i = 1.$$

(3) Analogous to the previous case.
(4) If i, j, k are pairwise distinct, the expression belongs to the presentation. Assume $j \neq k$, otherwise the conclusion is trivial; so either $i = j$ or $i = k$. We may assume without loss of generality that $i = j$ by applying (3). Moreover, by combining Remark A.1 with the fact that $[\bar{x}_i, [y_i^\varepsilon, y_k^\delta \bar{x}_k^\delta]]$ is conjugate to $[x_i, [y_i^\varepsilon, y_k^\delta \bar{x}_k^\delta]]$, we may assume $\varepsilon = \delta = 1$.

Therefore, consider

$$[x_i, [y_i, y_k \bar{x}_k]] = [x_i, y_i] y_i y_k \bar{x}_k \bar{y}_i x_k \bar{y}_k [y_k \bar{x}_k y_i x_k \bar{y}_k, x_i] y_k \bar{x}_k y_i x_k \bar{y}_k \bar{y}_i.$$

Note that

$$[y_k \bar{x}_k y_i x_k \bar{y}_k, x_i] = x_i y_k \bar{x}_i [x_i, \bar{y}_k] [\bar{x}_k, y_i] y_i x_i [\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_k] [\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_i] \bar{y}_i \bar{y}_k \bar{x}_i$$

which is trivial by $[y_i, \bar{x}_k][\bar{y}_k, x_i]$, $[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_k][\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_i]$ and $[x_i, y_i]$.

- (5) Analogous to the previous item.
(6) If i, j, k, h are pairwise distinct, then the expression is a relation. If either $i = k$ or $j = h$, then the conclusion is trivial: so assume that one of i, k is equal to one either j or h . By applying (2), (3) we may assume that $i = j$.

Suppose that $\varepsilon = \sigma$. Consider the expression $[[x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [y_i^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]$ and note that using (4)

it becomes

$$[x_i^\varepsilon \bar{y}_k^\delta \bar{x}_i^\varepsilon y_k^\delta \bar{x}_k^\delta, [y_i^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]$$

which, using $[x_i^\varepsilon, \bar{y}_k^\delta][\bar{x}_k^\delta, y_i^\varepsilon]$, becomes

$$[y_i^\varepsilon \bar{x}_k^\delta \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon, [y_i^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]].$$

Now we use $\varepsilon = \sigma$ to rewrite it as

$$y_i^\varepsilon [\bar{x}_k^\delta, [x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau, \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon]] \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon$$

and the conclusion follows.

Suppose instead that $\varepsilon = -\sigma$. Starting again from $[[x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [y_i^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]$ and using (5) twice we obtain

$$[[x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau, \bar{y}_i^\sigma]].$$

By the same arguments as before we reach

$$[y_i^\varepsilon \bar{x}_k^\delta \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon, [x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau, \bar{y}_i^\sigma]]$$

that, using $\varepsilon = -\sigma$, can be rewritten as

$$y_i^\varepsilon [\bar{x}_k^\delta, [\bar{y}_i^\varepsilon, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]] \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon$$

and again we conclude.

(7) Assume $\sigma = \varepsilon = \delta = 1$. We observe that

$$\bar{y}_j \bar{x}_i [x_k \bar{y}_k, [x_i, y_j]] x_i y_j = \bar{y}_j [\bar{x}_i, x_k \bar{y}_k] y_j [\bar{y}_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] [x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{x}_i] \bar{x}_i [x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{y}_j] x_i$$

and the conclusion follows by Items 4 to 6.

The other cases are completely analogous, by replacing $x_i \rightsquigarrow x_i^\varepsilon$, $y_j \rightsquigarrow y_j^\delta$, $x_k \rightsquigarrow x_k^\sigma$ and $y_k \rightsquigarrow y_k^\tau$ in the proof above.

(8) Assume $\sigma = \varepsilon = \delta = \tau = 1$. We observe that

$$[[x_i, y_j], [x_k, x_h \bar{y}_h]] = [y_i [\bar{y}_i x_i, y_j] y_j \bar{y}_i \bar{y}_j, [x_k, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$$

and the conclusion follows by (4), (6). The other cases are analogous.

(9) Analogous to the previous case. □

A.2. Proof of Proposition 3.3 for three factors. Recall from Definition 2.1 that for a homomorphism $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ the norm $\|\phi\|$ is the maximum of the lengths of $\phi(\xi_1), \dots, \phi(\xi_r)$ as reduced words in $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'}$ (and their inverses). Notice that $\|\widehat{\phi}\| = \|\phi\|$.

Proposition A.4 (Proposition 3.3 for $n = 3$). *There exists a constant $A_1 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all integers $r, r' \geq 1$ and every homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 1$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r,r'}}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r^3)) \leq A_1.$$

Proof. Let $r \geq 1$, $n \geq 3$ be integers. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^3$ and let i_1, \dots, i_k be the indices involved in R , where $1 \leq k \leq 4$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r$. If $\phi(\xi_{i_j}) = 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq k$ then $\widehat{\phi}(R) = 1$ and we are done. Otherwise, the conclusion follows by Lemma A.3. □

A.3. Proof of Proposition 3.4 for three factors. The purpose of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.5 (Proposition 3.4 for $n = 3$). *There exists a constant $A_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: for every integer $r \geq 1$, consider the homomorphism $\rho_r: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+1})$ given by $\rho_r(\xi_1) = \xi_1 \xi_2$ and $\rho_r(\xi_i) = \xi_{i+1}$ for $i = 2, \dots, r$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r+1}}(\widehat{\rho}(\mathcal{R}_r^3)) \leq A_2.$$

We split the proof into several lemmas, one for every type of relation.

Lemma A.6 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i x_{i'}, y_i y_{i'}]) \leq C.$$

Proof. We have

$$\bar{y}_i[x_i x_{i'}, y_i y_{i'}] y_i = (\bar{y}_i x_i) x_{i'} y_i (y_{i'} \bar{x}_{i'}) \bar{x}_i \bar{y}_{i'},$$

which, using $[x_i, y_i]$ and $[x_{i'}, y_{i'}]$ and conjugating, becomes

$$[\bar{y}_i, x_{i'}][y_{i'}, \bar{x}_i]$$

and the conclusion follows. \square

Lemma A.7 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,3}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i', j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([(x_i x_{i'})^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta][x_j^\delta, (y_i y_{i'})^\varepsilon]) \leq C.$$

Proof. We have

$$[x_i x_{i'}, y_j][x_j, y_i y_{i'}] = x_i [x_{i'}, y_j] \bar{x}_i [x_i, y_j] [x_j, y_i] y_i [x_j, y_{i'}] \bar{y}_i$$

and we can use the relation $[x_i, y_j][x_j, y_i]$ and conjugate to obtain

$$\bar{y}_i x_i [x_{i'}, y_j] \bar{x}_i y_i [x_j, y_{i'}].$$

We conclude by applying the the trivial word $[\bar{x}_i y_i, [x_{i'}, y_j]]$ (Lemma A.3 (7)) and the relation $[x_{i'}, y_j][x_j, y_{i'}]$. \square

Lemma A.8 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$ - Part I). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i', j, j', k, k' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i x_{i'}, [y_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]]) \leq C;$
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i, [(y_j y_{j'})^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]]) \leq C;$
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i, [y_j^\varepsilon, (x_k x_{k'})^\delta (\bar{y}_k \bar{y}_k)^\delta]]) \leq C.$

Proof. We distinguish the three cases.

- (1) Immediate from the relations in $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$.
- (2) We have

$$[x_i, [y_j y_{j'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]] = [x_i, y_j [y_{j'}, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$$

and we can use $[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ and conjugate to obtain

$$[\bar{y}_j x_i y_j, [y_{j'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$$

which follows using $[x_i, [y_{j'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ and $[[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j], [y_{j'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$; for this last identity, we apply Lemma A.3 (9).

- (3) We consider

$$[x_i, [y_j, x_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'} \bar{y}_k]]$$

and we use $[x_k x_{k'}, y_k y_{k'}]$ (using Lemma A.6) in order to obtain

$$[x_i, [y_j, \bar{y}_{k'} \bar{y}_k x_k x_{k'}]]$$

Using $[x_k, y_k]$ and $[x_{k'}, y_{k'}]$ this becomes

$$[x_i, [y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k] x_k \bar{y}_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]].$$

This is equal to

$$[x_i, [y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]] [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k] [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}] [x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{y}_{k'}]],$$

which is a product of conjugates of $[x_i, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$, $[x_i, [y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]]$, and $[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]]$.

In order to compute the area of $[x_i, [y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]] = 1$ we observe that

$$[x_i, [y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]] = [x_i, y_j [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j [x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{y}_{k'}']]$$

which, using $[x_i, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ and conjugating, becomes

$$[\bar{y}_j x_i y_j, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$$

which follows using $[x_i, [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ and $[[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j], [\bar{y}_{k'}, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$; for this last identity we use Lemma A.3(9).

To obtain $[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]] = 1$ we observe that

$$[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]] = [x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] x_k \bar{y}_k [y_j, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}] y_k \bar{x}_k]$$

which, using $[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ and conjugating, becomes

$$[y_k \bar{x}_k x_i x_k \bar{y}_k, [y_j, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]]$$

which follows using $[x_k, y_k]$, $[x_i, [y_j, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]]$ and $[[\bar{x}_i, \bar{x}_k y_k], [y_j, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}]]$. □

Lemma A.9 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$ - Part II). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i', j, j', k, k' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i y_{i'}, [x_j^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]]) \leq C$;
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i, [(x_j x_{j'})^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta]]) \leq C$;
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, (x_k x_{k'})^\delta (\bar{y}_{k'} \bar{y}_k)^\delta]]) \leq C$.

Proof. Analogous to Lemma A.8. □

Lemma A.10 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,5}$). *There is a constant C (independent on r) such that, for every $i, i', j, j', k, k', h, h' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([[(x_i x_{i'})^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta], [y_j^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]) \leq C$;
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([[(x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta)], [(y_j y_{j'})^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]) \leq C$;
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([[(x_i^\varepsilon, (x_k x_{k'})^\delta (\bar{y}_{k'} \bar{y}_k)^\delta)], [y_j^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]]) \leq C$;
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([[(x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\delta \bar{y}_k^\delta)], [y_j^\sigma, (x_h x_{h'})^\tau (\bar{y}_{h'} \bar{y}_h)^\tau]]) \leq C$.

Proof. We distinguish the four cases.

- (1) We observe that

$$[[x_i x_{i'}, x_k \bar{y}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]] = [x_i [x_{i'}, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{x}_i [x_i, x_k \bar{y}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$$

and the conclusion follows.

- (2) Analogous to the previous item.

(3) We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} [[x_i, x_k x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'} \bar{y}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]] &= \\ &= [x_i x_k \bar{x}_i [x_i, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}] (x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'} [x_i, \bar{y}_k] y_{k'} \bar{x}_{k'}) \bar{x}_k, [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]] \end{aligned}$$

which, using $[x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}, [x_i, \bar{y}_k]]$ (obtained from Lemma A.3), becomes

$$[x_i x_k \bar{x}_i [x_i, x_{k'} \bar{y}_{k'}] [x_i, \bar{y}_k] \bar{x}_k, [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$$

and the conclusion follows using Lemma A.3.

(4) Analogous to the previous item. □

Proof of Proposition A.5. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r$ and let i_1, \dots, i_k be the indices involved in R , where $1 \leq k \leq 4$ and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq r$. If $i_1 > 1$ then $\tilde{\rho}(R) \in \mathcal{R}_{r+1}$ and we are done. If $i_1 = 1$ then the conclusion follows by Lemmas A.6 to A.10. □

A.4. Proof of Proposition 3.8 for three factors. In this proposition we will prove Proposition 3.8, that we recall here.

Proposition A.11 (Proposition 3.8 for $n = 3$). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following happens: let $r \geq 2$ and N_1, \dots, N_r be integers, and consider the homomorphism*

$$\omega = \omega_{N_1, \dots, N_r} : F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

given by $\omega(\xi_i) = \xi_i^{N_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}(\widehat{\omega}(\mathcal{R}_r^3)) \leq C(\max\{|N_1|, \dots, |N_r|\})^7.$$

Lemma A.12 (Power relations for $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N and all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, y_i^N]) \leq CN^2.$$

Proof. Immediate. □

The following lemmas compute the area of some expressions that are useful for proving power relations.

Lemma A.13 (Power relations for $\mathcal{R}_{r,3}$ and similar). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N , $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^N][x_j^N, y_i^\varepsilon]) \leq CN^2;$
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_j^N \bar{y}_j^N][x_j^N, x_i^\varepsilon \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon]) \leq CN^2;$
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i^\varepsilon, y_j^N \bar{x}_j^N][y_j^N, x_i^\varepsilon \bar{y}_i^\varepsilon]) \leq CN^2.$

Proof. Assume $N > 0$ (the other case is analogous). We observe that

$$[x_i, y_j^N][x_j^N, y_i] = ([x_i, y_j] y_j)^N \bar{y}_j^N x_j^N (\bar{x}_j [x_j, y_i])^N$$

which, using $O(N^2)$ times $[x_j, y_j]$, becomes

$$([x_i, y_j]y_j)^N (x_j\bar{y}_j)^N (\bar{x}_j[x_j, y_i])^N.$$

But for $L \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have

$$[x_i, y_j]y_j(x_j\bar{y}_j)^L \bar{x}_j[x_j, y_i] = [x_i, y_j](x_j\bar{y}_j)^{L-1}[x_j, y_i] = (x_i\bar{y}_j)^{L-1}$$

by using $O(L)$ times $[x_j, y_j]$, $O(L)$ times $[x_j\bar{y}_j, [x_i, y_j]]$ (obtained from Lemma A.3) and once $[x_i, y_j][x_j, y_i]$. This proves (1). The other items are analogous. \square

Lemma A.14 (Power relations for $\mathcal{R}_{r,5}$ and similar). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N , all $i, j, k, h \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and all $\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, x_k^\sigma \bar{y}_k^\sigma], [y_j^\delta, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|;$
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^N \bar{y}_k^N], [y_j^\delta, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\sigma \bar{y}_k^\sigma], [y_j^N, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|;$
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, x_k^\sigma \bar{y}_k^\sigma], [y_j^\delta, x_h^N \bar{y}_h^N]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (5) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, y_j^\delta], [x_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (6) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^N], [x_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|;$
- (7) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [x_k^N, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (8) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [x_k^\sigma, x_h^N \bar{y}_h^N]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (9) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, y_j^\delta], [y_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|;$
- (10) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^N], [y_k^\sigma, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (11) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [y_k^N, x_h^\tau \bar{y}_h^\tau]) \leq C|N|^2;$
- (12) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^\varepsilon, y_j^\delta], [y_k^\sigma, x_h^N \bar{y}_h^N]) \leq C|N|^2.$

Proof. For (1), note that

$$[[x_i^N, x_k \bar{y}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]] = [x_i^N ([x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{x}_i] \bar{x}_i)^N, [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$$

which follows using $O(N)$ times the relation $[x_i, [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$ and $O(N)$ times the relation $[[x_k \bar{y}_k, \bar{x}_i], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$. (2) is analogous, with the only difference that at the beginning we need to substitute $[x_i, x_k^N \bar{y}_k^N]$ with $[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k^N]$ using Lemma A.13. The other items are analogous. \square

Lemma A.15 (Power relation for $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N , all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and all $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i, [y_j^N, x_k^\varepsilon \bar{y}_k^\varepsilon]]) \leq C|N|^3;$
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i, [y_j^\varepsilon, x_k^N \bar{y}_k^N]]) \leq C|N|^3;$
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i, [x_j^N, x_k^\varepsilon \bar{y}_k^\varepsilon]]) \leq C|N|^3;$
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([y_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, x_k^N \bar{y}_k^N]]) \leq C|N|^3;$
- (5) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i \bar{y}_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, y_k^N]]) \leq C|N|^3.$

Proof. We assume $N > 0$ and $\varepsilon = 1$, the other cases being similar. For (1) we note that

$$[y_j^N, x_k \bar{y}_k] = (y_j^{N-1} [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j^{N-1}) (y_j^{N-2} [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j^{N-2}) \dots ([y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]),$$

and thus it is enough to prove that, for every $L = 0, \dots, N-1$, the area of $[x_i, y_j^L [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j^L]$ is at most $O(L^2)$. But $[x_i, y_j^L [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] \bar{y}_j^L]$ is conjugate to

$$[\bar{y}_j^L x_i y_j^L, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$$

which follows using $[x_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ once and $[[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j^L], [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$ (whose area is $O(L^2)$ by Lemma A.14). The other parts are analogous. \square

Lemma A.16. *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N, M, P, Q and all $i, j, k, h \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, y_i^N]) \leq C|N|^2$;
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, y_j^M][x_j^M, y_i^N]) \leq C|M|^2|N|^3$;
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, [y_j^M, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]) \leq C|N|(|M|^3 + |M|^2|P|^3)$;
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}([x_i^N, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]) \leq C|N||P|(|P| + |M|^3 + |M|^2|Q|^3)$.

Proof. We prove each item separately.

- (1) Immediate.
- (2) We assume that $M > 1$, the case $M \leq 0$ being similar. We observe that

$$[x_i^N, y_j^M][x_j^M, y_i^N] = ([x_i^N, y_j] y_j)^M \bar{y}_j^M x_j^M (\bar{x}_j [x_j, y_i^N])^M$$

which using $O(M^2)$ times $[x_j, y_j]$ becomes

$$([x_i^N, y_j] y_j)^M (x_j \bar{y}_j)^M (\bar{x}_j [x_j, y_i^N])^M.$$

But for $L = 1, \dots, M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} ([x_i^N, y_j] y_j) (x_j \bar{y}_j)^L (\bar{x}_j [x_j, y_i^N]) &= [x_i^N, y_j] (x_j \bar{y}_j)^{L-1} [x_j, y_i^N] \\ &= (x_j \bar{y}_j)^{L-1} \end{aligned}$$

using $O(L)$ times $[x_j, y_j]$ and $O(L)$ times $[x_j \bar{y}_j, [x_i^N, y_j]]$ (whose area is at most $O(N^3)$ by Lemma A.15) and once $[x_i^N, y_j][x_j, y_i^N]$ (which has area at most $O(N^2)$ by Lemma A.13). This proves (2).

- (3) We assume that $M > 1$, the case $M \leq 0$ being similar. We note that

$$[y_j^M, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P] = (y_j^{M-1} [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P] \bar{y}_j^{M-1}) (y_j^{M-2} [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P] \bar{y}_j^{M-2}) \dots ([y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P])$$

and thus it is enough to prove that, for every $L = 1, \dots, M$, the area of $[x_i, y_j^L [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P] \bar{y}_j^L]$ is at most $O(L^2 + LP^3)$. But $[x_i, y_j^L [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P] \bar{y}_j^L]$ is conjugate to

$$[\bar{y}_j^L x_i y_j^L, [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$$

which, using $[x_i, [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$ (whose area is bounded from above by $O(P^3)$ by Lemma A.15), becomes

$$[[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j^L], [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$$

which, using $[\bar{x}_i, \bar{y}_j^L][\bar{x}_j^L, \bar{y}_i]$ (whose area is bounded from above by $O(L^2)$ by Lemma A.13), becomes

$$[[\bar{y}_i, \bar{x}_j^L], [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]] = [([\bar{y}_i, \bar{x}_j] \bar{x}_j)^L x_j^L, [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$$

which follows using $O(L)$ times $[x_j, [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$, of area bounded from by $O(P^3)$ (Lemma A.15) and $O(L)$ times $[[\bar{y}_i, \bar{x}_j], [y_j, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P]]$ (which has area at most $O(P^2)$ by Lemma A.14). Finally, in order to prove (3), we observe that $[x_i^N, [y_j^{M\varepsilon}, x_k^{P\delta} \bar{y}_k^{P\delta}]]$ follows by applying N times $[x_i, [y_j^{M\varepsilon}, x_k^{P\delta} \bar{y}_k^{P\delta}]]$.

(4) We note that

$$[[x_i^N, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]] = [x_i^N (\bar{x}_i [x_i, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P])^N, [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$$

which, using $O(N)$ times $[x_i, x_k^P \bar{y}_k^P][x_k^P, x_i \bar{y}_i]$ (which has area at most $O(P^2)$ by Lemma A.13), becomes

$$[x_i^N (\bar{x}_i [x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k^P])^N, [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$$

which follows using $O(N)$ times the element $[x_i, [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$, whose area is bounded by $O(M^3 + M^2 Q^3)$ by (3), and $O(N)$ times $[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k^P], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$, whose area we will estimate now.

We note that

$$[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k^P], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]] = [([x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k] x_k)^P \bar{x}_k^P, [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$$

which follows using $O(P)$ times the element $[x_k, [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$ (which has area at most $O(M^3 + M^2 Q^3)$ by (3)) and $O(P)$ times $[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$, whose area we estimate next.

We note that

$$[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k], [y_j^M, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]] = [[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k], y_j^M (\bar{y}_j [y_j, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q])^M]$$

which follows using $O(M)$ times the element $[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k], y_j]$ and $O(M)$ times $[[x_i \bar{y}_i, x_k], [y_j, x_h^Q \bar{y}_h^Q]]$ (whose area is bounded by $O(Q^2)$ by Lemma A.14). This proves (4). □

Proof of Proposition A.11. It is a direct consequence of Lemma A.16. □

A.5. Proof of Proposition 3.12 for three factors. We recall (and introduce) the following notation (translated to the three factor-setting, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_r)$, $\mathbf{q}' = (q'_1, \dots, q'_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$:

- $|\mathbf{q}| = \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_r|\}$;
- $\mathcal{A}_r = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, r\}\}$;
- $\mathcal{C}_r = \{[a_i, b_j], [a_i, c_k], [b_j, c_k] \text{ for } i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\}\}$;
- $F_r^{(a)} \times F_r^{(b)} \times F_r^{(c)} = \langle \mathcal{A}_r \mid \mathcal{C}_r \rangle$;
- $\mathbf{q}^{[i:j]} = (0, \dots, 0, q_i, \dots, q_j, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$;
- $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}} = x_1^{-q_1} \cdots x_r^{-q_r}$;
- $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}} = y_1^{-q_1} \cdots y_r^{-q_r}$;
- a push down map for the short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K_r^3(r) \rightarrow F_r^{(a)} \times F_r^{(b)} \times F_r^{(c)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow 1$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i) &= y_1^{-q_1} \cdots y_{i-1}^{-q_{i-1}} x_i y_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} \cdots y_1^{q_1} = \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}^{[1:i-1]}} x_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}^{[1:i-1]}}; \\ \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(b_i) &= x_1^{-q_1} \cdots x_{i-1}^{-q_{i-1}} y_i x_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} \cdots x_1^{q_1} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}^{[1:i-1]}} y_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}^{[1:i-1]}}; \\ \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(c_i) &= y_1^{-q_1} \cdots y_r^{-q_r} \bar{x}_i y_r^{q_r} \cdots y_i^{q_i} x_i y_{i-1}^{q_{i-1}} \cdots y_1^{q_1} \\ &= \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}} \bar{x}_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}^{[i:r]}} x_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}^{[1:i-1]}}; \end{aligned}$$

and it satisfies $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(uw) = \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(u) \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} + \tilde{\psi}(u)}(w)$ for any $u, w \in F(\mathcal{A}_r)$,

where the homomorphism $\tilde{\psi}: F(\mathcal{A}_r) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ is given by the composition

$$F(\mathcal{A}_r) \longrightarrow F_r^{(a)} \times F_r^{(b)} \times F_r^{(c)} \xrightarrow{\phi_r^n} \mathbb{Z}^r.$$

- $\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ is defined as the homomorphism sending ξ_{r+1} to $\xi_1^{q_1} \cdots \xi_r^{q_r}$, ξ_{r+2} to $\xi_1^{q'_1} \cdots \xi_r^{q'_r}$ and ξ_i to ξ_i , for every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- Given $m > 0$, the set of m -thick relations is

$$\mathcal{R}_r^3(m) := \bigcup_{\|\phi\| \leq 1} \bigcup_{|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{q}'| \leq m+1} \hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'} \left(\hat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_{r+2}^3) \right).$$

The aim of this section is to prove the following.

Proposition A.17 (Proposition 3.12 for $n = 3$). *There is a constant E (independent of r) such that, for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$ and $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, the following hold:*

- $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}([a_i, b_j])) \leq E$;
- $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}([a_i, c_k])) \leq E$;
- $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}([b_j, c_k])) \leq E$.

We start with a preliminary lemma.

Lemma A.18. *For every $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and $\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$ we have*

$$(1) \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}([x_i \bar{y}_i, [x_j^\varepsilon, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}}^\delta]]) \leq C;$$

- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}([\mathbf{x}_q, [(y_i \bar{x}_i)^\varepsilon, \mathbf{y}_{q'}^\delta]]) \leq C$;
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}([\mathbf{y}_q \bar{\mathbf{x}}_q, [x_j^\varepsilon, \mathbf{y}_{q'}^\delta]]) \leq C$;
- (4) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}([(x_i \bar{y}_i)^\varepsilon, \mathbf{y}_q^\delta], [x_j^\tau, \mathbf{y}_{q'}^\sigma]) \leq C$;

for some constant C independent of $r, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}', i, j$.

Proof. Since the proof is similar for each statement, we only prove the second (since it contains both \mathbf{q} and \mathbf{q}').

Consider the expression $[x_{r+1}, [(y_i \bar{x}_i)^\varepsilon, y_{r+2}^\delta]]$. By Lemma A.3, this can be written as a product of a finite number of conjugates of relations in \mathcal{R}_{r+2}^3 , i.e.

$$[x_{r+1}, [(y_i \bar{x}_i)^\varepsilon, y_{r+2}^\delta]] = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \bar{z}_k R_k z_k$$

where $z_s \in F(\mathcal{X}_{r+2})$ and $R_s \in \mathcal{R}_{r+2}^3$. Let $\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ as defined above. Then applying $\widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}$ to both sides of the equation gives

$$[\mathbf{x}_q, [(y_i \bar{x}_i)^\varepsilon, \mathbf{y}_{q'}^\delta]] = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(\bar{z}_k) \widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(R_k) \widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(z_k),$$

where, by definition, $\widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(R_k) \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$. This proves the claim. \square

We split the proof of Proposition A.17 into three lemmas, one for every item.

Lemma A.19. *For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i b_j \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_j)) \leq C$$

for some constant C independent of m, r, \mathbf{q}, i, j .

Proof. We split the proof in three cases.

- if $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i b_j \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_j)$ is

$$(x_i [\bar{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}]) (\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}+e_i} y_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}+e_i}) ([\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, \bar{x}_i] \bar{x}_i) (\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} \bar{y}_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}),$$

(where we set $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} = 1$ if $i = 1$). Using $[\bar{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}] [\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, \bar{y}_i] \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$ twice, and that $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}+e_i} = \bar{x}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} \bar{x}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}} y_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}} x_i \bar{y}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} \bar{y}_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} = \\ x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} y_i \bar{x}_i [[x_i \bar{y}_i, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}}, y_j] y_j x_i \bar{y}_i \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} \bar{y}_j \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using $[[x_i \bar{y}_i, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}}, y_j] \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$, one gets

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} [[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}, x_i \bar{y}_i], y_j] \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}},$$

which is a conjugate of an element inside $\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$.

- If $1 \leq j < i \leq r$ the proof is analogous.

- If $1 \leq i = j \leq r$, then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i b_j \bar{a}_i \bar{b}_j)$ is

$$x_i [\bar{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}] [\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, y_i] y_i \bar{x}_i [x_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}] [\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, \bar{y}_i] \bar{y}_i,$$

which is trivial via the thick relations $[y_i \bar{x}_i, [\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, y_i]]$, $[y_i \bar{x}_i, [\bar{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]} }]]$, $[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, y_i] [x_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}]$, $[\bar{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}] [\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}, \bar{y}_i]$, and $[x_i, y_i]$.

□

Lemma A.20. *For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i c_j \bar{a}_i \bar{c}_j)) \leq C$$

for some constant C independent of m, r, \mathbf{q}, i, j .

Proof. We split the proof in three cases:

- If $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i c_j \bar{a}_i \bar{c}_j)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} \bar{x}_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}} x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}} \bar{x}_j \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}} x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}} = \\ = \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} \left[x_i \bar{y}_i [y_i \bar{x}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:j-1]}}], [\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}, \bar{x}_j] \right] \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}} \end{aligned}$$

(where, if $i = 1$, we set $\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} = 1$), which becomes trivial via Lemma A.18.

- If $1 \leq j < i \leq r$, then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i c_j \bar{a}_i \bar{c}_j)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} \bar{x}_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} y_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:i-1]}} x_j \bar{y}_j \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:i-1]}} \bar{x}_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:i-1]}} y_j \bar{x}_j \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}} x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}} = \\ \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} \bar{x}_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \left[x_i, x_j \bar{y}_j [y_j \bar{x}_j, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:i-1]}}] \right] \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

which, using $[x_i, [y_j \bar{x}_j, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:i-1]}}]]$, $[[x_i, x_j \bar{y}_j], \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}] \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$, becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} x_i \bar{y}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} \bar{x}_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} y_i \bar{x}_i \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}} [x_i, x_j \bar{y}_j] x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}} = \\ = \mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}} \bar{x}_j \left[x_j, x_i \bar{y}_i [y_i \bar{x}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}] \right] [x_i, x_j \bar{y}_j] x_j \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is trivial via $[x_j, [y_i \bar{x}_i, \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}]] \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$ and Lemma A.3.

- If $1 \leq i = j \leq r$, then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_i c_i \bar{a}_i \bar{c}_i)$ is

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}} \left[x_i \bar{y}_i, [\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}, \bar{x}_i] \bar{x}_i \right] \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}$$

which is trivial by $[x_i, y_i]$ and Lemma A.18.

□

Lemma A.21. *For every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq r$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(b_i c_j \bar{b}_i \bar{c}_j)) \leq C$$

for some constant C independent of m, r, \mathbf{q}, i, j .

Proof. We only need to show that we can exchange x and y in the definition of $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(c_j)$ by using a bounded number of thick relations, that is,

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}}\bar{x}_i\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}x_i\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}\bar{y}_i\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}y_i\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}) \leq E$$

for some universal constant E . After that, we can conclude in the same way as in Lemma A.20 by exploiting the symmetry in x and y .

The expression above can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}[\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}, \bar{x}_i]\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}[\bar{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}]\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}$$

which becomes trivial after using $[[\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}, \bar{x}_i], \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:i-1]}}]$ (see Lemma A.18 (3)) and $[\mathbf{y}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}, \bar{x}_i][\bar{y}_i, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[i:r]}}]$. \square

APPENDIX B. FIVE FACTORS OR MORE

In this appendix we prove Propositions 3.3, 3.4, 3.8 and 3.12 for $K_r^n(r)$ when the number of factors n is at least 5. We fix an $n \geq 5$ throughout the whole section (so that we do not need to specify the number of factors in every set we define). Recall from Section 3 that $K_r^n(r)$ is generated by

$$\mathcal{X}_r^n = \bigcup_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)},$$

where

$$\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)} = (x_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, x_r^{(\alpha)}).$$

We consider the sets of trivial words

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)}] \mid i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n &:= \left\{ [x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_j^{(\beta)}\bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)}] \mid i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \text{ pairwise distinct} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and we claim

$$K_r^n(r) = \langle \mathcal{X}_r^n \mid \mathcal{R}_r^n \rangle,$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_r^n = \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n.$$

B.1. Proof of Proposition 3.3 for more factors. Recall from Definition 2.1 that for a homomorphism $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ the norm $\|\phi\|$ is the maximum of the lengths of $\phi(\xi_1), \dots, \phi(\xi_r)$ as reduced words in $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'}$ (and their inverses). Notice that $\|\widehat{\phi}\| = \|\phi\|$.

Proposition B.1 (Proposition 3.3 for $n \geq 5$). *There exists a constant $A_1 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all integers $r, r' \geq 1$ and every homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 1$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}^n}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r^n)) \leq A_1.$$

The proposition is a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma B.2. *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that the following holds. For every $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ (not necessarily distinct), $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $\varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n} \left(\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)} \right)^\varepsilon, \left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^\delta \left(\bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right)^\delta \right] \right) \leq C.$$

Proof. We observe that, up to applying the commutator $[x_j^{(\beta)}, x_j^{(\gamma)}]$ (and renaming γ and β accordingly), we can assume $\varepsilon = \delta = 1$.

When $i \neq j$, the statement is trivial. If $i = j$, then

$$\left[x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)} \right] = \left[x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)} \right] \left(x_i^{(\beta)} x_i^{(\alpha)} \left[\bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)}, \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \right] \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\beta)} \right),$$

proving the statement. \square

Proof of Proposition B.1. Fix two integers $r, r' \geq 1$. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^n$. If $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r,1}$, then $\widehat{\phi}(R)$ is either trivial or in $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$, and there is nothing to prove. If $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r,2}$, then let i_1, i_2 be the indices involved in R , where $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 \leq r$. If $\phi(x_{i_j}) = 1$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 2$ then $\widehat{\phi}(R) = 1$ and we are done. Otherwise, the conclusion follows by Lemma B.2. \square

B.2. Proof of Proposition 3.4 for more factors. The purpose of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition B.3 (Proposition 3.4 for $n \geq 5$). *There exists a constant $A_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: for every integer $r \geq 1$, consider the homomorphism $\rho_r: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+1})$ given by $\rho_r(\xi_1) = \xi_1 \xi_2$ and $\rho_r(\xi_i) = \xi_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r+1}^n}(\widehat{\rho}(\mathcal{R}_r^n)) \leq A_2.$$

The proposition is a consequence of the following two lemmas.

Lemma B.4 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n} \left(\left[x_i^{(\alpha)} x_{i'}^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)} x_{i'}^{(\beta)} \right] \right) \leq C.$$

Proof. For each $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we set $x_k = x_k^{(\alpha)}$, $y_k = x_k^{(\beta)}$ and $z_{i'} = x_{i'}^{(\gamma)}$ for some $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Using the relation $[x_{i'}, y_{i'}]$, the element $[x_i x_{i'}, y_i y_{i'}]$ becomes

$$x_i x_{i'} y_i \bar{x}_{i'} y_{i'} \bar{x}_i \bar{y}_{i'} \bar{y}_i = x_i x_{i'} (y_i \bar{x}_{i'} z_{i'}) (\bar{z}_{i'} y_{i'} \bar{x}_i) \bar{y}_{i'} \bar{y}_i.$$

Using $[y_i, z_{i'} \bar{x}_{i'}]$ and $[x_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]$, we deduce

$$x_i z_{i'} y_i \bar{x}_i \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{y}_i,$$

which is trivial with $[z_{i'}, y_i \bar{x}_i]$ and $[x_i, y_i]$. \square

Lemma B.5 (Doubling for $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $i, i', j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ pairwise distinct, and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ pairwise distinct, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n} \left(\left[x_j^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)} x_{i'}^{(\beta)} \bar{x}_{i'}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)} \right] \right) \leq C.$$

Proof. For each $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we set $x_k = x_k^{(\alpha)}$, $y_k = x_k^{(\beta)}$ and $z_k = x_k^{(\gamma)}$. We observe that

$$[x_j, y_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{z}_i] = [x_j, y_i \bar{z}_i [z_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}] y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}].$$

Using $[x_j, y_i \bar{z}_i]$ this becomes $[x_j, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]$,

$$y_i \bar{z}_i ([x_j, [z_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]]) z_i \bar{y}_i = y_i \bar{z}_i (x_j z_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{z}_i [z_{i'} \bar{y}_{i'}, \bar{x}_j] \bar{x}_j z_i z_{i'} \bar{y}_{i'} \bar{z}_i) z_i \bar{y}_i.$$

By conjugating by $y_i \bar{z}_i$ and applying the relation $[x_j, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]$ one gets

$$x_j z_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{z}_i \bar{x}_j z_i z_{i'} \bar{y}_{i'} \bar{z}_i = x_j z_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} (\bar{z}_i [x_j, z_i \bar{w}_i] z_i) z_{i'} \bar{y}_{i'} \bar{w}_i \bar{x}_j w_i [\bar{w}_i x_j w_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}] \bar{z}_i$$

where $w_i = x_i^{(\delta)}$ for some $\delta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. And now, using several relations in $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$, one gets

$$x_j z_i \bar{w}_i \bar{x}_j w_i \bar{z}_i$$

which is once more a relation in $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$. \square

Proof of Proposition B.3. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^n$. If 1 is not an index involved in R , then $\widehat{\rho}(R) \in \mathcal{R}_{r+1}^n$ and we are done. Otherwise, the conclusion follows by Lemmas B.4 and B.5. \square

B.3. Proof of Proposition 3.8. In this section we aim to prove the following proposition.

Proposition B.6 (Proposition 3.8 for $n \geq 5$). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following happens: let $r \geq 2$ and N_1, \dots, N_r be integers and consider the homomorphism*

$$\omega = \omega_{N_1, \dots, N_r}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

given by $\omega(\xi_i) = \xi_i^{N_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then,

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n}(\widehat{\omega}(\mathcal{R}_r^n)) \leq C(\max\{|N_1|, \dots, |N_r|\})^2.$$

As usual, we split the proof into two lemmas, one for each set of relations.

Lemma B.7 (Power relations for $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$). *For all integers N , all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, and all $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have:*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n} \left(\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)} \right)^N, \left(x_i^{(\beta)} \right)^N \right] \right) \leq |N|^2.$$

Proof. Immediate. \square

Lemma B.8 (Power relations for $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$). *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N , all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ pairwise distinct, and all $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n} \left(\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)} \right)^M, \left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^N \left(\bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right)^N \right] \right) \leq C \left(|M||N| + |N|^2 \right).$$

Proof. Let $x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}$, $y_j = x_j^{(\beta)}$ and $z_j = x_j^{(\gamma)}$. We observe that the element $[x_i^M, y_j^N \bar{z}_j^N]$, after using $O(N^2)$ times the relation $[y_j, z_j]$, becomes $[x_i, (y_j \bar{z}_j)^N]$, which becomes trivial by applying $|M||N|$ times the relation $[x_i, y_j \bar{z}_j]$. \square

Proof of Proposition B.6. The result is a direct consequence of Lemmas B.7 and B.8. \square

B.4. Proof of Proposition 3.12 for more factors. Recall the following notation, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, $|\mathbf{q}| = \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_r|\}$, and $\sigma: \{1, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is any map without fixed points:

- $\mathcal{A}_r = \left\{ a_i^{(\alpha)}, \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$;
- $\mathcal{C}_r = \left\{ \left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)} \right], \text{ for } i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$;
- $F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} = \langle \mathcal{A}_r^n \mid \mathcal{C}_r \rangle$;
- $\mathbf{q}_{[i:j]} = (0, \dots, 0, q_i, \dots, q_j, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$;
- $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\alpha)} = \left(x_1^{(\alpha)} \right)^{-q_1} \dots \left(x_r^{(\alpha)} \right)^{-q_r}$;
- a push down map for the short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow K_r^n(r) \rightarrow F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow 1$$

is defined on the generators (where $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$) by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}} \left(a_j^{(\alpha)} \right) &= \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_j^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}; \\ \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}} \left(a_j^{(n)} \right) &= \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \bar{x}_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)}. \end{aligned}$$

It satisfies $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(uw) = \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(u) \text{push}_{\mathbf{q} + \tilde{\psi}(u)}(w)$ for any $u, w \in F(\mathcal{A}_r)$, where the homomorphism $\tilde{\psi}: F(\mathcal{A}_r) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ is given by the composition $F(\mathcal{A}_r) \longrightarrow F_r^{(1)} \times \dots \times F_r^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\phi_r^n} \mathbb{Z}^r$.

- $\kappa_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+2}) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$ is defined as the homomorphism sending ξ_{r+1} to $\xi_1^{q_1} \dots \xi_r^{q_r}$, ξ_{r+2} to $\xi_1^{q'_1} \dots \xi_r^{q'_r}$ and ξ_i to ξ_i , for every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- Given $m > 0$, the set of m -thick relation is

$$\mathcal{R}_r^n(m) := \bigcup_{\|\phi\| \leq 1} \bigcup_{|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{q}'| \leq m+1} \widehat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'} \left(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_{r+2}^n) \right).$$

The aim of this section is to prove the following.

Proposition B.9 (Proposition 3.12 for $n \geq 5$). *There is a constant E (independent of r) such that, for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, the following holds:*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n(m)}\left(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)}\right]\right)\right) \leq E.$$

We start with the following lemma stating that, up to applying a finite number of thick relations, the push-down map does not depend on the choice of the fixed-point-free map σ .

Lemma B.10. *There exists a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ pairwise distinct, every positive integer m and every $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{q}'| \leq m$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n(m)}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right)^{-1}\right) \leq C.$$

Proof. It is enough to observe that

$$\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right)^{-1} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)}, \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right]\right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)},$$

and then use that $\left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right], \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)}, \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right] \in \mathcal{R}_r^n(m)$. \square

Lemma B.11. *There exists a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, every positive integer m and every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^n(m)}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \overline{x}_j^{(1)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \overline{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(\beta)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\beta)}\right)^{-1}\right) \leq C.$$

Proof. If $\alpha \neq 2$, then we can apply Lemma B.10 to $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} (\overline{x}_j^{(1)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)}) \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)}$ to obtain

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \overline{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)} = \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \overline{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)}.$$

Using Lemma B.10 once more, this is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \overline{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\beta)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\beta)}.$$

Thus, $\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} (\overline{x}_j^{(1)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[j:r]}}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)}) \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(2)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \overline{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\beta)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}_{[1:j-1]}}^{(\beta)}\right)^{-1}$ can be filled with a finite number of thick relations.

If $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta \neq 1$, we can apply the same transformations as above in reversed order, starting by replacing 2 by β and after that 1 by α .

If $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta = 1$, then we similarly first replace 1 by 3, then 2 by $1 = \beta$, and finally 3 by $2 = \alpha$. \square

Proof of Proposition B.9. First, suppose that $\alpha, \beta \neq n$ and $i < j$. Then the expression $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)}\right]\right)$ is given by

$$\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{e_i+\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\beta))} x_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{e_i+\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\beta))}\right) \cdot \\ \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\beta))} \bar{x}_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\beta))}\right)$$

Thanks to Lemma B.10, we may assume (after applying a fixed number of thick relations) $\gamma := \sigma(\alpha) = \sigma(\beta) \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$. Thus the previous expression becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)} \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\gamma)} x_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\gamma)}\right) x_i^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\gamma)}$$

Let $\delta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ (this choice is possible due to our hypothesis $n \geq 5$). After applying Lemma B.10, we obtain

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)} \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} x_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)}\right) x_i^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\gamma)}$$

Using $\left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)}\right], \left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\gamma)}, x_j^{(\beta)}\right] \in \mathcal{R}_r^n(m)$, this becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} x_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)}\right) \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_j^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\gamma)},$$

which becomes trivial after applying Lemma B.10 once more.

If $i > j$, then it is enough to notice that $\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)}\right] = \left[a_j^{(\beta)}, a_i^{(\alpha)}\right]^{-1}$ and, thus, the statement follows from the previous case.

If $i = j$, then by applying Lemma B.10 as in the previous cases, we get that $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_i^{(\beta)}\right]\right)$ is equivalent to

$$\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} x_i^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)}\right) \cdot \\ \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)} \bar{x}_i^{(\beta)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\gamma)}\right),$$

which is a conjugate of a relation in \mathcal{R}_r^n .

We are left with considering the case $\alpha < \beta = n$. Assume $i < j$. By using Lemma B.11 we may replace $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}(a_j^{(n)})$ by $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_j^{(\gamma)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$, where $\gamma \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ is different from $\alpha, \sigma(\alpha)$. Then $\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(n)}\right]\right)$ is

$$\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{e_i+\mathbf{q}}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_j^{(\gamma)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{e_i+\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right) \cdot \\ \cdot \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{x}_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_j^{(\gamma)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right),$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \bar{x}_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \bar{x}_j^{(\gamma)}\right] \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}\right] \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$$

Using $[\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\alpha)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)}]$, one obtains

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \overline{x}_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\alpha)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}.$$

For $\delta \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ apply the thick relations $[\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\alpha)}]$ and $[\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)}]$, to deduce

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \overline{x}_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\alpha)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$$

which, using $[\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\alpha)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\delta)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)}]$, becomes

$$\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} \left[x_i^{(\alpha)} \overline{x}_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} \left[\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\delta)}, \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[i:j-1]}^{(\delta)} \right] \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:i-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$$

Then we conclude since $x_i^{(\alpha)} \overline{x}_i^{(\sigma(\alpha))}$ commutes with each factor of the second term of the commutator via thick relations.

The cases $i > j$ and $i = j$ are similar. □

APPENDIX C. FOUR FACTORS

We conclude with the remaining case, that is when the number of factors is $n = 4$. We left it for last since it presents some similarities with both the case $n = 3$ and $n \geq 5$, so we will be able to reuse some arguments from these two sections.

Our purpose is to prove Propositions 3.3, 3.4, 3.8 and 3.12 for $K_r^4(r)$. Recall from Section 3 that $K_r^4(r)$ is generated by

$$\mathcal{X}_r^4 = \mathcal{X}_r^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{X}_r^{(2)} \cup \mathcal{X}_r^{(3)}$$

where

$$\mathcal{X}_r^{(\alpha)} = \left(x_1^{(\alpha)}, \dots, x_r^{(\alpha)} \right).$$

for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We consider the sets of trivial words

$$\mathcal{R}_{r,1} := \left\{ \left[x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_i^{(\beta)} \right] \mid i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, 3\} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{r,2} := \left\{ \left[x_i^{(\alpha)}, x_j^{(\beta)} \overline{x}_j^{(\gamma)} \right] \mid \begin{array}{l} i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} = \{1, 2, 3\} \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{r,4} := \left\{ \left[x_i^{(\alpha)}, \left[\left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^\varepsilon, \left(x_k^{(\alpha)} \right)^\delta \left(\overline{x}_k^{(\beta)} \right)^\delta \right] \right] \mid \begin{array}{l} i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\} \text{ pairwise distinct,} \\ \varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}, \alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, 3\} \end{array} \right\}$$

and we claim

$$K_r^4(r) = \langle \mathcal{X}_r^4 \mid \mathcal{R}_r^4 \rangle,$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_r^4 = \mathcal{R}_{r,1}^n \cup \mathcal{R}_{r,2}^n.$$

Since the number of factors is small, we will often write x_i, y_j, z_k instead of $x_i^{(1)}, x_j^{(2)}, x_k^{(3)}$ to keep a simplify the notation, especially in the proofs that involve a lot of computations.

C.1. Useful trivial words. We start by noting that all the relations we had in the three factors case are still trivial in the presentation given above. This allows us to recycle several proofs from the three factor case (Appendix A).

Lemma C.1. *There is a constant C (independent of r) such that for every $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ pairwise distinct, $i, j, k, h \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ pairwise distinct, and $\varepsilon, \delta, \sigma, \tau \in \{\pm 1\}$, we have:*

- (1) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4} \left(\left[\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)} \right)^\varepsilon, \left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^\delta \right] \left[\left(x_j^{(\alpha)} \right)^\delta, \left(x_i^{(\beta)} \right)^\varepsilon \right] \right) \leq C$ for $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- (2) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4} \left(\left[\left[x_i^{(\gamma)}, \left[\left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^\varepsilon, \left(x_k^{(\alpha)} \right)^\delta \left(\bar{x}_k^{(\beta)} \right)^\delta \right] \right] \right) \leq C$;
- (3) $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4} \left(\left[\left[\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)} \right)^\varepsilon, \left(x_k^{(\alpha)} \right)^\delta \left(\bar{x}_k^{(\beta)} \right)^\delta \right], \left[\left(x_j^{(\beta)} \right)^\sigma, \left(x_h^{(\alpha)} \right)^\tau \left(\bar{x}_h^{(\beta)} \right)^\tau \right] \right] \right) \leq C$.

Proof. For sake of simplicity, assume $\delta = \varepsilon = \tau = \sigma = 1$ and $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2, \gamma = 3$ (the other cases are completely analogous).

(1) Note that

$$[x_i, y_j][x_j, y_i] = x_i z_j (\bar{z}_j y_j) \bar{x}_i (\bar{y}_j z_j) (\bar{z}_j x_j) y_i (\bar{x}_j z_j) \bar{z}_j \bar{y}_i$$

Using $[\bar{z}_j y_j, x_i]$ and $[\bar{z}_j x_j, y_i]$ this becomes

$$y_i [\bar{y}_i x_i, z_j] \bar{y}_i$$

which is conjugate to a relation, proving this assertion.

(2) We have

$$[y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k] = [y_j, z_k \bar{y}_k],$$

using the relations $[x_k, y_k]$, $[\bar{y}_j, \bar{z}_k x_k]$ and $[z_k, y_k]$.

Thus, the element

$$[z_i, [y_j, x_k \bar{y}_k]]$$

becomes $[z_i, [y_j, z_k \bar{y}_k]]$, which is a relation of $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$. This proves the second assertion.

(3) Since \bar{x}_i commutes with $y_k \bar{z}_k$, we obtain

$$[x_i, x_k \bar{y}_k] = [x_i, x_k \bar{z}_k],$$

implying that

$$[[x_i, x_k \bar{y}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]] = [[x_i, x_k \bar{z}_k], [y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]]$$

We thus obtain the last statement from the fact that x_i, x_k and z_k commute with $[y_j, x_h \bar{y}_h]$.

□

Lemma C.2. *Let $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and consider the embedding $\iota: K_r^3(r) \hookrightarrow K_r^4(r)$ given by sending $x_i \mapsto x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_j \mapsto x_j^{(\beta)}$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, if $w \in K_r^3(r)$, then*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4}(\iota(w)) \leq C \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3}(w).$$

Proof. Note that all relations in \mathcal{R}_r^3 are either relations of \mathcal{R}_r^4 , or they are products of conjugates of relations in \mathcal{R}_r^4 by Lemma C.1. We conclude by Lemma 2.3. \square

C.2. Proof of Proposition 3.3 for four factors. The following proposition is a consequence of the previous section.

Proposition C.3 (Proposition 3.3 for $n = 4$). *There exists a constant $A_1 > 0$ such that the following holds: for all integers $r, r' \geq 1$ and every homomorphism of free groups $\phi: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r'})$ with $\|\phi\| \leq 1$,*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r'}^4}(\widehat{\phi}(\mathcal{R}_r^4)) \leq A_1.$$

Proof. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^4$. If the relation belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$ or $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$, then without loss of generality, up to a permutation of the indices, we may assume that $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^3$. The conclusion then follows from Lemma C.2. If it belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$, then the proof is identical to the proof of Lemma B.2. \square

C.3. Proof of Proposition 3.4 for four factors. We now prove the doubling lemma.

Proposition C.4 (Proposition 3.4 for $n = 4$). *There exists a constant $A_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: for every integer $r \geq 1$, consider the homomorphism $\rho_r: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{r+1})$ given by $\rho_r(\xi_1) = \xi_1 \xi_2$ and $\rho_r(\xi_i) = \xi_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$. Then we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r+1}^4}(\widehat{\rho}(\mathcal{R}_r^4)) \leq A_2.$$

Proof. Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_r^4$. If R is in $\mathcal{R}_{r,1}$ or $\mathcal{R}_{r,4}$, we conclude by combining Proposition A.5 and Lemma C.2.

Otherwise, we claim that $[x_j, y_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{z}_i]$ is trivial in $\langle \mathcal{X}_r^4 \mid \mathcal{R}_r^4 \rangle$, for $i, i', j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. We have

$$[x_j, y_i y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'} \bar{z}_i] = [x_j, y_i \bar{z}_i [z_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}] y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}],$$

that becomes, using $[x_j, y_i \bar{z}_i]$ and $[x_j, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]$,

$$y_i \bar{z}_i ([x_j, [z_i, y_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'}]]) z_i \bar{y}_i$$

which is trivial by Lemma C.1.

Now, if $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r,2}$, either one of the indices involved is 1 and the conclusion follows from the claim, or the conclusion is trivial. \square

C.4. Proof of Proposition 3.8 for four factors. In this section we aim to prove the following proposition.

Proposition C.5 (Proposition 3.8 for $n = 4$). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds: let $r \geq 2$ and $N_1, \dots, N_r \geq 1$ be integers, and let*

$$\omega = \omega_{N_1, \dots, N_r}: F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r) \rightarrow F(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_r)$$

be the homomorphism given by $\omega(\xi_i) = \xi_i^{N_i}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Then

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4}(\widehat{\omega}(\mathcal{R}_r^4)) \leq C(\max\{|N_1|, \dots, |N_r|\})^3.$$

The proof is essentially the same as in the case $n = 3$, with the difference that we can exploit the extra factor to obtain more efficient bounds, as follows.

Lemma C.6. *There exists a constant C (independent of r) such that, for all integers N, M, P and all $i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4}\left(\left[\left(x_i^{(\alpha)}\right)^N, \left[\left(x_j^{(\beta)}\right)^M, \left(x_k^{(\alpha)}\right)^P \left(\overline{x_k^{(\beta)}}\right)^P\right]\right]\right) \leq C|P|(|P| + |M|^2 + |N||M|).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $x_i = x_i^{(\alpha)}, y_j = x_j^{(\beta)}$ and $N, M, P > 0$ and we consider

$$[x_i^N, [y_j^M, x_k^P \overline{y_k}^P]];$$

the other cases are treated similarly.

Using $O(P^2)$ times the relations $[x_k, y_k], [x_k, z_k], [x_k, z_k]$ and $O(PM)$ times the relation $[y_j, x_k \overline{z_k}]$ we rewrite it as

$$[x_i^N, [y_j^M, (z_k \overline{y_k})^P]] = [x_i^N, ([y_j^M, z_k \overline{y_k}] z_k \overline{y_k})^P (y_k \overline{z_k})^P].$$

We then apply P times the identity $[y_j^M, z_k \overline{y_k}] = [(y_j \overline{z_j})^M, \overline{y_k}]$ (see Lemma A.13 (3)), which has area $O(M^2)$, to get

$$[x_i^N, ([y_j \overline{z_j}]^M, \overline{y_k}] z_k \overline{y_k})^P (y_k \overline{z_k})^P] = [x_i^N, ((y_j \overline{z_j})^M ([\overline{y_k}, z_j \overline{y_j}] z_j \overline{y_j})^M z_k \overline{y_k})^P (y_k \overline{z_k})^P]$$

and finally x_i commutes with every factor on the right-hand side, so we conclude with $O(NMP)$ additional relations. \square

Proof of Proposition C.5. If $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r,1}$, the result is trivial, while if it belongs to $\mathcal{R}_{r,2}$, the proof is the same as the one of Lemma B.8 (in both cases we get a quadratic upper bound). Finally, if $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r,4}$, the result follows from Lemma C.6. \square

C.5. Proof of Proposition 3.12 for four factors. The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Proposition C.7 (Proposition 3.12 for $n = 4$). *There is a constant E (independent of r) such that, for every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ with $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ and $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, the following holds:*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4(m)}\left(\text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(\left[a_i^{(\alpha)}, a_j^{(\beta)}\right]\right)\right) \leq E.$$

Let $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$, $|\mathbf{q}| = \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_r|\}$, and let $\sigma: \{1, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ be any map without fixed points. We use the same terminology as in Appendix B.4, so the push-down map is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(a_j^{(\alpha)}\right) &= \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))} x_j^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\sigma(\alpha))}, \\ \text{push}_{\mathbf{q}}\left(a_j^{(4)}\right) &= \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \bar{x}_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

We proceed as in the case with at least 5 factors.

Lemma C.8. *There exists a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ pairwise distinct, every positive integer m and every $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4(m)}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}'}^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\gamma)}\right)^{-1}\right) \leq C.$$

Proof. Identical to Lemma B.10. \square

Lemma C.9. *There exists a constant C (independent of r) such that, for every $\alpha \neq \beta \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, every positive integer m and every $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $|\mathbf{q}| \leq m$, it holds that*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4(m)}\left(\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(2)} \bar{x}_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(2)} x_j^{(1)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(2)}\right) \left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{q}}^{(\beta)} \bar{x}_j^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[j:r]}^{(\beta)} x_j^{(\alpha)} \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{q}[1:j-1]}^{(\beta)}\right)^{-1}\right) \leq C.$$

Proof. Identical to Lemma B.11. \square

We improve Lemma C.2 to thick relations.

Lemma C.10. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, if $w \in K_r^3(r) \subseteq K_r^4(r)$, then*

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4(m)}(w) \leq C \cdot \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(w)$$

Proof. It is enough to prove the inequality when $\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)}(w) = 1$.

Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_{r+2}^3$, and consider $w = \hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(R) \in \mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$, where $|\mathbf{q}|, |\mathbf{q}'| \leq m$. Using that $\hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(\mathcal{R}_{r+2}^4) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_r^4(m)$ and Lemma 2.3 we have

$$\text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_r^4(m)}(\hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(R)) \leq \text{Area}_{\hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(\mathcal{R}_{r+2}^4)}(\hat{\kappa}_{\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}'}(R)) \leq \text{Area}_{\mathcal{R}_{r+2}^4}(R)$$

which is bounded by a constant by Lemma C.2. \square

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.12 for $n = 4$.

Proof. If $\alpha, \beta \neq 4$, by Lemma C.8 we may assume that $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$ and $\sigma(\beta) = \alpha$. Then the push belongs to $\ker(F_r^{(\alpha)} \times F_r^{(\beta)} \times F_r^{(4)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r) \cong K_r^3(r)$, and we have already proved in Lemma A.19 that it can be obtained by a constant number of thick relations of $\mathcal{R}_r^3(m)$. The conclusion follows from Lemma C.10.

If $\alpha \neq \beta = 4$ the conclusion is similar by using Lemma C.9 and then combining the proof of Lemma A.20 with Lemma C.10. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB06] Emina Alibegović and Mladen Bestvina. Limit groups are CAT(0). *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 74(1):259–272, 2006.
- [ABD⁺13] Aaron Abrams, Noel Brady, Pallavi Dani, Moon Duchin, and Robert Young. Pushing fillings in right-angled Artin groups. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 87(3):663–688, 2013.
- [Art50] Emil Artin. The theory of braids. *American Scientist*, 38(1):112–119, 1950.
- [BBMS97] Gilbert Baumslag, Martin R. Bridson, Charles F. Miller, III, and Hamish Short. Finitely Presented Subgroups of Automatic Groups and their Isoperimetric Functions. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 56(2):292–304, 10 1997.
- [BHMS02] Martin R. Bridson, James Howie, Charles F. Miller, III, and Hamish Short. The subgroups of direct products of surface groups. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 92:95–103, 2002.
- [BHMS09] Martin R. Bridson, James Howie, Charles F. Miller, III, and Hamish Short. Subgroups of direct products of limit groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170(3):1447–1467, 2009.
- [BHMS13] Martin R. Bridson, James Howie, Charles F. Miller, III, and Hamish Short. On the finite presentation of subdirect products and the nature of residually free groups. *Amer. J. Math.*, 135(4):891–933, 2013.
- [Bie81] Robert Bieri. *Homological Dimension of Discrete Groups*. Mathematics Department, Queen Mary College, University of London, 1981.
- [BR84] Gilbert Baumslag and James E. Roseblade. Subgroups of direct products of free groups. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 30(1):44–52, 1984.
- [BR09] Martin R. Bridson and Timothy R. Riley. Extrinsic versus intrinsic diameter for Riemannian filling-discs and van Kampen diagrams. *J. Differential Geom.*, 82(1):115–154, 2009.
- [Bri] Martin R. Bridson. Personal communication.
- [Bri99] Martin R. Bridson. Doubles, finiteness properties of groups, and quadratic isoperimetric inequalities. *J. Algebra*, 214(2):652–667, 1999.
- [CF17] William Carter and Max Forester. The Dehn functions of Stallings-Bieri groups. *Mathematische Annalen*, 368, 06 2017.
- [DERY09] Will Dison, Murray Elder, Timothy R. Riley, and Robert Young. The Dehn function of Stallings’ group. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(2):406–422, 2009.
- [Dis08a] Will Dison. An isoperimetric function for Bestvina-Brady groups. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 40(3):384–394, 2008.
- [Dis08b] Will Dison. *Isoperimetric functions for subdirect products and Bestvina-Brady groups*. PhD thesis, Imperial College London, October 2008.
- [Dis09] Will Dison. A subgroup of a direct product of free groups whose Dehn function has a cubic lower bound. *J. Group Theory*, 12(5):783–793, 2009.
- [Geo08] Ross Geoghegan. *Topological methods in group theory*, volume 243 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2008.
- [Ger95] S. M. Gersten. Finiteness properties of asynchronously automatic groups. In *Geometric group theory (Columbus, OH, 1992)*, volume 3 of *Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 121–133. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1995.
- [GS02] S. Gersten and H. Short. Some isoperimetric inequalities for kernels of free extensions. *Geom. Dedicata*, 92:63–72, 2002. Dedicated to John Stallings on the occasion of his 65th birthday.
- [KLI22] Robert Kropholler and Claudio Llosa Isenrich. Dehn functions of coabelian subgroups of direct products of groups. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 107(1):123–152, 2022.
- [Koc10] Dessislava H. Kochloukova. On subdirect products of type FP_m of limit groups. *J. Group Theory*, 13(1):1–19, 2010.

- [Kuc14] Benno Kuckuck. Subdirect products of groups and the n - $(n+1)$ - $(n+2)$ conjecture. *Q. J. Math.*, 65(4):1293–1318, 2014.
- [LI20] Claudio Llosa Isenrich. Kähler groups and subdirect products of surface groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 24(2):971–1017, 2020.
- [LI24] Claudio Llosa Isenrich. From the second BNSR invariant to Dehn functions of coabelian subgroups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12334*, 2024.
- [Lic97] Raymond W. B. Lickorish. *An Introduction to Knot Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 1997.
- [LIT20] Claudio Llosa Isenrich and Romain Tessera. Residually free groups do not admit a uniform polynomial isoperimetric function. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 148(10):4203–4212, 2020.
- [LZ91] Bernt Lindström and Hans-Olov Zetterström. Borromean circles are impossible. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 98(4):340–341, 1991.
- [Mih68] K. A. Mihailova. The occurrence problem for free products of groups. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 4(2):181, 1968.
- [Nan93] Ollie Nanyes. An elementary proof that the borromean rings are non-splittable. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 100(8):786–789, 1993.
- [Pap96] Panos Papasoglu. On the asymptotic cone of groups satisfying a quadratic isoperimetric inequality. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 44(4):789 – 806, 1996.
- [Sta63] John Stallings. A finitely presented group whose 3-dimensional integral homology is not finitely generated. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 85(4):541–543, 1963.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF THE BASQUE COUNTRY,
 BARRIO SARRIENA, LEIOA, 48940, SPAIN
Email address: `ascari.maths@gmail.com`

SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE, PIAZZA DEI CAVALIERI 7, 56126 PISA, ITALY
Email address: `federica.bertolotti@sns.it`

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,
 ANDREW WILES BUILDING, WOODSTOCK ROAD, OX2 6GG OXFORD, UK
Email address: `giovanni.italiano@maths.ox.ac.uk`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, KIT, ENGLERSTR. 2, 76131 KARLSRUHE, GERMANY
Email address: `claudio.llosa@kit.edu`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, KIT, ENGLERSTR. 2, 76131 KARLSRUHE, GERMANY
Email address: `matteo.migliorini@kit.edu`