

EMBEDDING PARTIAL HNN EXTENSIONS IN ASCENDING HNN EXTENSIONS

HIP KUEN CHONG AND DANIEL T. WISE

ABSTRACT. We show that any partial ascending HNN extension of a free group embeds in an actual ascending HNN extension of a free group. Moreover, we can ensure that it embeds as the parabolic subgroup of a relatively hyperbolic group.

1. INTRODUCTION

Feighn and Handel [FH99] proved that any finitely generated group G that is an ascending HNN extension of a free group is finitely presented. Their proof actually shows that G splits as a partial ascending HNN extension. Let $\Phi: F \rightarrow F$ be a monomorphism of the free group $F = \langle a_i: i \in I \rangle$. The associated *ascending HNN extension* is $G = F *_{\Phi} = \langle t, a_i: i \in I \mid a_i^t = \Phi(a_i): i \in I \rangle$. A *partial ascending HNN extension* is a group of the form $G' = F' *_{\Psi} = \langle t, a_i: i \in I \mid a_i^t = \Psi(a_i): i \in J \rangle$ where $J \subseteq I$ and $\Psi: F' \rightarrow F$ is a monomorphism where $F' = \langle a_i: i \in J \rangle$.

The motivation of this paper is to prove a converse:

Theorem 1.1. Let G' be a partial ascending HNN extension of a f.g. free group. Then there is an injection $G' \subseteq G$ where G is an ascending HNN extension of a f.g. free group. Moreover, we can ensure that $G' \hookrightarrow G$ arises as $F *_{\varphi} \hookrightarrow F'' *_{\Phi}$ where Φ extends φ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F' & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ F'' & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & F'' \end{array}$$

Our result raises the following:

Date: August 2, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20E06, 20F67, 20F06.

Key words and phrases. HNN Extensions, Relative Hyperbolic Groups, Small Cancellation Theory.

Research supported by NSERC.

Conjecture 1.2. Every f.g. free-by-cyclic group is a subgroup of a (f.g. free)-by-cyclic group. Moreover, there is an extension $\varphi \rightarrow \Phi$ as in the above diagram.

This corresponds to the case where both $F' \subseteq F$ and $\Phi(F') \subseteq F$ are free factors.

The method we employ to prove Theorem 1.1 is of independent interest.

Proposition 1.3. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subcomplex. Suppose X/Y is combinatorially reducible and $X \rightarrow X/Y$ has liftable cancellable pairs. Then $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective.

Proposition 1.3, which is proven as Proposition 3.5, is simple and definitional, but highly applicable. Proposition 1.3 is proven by considering a disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$, observing the quotient disk diagram $\bar{D} \rightarrow X/Y$ must have a cancellable pair, and lifting this to a cancellable pair in $D \rightarrow X$.

Proposition 1.4. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subcomplex of a compact 2-complex X . Suppose X/Y is combinatorially reducible and $X \rightarrow X/Y$ has liftable cancellable pairs. Suppose there is $K > 0$ such that for each reduced disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$, the induced diagram $\bar{D} \rightarrow X/Y$ satisfies $\text{Area}(\bar{D}) \leq K \cdot |\partial_p \bar{D}|$. Then $\pi_1 X$ is hyperbolic relative to $\pi_1 Y$.

Proposition 1.4 is proven in Proposition 5.10 and Corollary 5.11 with the aid of Osin's relative hyperbolicity criterion. We consider an associated disk diagram \widehat{D} to Osin's complex \widehat{X} and relate the numbers of cells in \widehat{D} and the quotient diagram \bar{D} . In particular, we show $\text{Area}_{X-Y}(\widehat{D}) = \text{Area}(\bar{D})$, and show that the number of remaining 2-cells is at most proportional to $\text{Area}_{X-Y}(\widehat{D})$.

Theorem 1.1 is proven by letting Y be the mapping torus of φ , and then adding two generators to the free group and extending φ to those new generators. The resulting mapping cylinder is X . We extend φ by adding long relators to ensure the small-cancellation property for X/Y . This is described in Construction 4.12 and $\pi_1 Y \leq \pi_1 X$ is proved in Proposition 4.13. The extension $Y \hookrightarrow X$ is illustrated by the following presentations where the new cells are indicated in bold:

$$\langle a, b, c, t \mid a^t = (abc)^8, b^t = (ac)^9 b \rangle$$

$$\langle a, b, c, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t \mid a^t = (abc)^8, b^t = (ac)^9 b, \mathbf{c}^t = (\mathbf{xy})^{100}, \mathbf{x}^t = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{xxxy})^{100}, \mathbf{y}^t = \mathbf{y}(\mathbf{xxxxy})^{100} \rangle$$

We end Section 4 with an amusing application: if one assumes moreover that φ is fully irreducible, then we may ensure its extension Φ is also fully irreducible. See Definition 4.14 and Proposition 4.19.

2. DISK DIAGRAM AND DIAGRAMMATIC REDUCIBILITY

Let X be a combinatorial 2-complex. Denote X^k as the k -dimensional skeleton of X .

Definition 2.1. The *boundary path* of a 2-cell R is denoted by $\partial_p R$. The boundary path is an n -th power if $\partial_p R = w^n$ for some cycle $w \rightarrow X^1$. The boundary path has *exponent* n if it is an n -th power but not an m -th power for $m > n$.

Definition 2.2. Let $D \rightarrow X$ be a combinatorial map. A *cancellable pair* of 2-cells R_1, R_2 along a 1-cell e consists of 2-cells of D where $\partial_p R_1 = eP_1$ and $\partial_p R_2 = eP_2$, and the compositions $eP_1 \rightarrow X$ and $eP_2 \rightarrow X$ are the same closed path.

A *disk diagram* D is a compact contractible 2-complex with a chosen spherical embedding $D \hookrightarrow S^2$. The *boundary cycle* $\partial_p D$ of D is the cycle equals $\partial_p C_\infty$, where C_∞ is the open 2-cell consisting of $S^2 - D$.

A map $D \rightarrow X$ is *reduced* if it has no cancellable pair. We are especially interested in reduced maps where D is a disk diagram or $D \cong S^2$ is a 2-sphere. We often refer to a combinatorial map $D \rightarrow X$ as a *disk diagram D in X* when D is a disk diagram. We similarly define a *spherical diagram in X* . The motivation for reduced disk diagrams is that if D has a cancellable pair, then one can remove the open 2-cells R_1, R_2 and an open arc containing e between them, and then obtain a smaller spherical or disk diagram with the same boundary path by gluing.

Definition 2.3. A 2-complex X is *combinatorially reducible* if each combinatorial map $S^2 \rightarrow X$ from a 2-sphere has a cancellable pair. Equivalently, there is no reduced spherical diagram $S^2 \rightarrow X$.

Some examples of combinatorially reducible 2-complexes are staggered 2-complexes, complexes satisfying the Gersten-Pride weight-test condition, and complexes satisfying the classical small-cancellation conditions (see Proposition 4.5).

3. SUBCOMPLEX π_1 -INJECTION

In this section, we state a criterion for π_1 -injectivity of a subcomplex $Y \subseteq X$. Consider the quotient map $\rho: X \rightarrow \bar{X}$, where $\bar{X} = X/Y$. For a 2-cell R in X , let \bar{R} denote its image in \bar{X} .

Remark 3.1. It is possible that $\partial_p \bar{R}$ has backtracks even when $\partial_p R$ is an immersion.

Construction 3.2. Given a disk diagram $\phi: D \rightarrow X$,

the *projected diagram* $\bar{\phi}: \bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ is constructed by first taking $\bar{D} = D \rightarrow X$, then quotient each component of the preimage of the basepoint in the map $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ to a point.

Let \bar{R} be a 2-cell in \bar{D} . Let the 2-cell $R \subseteq D$ be the preimage of \bar{R} under the quotient $D \rightarrow \bar{D}$. We set $\bar{\phi}(\bar{R}) = \overline{\phi(R)}$, where $\overline{\phi(R)}$ is the image of $\phi(R)$ under $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$.

Definition 3.3. $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has *liftable cancellable pairs* if for each disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$ projecting to $\bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$, if \bar{R}_1, \bar{R}_2 is a cancellable pair in \bar{D} then R_1, R_2 is a cancellable pair in D . (It suffices to consider diagrams with two 2-cells.)

Lemma 3.4. The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs.
- (ii) For every reduced disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$, the projected diagram $\bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ is also reduced.

Proof. ((i) \implies (ii)) Suppose $D \rightarrow X$ is reduced and assume $\bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ is not reduced. Then there is a cancellable pair \bar{R}_1, \bar{R}_2 in \bar{D} . Their preimages R_1, R_2 form a cancellable pair in D by the lifting property, contradicting the reducibility of D .

((ii) \implies (i)) Suppose \bar{R}_1, \bar{R}_2 is a cancellable pair in \bar{D} . Then their preimages R_1, R_2 share at least an edge with each other. Assume R_1, R_2 do not form a cancellable pair. Let $D' \rightarrow X$ to be the disk diagram containing only R_1, R_2 . Then D' is reduced, and hence $\bar{D}' \rightarrow \bar{X}$ is also reduced, leading to a contradiction. \square

Proposition 3.5. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subcomplex. Suppose \bar{X} is combinatorially reducible and $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs. Then $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective.

Proof. Let $\gamma \rightarrow Y$ be a closed combinatorial path. We show that if $\gamma \rightarrow X$ is nullhomotopic, then $\gamma \rightarrow Y$ is nullhomotopic.

Suppose $\gamma = \partial_p D$ for some reduced disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$ (existence by [Kam33]). Assume $\gamma \rightarrow Y$ is essential, then \bar{D} contains at least one 2-cell α .

We claim \bar{D} is homeomorphic to a *singular surface* obtained by gluing surfaces together along vertices and isolated edges. Since $\partial_p D$ maps to Y , we have $\overline{\partial_p D}$ is a point. The link of each vertex of \bar{D} is a disjoint union of circles and points. Indeed, the preimage of a 0-cell v in \bar{D} is a connected

subcomplex $Z \subseteq D$ mapping to Y . Each component of the link of v corresponds to a cycle or (possibly trivial) arc in the boundary of a regular neighbourhood of Z .

We now show \bar{D} is simply connected. Since we may quotient components one at a time and apply induction, it suffices to show that $H_1(D/C) = 0$ for each component C of the preimage of Y . By the relative Mayer-Vietoris sequence $H_1(D) \rightarrow H_1(D, C) \rightarrow H_0(C) \rightarrow H_0(D) \rightarrow H_0(D, C)$, since $H_1(D) = 0 = H_0(D, C)$ and $H_0(C) = \mathbb{Z} = H_0(D)$, we have $H_1(D, C) = 0$. Since $C \subseteq D$ is a subcomplex, $H_1(D/C) = H_1(D, C) = 0$.

Each surface of \bar{D} is a sphere since it homologically injects. It follows that \bar{D} is a tree of spheres. Consider a sphere in \bar{D} containing α . Since \bar{X} is combinatorially reducible, there is a cancellable pair $\bar{R}_1, \bar{R}_2 \subseteq \bar{D}$. Since $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs, the pair of preimages $R_1, R_2 \subseteq D$ is cancellable. This contradicts that D is reduced. Hence, $Y \rightarrow X$ is π_1 -injective. \square

4. SMALL CANCELLATION

4.1. Background.

Definition 4.1. In a group presentation $\langle S | R \rangle$, a *piece* is a common cyclic subword w appearing as two different ways in R . Note that for a relator $r = q^n$, subwords that differ by a \mathbb{Z}_n -action are regarded as appearing in the same way. The presentation is *C(7)* if all $r \in R$ cannot be written as a concatenation of 6 pieces.

Definition 4.2. The *presentation complex* X associated to a group presentation $\langle S | R \rangle$ is constructed by:

- a 0-cell v ;
- a 1-cell e_s for each $s \in S$. We label each e_s by s , and attach each e_s to v on both sides;
- a 2-cell f_r for each $r \in R$, with the attaching map corresponding to the word r .

Definition 4.3. *Length* of a combinatorial path $p \rightarrow X$ is the number of 1-cell in p , denoted by $|p|$. The *area* of a combinatorial diagram $D \rightarrow X$ is the number of 2-cell in D , denoted by $\text{Area}(D)$.

A finite presentation *admits a linear isoperimetric function* if there is a constant $K > 0$ such that for all reduced disk diagram D in the associated presentation complex, $\text{Area}(D) \leq K \cdot |\partial_p D|$.

Proposition 4.4. Let $G = \langle S | R \rangle$ be a finite $C(7)$ presentation. Then it admits a linear isoperimetric function.

Proof. For any word w representing 1_G , there is a reduced disk diagram D such that $\partial_p D = w$. By [Lyn66, Cor 2.4], there is a shell $R \subseteq D$ such that $\partial_p R \cap \partial_p D$ has more pieces than $\partial_p R - \partial_p D$. Hence $\text{Area}(D)$ is upper bounded by the number of pieces of w by removing shells in succession. \square

Proposition 4.5. Every spherical diagram $D \rightarrow X$ to a $C(7)$ presentation complex contains a cancellable pair. In other words, every $C(7)$ presentation complex is combinatorially reducible.

Proof. Let $D \rightarrow X$ be a reduced spherical diagram. Let $R \subseteq D \rightarrow X$ be a 2-cell. Since X is a presentation complex and D is spherical, $R \neq D$. Hence, $D - R \rightarrow X$ is a reduced disk diagram, hence there is a shell R' in $D - R$ such that $R' \cap \partial_p(D - R)$ is a concatenation of at least 2 pieces [Lyn66, Cor 2.4]. This is not possible since $\partial_p(D - R) = \partial_p R$ and R is a single 2-cell. \square

4.2. Ensuring Injectivity via Small Cancellation. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a combinatorial subcomplex. Let $\bar{X} = X/Y$ as the beginning of Section 3 and denote the image of a 2-cell R by \bar{R} .

Definition 4.6. X has *no extra powers relative to Y* if for each 2-cell $R \not\subseteq Y$, if $\partial_p \bar{R}$ has exponent n for some n , then $\partial_p R$ also has exponent n .

Definition 4.7. X has *no duplicates relative to Y* if for any 2-cells $R_1, R_2 \not\subseteq Y$, if $\partial_p \bar{R}_1 = \partial_p \bar{R}_2$ then $\partial_p R_1 = \partial_p R_2$.

Example 4.8. Let X_1 be the presentation complex of $\langle a, b, c | bcabc \rangle$. Let X_2 be the presentation complex of $\langle a, b, c | abc, abcc \rangle$. Let Y_a be a subcomplex of X_i corresponding to $\langle a \rangle$, and let Y_c be a subcomplex of X_i corresponding to $\langle c \rangle$, for $i = 1, 2$.

X_1 has extra powers relative to Y_a since X_1/Y_a is the presentation complex of $\langle b, c | bcabc \rangle$, which $bcabc$ has exponent 3 instead of $bcabc$ having exponent 1. On the other hand, X_1 has no extra powers relative to Y_c since X_1/Y_c is the presentation complex of $\langle a, b | babb \rangle$, which $babb$ also has exponent 1.

X_2 has duplicates relative to Y_c since X_2/Y_c is the presentation complex of $\langle a, b | ab, ab \rangle$. On the other hand, X_2 has no duplicates relative to Y_a since X_2/Y_a is the presentation complex of $\langle b, c | bc, bcc \rangle$.

Lemma 4.9. Suppose X has no extra powers and no duplicates relative to Y . Then $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs.

Proof. Let \bar{R}_1, \bar{R}_2 be a cancellable pair intersecting at 1-cell \bar{e} in a disk diagram \bar{D} in \bar{X} . Then there is an isomorphism $\bar{f}: \partial_p \bar{R}_1 \rightarrow \partial_p \bar{R}_2$ with $\bar{f}(\bar{e}) \in \text{Aut}(\partial_p \bar{R}_2)\bar{e}$. Since X has no duplicates relative to Y , the isomorphism \bar{f} lifts to $f: \partial_p R_1 \rightarrow \partial_p R_2$.

Let e be the preimage of \bar{e} . Since $\text{Aut}(\partial_p R_2) \cong \text{Aut}(\partial_p \bar{R}_2)$ by no extra relative powers, $f(e) \in \text{Aut}(\partial_p R_2)e$. Hence, $g \circ f$ fixes e for some $g \in \text{Aut}(\partial_p R_2)$ and so R_1 and R_2 form a cancellable pair along e . □

Corollary 4.10. Suppose X has no extra powers and duplicates relative to Y and the 2-skeleton of the quotient \bar{X} is a $C(7)$ presentation complex. Then $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective.

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, 2-skeleton of \bar{X} is $C(7)$ implies \bar{X} is combinatorially reducible since the definition of combinatorially reducible only depends on 2-skeleton. By Lemma 4.9, $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs. By Proposition 3.5, $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective. □

4.3. Partial Ascending HNN Extension embeds in Ascending HNN Extension. We will show that any partial ascending HNN extension of a finitely generated free group is isomorphic to a subgroup of an ascending HNN extension of a finitely generated free group by applying Corollary 4.10.

Definition 4.11. Let $G = F *_{F_1^t = F_2}$ be the HNN extension of a group F associated with an isomorphism $\phi: F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ between subgroups of F . The HNN extension is *ascending* if $F_1 = F$. The HNN extension is *partial ascending* if F_1 is a free factor of F .

Construction 4.12. Given H a partial ascending HNN extension of a finitely generated free group F , we will construct an ascending HNN extension G with $H \leq G$. The subgroup relationship is proved in Proposition 4.13.

H can be presented as:

$$(1) \quad H = \langle a_i, b_j, t : i \in I, j \in J \mid ta_i t^{-1} = A_i : i \in I \rangle$$

where $F = \langle a_i, b_j : i \in I, j \in J \rangle$ and $F_1 = \langle a_i : i \in I \rangle$ and A_ℓ is a reduced word in $\{a_i^{\pm 1}, b_j^{\pm 1} : i \in I, j \in J\}$ for each $\ell \in I$.

Let $\{B_j, C_1, C_2 : j \in J\}$ be a set of words in $\{c_1, c_2\}$ such that $W = \{B_j, c_1^{-1}C_1, c_2^{-1}C_2 : j \in J\}$ satisfies $C(7)$ in the sense that $\langle c_1, c_2 | W \rangle$ is $C(7)$ and no word in W is a proper power. We construct G to be an ascending HNN extension with presentation

(2)

$$G = \langle a_i, b_j, c_1, c_2, t : i \in I, j \in J \mid ta_it^{-1} = A_i, tb_jt^{-1} = B_j, tc_1t^{-1} = C_1, tc_2t^{-1} = C_2 : i \in I, j \in J \rangle$$

Proposition 4.13. With H and G as in Construction 4.12, there is an injective homomorphism from H to G .

Proof. Let X and Y be the presentation complexes of G and H respectively. We regard Y as a subcomplex of X . It suffices to show that $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective. Recall $\bar{X} = X/Y$.

$\bar{X}^1 = \{c_1, c_2\}$ and 2-cells in \bar{X} have attaching maps labelled by W . Hence, \bar{X} is $C(7)$.

Since words in W have exponent 1, X has no extra power relative to Y .

Since words in W are distinct, X has no duplicates relative to Y .

Therefore, $H = \pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X = G$ is injective by Corollary 4.10. \square

4.4. Partial Ascending Fully Irreducible HNN Extension embeds in Fully Irreducible Ascending HNN Extension. In this subsection, we show that any partial ascending fully irreducible HNN extension of a finitely generated free group is isomorphic to a subgroup of a fully irreducible ascending HNN extension of a finitely generated free group by applying Corollary 4.10. We refer to [AW23] for more about irreducible partial endomorphisms and their relationship with other combinatorial group theory notions.

Definition 4.14. Let $G = F *_{F_1^t = F_2}$ be the HNN extension associated with an isomorphism $\phi : F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ between subgroups of F . The isomorphism ϕ is *weakly reducible* if there are $p > 1$, a proper nontrivial free factor $A \subseteq F$ and $g \in F$ such that $\phi^p(A)$ is well-defined and $\phi^p(A) \subseteq gAg^{-1}$. Here A is a *weakly invariant free factor* of ϕ . The isomorphism ϕ is *fully irreducible* if ϕ is not weakly reducible. G is *fully irreducible* if the associated isomorphism ϕ is.

Let $F(X)$ be the free group on X . We use the following special case of [Sta99, Thm 2.4]:

Theorem 4.15. Let $F = F(S)$ be a free group with $2 \leq |S| < \infty$. Let w be a cyclically reduced word in S^\pm . Suppose w contains pq for each $p, q \in S^\pm$ with pq reduced. Then the element represented by w is not contained in any proper free factor of F .

We also need Lemma 4.17 for proving Proposition 4.19.

Definition 4.16. The *based core at x* of a connected graph B is the smallest connected subgraph containing x and all closed cycles of B . Let $H \leq F$ be a finitely generated subgroup of a free group. The *core* of H is the core of the associated cover of $H \leq F$.

See [Sta83, Constr 5.4] for the construction of the core of $H \leq F$ by folding.

Lemma 4.17. Let F be a free group. Let $A_i \in F$ be a reduced word for each $i \in I$ with $|I| < \infty$. Let Γ be the graph of the core associated with $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle \leq F$. Let x be the basepoint of Γ . Then $\deg x \leq 2|I|$.

Proof. Assume $\deg x > 2|I|$. Graph Γ contains no vertex of degree 1 except possibly at x because each A_ℓ has no backtrack for $\ell \in I$. Observe $\chi(\Gamma) \geq 1 - |I|$ since Γ is constructed from a bouquet of $|I|$ circles and folding does not decrease $\chi(\Gamma)$. Moreover, $\chi(\Gamma) = \sum_v (1 - \frac{\deg v}{2})$ since Γ is a graph. This leads to a contradiction since $\chi(\Gamma) \leq 1 - \frac{\deg v}{2} < 1 - |I| = \chi(\Gamma)$, where the first inequality holds since $1 - \frac{\deg v}{2} \leq 0$ for each vertex v . \square

Construction 4.18. Given H a partial ascending fully irreducible HNN extension of a finitely generated free group F , we will construct a fully irreducible ascending HNN extension G with $H \leq G$. The subgroup relationship is proved in Proposition 4.19.

Observe H can be presented as Equation (1). Recall that no A_ℓ has a backtrack for $\ell \in I$ since each A_ℓ is reduced.

Let Γ be the core of $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle \leq F(a_i, b_j)$ with basepoint x . Then, $\deg x \leq 2|I|$ by Lemma 4.17, so there are at most $2|I|$ labels in $\{a_i^\pm, b_j^\pm : i \in I, j \in J\}$ used on the edges emerging from x . Therefore, we enumerate $2|J|$ labels in $\{a_i^\pm, b_j^\pm : i \in I, j \in J\}$ not used as $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2|J|}$.

Let $\rho: F(a_i, b_j, c_1, c_2) \rightarrow F(c_1, c_2)$ be the projection map. Let $B_j, C_1, C_2 \in F(a_i, b_j, c_1, c_2)$ for each $j \in J$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B_j &= x_{j+|J|} U_j \beta_j x_j^{-1} \\ C_1 &= c_1 V_1 \gamma_1 c_1^{-1} \\ C_2 &= c_2 V_2 \gamma_2 c_2^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where

- U_j, V_1, V_2 are words such that pq is a subword of U_j and V_k for each reduced pq with $p, q \in \{a_i, b_j, c_1, c_2: i \in I, j \in J\}$, and U_j, V_1, V_2 do not start with $x_j^{-1}, c_1^{-1}, c_2^{-1}$ respectively;
- $\beta_j, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$ are words such that $W = \{\rho(B_j)\}_{j \in J} \cup \{\rho(c_1^{-1}C_1), \rho(c_2^{-1}C_2)\}$ is $C'(\frac{1}{7})$;
- no word in W is a proper power; and
- B_j, C_k are cyclically reduced

One may choose β_j and γ_k to be long words in $\{c_k: k \in K\}$ to satisfy all the conditions.

We construct G to be an ascending HNN extension with presentation as Equation (2).

Proposition 4.19. With H and G as in Construction 4.18, there is a group embedding from H to G . Moreover, G is fully irreducible.

Proof. Similar to Proposition 4.13, we claim that $H = \pi_Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X = G$ is an embedding. Indeed, observe $\overline{X}^1 = \{c_k: k \in K\}$ and 2-cells in \overline{X} have attaching maps labelled by W , thus \overline{X} is $C(7)$. Words in W are all distinct and have exponent 1.

Assume G is weakly reducible. Let $F_0 \leq F$ be a weakly invariant free factor of ϕ . Write $F = F_0 * F'$. Observe $\phi(F_0) \leq gF_0g^{-1}$ for some $g \in F$ implies $\phi^p(F_0)$ is in some proper free factor of F for some $p > 0$. Let $\Phi = \phi^p$.

Since H is fully irreducible, $F_0 \not\subseteq F(a_i)$. Therefore, there is $g \in F_0 - F(a_i)$. Write $g = p_1 q_1 \cdots q_{n-1} p_n$ for some $p_i \in F(a_i)$ and letter $q_j \in \{b_j^\pm, c_k^\pm\}$ and $n \geq 2$ since $g \notin F(a_i)$.

The core $\widehat{\Gamma}$ of $\langle A_i, B_j, C_k: i \in I, j \in J, k \in K \rangle \leq F(a_i, b_j, c_k)$ is the wedge of Γ and bouquet of circles with paths $\{B_j, C_k: j \in J, k \in K\}$. Indeed by construction, there is no folding at the basepoint when adding B_j and C_k for each $j \in J, k \in K$.

Therefore, $\phi(g) = \phi(p_1)\phi(q_1)\cdots\phi(q_{n-1})\phi(p_n)$ does not have folding between $\phi(p_i)$ and $\phi(q_j)$ for any i, j and hence is cyclically reduced. In particular, U_j or V_k is an immersed subword of $\phi(g)$. Hence, $\phi(g)$ does not lie in any proper free factor by Theorem 4.15, and in particular, $\phi(g) \notin F(a_i)$.

Iterate the argument above for p times to obtain $\phi^p(g)$ does not lie in any proper free factor, contradicting the free decomposition of F as given by the definition. \square

5. RELATIVE HYPERBOLICITY

We will use Osin's criterion for relative hyperbolicity [Osi06]. We first recall the definitions from Osin's paper. Then, we focus on some types of subcomplexes of compact complexes and deduce relative hyperbolicity in that case.

Definition 5.1. Let G be a group with a finite symmetric generating set S . Let $H \leq G$ be a subgroup. Let \widehat{H} be an isomorphic copy of H . Let $F(S \cup \widehat{H})$ be the free group with basis $S \cup \widehat{H}$. We use $|w|$ to denote the length of a word w .

Let \mathcal{Z} be the subset of $F(\widehat{H})$ representing the elements of $\ker(F(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow \widehat{H})$.

Definition 5.2. Let \mathcal{R} be a set of words in $S \cup \widehat{H}$ such that G can be presented as $\langle S, \widehat{H} \mid \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$, i.e. $F(S \cup \widehat{H}) \rightarrow G$ has kernel $\langle\langle \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle\rangle$. The presentation $P = \langle S, \widehat{H} \mid \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$ is a *finite presentation relative to H* if \mathcal{R} is finite. Note that P is only *relatively* finite.

Let \widehat{X} be the presentation complex of P . Let w be a word in $S \cup \widehat{H}$ that represents 1_G . The *area of w in P* , denoted $\text{Area}_P(w)$, is the minimal area of disk diagrams $D \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ with $\partial_p D = w$. Suppose P is a finite presentation relative to H . We say P has a *linear isoperimetric function* if there is $K > 0$ such that $\text{Area}_P(w) \leq K \cdot |w|$ for any word w in $S \cup \widehat{H}$ representing 1_G . We say G has a *linear isoperimetric function relative to H* if there is a finite presentation P relative to H such that P has a linear isoperimetric function.

Theorem 5.3. Suppose G admits a linear isoperimetric function relative to H . Then G is hyperbolic relative to H .

Proof. See [Osi06, Cor. 2.54]. \square

Construction 5.4. Given a compact combinatorial 2-complex X with one 0-cell and $\iota: Y \hookrightarrow X$ a subcomplex. We will construct a finite presentation of $G = \pi_1 X$ relative to $H = \iota_*(\pi_1 Y)$. The properties of this presentation are proved in Lemma 5.6.

Let $\{\bar{c}_i\}_i$ be the 1-cells in Y . Let $c_i = [\bar{c}_i] \in H$ for each i . Let $\{\bar{d}_j\}_j$ be the 1-cells of X that are not in Y . Let $d_j = [\bar{d}_j] \in G$ for each j . Let $P = \langle S, \widehat{H} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$, where:

- $S = \{c_i\}_i \cup \{d_j\}_j$.
- \widehat{H} is a copy of H where for each $h \in H$, the corresponding element is denoted $\widehat{h} \in \widehat{H}$.
- $\mathcal{A} = \{[\partial_p R]: R \text{ in 2-cells of } X\}$.
- $\mathcal{B} = \{c_i^{-1} \widehat{c}_i\}_i$.
- \mathcal{Z} is the subset of $F(\widehat{H})$ representing elements of $\ker(F(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow H)$.

Remark 5.5. Each relator in \mathcal{B} declares that c_i equals its corresponding element $\widehat{c}_i \in \widehat{H}$.

Lemma 5.6. With notations as in Construction 5.4, P is a finite presentation relative to H . Moreover, let \widehat{X} be the presentation complex of P . There is a natural injection $X \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ and a retraction $r: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$, and hence $G \cong \pi_1 \widehat{X}$.

Proof. P is finitely presented relative to H since X is compact, implying \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are finite.

Observe that X is the presentation complex of $\langle S \mid \mathcal{A} \rangle$, so there is an injection $X \rightarrow \widehat{X}$. We now specify the retraction map r . Each edge corresponding to $\widehat{h} \in \widehat{H}$ is mapped to a closed path in X corresponding to $h \in H \leq G$. Each 2-cell of \mathcal{B} maps to a backtrack $c_i^{-1} c_i$. Each 2-cell of \mathcal{Z} maps to a disk diagram in X since the boundary path corresponds to $1 \in H \leq G$. The retraction $r: \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ implies $\pi_1 X \rightarrow \pi_1 \widehat{X}$ is injective.

Since relators in \mathcal{B} equates each $c_i \in G$ to $\widehat{c}_i \in \widehat{H}$ and \widehat{H} is generated by $\{\widehat{c}_i\}$, so $\pi_1 X \rightarrow \pi_1 \widehat{X}$ is surjective. Therefore, $\pi_1 \widehat{X} \cong \pi_1 X = G$. \square

Definition 5.7. Let \widehat{X} be the presentation complex of $\langle S, \widehat{H} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$ as in Construction 5.4.

Let $\widehat{D} \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ be a disk diagram. A 2-cell R in \widehat{D} is a \mathcal{Z} -face if R maps to a 2-cell of \widehat{X} corresponding to an element of \mathcal{Z} . The \mathcal{Z} -area of \widehat{D} is the number of \mathcal{Z} -faces in \widehat{D} . We likewise define \mathcal{A} -face, \mathcal{B} -face, \mathcal{A} -area and \mathcal{B} -area. A 1-cell e in \widehat{D} is an S -edge if e maps to a 1-cell of \widehat{X} corresponding to an element in S . We likewise define \widehat{H} -edge.

Since Y is a subcomplex of X , which can be presented by $\langle S \mid \mathcal{A} \rangle$, any \mathcal{A} -face mapping to Y is called an \mathcal{A}_Y -face and any \mathcal{A} -face (with interior) mapping to $X - Y$ is called an \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -face. We likewise define \mathcal{A}_Y -area and \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -area.

A $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram in \widehat{D} is a connected component of $[\bigcup_{\mathcal{B}\text{-faces } R} \overline{R}] \cup [\bigcup_{\mathcal{Z}\text{-faces } R} \overline{R}]$.

Remark 5.8. $\partial_p R$ consists of only S -edges if R is a \mathcal{A} -face; $\partial_p R$ consists of exactly one S -edge and one \widehat{H} -edge if R is a \mathcal{B} -face; $\partial_p R$ consists of only \widehat{H} -edge if R is a \mathcal{Z} -face.

Construction 5.9. Given a disk diagram $\widehat{D} \rightarrow \widehat{X}$, we construct an *associated disk diagram* $D \rightarrow X$. For every $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram E in \widehat{D} , since $\partial_p E$ maps to labels in S , we may replace the subdiagram by a minimal (possibly singular) disk diagram in X with \mathcal{A} -faces.

Proposition 5.10. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subcomplex of a compact 2-complex X with one 0-cell. Suppose $X/Y = \overline{X}$ is combinatorially reducible and $X \rightarrow \overline{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs. Suppose there is $K > 0$ such that for each reduced disk diagram $D \rightarrow X$, the induced diagram $\overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{X}$ satisfies $\text{Area}(\overline{D}) \leq K \cdot |\partial_p \overline{D}|$. Then $\pi_1 X$ is hyperbolic relative to $\iota_*(\pi_1 Y)$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.5, $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective and so we identify $\pi_1 Y$ with $\iota_*(\pi_1 Y) \leq \pi_1 X$. Let $G = \pi_1 X$ and $H = \iota_*(\pi_1 Y)$. Then by Lemma 5.6, G admits a finite presentation $P = \langle S, \widehat{H} \mid \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Z} \rangle$ relative to H . We will show that P has a linear isoperimetric function, and so the result follows by Theorem 5.3.

Let \widehat{X} be the presentation complex of P . Let $\sigma \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ be a nullhomotopic path. When σ only consists of \widehat{H} -edges, there is a reduced disk diagram R with one \mathcal{Z} -face with $\partial_p R = \sigma$. A linear isoperimetric inequality holds for any $K \geq 1$ in this case. Hence, we may assume σ has an \mathcal{S} -edge.

Consider a disk diagram $\widehat{D} \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ with $\partial_p \widehat{D} = \sigma$ such that the $(\mathcal{A}_Y, \mathcal{A}_{X-Y}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{B})$ -area is minimal in dictionary order.

Any \mathcal{A}_Y -face mapping to a 2-cell R can be replaced by a \mathcal{Z} -face surrounded by \mathcal{B} -faces. Indeed $R \subseteq Y$ so $\partial_p R$ can be lined by \mathcal{B} -faces, leaving a boundary path in \widehat{H} . As this boundary is in $\ker(F(\widehat{H}) \rightarrow H)$, we can fill it with a \mathcal{Z} -face. Thus, by minimality, there is no \mathcal{A}_Y -face in \widehat{D} .

We now show the associated diagram $D \rightarrow X$, given by Construction 5.9, is reduced. In \widehat{D} , there is no \mathcal{A}_Y -face. Therefore, after replacing each $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram with \mathcal{A}_Y -faces in the construction of D , cancellable pairs may only occur between \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -faces meeting along isolated




FIGURE 1. The configuration leading to cancellation in D . The $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram is associated with a singular disk diagram, where a pair of cancellable \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -faces meet along a common edge. Replacing each component of \mathcal{A}_Y -faces with a $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram yields a diagram in \widehat{X} with fewer \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -faces, violating minimality.

edges of the replacement diagram. See Figure 1. However, cancellable pairs of \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -faces in D violate minimality of \widehat{D} . Replacing each connected component of \mathcal{A}_Y -faces with a $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram, we obtain a diagram in \widehat{X} having a cancellable pair of \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -faces, contradicting minimality of \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -area.

Since $X \rightarrow \overline{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs, Lemma 3.4 implies that $\overline{D} \rightarrow \overline{X}$ is reduced. The proof of Proposition 3.5 shows that \overline{D} is a tree of spheres and disks. Moreover, \overline{D} does not contain spheres by combinatorial reducibility of \overline{X} . Observe $|\partial_p \overline{D}| \leq |\sigma|$ and there is no \mathcal{A}_Y -face in \overline{D} . The linear isoperimetric inequality for disks in \overline{D} implies:

$$\#\{\mathcal{A}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} = \#\{\mathcal{A}_{X-Y}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} = \text{Area}(\overline{D}) \leq K |\partial_p \overline{D}| \leq K |\sigma|$$

Let M be an upper bound on the boundary lengths of 2-cells of X . As \widehat{D} is reduced, each \mathcal{B} -face is either along an edge of $\partial_p D$ or along an \mathcal{A}_{X-Y} -face. Therefore,

$$\#\{\mathcal{B}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} \leq M \cdot \#\{\mathcal{A}_{X-Y}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} + |\partial_p \widehat{D}| \leq (MK + 1) |\sigma|$$

For a $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram E , let $|E|_S$ be the number of S -edges in ∂E (possibly disconnected). Since each \mathcal{B} -face has only one S -edge and no \mathcal{Z} -face has an S -edge, summing over all $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagrams, we have: $\sum_i |E_i|_S \leq \#\{\mathcal{B}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} \leq (MK + 1)|\sigma|$

A $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -subdiagram E is homeomorphic to a genus-0 surface with $p(E) \geq 1$ boundary circles since E is a subcomplex of \widehat{D} .

We claim that there is an S -edge in each connected component C of ∂E . Indeed, assume C consists only of \widehat{H} -edges. Since no \mathcal{A} -face has an \widehat{H} -edge on the boundary, each 2-cell intersecting C is a \mathcal{B} -face or \mathcal{Z} -face. Therefore, there is no 2-cell outside E since E is a $(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})$ -diagram. Hence, $C \subseteq \partial_p D$ and since D is not singular, $C = \partial_p D = \sigma$, contradicting the assumption that σ contains an S -edge. We conclude that each C contains an S -edge and $|E|_S \geq p(E)$.

By the construction of \mathcal{Z} , observe that \mathcal{Z} -faces can be merged if the merged cell is simply-connected. Since E is homeomorphic to a sphere with $p(E)$ boundary circles, E can be merged into $p(E)$ simply-connected \mathcal{Z} -faces. Let \widehat{D}' be the disk diagram after merging \mathcal{Z} -faces. We have:

$$\#\{\mathcal{Z}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}'\} = \sum_{(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})\text{-diag } E} p(E) \leq \sum_{(\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{Z})\text{-diag } E} |E|_S \leq (MK + 1)|\sigma|$$

Summing up, since \widehat{D}' is a disk diagram with $\partial_p \widehat{D}' = \sigma$, we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Area}_p(\sigma) &\leq \#\{\mathcal{A}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}'\} + \#\{\mathcal{B}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}'\} + \#\{\mathcal{Z}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}'\} \\ &\leq \#\{\mathcal{A}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} + \#\{\mathcal{B}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}\} + \#\{\mathcal{Z}\text{-faces in } \widehat{D}'\} \\ &\leq (2MK + K + 2)|\sigma| \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.11. The statement of Proposition 5.10 holds when X is a compact 2-complex (possibly with more than one 0-cell).

Proof. By Proposition 3.5, $\pi_1 Y \rightarrow \pi_1 X$ is injective and so we regard $\pi_1 Y = \iota_*(\pi_1 Y) \leq \pi_1 X$.

Pick a basepoint in Y^0 . Choose a maximal tree $T_Y \subseteq Y^1$ and extend it to $T_X \subseteq X^1$. Let $X' = X/T_X$ and $Y' = X/T_Y$. Then $\pi_1 X' = \pi_1 X$ and $\pi_1 Y' = \pi_1 Y$.

Since X is compact, T_X has a finite diameter d . Hence, every closed path $p' \rightarrow X'/Y'$ canonically corresponds to $p \rightarrow X/Y$ with $|p| \leq (d + 1)|p'|$. By the correspondence, the conditions of combinatorial reducibility and having liftable cancellable pairs inherit to X' and Y' . Therefore, by

Proposition 5.10, it suffices to show that there is $K > 0$ such that for each reduced disk diagram $D' \rightarrow X'$, the projected diagram $\bar{D} \rightarrow X'/Y'$ satisfies $\text{Area}(\bar{D}') \leq K \cdot |\partial_p D'|$.

By the correspondence between (X, Y) and (X', Y') , let $D \rightarrow X$ correspond to $D' \rightarrow X'$ and $\bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ correspond to $\bar{D}' \rightarrow X'/Y'$. As the correspondence is canonical, $D \rightarrow X$ is reduced. Thus,

$$\text{Area}(\bar{D}') = \text{Area}(\bar{D}) \leq K |\partial_p D| \leq K(d+1) |\partial_p D'| \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.12. H is an almost malnormal quasi-isometrically embedded subgroup in G .

Proof. Since G is hyperbolic relative to H by Proposition 5.10, so H is almost malnormal and quasi-isometrically embedded. See for instance [Bow12, Thm 1.2]. \square

Corollary 5.13. Let G and H as in Constructions 4.12 and 4.18. G is hyperbolic relative to H .

Proof. By constructions, \bar{X} is a $C(7)$ presentation complex, and X has no relative extra power and no duplicates relative to Y . By Proposition 4.5, \bar{X} is combinatorially reducible. By Lemma 4.9, $X \rightarrow \bar{X}$ has liftable cancellable pairs. Moreover, \bar{X} is $C(7)$, so all reduced diagram $\bar{D} \rightarrow \bar{X}$ satisfies linear isoperimetric function by Proposition 4.4. Therefore, G is hyperbolic relative to H . \square

REFERENCES

- [AW23] Brahim Abdenbi and Daniel T. Wise. Negative immersions and finite height mappings, 2023.
- [Bow12] B. H. Bowditch. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 22(3):1250016, 66, 2012.
- [FH99] Mark Feighn and Michael Handel. Mapping tori of free group automorphisms are coherent. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 149(3):1061–1077, 1999.
- [Kam33] Egbert R. Van Kampen. On the connection between the fundamental groups of some related spaces. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 55(1):261–267, 1933.
- [Lyn66] Roger C. Lyndon. On dehn’s algorithm. *Mathematische Annalen*, 166(3):208–228, 1966.
- [Osi06] Denis V. Osin. Relatively hyperbolic groups: intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179(843):1–100, 2006.
- [Sta83] John R. Stallings. Topology of finite graphs. *Invent. Math.*, 71(3):551–565, 1983.
- [Sta99] John R. Stallings. Whitehead graphs on handlebodies. In *Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996)*, pages 317–330. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.

Email address: chonghk1997@gmail.com

Email address: wise@math.mcgill.ca