

A NOTE ON WORDS HAVING SAME IMAGE ON FINITE GROUPS

SHRINIT SINGH

ABSTRACT. The question of whether two words in a free group that induce the same measure on every finite group as word maps are automorphic remains open. In this work, we study words whose images as word maps on every finite group are identical. We establish that two words in F_2 , where one of the words is x^n or $[x, y]^n$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, having same image on every finite group, are endomorphic to each other. Furthermore, we demonstrate that if the word map corresponding to a word $w_1 \in F_n$ has the same image as a test word $w_2 \in F_n$ on every finite group, then this is sufficient to ensure that w_1 and w_2 induce the same measure on every finite group.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let F_d be a free group on d -generators. An element w of the free group is said to be a word and has an expression $\prod_{j=1}^s x_{i_j}^{a_j}$, where $i_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $a_j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and for every $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $x_{i_j} \neq (x_{i_{j+1}})^{-1}$. For any group G , we use $G^{(n)}$ to denote direct product of n copies of G . Corresponding to the word $w \in F_d$ as above, we define a word map w on a group G to be a map from G^d to G as follows $w(g_1, \dots, g_d) = \prod_{j=1}^s g_{i_j}^{a_j}$. The image of the word map w on G is denoted by G_w .

Let $w_1, w_2 \in F_d$ induce word maps on a finite group G . We say that w_1 and w_2 induce same measure on G if cardinality of $w_1^{-1}(g)$ and $w_2^{-1}(g)$ for every $g \in G$ is same. Otherwise, we say that they induce different measure. Two words w_1 and w_2 are automorphic if there exists an automorphism ϕ of free group F_d such that $\phi(w_1) = w_2$. It is easy to note that one cannot distinguish automorphic words just based on their measures on finite groups. A word $w \in F_d$ is said to be *profinutely rigid* if a word $u \in F_d$ induces the same measure as w on every finite group, then u must be automorphic to w .

Finite groups have been studied via word maps [3, 5, 7]. On the other hand, one can talk about relation between words if corresponding word maps on every finite group behave similarly. In this direction, the following conjecture is well known:

Conjecture 1.1. [2, 10] *Every word in F_d for $d \geq 2$, is profinitely rigid.*

The conjecture, if true, suggests that for any finite set of words of a free group in which no element from the set is automorphic to any other element in the set, one can find a finite group where different words will induce different measures. It is straightforward that every word in F_1 is profinitely rigid. Although the conjecture is still open for F_d , $d \geq 2$, but recently, there has been developments in this direction. Puder and Parzanchevski [8] proved that primitive words in any free group are profinitely rigid.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20F10.
Key words and phrases. free group, word map.

Recently, Hanany, Meiri and Puder [6] proved that x_1^n and $[x_1, x_2]^n$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, are profinitely rigid in every free group F_d for $d \geq 2$.

In this article, we focus on the image of a word map on every finite group. For example, let $w_1 = x_1$ and $w_2 = x_1^2 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1}$ be two words in F_2 , they have the same image in every group. But they induce different measures on symmetric group S_3 . By [8], we get that w_1 and w_2 are not automorphic. The main goal of this article is to understand relationship between words which have same image on every finite group and under what condition these words will induce identical measure on every finite group.

In this regard, we propose an intuitive question backed by some results from this article. But before the question, let's setup some definitions:

Definition 1.2. *Two elements g and h in a group G are endomorphic equivalent if there exists two endomorphisms ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 of G such that $\phi_1(g) = h$ and $\phi_2(h) = g$.*

Lemma 1.3. *Two words w_1 and w_2 in a free group F_d are endomorphic equivalent if and only if they have same image as word maps on every group.*

Definition 1.4. *We call a word $w \in F_d$ weakly profinitely rigid if any word $u \in F_d$ that have same image as the word w on every finite group, then w and u are endomorphic equivalent.*

In free group $F_1 = \langle x_1 \rangle$, any two words x_1^m and x_1^n have same images on every finite group if and only if $m = \pm n$. Then words x_1^m and x_1^n are automorphic. So every word in F_1 is weakly profinitely rigid. Hence any two words in F_1 which have same image on every finite group induce same measure on every finite group. Although it is important to mention that it is not known that profinitely rigidity of a word implies its weak profinite rigidity. We have the following question:

Question 1.5. *Is every word in F_d for $d \geq 2$ weakly profinitely rigid?*

A positive answer to the above question implies that words can be distinguished up to endomorphism equivalent if the image of word map on some finite group is different. It would also affirmatively answer [11, Question 18], indicating that for a chiral word, there exists a finite group on which the chiral word will exhibit chirality.

In the next section, we generalise weak profinite rigidity to elements of arbitrary finitely generated group. We establish an equivalent notion of two elements in a finitely generated group have same image on every finite group.

In the third section, we examine a word in a free (profinite) group that has the property of being fixed by any (continuous) endomorphism, which then necessarily becomes a (continuous) automorphism. Such words are known as test words. We demonstrate that test words in a free group remain test words in its profinite completion, where the free group is identified with its natural image in its profinite completion.

In the final section, we explore weak profinite rigidity among words in free groups. We proved that primitive words are weakly profinitely rigid. It is worth noting that while the weak profinite rigidity of the word $x_1^2 x_2 x_1^{-1} x_2^{-1}$ is established, its profinite rigidity is unknown. For a given test word $w \in F_n$, we establish that any word $u \in F_n$ having the same image as w on every finite group implies that w and u induce same probability measure on every finite group. We also show that the notion of weak profinite rigidity

coincides with that of profinite rigidity for test words. As a result, the word $[x, y]^d$ where $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ in F_2 is weakly profinitely rigid.

2. WEAK PROFINITE RIGIDITY AND ITS EQUIVALENT NOTIONS

We will prove lemma 1.3 which will be a quick corollary to the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let w and w' be two words in a free group F_d . There exists an endomorphism ϕ of F_d such that $\phi(w) = w'$ if and only if $G_{w'} \subseteq G_w$ for any group G .*

Proof. Given $\phi(w) = w'$ implies that $w(\phi(x_1), \dots, \phi(x_d)) = w'$. Now if $g = w'(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in G_{w'}$ where $g, g_i \in G$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$ then $w(\phi(x_1)(g_1, \dots, g_d), \dots, \phi(x_d)(g_1, \dots, g_d)) = g$ and hence $G_{w'} \subseteq G_w$.

To prove the converse part, let $G = F_d$, then $w' \in (F_d)_w$. This implies that there exists $w_1, \dots, w_d \in F_d$ such that $w(w_1, \dots, w_d) = w'$. Sending x_i to w_i for $1 \leq i \leq d$ will give an endomorphism ϕ of F_d with the property $\phi(w) = w'$. \square

If $w, w' \in F_d$ are endomorphic equivalent then $G_w = G_{w'}$ for every group G . It is clear that two words which have same image on every group are endomorphic equivalent. We want to study the problem whether two words which have same image on every finite group will be endomorphic equivalent. To restrict the class of all finite group, we give an easy lemma:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $w, u \in F_d$. w and u have same image on every finite group if and only if they have same image on every d -generated finite group.*

Proof. Suppose w and u have same image on every d -generated finite group. Let G be any finite group and $w(g_1, \dots, g_d) = g \in G_w$. Then $H = \langle g_1, \dots, g_d \rangle$ is d -generated finite group. And $H_w = H_u$ implies $g \in H_u \subseteq G_u$. \square

It suffices to consider the weak profinite rigidity of a word $w \in F_d$ only within the class of d -generated finite group. Profinite completion is a natural process that captures information of its finite quotient. Since all d -generated finite groups are quotients of the d -generated free group F_d , we need to transition from the free group to its profinite completion. To do this, we generalise the notion of word map corresponding to elements in arbitrary finitely generated group.

Given any d -tuple g_1, \dots, g_d in G , there is a homomorphism ϕ from F_d to G defined by $\phi(x_i) = g_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$ and conversely, any such homomorphism arises from a d -tuple in G due to the universal property of free groups. For $w \in F_d$, we have $w(g_1, \dots, g_d) = \phi(w)$.

Let P be a finitely generated group and G any group. Any $\gamma \in P$ corresponds to a word map on G , and the image of the word map γ on G is denoted by G_γ . Let $\text{Hom}(P, G)$ be the set of all homomorphisms from P to G , then we define $G_\gamma = \{\phi(\gamma) | \phi \in \text{Hom}(P, G)\}$. We can also interpret the measure induced by an element $\gamma \in P$ on a finite group G (see [6]).

Lemma 2.3. *Let P be a finitely generated group. If $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in P$ is endomorphically equivalent if and only if $G_{\gamma_1} = G_{\gamma_2}$ for any group G .*

Proof. Suppose there exists an endomorphism χ of P such that $\chi(\gamma_1) = \gamma_2$. If $\phi(\gamma_2)$, for some $\phi \in \text{Hom}(P, G)$, is in the image of γ_2 , then $\phi \circ \chi(\gamma_1) = \phi(\gamma_2)$ and hence we get

$G_{\gamma_2} \subseteq G_{\gamma_1}$. Similarly we can show $G_{\gamma_1} \subseteq G_{\gamma_2}$. For the other way, take $G = P$. Let ϕ be the identity automorphism of P . Then $\gamma_2 = \phi(\gamma_1) \in P_{\gamma_2} = P_{\gamma_1}$. Therefore there exists $\chi \in \text{Hom}(P, P)$ with $\chi(\gamma_1) = \gamma_2$. Similarly the remaining part can be shown. \square

We can define weak profinite rigidity for elements in any finitely generated group.

Definition 2.4. *An element γ in a finitely generated group P is said to be weakly profinitely rigid if every element $\beta \in P$ with $G_\gamma = G_\beta$ for every finite group G implies γ and β are endomorphically equivalent.*

Corollary 2.5. *Every element in finite group is weakly profinitely rigid.*

Proof. The proof follows similarly as the last part of proof of Lemma 2.3. \square

Although, it is straightforward that every element in every finite group is profinitely rigid. But two words which are endomorphic equivalent need not be automorphic. For example, take two elements of order 2 in group $S_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, namely $((12), 0)$ and $((), 1)$, they are endomorphic to each other but they are not automorphic. Here is an example of a group where no element is weakly profinitely rigid:

Example 2.6. *Let S be a finitely generated infinite simple group. Then no element of S is weakly profinitely rigid. As $\text{Hom}(S, G)$, for any finite group G , consists of only one element ϕ where $\phi(s) = e_G$ for all $s \in S$ and e_G is the identity element of G . Then for every finite group G , $G_{e_S} = G_s$ where $s \in S$ and e_S is the identity element of S . It is easy to see that e_S and s , where s is non trivial element, can never be endomorphically equivalent.*

Example 2.7. *Every non-residually finite group contains element which is not weakly profinitely rigid. Elements from the intersection of all normal subgroup of finite index will never be weakly profinitely rigid.*

Whatever example of groups, which consist of non weakly profinitely rigid elements, we have are non residually finite. So we are intrigued by the following question:

Question 2.8. *Is every element in residually finite group weakly profinitely rigid?*

In this context, we prove the following.

Lemma 2.9. *Every element of a finitely generated free abelian group is weakly profinitely rigid.*

Proof. Let \mathbb{Z}^r be any free abelian group of rank r . Any element $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ can be written as $m(b_1, \dots, b_r)$, where $m = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_r)$ and $mb_i = a_i$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. We notice that (b_1, \dots, b_r) is a basis element of \mathbb{Z}^r . It is straightforward that image of (b_1, \dots, b_r) as a word map on any finite group is the whole group. Hence image of (a_1, \dots, a_r) on any group consists of all m^{th} power elements of G . Similarly any other element in \mathbb{Z}^r which have same images on every finite group as (a_1, \dots, a_r) must be of the form $m(c_1, \dots, c_r)$, where (c_1, \dots, c_r) is a primitive element of \mathbb{Z}^r . It is not hard to see that (a_1, \dots, a_r) and $m(c_1, \dots, c_r)$ are automorphic as any two basis elements in \mathbb{Z}^r are automorphic. \square

Remark 2.10. *Calvert, Dutta and Prasad [4] have shown that any two endomorphic equivalent elements in countable abelian group are automorphic. Hence weak profinite rigidity implies profinite rigidity for the elements of finitely generated abelian group,.*

Now we provide a concise overview of the profinite completion of a group. For any group P , the basis for the profinite topology on P is the set of left cosets of subgroups of finite index. The profinite completion of P , denoted by \hat{P} , is the inverse limit of its finite quotients. A normal subgroup N of finite index in P is denoted by $N \trianglelefteq_{\text{f.i.}} P$. Formally, we write

$$\hat{P} = \varprojlim_{N \trianglelefteq_{\text{f.i.}} P} P/N.$$

\hat{P} possesses the topology of inverse limit, where each finite quotient P/N is a discrete topological group. With this topology, \hat{P} becomes compact, Hausdorff and totally disconnected topological group. Any compact, Hausdorff and totally disconnected topological group is referred to as a profinite group. There is a natural homomorphism $i : P \rightarrow \hat{P}$ defined by mapping γ to $(\gamma N)_{N \trianglelefteq_{\text{f.i.}} P}$.

Let G be a finite group endowed with discrete topology. By definition, we assume that homomorphism from profinite group to a finite group is continuous. For our purpose, we don't need to assume continuity as all homomorphisms are continuous when P is finitely generated. Let $\text{Hom}(\hat{P}, G)$ be the set of all continuous homomorphism from \hat{P} to G . By universal property of profinite completion of group, there is one-one correspondence between $\text{Hom}(P, G)$ and $\text{Hom}(\hat{P}, G)$. To be more precise, for every homomorphism $\phi \in \text{Hom}(P, G)$ there exists unique $\hat{\phi} \in \text{Hom}(\hat{P}, G)$ such that $\phi = \hat{\phi} \circ i$ [9, Lemma 3.2.1].

Let $\gamma \in P$ and $g \in G$ where P is finitely generated group and G is finite group. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\gamma, g}(P, G) &:= \{\phi \in \text{Hom}(P, G) \mid \phi(\gamma) = g\}, \\ K_P(G) &:= \bigcap_{N \trianglelefteq_{\text{f.i.}} P, \frac{P}{N} \cong H \leq G} N, \\ J_P(G) &:= \bigcap_{\phi \in \text{End}(P)} \phi^{-1}(K_P(G)). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $J_P(G)$ is finite indexed fully invariant subgroup of P . Since P is finitely generated, there are finitely many subgroups of given finite index. Hence it is easy to see that $K_P(G)$ is a finite indexed normal subgroup of P . For any $\phi \in \text{End}(P)$, define a map $\chi : P/\phi^{-1}(K_P(G)) \rightarrow P/K_P(G)$ by mapping $\chi(p\phi^{-1}(K_P(G))) = \phi(p)K_P(G)$. Clearly χ is one-one homomorphism. Hence $[P : \phi^{-1}(K_P(G))] \leq [P : K_P(G)]$ and it establishes that $J_P(G)$ is finite indexed normal subgroup as it is intersection of finitely many finite indexed normal subgroup of P . The full invariance of $J_P(G)$ in P follows from construction. When we talk about endomorphism in case of profinite group, it means continuous endomorphism. Now we give analogous theorem of [6, Theorem 2.2].

Theorem 2.11. *Let P be a finitely generated group and $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in P$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $i(\gamma_1)$ and $i(\gamma_2)$ are endomorphic equivalent in \hat{P} .

- (2) If $\text{Hom}_{\gamma_1, g}(P, G)$ is nonempty if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\gamma_2, g}(P, G)$ is nonempty.
(3) $\gamma_1 J$ and $\gamma_2 J$ are endomorphic equivalent in P/J , where $J = J_P(G)$ for every finite group G .
(4) For every $N \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P$, there exists $J \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P$ with $J \leq N$ such that $\gamma_1 J$ and $\gamma_2 J$ are endomorphic equivalent in P/J .

We notice that for a group P , $\text{End}(P)$ is a monoid and $\text{End}(\hat{P})$ is profinite monoid. More details about profinite monoid can be found in [1]. We need the following lemma to prove the above theorem.

Lemma 2.12. *Let P be a finitely generated group. Then $\text{End}(\hat{P}) = \varprojlim_{N \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P} \text{End}(P/N)$, where inverse limit is taken over all N such that $N = J_P(G)$ for some finite group G .*

Proof. Assume that $J_P(G_1) = J_1 \leq J_2 = J_P(G_2)$, and denote $Q_i = P/J_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. The image of J_2 in Q_1 is equal to $J_{Q_1}(G_2)$, making this image fully invariant in Q_1 . Consequently, there exists a well-defined monoid homomorphism $\text{End}(Q_1) \rightarrow \text{End}(Q_2)$.

Furthermore, for every $J_1 = J_P(G_1)$ and $J_2 = J_P(G_2)$, define $G_3 = P/J_1 \cap J_2$. Then $J_3 = J_P(G_3) \leq J_1, J_2$. Therefore, the inverse limit $\varprojlim_{N \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P} \text{End}(P/N)$ is well-defined, where the inverse limit is taken over all N such that $N = J_P(G)$ for some finite group G is well-defined inverse system.

By [9, Proposition 3.2.2], for $J \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P$ we have $P/J \cong \hat{P}/\overline{i(J)}$, and $i(J_P(G)) = J_{\hat{P}}(G)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that:

$$\text{End}(\hat{P}) = \varprojlim_J \text{End}(\hat{P}/J),$$

where the inverse limits is taken over all subgroups $J \leq \hat{P}$ such that $J = J_P(G)$ for some finite group G . Since $J = J_{\hat{P}}(G)$ is fully invariant in \hat{P} , every endomorphism of \hat{P} induces an endomorphism of \hat{P}/J which agrees with the inverse system, leading to a natural continuous homomorphism:

$$\omega : \text{End}(\hat{P}) \rightarrow \varprojlim_J \text{End}(\hat{P}/J).$$

The map ω is injective because $\bigcap_{G \text{ finite}} J_{\hat{P}}(G) = \{e_{\hat{P}}\}$. The map ω is surjective because every element of the inverse system $\varprojlim_J \text{End}(\hat{P}/J)$ defines a continuous endomorphism of $\varprojlim_J \hat{P}/J \cong \hat{P}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.11.

1 \implies 2: The proof follows from the fact that $\text{Hom}(P, G)$ and $\text{Hom}(\hat{P}, G)$, for every finite group G are in one correspondence and we have $|\text{Hom}_{\gamma, g}(P, G)| = |\text{Hom}_{i(\gamma), g}(\hat{P}, G)|$. And hence

$$|\text{Hom}_{\gamma_1, g}(P, G)| = |\text{Hom}_{i(\gamma_1), g}(\hat{P}, G)| = |\text{Hom}_{i(\gamma_2), g}(\hat{P}, G)| = |\text{Hom}_{\gamma_2, g}(P, G)|.$$

2 \implies 3: Let $J = J_P(G)$ for some finite group G . As $\text{Hom}_{\gamma_1, \gamma_1 K}(P, P/J) \neq \emptyset \implies \text{Hom}_{\gamma_2, \gamma_1 K}(P, P/J) \neq \emptyset$. Let $f_1 \in \text{Hom}_{\gamma_2, \gamma_1 K}(P, P/J)$. Then $J \subseteq \ker(f_1)$ because of the choice of J . Hence there exist an induced map $\tilde{f} : P/J \rightarrow P/J$ such

that $(\tilde{f}_1)(\gamma_2 J) = \gamma_1 J$. Similarly we can do the other way. Hence $\gamma_1 K, \gamma_2 K$ are endomorphic equivalent in P/K .

3 \implies 4: For every $N \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P$, we can take $J = J_P(P/N)$.

4 \implies 3: Let $J = J_P(G)$ for some finite group G . By assumption, there exists a subgroup $J' \leq J$ such that $J' \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P$ with $\gamma_1 J'$ and $\gamma_2 J'$ endomorphic equivalent. But the image of J in P/J' is $J_{P/J'}(G)$, so this image is fully invariant, hence every endomorphism of P/J' induces an endomorphism in P/J . Hence we conclude that $\gamma_1 J, \gamma_2 J$ are endomorphic equivalent in P/J .

3 \implies 1: For every J in the inverse system, we get that there exists an endomorphism from $\gamma_1 J$ to $\gamma_2 J$. By standard compactness argument, there exists an element in $\varprojlim_{J \trianglelefteq_{f.i.} P, J=J_P(G)} \text{End}(P/J)$ mapping $\gamma_1 J$ to $\gamma_2 J$. Similarly we can prove the vice versa. This proves our result. □

The above theorem is the reason to generalise the definition 2.4.

Definition 2.13. *Let P be a finitely generated group. An element $\gamma_1 \in P$ is said to be weakly profinitely rigid, whenever $\gamma_2 \in P$ satisfies $i(\gamma_1)$ and $i(\gamma_2)$ are endomorphically equivalent in \hat{P} , then γ_1, γ_2 are endomorphically equivalent in P .*

3. TEST ELEMENTS IN FREE PROFINITE GROUP

An element $g \in G$ is said to be test element if any endomorphism ϕ of the group G that satisfies $\phi(g) = g$ is an automorphism. In this section, we will discuss words in finitely generated free group that are test words in their profinite completion.

Definition 3.1. *A subgroup of a group G is said to be retract G if there exists a homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow H$ such that $\phi|_H$ is identity map.*

Turner has classified test words in free groups. The next lemma is a corollary of a result of Turner.

Theorem 3.2. [13] *The test words in a free group F_n are words not contained in any proper retract.*

Snopce and Tanushevski have proved the analogous result for finitely generated profinite group.

Theorem 3.3. [12, Theorem 3.5] *The test elements of a finitely generated profinite group are exactly the elements not contained in any proper retracts.*

Proposition 3.4. *A word $w \in F_n$ is a test element if and only if $i(w)$ is a test element in \hat{F}_n .*

Proof. Suppose w is not a test element in F_n . By Theorem 3.5, there exists a proper retract R of F_n containing w . Let $r : F_n \rightarrow R$ be the retraction. Take the induced map on its profinite completion we get $\hat{r} : \hat{F}_n \rightarrow \hat{R}$, which will again be a proper retraction, since the rank of proper retract of F_n is strictly less than n . Hence $i(w)$ is not a test word in \hat{F}_n by Theorem 3.3.

Suppose $i(w)$ is not a test word. By Theorem 3.3, there exists a proper retract S of \hat{F}_n containing $i(w)$. Consider $R = S \cap F_n$, where F_n and $i(F_n)$ are identified. R is clearly a proper retract of F_n containing w . Hence w is not a test word. \square

The next lemma is the explicit description of test words in F_2 given by Turner.

Lemma 3.5. [13] *Let $w \in F_2 \setminus \{e\}$. Write $w = u^m, m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ such that u is not a proper power word. Suppose $u = x_1^{m_1} x_2^{m_2} c$, where $c \in F_2'$. If $\gcd(m_1, m_2) \neq 1$, then w is test word.*

4. MAIN RESULTS

We begin this section by following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let F_n be a free group. If $w \in F_n$ is weakly profinitely rigid, then $w^d | d \in \mathbb{Z}$ is also weakly profinitely rigid.*

Lemma 4.2. [6] *Let $w \in F_n$ such that every image of w on symmetric group S_n is d th power for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists $v \in F_n$ such that $w = v^d$.*

Lemma 4.3. [6] *Every root of $w \in F_n$ in \hat{F}_n belongs to F_n .*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Lemma 4.2 suggests that any word which have same image as $w^d | d \in \mathbb{Z}$ on every finite group will be of the form v^d for some $v \in F_n$. By Theorem 2.11, we get that there exist endomorphisms $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{End}(\hat{F}_n)$ such that $\phi_1(i(w^d)) = i(v^d)$ and $\phi_2(i(v^d)) = i(w^d)$. Lemma 4.3 says that every d th root of $\phi_1(i(w))^d$ belongs to F_n so we get that $\phi_1(i(w)) = i(v)$. Since w is weakly profinitely rigid, w and v are endomorphic equivalent. And hence w^d and v^d are endomorphic equivalent proving w^d is weakly profinitely rigid. \square

Definition 4.4. *A word w is said to be surjective, if $G_w = G$ for every group G .*

Theorem 4.5. *Every surjective word in any finitely generated free group is weakly profinitely rigid.*

Proof. Let $w \in F_d$. Express $w = x_1^{t_1} x_2^{t_2} \dots x_d^{t_d} c$, where c lies in commutator subgroup of F_d . It is enough to prove that w is surjective as a word map on every finite group if and only if $\gcd\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_d\} = 1$. Suppose on the contrary that $\gcd\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_d\} = r \neq 1$. If $r \geq 2$, then for $G = \mathbb{Z}_d$, we get G_w to be trivial which is not surjective. Similarly if $t_i = 0$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, then for any abelian finite group G , G_w will be trivial.

If $r = 1$, then there exists $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sum n_i t_i = 1$. For any $g \in G$, send x_i to g^{n_i} , we get $w(g^{n_1}, g^{n_2}, \dots, g^{n_d}) = g$ and hence $G_w = G$. \square

Every primitive word is weakly profinitely rigid as well as profinitely rigid [8]. We want to mention that profinite rigidity of non primitive surjective words is not known.

Corollary 4.6. *Let w be any surjective word. Then $w^d | d \in \mathbb{Z}$ is weakly profinitely rigid.*

Proof. It directly follows from Theorems 4.5, 4.1. \square

Theorem 4.7. *For a test word $w_1 \in F_n$, word map corresponding to another word $w_2 \in F_n$ having same image as w_1 on every finite group is enough to ensure that they induce same probability measure on every finite group.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.11, we deduce that $i(w_1)$ and $i(w_2)$ are endomorphic equivalent. By Proposition 3.4, we get that $i(w_1)$ and $i(w_2)$ are automorphic. Hence by [6, Theorem 2.2], we get that w_1 and w_2 induce same probability measure. \square

Theorem 4.8. *A test word in F_n is weakly profinitely rigid if and only if it is profinitely rigid.*

Proof. Let w_1 be a test word in F_n which is also weakly profinitely rigid. Let w_2 be another word in F_n such that it induces same measure as the word w_1 on every finite group. By Theorem 2.11, $i(w_1)$ is endomorphic equivalent to $i(w_2)$. Weak profinite rigidity of w_1 implies w_1 is endomorphic equivalent to w_2 . Suppose σ_1 and σ_2 be two endomorphism of F_n such that $\sigma_1(w_1) = w_2$ and $\sigma_2(w_2) = w_1$. The composition $\sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1$ fixes the test word w_1 and therefore $\sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1$ is an automorphism. Hence σ_2 is surjective and free groups are hopfian implies σ_2 is an automorphism and σ_1 , a composition of two automorphism, is also an automorphism. Hence, w_1 is profinitely rigid.

Now suppose $w_1 \in F_n$ is profinitely rigid. Let $w_2 \in F_n$ be another word such that it has same image on every finite group as the word w_1 . By Theorem 4.7, we get that w_1 and w_2 induce same measure on every finite group. Profinite rigidity of w_1 implies that w_1 and w_2 are automorphic. Hence they are endomorphic equivalent. Hence w_1 is weakly profinitely rigid. \square

Corollary 4.9. *Word $[x, y]^d \in F_2$ for $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, is weakly profinitely rigid.*

Proof. As word $[x, y]^d$ is profinitely rigid [6], the result follows from previous theorem. \square

A word in F_2 can be either a power of a surjective word or a test word by Lemma 3.5. The following corollary can also be seen as another characterisation of test words in F_2 .

Corollary 4.10. *Let $w \in F_2 \setminus \{e\}$ be a word. If, for any word $u \in F_2$, w and u having same image on every finite group ensures that w and u induce same measure on every finite group, then w is a test word.*

Proof. It is enough to worry about non-trivial non-test word by Theorem 4.7. If w is a non-trivial non-test word, then it is a power of some surjective word w_1 , say $w = w_1^d$. Then we also have a surjective word u which is not automorphic to w_1 , then $w = w_1^d$ and u^d will have same image on every finite group but there exists a finite group G on which they will not induce same measure [6]. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. ALMEIDA, A. COSTA, R. KYRIAKOGLU, D. PERRIN, ET AL., *Profinite semigroups and symbolic dynamics*, Springer, 2020.
- [2] A. AMIT AND U. VISHNE, *Characters and solutions to equations in finite groups*, Journal of Algebra and its Applications, 10 (2011), pp. 675–686.
- [3] J. N. BRAY, J. S. WILSON, AND R. A. WILSON, *A Characterization of Finite Soluble Groups by Laws in Two Variables*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 37 (2005), pp. 179–186.
- [4] W. CALVERT, K. DUTTA, AND A. PRASAD, *Degeneration and orbits of tuples and subgroups in an abelian group*, Journal of Group Theory, 16 (2013), pp. 221–233.
- [5] W. COCKE AND M.-C. HO, *The probability distribution of word maps on finite groups*, Journal of Algebra, 518 (2019), pp. 440–452.

- [6] L. HANANY, C. MEIRI, AND D. PUDER, *Some orbits of free words that are determined by measures on finite groups*, Journal of Algebra, 555 (2020), pp. 305–324.
- [7] N. NIKOLOV AND D. SEGAL, *On finitely generated profinite groups I: strong completeness and uniform bounds*, Annals of Mathematics, 165 (2006), pp. 171–238.
- [8] D. PUDER AND O. PARZANCHEVSKI, *Measure preserving words are primitive*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 28 (2015), pp. 63–97.
- [9] L. RIBES AND P. ZALESSKII, *Profinite groups*, Springer, 2000.
- [10] A. SHALEV, *Some results and problems in the theory of word maps*, in Erdős centennial, Springer, 2013, pp. 611–649.
- [11] S. SINGH AND A. S. REDDY, *Achiral words*, To appear in Communications in Algebra.
- [12] I. SNOPCE AND S. TANUSHEVSKI, *Test elements in pro- p groups with applications in discrete groups*, Israel Journal of Mathematics, 219 (2017), pp. 783–816.
- [13] E. C. TURNER, *Test Words for Automorphisms of Free Groups*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 28 (1996), pp. 255–263.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHIV NADAR INSTITUTION OF EMINENCE, GREATER NOIDA,
DADRI-201314, INDIA

Email address: `ss101@snu.edu.in`, `shrinit Singh@gmail.com`