

Peripheral fillings of relatively hyperbolic groups

D. V. Osin *

Abstract

In this paper a group theoretic version of Dehn surgery is studied. Starting with an arbitrary relatively hyperbolic group G we define a *peripheral filling procedure*, which produces quotients of G by imitating the effect of the Dehn filling of a complete finite volume hyperbolic 3-manifold M on the fundamental group $\pi_1(M)$. The main result of the paper is an algebraic counterpart of Thurston's hyperbolic Dehn surgery theorem. We also show that peripheral subgroups of G 'almost' have the Congruence Extension Property and the group G is approximated (in an algebraic sense) by its quotients obtained by peripheral fillings.

Keywords. Relatively hyperbolic group, Dehn surgery, congruence extension property.

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification. 20F65, 20F67, 20F06, 57M27, 20E26.

1 Introduction

Let M be a compact orientable 3-manifold with finitely many toric boundary components T_1, \dots, T_k . Topologically distinct ways to attach a solid torus to T_i are parameterized by *slopes* on T_i , i.e., isotopy classes of unoriented essential simple closed curves in T_i . For a collection $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k)$, where σ_i is a slope on T_i , the *Dehn filling* $M(\sigma)$ of M is the manifold obtained from M by attaching a solid torus $\mathbb{D}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ to each boundary component T_i so that the meridian $\partial\mathbb{D}^2$ goes to a simple closed curve of the slope σ_i . The fundamental theorem of Thurston [34] asserts that if $M - \partial M$ admits a complete finite volume hyperbolic structure, then the resulting closed manifold $M(\sigma)$ is hyperbolic provided σ does not contain slopes from a fixed finite set.

Given a subset S of a group G , we denote by $\langle S \rangle^G$ the normal closure of S in G . Clearly,

$$\pi_1(M(\sigma)) = \pi_1(M) / \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle^{\pi_1(M)},$$

where $x_i \in \pi_1(T_i) \leq \pi_1(M)$ is the element corresponding to the slope σ_i . Thus Thurston's theorem implies the following group theoretic result:

Let G be the fundamental group of a complete finite volume hyperbolic 3-manifold, H_1, \dots, H_k the cusp subgroups of G . Then there exists a finite subset \mathcal{F} of G such that for any collection of (primitive) elements $x_i \in H_i \setminus \mathcal{F}$, the quotient group $G / \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle^G$ is (word) hyperbolic.

*This work has been partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-0605093 and by the Russian Fund for Basic Research grant #05-01-00895.

In our paper we generalize this result in two directions. First instead of the class of fundamental groups of complete finite volume hyperbolic manifolds we consider its far-reaching generalization, the class of *relatively hyperbolic groups*. Secondary instead of single elements $x_i \in H_i$ we deal with normal subgroups generated by arbitrary subsets of the cusp subgroups.

Recall that the notion of relative hyperbolicity was introduced in group theory by Gromov in [9] and since then it has been elaborated from different points of view [4, 6, 8, 25]. Here we mention some examples and refer the reader to the next section for the precise definition of relatively hyperbolic groups.

- If M is a complete finite-volume manifold of pinched negative sectional curvature, then $\pi_1(M)$ is hyperbolic with respect to the collection of the cusp subgroups [4, 8].
- Any (word) hyperbolic group G is hyperbolic relative to the trivial subgroup.
- Geometrically finite convergence groups acting on non-empty perfect compact metric spaces are hyperbolic relative to the set of the maximal parabolic subgroups [38].
- Free products of groups and their small cancellation quotients, as defined in [20], are hyperbolic relative to the factors [25].
- Fundamental groups of finite graphs of groups with finite edge groups are hyperbolic relative to the vertex groups [4]. In particular, according to the famous Stallings Theorem [32], any group with infinite number of ends carries such a relatively hyperbolic structure.
- Finitely generated groups acting freely on \mathbb{R}^n -trees are hyperbolic relative to the maximal non-cyclic abelian subgroups [14]. This class of examples includes limit groups studied by Kharlampovich, Myasnikov [19], and independently by Sela [31] in their solutions of the famous Tarskii problem.

In the context of relatively hyperbolic groups, the algebraic analogue of Dehn filling is defined as follows. Suppose that $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a collection of subgroups of a group G . To each collection $\mathfrak{N} = \{N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, where N_λ is a normal subgroup of H_λ , we associate the quotient group

$$G(\mathfrak{N}) = G / \langle \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} N_\lambda \rangle^G. \quad (1)$$

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that a group G is hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Then there exists a finite subset \mathcal{F} of non-trivial elements of G with the following property. Let $\mathfrak{N} = \{N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a collection of subgroups $N_\lambda \triangleleft H_\lambda$ such that $N_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then:*

- 1) *For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the natural map $H_\lambda/N_\lambda \rightarrow G(\mathfrak{N})$ is injective.*
- 2) *The quotient group $G(\mathfrak{N})$ is hyperbolic relative to the collection $\{H_\lambda/N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$.*

Moreover, for any finite subset $S \subseteq G$, there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{F}(S)$ of non-trivial elements of G such that the restriction of the natural homomorphism $G \rightarrow G(\mathfrak{N})$ to S is injective whenever $N_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F}(S) = \emptyset$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

It is worthwhile to notice that the theorem applies to general (not necessarily finitely generated) relatively hyperbolic groups. In case the group G is finitely generated, the condition $N_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ simply means that the subgroups N_λ contain no non-trivial elements of small (word) length.

Our proof is purely combinatorial and extensively uses techniques related to van Kampen diagrams over group presentations. Many ideas used in the proof go back to methods developed by Alexander Olshanskii in his geometric solution of the Burnside problem [21, 22]. After this paper was submitted, another proof of Theorem 1.1 in the particular case when the group G is torsion free and finitely generated was published by Daniel Groves and Jason Manning in arXiv [12]. Later in [13] they showed that their method works for infinitely generated groups as well.

Recall that if a finitely generated group G is hyperbolic relative to a collection of hyperbolic subgroups, then G is a hyperbolic group itself [8, 25]. The following corollary may be considered as a generalization of the group theoretic version of Thurston's hyperbolic Dehn surgery theorem. Indeed in case G is a fundamental group of a complete finite volume hyperbolic 3-manifold, all cusp subgroups are isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ and for any non-trivial element $x \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, the quotient $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/\langle x \rangle$ is hyperbolic.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, suppose in addition that G is finitely generated and H_λ/N_λ is hyperbolic for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $G(\mathfrak{N})$ is hyperbolic.*

On the other hand, Theorem 1.1 can also be applied to manifolds of higher dimension. Indeed let M be a complete finite volume hyperbolic n -manifold with cusp ends E_1, \dots, E_k . For simplicity we assume that each cusp end is homeomorphic to $T^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}^+$, where T^{n-1} is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional torus. Let $1 \leq l \leq k$. For each E_i , $1 \leq i \leq l$, we fix a torus $T_i^{n-1} \subset E_i$ and a closed simple curve σ_i in T_i^{n-1} . We now perform Dehn filling on the collection of cusps E_i , $1 \leq i \leq l$, by attaching a solid torus $\mathbb{D}^2 \times T^{n-2}$ onto T_i^{n-1} via a homeomorphism sending $\mathbb{S}^1 = \partial \mathbb{D}^2$ to σ_i . Let $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l)$. The topological type of the resulting manifold $M(\sigma)$ depends only on the homotopy class of unoriented curves σ_i , i.e., on $[\pm \sigma_i] \in \pi_1(T_i^{n-1})$ [30]. If $l = k$, $M(\sigma)$ is a closed manifold; otherwise it has $k - l$ remaining cusps.

The Gromov-Thurston 2π -theorem states that $M(\sigma)$ has a complete metric of non-positive sectional curvature for 'most' choices of σ . (Although the theorem was originally proved in the context of 3-manifolds, the same proof actually holds in any dimension as observed in [2].) This means that the fundamental group of $M(\sigma)$ is *semihyperbolic* in the sense of [1]. The following immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1 shows that, in fact, $\pi_1(M(\sigma))$ is *hyperbolic relative to finitely generated free abelian subgroups*, which is a much stronger property than semihyperbolicity (see [29]). We also note that relatively hyperbolic groups of this type are Hopfian [11, 10], are C^* -exact [28], have finite asymptotic dimension [27] (hence they satisfy the Novikov Conjecture [39]), and have many other nice properties. Below we consider $\pi_1(T_i^{n-1})$ as a subgroup of $\pi_1(M)$, and set $x_i = [\sigma_i] \in \pi_1(T_i^{n-1})$, $1 \leq i \leq l$, and $x_i = 1$ for $l < i \leq k$.

Corollary 1.3. *There is a finite subset of nontrivial elements $\mathcal{F} \subset \pi_1(M)$ such that if $x_i \notin \mathcal{F}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, then the quotient groups $\pi_1(T_i^{n-1})/\langle x_i \rangle$ naturally inject into $M(\sigma)$ and $\pi_1(M(\sigma))$ is hyperbolic relative to the collection of finitely generated free abelian subgroups $\{\pi_1(T_i^{n-1})/\langle x_i \rangle\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}$.*

Let us discuss some algebraic applications of Theorem 1.1. Recall that a subgroup H of a group G has the *Congruence Extension Property* if for any $N \triangleleft H$, we have $H \cap N^G = N$ (or, equivalently, the natural homomorphism $H/N \rightarrow G/N^G$ is injective). An obvious example of the CEP is provided by the pair G, H , where H is a free factor of G . Another example is a cyclic subgroup $H = \langle w \rangle$ generated by an arbitrary element w of a free group F . In this case the CEP for H is equivalent to the assertion that the element represented by w has order n in the one relator group $F/\langle w^n \rangle^F$, which is a part of the well known theorem of Karrass, Magnus, and Solitar [18]. Olshanskii [23] noticed that the free group of rank 2 contains subgroups of arbitrary rank having CEP. This easily implies the Higman–Neumann–Neumann theorem stating that any countable group can be embedded into a 2-generated group. The CEP has also been extensively studied for semigroups and universal algebras (see [3, 33, 37] and references therein). It plays an important role in some constructions of groups with 'exotic' properties [24].

We say that a subgroup H of a group G *almost has CEP* if there is a finite set of non-trivial elements $\mathcal{F} \subseteq H$ such that $H \cap N^G = N$ whenever $N \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$. Recall that a subgroup H of a group G is said to be *almost malnormal*, if $H^g \cap H$ is finite for all $g \notin H$. Bowditch [4] proved that if G is a hyperbolic group and H is an almost malnormal quasi-convex subgroup of G , then G is hyperbolic relative to H (see also [26]). Thus the following is an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.4. *Any almost malnormal quasi-convex subgroup of a hyperbolic group almost has CEP.*

If G is a free group, any almost malnormal subgroup $H \leq G$ is malnormal (i.e., it satisfies $H^g \cap H = \{1\}$ for all $g \notin H$). It is also well-known that a subgroup of a finitely generated free group is quasi-convex if and only if it is finitely generated. Even the following result seems to be new.

Corollary 1.5. *Any finitely generated malnormal subgroup of a free group almost has CEP.*

If the free group is finitely generated this is a particular case of the previous corollary. To prove Corollary 1.5 in the full generality, it suffices to notice that any finitely generated subgroup H of a free group F belongs to a finitely generated free factor F_0 of F and F_0 has CEP as a subgroup of F . This easily implies that H almost has CEP in F .

Considering a series of subgroups $K \triangleleft H \triangleleft F$ in a free group F , where K is not normal in F , it is easy to notice that the word 'malnormal' can not be removed from the corollary. It is less trivial that, in general, malnormal subgroups of free groups do not have CEP. Here we sketch an example suggested by A. Klyachko. Let F be the free group with basis x, y . Using small cancellation arguments, it is not hard to construct a malnormal subgroup H of F generated by x and some word $w \in [F, F]$. Then $\langle x \rangle^F = H \neq \langle x \rangle^H$ since $w \in \langle x \rangle^F$.

Theorem 1.1 also implies that, in an algebraic sense, the group G is approximated by its images obtained by peripheral fillings. To be more precise, we recall that a group G is

fully residually \mathcal{C} , where \mathcal{C} is a class of groups, if for any finite subset $S \subseteq G$, there is a homomorphism of G onto a group from \mathcal{C} that is injective on S . The study of this notion has a long history and is motivated by the following observation: If \mathcal{C} is a class of 'nice' groups in a certain sense, then any (fully) residually \mathcal{C} group also enjoys some nice properties.

Using Theorem 1.1, we will obtain some non-trivial examples of fully residually hyperbolic groups. We recall that a group is called *non-elementary* if it does not contain a cyclic subgroup of finite index.

Corollary 1.6. *Suppose that a finitely generated group G is hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, the group H_λ is fully residually hyperbolic. Then G is fully residually hyperbolic. Moreover, if G is non-elementary and all subgroups H_λ are proper, then G is fully residually non-elementary hyperbolic.*

For instance, fundamental groups of complete finite volume Riemannian manifolds of pinched negative curvature are hyperbolic relative to the cusp subgroups [4, 8], which are virtually nilpotent [7]. It is well-known that any nilpotent group is residually finite [15] and hence so is any virtually nilpotent group. Finally we recall that finite groups are hyperbolic. Combining this with Corollary 1.6 we obtain

Corollary 1.7. *Fundamental groups of complete finite volume Riemannian manifolds of pinched negative curvature are fully residually non-elementary hyperbolic.*

Note that any fully residually non-elementary hyperbolic group G has infinite quotients of bounded period and, moreover, $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} G^n = \{1\}$, where $G^n = \{g^n \mid g \in G\}$. This easily follows from the result of Ivanov and Olshanskii [17].

Another application is related to the well known question of whether all hyperbolic groups are residually finite. Although in many particular cases the answer is known to be positive (see [36] and references therein), in the general case the question is still open. The following obvious consequence of Corollary 1.6 shows that this problem is equivalent to its relative analogue. In particular, in order to construct a non-residually finite hyperbolic group it suffices to find a non-residually finite group that is hyperbolic relative to a collection of residually finite subgroups.

Corollary 1.8. *The following assertions are equivalent.*

1. *Suppose that a finitely generated group G is hyperbolic relative to a collection of residually finite subgroups. Then G is residually finite.*
2. *Any hyperbolic group is residually finite.*

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we give the definition of relatively hyperbolic groups and provide a background for the rest of the paper. The proof of the main theorem consists of two ingredients. The first one is Proposition 3.2 concerning geodesic polygons in Cayley graphs of relatively hyperbolic groups. It is proved in Section 3 and seems to be of independent interest. The second ingredient is a surgery on van Kampen diagrams described in Sections 4. Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.6 are proved in Section 5.

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to Koji Fujiwara, Anton Klyachko, Alexander Olshanskii, and John Ratcliffe for useful discussions.

2 Preliminaries

Some conventions and notation. Given a word W in an alphabet \mathcal{A} , we denote by $\|W\|$ its length. We also write $W \equiv V$ to express the letter-for-letter equality of words W and V . Recall that a subset X of a group G is said to be *symmetric* if for any $x \in X$, we have $x^{-1} \in X$. In this paper all generating sets of groups under consideration are supposed to be symmetric.

Word metrics and Cayley graphs. Let G be a group generated by a (symmetric) set \mathcal{A} . Recall that the *Cayley graph* $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$ of a group G with respect to the set of generators \mathcal{A} is an oriented labelled 1-complex with the vertex set $V(\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})) = G$ and the edge set $E(\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})) = G \times \mathcal{A}$. An edge $e = (g, a)$ goes from the vertex g to the vertex ga and has label $\mathbf{Lab}(e) \equiv a$. As usual, we denote the origin and the terminus of the edge e by e_- and e_+ respectively. Given a combinatorial path $p = e_1 e_2 \dots e_k$ in the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$, where $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k \in E(\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A}))$, we denote by $\mathbf{Lab}(p)$ its label. By definition, $\mathbf{Lab}(p) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(e_1)\mathbf{Lab}(e_2)\dots\mathbf{Lab}(e_k)$. We also denote by $p_- = (e_1)_-$ and $p_+ = (e_k)_+$ the origin and the terminus of p respectively. The length $l(p)$ of p is the number of edges in p .

The (*word*) *length* $|g|_{\mathcal{A}}$ of an element $g \in G$ is defined to be the length of a shortest word in \mathcal{A} representing g in G . This defines a metric on G by $dist_{\mathcal{A}}(f, g) = |f^{-1}g|_{\mathcal{A}}$. We also denote by $dist_{\mathcal{A}}$ the natural extension of the corresponding metric on the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$.

Van Kampen Diagrams. For technical reasons, it is convenient to define the diagrams as in the book [21], i.e., to allow the so called 0-cells. More precisely, a *van Kampen diagram* Δ over a presentation

$$G = \langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{O} \rangle \tag{2}$$

is a finite oriented connected planar 2-complex endowed with a labelling function $\mathbf{Lab} : E(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \sqcup \{1\}$, where $E(\Delta)$ denotes the set of oriented edges of Δ , such that $\mathbf{Lab}(e^{-1}) \equiv (\mathbf{Lab}(e))^{-1}$. The symbol 1 denotes the trivial word here. We call the edges of Δ labelled by letters from \mathcal{A} *essential*. Labels of paths are defined as in the case of Cayley graphs, but the symbols 1 are always omitted. Hence labels of paths are words in \mathcal{A} . When defining the lengths of a paths, we do not count the edges labelled by 1. Thus the lengths of a path always agrees with the lengths of its label.

Given a cell Π of Δ , we denote by $\partial\Pi$ the boundary of Π ; similarly, $\partial\Delta$ denotes the boundary of Δ . The labels of $\partial\Pi$ and $\partial\Delta$ are defined up to cyclic permutations. An additional requirement is that any cell Π of Δ satisfies one of the following two conditions:

1. $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Pi)$ is equal to (a cyclic permutation of) a word $P^{\pm 1}$, where $P \in \mathcal{O}$. We call such cells *essential*.
2. The set of essential edges of $\partial\Pi$ is empty or consists of exactly two edges whose labels are a and a^{-1} for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus $\mathbf{Lab}(\Pi)$ represents the identity element in the free group generated by \mathcal{A} . The cells of this type are called *0-cells*.

One says that a diagram Δ' is a *0-refinement* of a diagram Δ , if, roughly speaking, it is obtained from Δ by replacing some edges and vertices of Δ with appropriate 0-cells (see Fig. 1). This notion is quite standard and we refer the reader to [21, Ch. 4] for details.




Figure 1: A 0-refinement of a diagram over the presentation $\langle a, b \mid a^3 = 1 \rangle$.

The van Kampen Lemma states that a word W over an alphabet \mathcal{A} represents the identity in the group given by (2) if and only if there exists a connected simply-connected planar diagram Δ over (2) such that $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Delta) \equiv W$ [20, Ch. 5, Theorem 1.1]. Using 0-refinement if necessary, we may always assume Δ to be homeomorphic to a disk.

Finally we make the following quite obvious observation (see [21, Ch. 4]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let Δ be a connected simply-connected diagram over (2) with a fixed vertex O , $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$ the Cayley graph of G with respect to the generating set \mathcal{A} . Then there is a (unique) continuous map $\mu: Sk^{(1)}(\Delta) \rightarrow \Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$ that maps O to the identity vertex of $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$, vertices of Δ and edges labelled by 1 to vertices of $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$, and essential edges of Δ to edges of $\Gamma(G, \mathcal{A})$ preserving labels and orientation.*

Hyperbolic spaces. Recall that a metric space X is δ -hyperbolic for some $\delta \geq 0$ (or simply *hyperbolic*) if for any geodesic triangle T in X , any side of T belongs to the union of the closed δ -neighborhoods of the other two sides [9].

In this paper we use some results about polygons in hyperbolic spaces. We recall that a path p in a metric space X is called (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic for some $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$ if

$$l(q) \leq \lambda \text{dist}(q_-, q_+) + c$$

for any subpath q of p . Recall also that for any fixed δ , λ , and c , all (λ, c) -quasi-geodesics with same endpoints in a δ -hyperbolic space are uniformly close (see, for example, [5, Ch. III. H, Theorem 1.7]). The first lemma can easily be derived from this result and the definition of a hyperbolic space by drawing the diagonal.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\delta \geq 0$, $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, there exists a constant $\varkappa = \varkappa(\delta, \lambda, c) \geq 0$ with the following property. Let Q be a quadrangle in a δ -hyperbolic space whose sides are (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic. Then each side of Q belongs to the closed \varkappa -neighborhood of the union of the other three sides.*

The next lemma was proved by Olshanskii [22, Lemma 23] for geodesic polygons. In [22], the inequality (3) had the form $\text{dist}(u, v) \leq 2\delta(2 + \log_2 n)$. Passing to quasi-geodesic polygons we only need to add a constant to the right hand side according to the above-mentioned property of quasi-geodesics in hyperbolic spaces.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $\delta \geq 0$, $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, there exists a constant $\theta = \theta(\delta, \lambda, c)$ with the following property. Let $\mathcal{P} = p_1 \dots p_n$ be a (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic n -gon in a δ -hyperbolic space. Then there are points u and v on sides of \mathcal{P} such that*

$$\text{dist}(u, v) \leq 2\delta(2 + \log_2 n) + \theta \quad (3)$$

and the geodesic segment connecting u to v divides \mathcal{P} into an m_1 -gon and m_2 -gon such that $n/4 < m_i < 3n/4 + 2$.

Relatively hyperbolic groups. In this paper we use the notion of relative hyperbolicity which is sometimes called strong relative hyperbolicity and goes back to Gromov [9]. There are many equivalent definitions of (strongly) relatively hyperbolic groups [4, 6, 8, 25]. We recall the isoperimetric characterization suggested in [25], which is most suitable for our purposes.

Let G be a group, $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ a collection of subgroups of G , X a subset of G . We say that X is a *relative generating set of G with respect to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$* if G is generated by X together with the union of all H_λ . (In what follows we always assume X to be symmetric.) In this situation the group G can be regarded as a quotient group of the free product

$$F = (*_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_\lambda) * F(X), \quad (4)$$

where $F(X)$ is the free group with the basis X . If the kernel of the natural homomorphism $F \rightarrow G$ is a normal closure of a subset \mathcal{R} in the group F , we say that G has *relative presentation*

$$\langle X, H_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle. \quad (5)$$

If $\#X < \infty$ and $\#\mathcal{R} < \infty$, the relative presentation (5) is said to be *finite* and the group G is said to be *finitely presented relative to the collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$* .

Set

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} (H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}). \quad (6)$$

Given a word W in the alphabet $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ such that W represents 1 in G , there exists an expression

$$W =_F \prod_{i=1}^k f_i^{-1} R_i^{\pm 1} f_i \quad (7)$$

with the equality in the group F , where $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and $f_i \in F$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. The smallest possible number k in a representation of the form (7) is called the *relative area* of W and is denoted by $\text{Area}^{rel}(W)$.

Definition 2.4. A group G is *hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$* if G is finitely presented relative to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing the identity in G , we have $\text{Area}^{rel}(W) \leq C\|W\|$. The constant C is called an *isoperimetric constant* of the relative presentation (5).

In particular, G is an ordinary *hyperbolic group* if G is hyperbolic relative to the trivial subgroup. An equivalent definition says that G is hyperbolic if it is generated by a finite set X and the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, X)$ is hyperbolic. In the relative case these approaches are not equivalent, but we still have the following [25, Theorem 1.7].

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that G is a group hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Let X be a finite relative generating set of G with respect to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Then the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ of G with respect to the generating set $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ is a hyperbolic metric space.*

Observe also that the relative area of a word W representing 1 in G can be defined geometrically via van Kampen diagrams. Let G be a group given by the relative presentation (5) with respect to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. We denote by \mathcal{S} the set of all words in the alphabet \mathcal{H} representing the identity in the groups F defined by (4). Then G has the ordinary (non–relative) presentation

$$G = \langle X \cup \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{R} \rangle. \quad (8)$$

A cell in van Kampen diagram Δ over (8) is called an \mathcal{R} –cell if its boundary is labeled by a word from \mathcal{R} . We denote by $N_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta)$ the number of \mathcal{R} –cells of Δ . Obviously given a word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ that represents 1 in G , we have

$$\text{Area}^{rel}(W) = \min_{\mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Delta) \equiv W} N_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta),$$

where the minimum is taken over all disk van Kampen diagrams with boundary label W .

We recall an auxiliary terminology introduced in [25], which plays an important role in our paper.

Definition 2.6. Let q be a path in the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$. A (non–trivial) subpath p of q is called an H_λ –subpath for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$, if the label of p is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. If p is a maximal H_λ –subpath of q , i.e. it is not contained in a bigger H_λ –subpath, then p is called an H_λ –component (or simply a component) of q .

Two H_λ –subpaths (or H_λ –components) p_1, p_2 of a path q in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ are called *connected* if there exists a path c in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ that connects some vertex of p_1 to some vertex of p_2 and $\mathbf{Lab}(c)$ is a word consisting of letters from $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. In algebraic terms this means that all vertices of p_1 and p_2 belong to the same coset gH_λ for a certain $g \in G$. Note that we can always assume that c has length at most 1, as every nontrivial element of $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ is included in the set of generators. An H_λ –component p of a path q is called *isolated* (in q) if no distinct H_λ –component of q is connected to p .

To every subset Ω of G , we can associate a (partial) distance function $dist_\Omega: G \times G \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ as follows. If $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $g_1^{-1}g_2 \in \langle \Omega \rangle$, we define $dist_\Omega(g_1, g_2) = |g_1^{-1}g_2|_\Omega$, where $|\cdot|_\Omega$ is the word length with respect to Ω . If $g_1^{-1}g_2 \notin \langle \Omega \rangle$, we set $dist_\Omega(g_1, g_2) = \infty$. Finally, for any path p in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, we define its Ω –length as

$$l_\Omega(p) = dist_\Omega(p_-, p_+).$$

The lemma below was proved in [25, Lemma 2.27] in the case when p_1, \dots, p_k are H_λ –components for a fixed λ . Actually the proof from [25] works in the general case as well. Here we provide it for convenience of the reader.




Figure 2: Decomposition of the diagram Δ

Lemma 2.7. *Let G be a group that is hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Then there exists a finite subset $\Omega \subseteq G$ and a constant $L > 0$ such that the following condition holds. Let q be a cycle in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, p_1, \dots, p_k a set of isolated components of q . Then the Ω -lengths of p_i 's satisfy*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k l_\Omega(p_i) \leq Ll(q).$$

Proof. Let Ω consist of all letters from \mathcal{H} that appear in words from the set \mathcal{R} (see (5)). Since $\#\mathcal{R} < \infty$, we have $\#\Omega < \infty$. To prove the lemma we consider a van Kampen diagram Δ over (8) whose boundary label is $\mathbf{Lab}(q)$. In what follows we identify $\partial\Delta$ with q .

Assume that $q = p_1 r_1 \cdots p_k r_k$ and p_i is an H_{λ_i} -component for some $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$. For each $i = 1, \dots, k$, let \mathcal{D}_i denote the set of all subdiagrams of Δ bounded by $p_i(p'_i)^{-1}$, where p'_i is a simple path in Δ such that $(p'_i)_- = (p_i)_-$, $(p'_i)_+ = (p_i)_+$, and $\mathbf{Lab}(p'_i)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_{\lambda_i} \setminus \{1\}$. We choose a subdiagram $\Sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}_i$ that has maximal number of cells among all subdiagrams from \mathcal{D}_i .

Let $\partial\Sigma_i = p_i s_i^{-1}$. Since p_i is an isolated component of q , the path s_i has no common edges with r_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$, and the sets of edges of s_i and s_j are disjoint whenever $j \neq i$. Therefore each edge e of s_i belongs to a boundary of some cell Π of the subdiagram Ξ of Δ bounded by $s_1 r_1 \cdots s_k r_k$. If Π is an S -cell, then $\mathbf{Lab}(\Pi)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_{\lambda_i} \setminus \{1\}$. Hence by joining Π to Σ_i we get a subdiagram $\Sigma'_i \in \mathcal{D}_i$ with bigger number of cells that contradicts the choice of Σ_i . Thus each edge of s_i belongs to a boundary of an \mathcal{R} -cell and, in particular, has Ω -length 1. The total number of such edges does not exceed the number of \mathcal{R} -cells in Ξ times the maximal number of edges in boundary of an \mathcal{R} -cell. Therefore we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k l_\Omega(p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k l_\Omega(s_i) \leq M \text{Area}^{rel}(\mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Delta)) \leq MC l(q),$$

where C is the isoperimetric constant of (5) and $M = \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \|R\|$. \square

3 Components and quasi-geodesic polygons.

Throughout the rest of the paper let G denote a group that is hyperbolic relative to a collection of subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Let also X be a finite generating set of G with respect to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, Ω the subset of G , and L the constant provided by Lemma 2.7. In this section we show that the bound on Ω -lengths of components in Lemma 2.7 can be essentially improved in some special cases.

Definition 3.1. For $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, and $n \geq 2$, let $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(n)$ denote the set of all pairs (\mathcal{P}, I) , where $\mathcal{P} = p_1 \dots p_n$ is an n -gon in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ and I is a distinguished subset of the set of sides $\{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ of \mathcal{P} such that:

1. Each side $p_i \in I$ is an isolated component of \mathcal{P} .
2. Each side $p_i \notin I$ is (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic.

For technical reasons, it is convenient to allow some of the sides p_1, \dots, p_n to be trivial. Thus we have $\mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(2) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(3) \subseteq \dots$. Below we also use the following notation for vertices of \mathcal{P} :

$$x_1 = (p_n)_+ = (p_1)_-, \quad x_2 = (p_1)_+ = (p_2)_-, \quad \dots, \quad x_n = (p_{n-1})_+ = (p_n)_-.$$

Given $(\mathcal{P}, I) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(n)$, we set

$$s(\mathcal{P}, I) = \sum_{p_i \in I} l_\Omega(p_i)$$

and consider the quantity

$$s_{\lambda,c}(n) = \sup_{(\mathcal{P}, I) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(n)} s(\mathcal{P}, I).$$

Observe that, a priori, it is not clear whether $s_{\lambda,c}(n)$ is finite for fixed values of n , λ , and c . The main purpose of this section is to prove a much stronger result.

Proposition 3.2. *For any $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, there exists a constant $D = D(\lambda, c) > 0$ such that $s_{\lambda,c}(n) \leq Dn$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

The following simple observation will often be used in this section without special references. If p_1, p_2 are connected components of some path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, then for any two vertices $u \in p_1$ and $v \in p_2$, we have $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, v) \leq 1$.

The proof of Proposition 3.2 is by induction on n . We begin with the case $n \leq 4$.

Lemma 3.3. *For any $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, and $n \leq 4$, $s_{\lambda,c}(n)$ is finite.*

Proof. Suppose that $(\mathcal{P}, I) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(4)$, $\mathcal{P} = p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4$. We want to show that $s(\mathcal{P}, I)$ is bounded by a constant, which depends on λ , c , and the hyperbolicity constant δ of the graph $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ only. We notice that for a path p in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, $l_\Omega(p)$ depends on p_- and p_+ only and otherwise is independent of p itself. Since every $p_i \in I$ is an H_{λ_i} -component for some $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$, we can replace each $p_i \in I$ with a single edge e_i labelled by an appropriate element of H_{λ_i} . Clearly e_i is isolated in \mathcal{P} whenever p_i is. Thus we may assume that $l(p_i) = 1$ whenever $p_i \in I$.

Let $\varkappa = \varkappa(\delta, \lambda, c)$ be the constant provided by Lemma 2.2. Without loss of generality we may assume \varkappa to be a positive integer. According to Lemma 2.7, it suffices to show that for each $p_i \in I$, there is a cycle c_i in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ of length less than $K = 100(\lambda\varkappa + c + \varkappa)$ such that p_i is an isolated component of c_i . There are 4 cases to consider.

Case 1. Suppose $\sharp I = 4$. Then the assertion of the lemma is obvious. Indeed $l(\mathcal{P}) = 4 < K$ as each $p_i \in I$ has lengths 1, and we can set $c_i = \mathcal{P}$ for all i .

Case 2. Suppose $\sharp I = 3$, say $I = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$. Since p_4 is (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic, we have

$$l(p_4) \leq \lambda \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_4, x_1) + c \leq 3\lambda + c$$

by the triangle inequality. Hence $l(\mathcal{P}) \leq 3\lambda + c + 3 < K$ and we can set $c_i = \mathcal{P}$ again.

Case 3. Assume now that $\sharp I = 2$. Up to enumeration of the sides, there are two possibilities to consider.

a) First suppose $I = \{p_1, p_2\}$. If $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, x_4) < \varkappa + 2$, we have

$$l(p_3) \leq \lambda \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, x_4) + c < \lambda(\varkappa + 2) + c,$$

$$\begin{aligned} l(p_4) &\leq \lambda \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_4, x_1) + c \leq \\ &\lambda(\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_1, x_2) + \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) + \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, x_4)) + c < \\ &\lambda(1 + 1 + \varkappa + 2) + c \leq \lambda(\varkappa + 4) + c, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$l(\mathcal{P}) < 2 + l(p_3) + l(p_3) < \lambda(2\varkappa + 6) + 2c + 2 < K.$$

Thus we may assume $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, x_4) \geq \varkappa + 2$. Let u be a vertex on p_3 such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, u) = \varkappa + 2$. By Lemma 2.2 there exists a vertex $v \in p_1 \cup p_2 \cup p_4$ such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, v) \leq \varkappa$. Note that, in fact, $v \in p_4$. Indeed otherwise $v = x_2$ or $v = x_3$ and we have

$$\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, u) \leq \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, v) + \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, v) \leq 1 + \varkappa$$

that contradicts the choice of u .

Let r be a geodesic path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ connecting u to v . We wish to show that no component of r is connected to p_1 or p_2 . Indeed suppose that a component s of r is connected to p_1 or p_2 (Fig.3). Then $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, s_-) \leq 1$ and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, x_3) &\leq \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, s_-) + \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(s_-, x_2) + \text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) \leq \\ &(\varkappa - 1) + 1 + 1 = \varkappa + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the choice of u again. Note also that p_1, p_2 can not be connected to a component of p_3 or p_4 as p_1, p_2 are isolated components in \mathcal{P} . Therefore p_1 and p_2 are isolated components of the cycle

$$c = p_1 p_2 [x_3, u] r [v, x_1],$$

where $[x_3, u]$ and $[v, x_1]$ are segments of p_3 and p_4 respectively. Using the triangle inequality, it is easy to check that $l([v, x_1]) \leq \lambda(2\varkappa + 4)$ and $l(c) \leq \lambda(3\varkappa + 6) + 2c + \varkappa + 2 < K$.




Figure 3: Cases 3 a) and b)

b) Let $I = \{p_1, p_3\}$. If $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) < 2\kappa + 2$, we obtain $l(\mathcal{P}) < K$ arguing as in the previous case. Now assume that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) \geq 2\kappa + 2$. Let u_1 (respectively u_2) be the vertex on p_2 such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, u_1) = \kappa + 1$ (respectively $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_3, u_2) = \kappa + 1$). By Lemma 2.2 there exist vertices v_1, v_2 on $p_1 \cup p_3 \cup p_4$ such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(v_i, u_i) \leq \kappa$, $i = 1, 2$. In fact, v_1, v_2 belong to p_4 (Fig.3). Indeed the reader can easily check that the assumption $v_1 = x_2$ (respectively $v_1 = x_3$) leads to the inequality $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, u_1) \leq \kappa$ (respectively $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) \leq 2\kappa + 1$). In both cases we get a contradiction. Hence $v_1 \in p_4$ and similarly $v_2 \in p_4$.

Let r_i , $i = 1, 2$, be a geodesic path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ connecting u_i to v_i . We set

$$c_1 = p_1[x_2, u_1]r_1[v_1, x_1]$$

and

$$c_3 = p_3[x_4, v_2]r_2^{-1}[u_2, x_3].$$

Arguing as in Case 3a) we can easily show that p_i is an isolated component of c_i and $l(c_i) < K$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Case 4. Finally assume $\sharp I = 1$. To be definite, let $I = \{p_1\}$. If $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) < \kappa + 1$ and $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_4, x_1) < \kappa + 1$, we obtain $l(\mathcal{P}) < K$ as in the previous cases. Thus, changing the enumeration of the sides if necessary, we may assume that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, x_3) \geq \kappa + 1$. Let u be a point on p_2 such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_2, u) = \kappa + 1$, v a point on $p_1 \cup p_3 \cup p_4$ such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(u, v) \leq \kappa$, r a geodesic path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ connecting u to v . As above it is easy to show that $v \in p_3 \cup p_4$. Let us consider two possibilities (see Fig. 4).

a) $v \in p_4$. Using the same arguments as in Cases 2 and 3 the reader can easily prove that p_1 is an isolated component of the cycle

$$c = p_1[x_2, u]r[v, x_1]. \quad (9)$$




Figure 4: Cases 4 a), b1), and b2).

It is easy to show that $l(c) < K$.

b) $v \in p_3$. Here there are 2 cases again.

b1) If $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_1, x_4) < \varkappa + 1$, then we set

$$c = p_1[x_2, u]r[v, x_4]p_4.$$

The standard arguments show that $l(c) < K$ and p_1 is isolated in c .

b2) $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_1, x_4) \geq \varkappa + 1$. Let w be a vertex on p_4 such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_1, w) = \varkappa + 1$, z a vertex on $p_1 \cup p_2 \cup p_3$ such that $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(z, w) \leq \varkappa$. Again, in fact, our assumptions imply that $z \in p_2 \cup p_3$. If $z \in p_2$, the lemma can be proved by repeating the arguments from the case 4a) (after changing enumeration of the sides). If $z \in p_3$, we set

$$c = p_1[x_2, u]r[v, z]s[w, x_1],$$

where s is a geodesic in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ connecting z to w . It is straightforward to check that p_1 is an isolated component of c and $l(c) < K$. We leave details to the reader. \square

Lemma 3.4. *For any $n \geq 4$, we have*

$$s_{\lambda, c}(n) \leq n(s_{\lambda, c}(n-1) + s_{\lambda, c}(4)). \quad (10)$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . The case $n = 4$ is obvious, so we assume that $n \geq 5$. Let $(\mathcal{P}, I) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda, c}(n)$, $p_i \in I$, and let q be a geodesic in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ connecting x_i to x_{i+3}




Figure 5:

(indices are taken *mod n*). If p_i is isolated in the cycle $p_i p_{i+1} p_{i+2} q^{-1}$, we have $l_\Omega(p_i) \leq s_{\lambda,c}(4)$. Assume now that the component p_i is not isolated in the cycle $p_i p_{i+1} p_{i+2} q^{-1}$. As p_i is isolated in \mathcal{P} , this means that p_i is connected to a component s of q . Hence $\text{dist}_{X \cup \mathcal{H}}(x_i, s_+) \leq 1$. Since q is geodesic in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, this implies $s_- = x_i$ (see Fig. 5).

Let $q = ss'$ and let e denote a paths in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ of lengths at most 1 such that $e_- = x_{i+1}$, $e_+ = s_+$, and $\mathbf{Lab}(e)$ is a word in \mathcal{H} . We notice that if e is nontrivial, it is an isolated component of the cycle $r = p_{i+1} p_{i+2} (s')^{-1}$. Indeed if e is connected to a component of p_{i+1} or p_{i+2} , then p_i is not isolated in p , and if e is connected to a component of s' , then q is not geodesic. Similarly s is an isolated component of $p_{i+3} \dots p_{i-1} ss'$. Hence $l_\Omega(s) \leq s_{\lambda,c}(n-1)$ by the inductive assumption and $l_\Omega(e) \leq s_{\lambda,c}(4)$. Therefore we have $l_\Omega(p_i) \leq s_{\lambda,c}(4) + s_{\lambda,c}(n-1)$. Repeating these arguments for all $p_i \in I$, we get (10). \square

Corollary 3.5. $s_{\lambda,c}(n)$ is finite for any n .

To prove the main result of this section we need the following auxiliary lemma. Although it is probably known, we did not find any precise reference in the literature.

Lemma 3.6. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that there exist constants $C, N > 0$, and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > N$, there are $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- a) $k \leq C \ln n$;
- b) $f(n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k f(n_i)$;
- c) $n \leq \sum_{i=1}^k n_i \leq n + C \ln n$;
- d) $n_i \leq \alpha n$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Then $f(n)$ is bounded by a linear function from above.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon(n) = \ln \frac{C^2 \ln^2 n}{1-\alpha}$ and let $N_0 > N$ be a constant such that

$$2\varepsilon(n) \leq \ln n \tag{11}$$

and

$$n - 2C \ln n > 0, \tag{12}$$

for all $n \geq N_0$. Further let $N_1 > N_0$ be a constant such that

$$\frac{n(1-\alpha)}{C \ln n} \geq N_0 \quad (13)$$

for all $n \geq N_1$. The inequality (12) allows us to chose a positive constant D such that

$$f(n) \leq Dn \quad (14)$$

for all $n \leq N_0$ and

$$f(n) \leq D(n - 2C \ln n) \quad (15)$$

for all $N_0 < n \leq N_1$. To prove the lemma it suffices to show that (15) holds for all $n \geq N_1$. We proceed by induction on n .

Suppose that $n > N_1$. According to a) and c), there exists $i_1 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $n_{i_1} \geq n/(C \ln n)$. Furthermore, by d) we have $\sum_{i \neq i_1} n_i \geq n(1-\alpha)$. Hence there is $i_2 \neq i_1$ such that $n_{i_2} \geq n(1-\alpha)/(C \ln n)$. Note that $n_{i_j} \geq N_0$ for $j = 1, 2$ by (13). Obviously,

$$\ln n_{i_1} + \ln n_{i_2} = \ln(n_{i_1} n_{i_2}) \geq \ln \frac{n^2(1-\alpha)}{C^2 \ln^2 n} = 2 \ln n - \varepsilon(n). \quad (16)$$

Let $\{1, \dots, k\} = J_1 \sqcup J_2$, where J_1 consists of all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $n_j \geq N_0$. Applying subsequently b), the inductive assumption together with (14) and (15), c), (16), and (11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(n) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k f(n_i) \leq \sum_{i \in J_1} D(n_i - 2C \ln n_i) + \sum_{i \in J_2} Dn_i \leq D \sum_{i=1}^k n_i - 2CD(\ln n_{i_1} + \ln n_{i_2}) \leq \\ &D(n + C \ln n) - 2CD(2 \ln n - \varepsilon(n)) \leq D(n - 2C \ln n) + DC(2\varepsilon(n) - \ln n) \leq \\ &D(n - 2C \ln n). \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We are going to show that for any fixed $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, the function $s_{\lambda,c}(n)$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.6. Let $(\mathcal{P}, I) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\lambda,c}(n)$, where $\mathcal{P} = p_1 \dots p_n$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we may assume that every $p_i \in I$ consists of a single edge. We also assume $n \geq N$, where the constant N is big enough. The exact value of N will be specified later.

Let u, v be the points on \mathcal{P} provided by Lemma 2.3. Without loss of generality we may assume that u, v are vertices of $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$. Further let t denote a geodesic paths in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ such that $t_- = u$, $t_+ = v$. According to Lemma 2.3,

$$l(t) \leq 2\delta(2 + \log_2 n) + \theta, \quad (17)$$

where θ is a constant depending only on δ , λ , and c , and t divides \mathcal{P} into an m_1 -gon \mathcal{P}_1 and m_2 -gon \mathcal{P}_2 such that

$$m_i \leq 3n/4 + 2 < n \quad (18)$$




Figure 6: Decomposition of the n -gon in the proof of Proposition 3.2

for $i = 1, 2$. To be precise we assume that $u \in p_\alpha$, $v \in p_\beta$, and $p_\alpha = p'_\alpha p''_\alpha$, $p_\beta = p'_\beta p''_\beta$, where $(p'_\alpha)_+ = (p''_\alpha)_- = u$, $(p'_\beta)_+ = (p''_\beta)_- = v$. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = p''_\alpha p_{\alpha+1} \cdots p_{\beta-1} p'_\beta t^{-1}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_2 = p''_\beta p_{\beta+1} \cdots p_{\alpha-1} p'_\alpha t.$$

(Here and below the indices are taken modulo n .) Since each $p_i \in I$ consists of a single edge, one of the paths p'_α , p''_α (respectively p'_β , p''_β) is trivial whenever $p_\alpha \in I$ (respectively $p_\beta \in I$). Hence the set I is naturally divided into two disjoint parts $I = I_1 \sqcup I_2$, where I_i is a subset of I consisting of sides of \mathcal{P}_i , $i = 1, 2$.

Let us consider the polygon \mathcal{P}_1 and construct cycles c_0, \dots, c_l in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ as follows. If each $p_i \in I_1$ is isolated in \mathcal{P}_1 , we set $l = 0$ and $c_0 = \mathcal{P}_1$. Further suppose this is not so. Let $p_{i_1} \in I_1$, be the first component (say, an H_{λ_1} -component) in the sequence $p_\alpha, p_{\alpha+1}, \dots$ such that p_{i_1} is not isolated in \mathcal{P}_1 . As p_{i_1} is isolated in \mathcal{P} , this means that p_{i_1} is connected to an H_{λ_1} -component y_1 of t . Let f_1 (respectively e_1) be an edge in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ labelled by an element of $H_{\lambda_1} \setminus \{1\}$ (or a trivial path) such that $(f_1)_- = (p_{i_1})_-$, $(f_1)_+ = (y_1)_-$ (respectively $(e_1)_- = (p_{i_1})_+$, $(e_1)_+ = (y_1)_+$). We set

$$c_0 = p''_\alpha p_{\alpha+1} \cdots p_{i_1-1} f_1 [(y_1)_-, u],$$

where $[(y_1)_-, u]$ is the segment of t^{-1} (see Fig. 6).

Now we proceed by induction. Suppose that the cycle c_{k-1} and the corresponding paths $f_{k-1}, e_{k-1}, y_{k-1}, p_{i_{k-1}}$ have already been constructed. If the sequence $p_{i_{k-1}+1}, p_{i_{k-1}+2}, \dots$ contains no component $p_i \in I_1$ that is not isolated in \mathcal{P}_1 , we set $l = k$,

$$c_k = e_{k-1}^{-1} p_{i_{k-1}+1} \cdots p_{\beta-1} p'_\beta [v, (y_{k-1})_+],$$

where $[v, (y_{k-1})_+]$ is the segment of t^{-1} , and finish the procedure. Otherwise we continue as follows. We denote by p_{i_k} the first component in the sequence $p_{i_{k-1}+1}, p_{i_{k-1}+2}, \dots$ such that $p_{i_k} \in I_1$ and p_{i_k} is connected to some component y_k of t . Then we construct f_k, e_k as above and set

$$c_k = e_{k-1}^{-1} p_{i_{k-1}+1} \cdots p_{i_k-1} f_k [(y_k)_-, (y_{k-1})_+].$$

Observe that each path $p_i \in I_1$ is either included in the set $J_1 = \{p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_l}\}$ or is an isolated component of some c_j . Indeed a paths $p_i \in I_1 \setminus J_1$ can not be connected to a component of t according to our choice of p_{i_1}, \dots, p_{i_l} . Moreover $p_i \in I_1 \setminus J_1$ can not be connected to some f_j or e_j since otherwise p_i is connected to p_{i_j} that contradicts the assumption that sides from the set I are isolated components in \mathcal{P} .

By repeating the 'mirror copy' of this algorithm for \mathcal{P}_2 , we construct cycles $c_{l+1}, \dots, c_{l+m+1}$, $m \geq 0$, the set of components $J_2 = \{p_{i_{l+1}}, \dots, p_{i_{l+m}}\} \subseteq I_2$, components y_{l+1}, \dots, y_{l+m} of t , and edges (or trivial paths) $f_{l+1}, e_{l+1}, \dots, f_{l+m}, e_{l+m}$ in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ such that f_j (respectively e_j) goes from $(p_{i_j})_-$ to $(y_j)_+$ (respectively from $(p_{i_j})_+$ to $(y_j)_-$) (see Fig. 6) and each path $p_i \in I_2$ is either included in the set J_2 or is an isolated component of c_j for a certain $j \in \{l+1, \dots, l+m+1\}$.

Each of the cycles c_j , $0 \leq j \leq l+m+1$, can be regarded as a geodesic n_j -gon whose set of sides consists of paths of the following five types (up to orientation):

- (1) Components from the set $I \setminus (J_1 \cup J_2)$.
- (2) Sides of \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 that do not belong to the set I .
- (3) Paths f_j and e_j , $1 \leq j \leq l + m$.
- (4) Components y_1, \dots, y_{l+m} of t .
- (5) Maximal subpaths of t lying 'between' y_1, \dots, y_{l+m} , i.e. those maximal subpaths of t that have no common edges with y_1, \dots, y_{l+m} .

It is straightforward to check that for a given $0 \leq j \leq l + m + 1$, all sides of c_j of type (1), (3), and (4) are isolated components of c_j . Indeed we have already explained that sides of type (1) are isolated in c_j . Further, if f_j or e_j is connected to f_k , e_k , or y_k for $k \neq j$, then p_{i_j} is connected to p_{i_k} and we get a contradiction. For the same reason f_j or e_j can not be connected to a component of a side of type (2). If f_j or e_j is connected to a component x of a side of type (5), i.e., to a component of t , then y_j is connected to x . This contradicts the assumption that t is geodesic. Finally y_j can not be connected to a component of a side of type (2) since otherwise p_{i_j} is not isolated in \mathcal{P} , and y_j can not be connected to another component of t as notified in the previous sentence.

Observe that (17) and (18) imply the following estimate of the number of sides of c_j :

$$n_j \leq \max\{m_1, m_2\} + l(t) \leq 3n/4 + 2 + 2\delta(\log_2 n + 2) + \theta.$$

Assume that N is a constant such that $3n/4 + 2 + 2\delta(\log_2 n + 2) + \theta \leq 4n/5$ for all $n \geq N$. Then for any $n \geq N$, we can apply the inductive assumption for the set of components of type (1), (3), and (4) in each of the polygons c_0, \dots, c_{l+m+1} . This yields

$$\sum_{p_i \in I} l_\Omega(p_i) \leq \sum_{p_i \in I \setminus (J_1 \cup J_2)} l_\Omega(p_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{l+m} (l_\Omega(y_j) + l_\Omega(e_j) + l_\Omega(f_j)) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{l+m+1} s_{\lambda, c}(n_j)$$

Further there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m+l+1} n_j \leq n + 6l(t) \leq n + 12\delta(\log_2 n + 2) + 6\theta \leq n + C \log_2 n$$

and

$$m + l + 2 \leq 2l(t) + 2 \leq C \log_2 n.$$

Therefore, for any $n \geq N$, the function $s_{\lambda, c}(n)$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.6 for $k = m + l + 2$ and $\alpha = 4/5$. Thus $s(n, \lambda, c)$ is bounded by a linear function from above. \square

4 Diagram surgery

All conventions and notation from the beginning of the previous section remain valid here. Together with the relative presentation (5) of G with respect to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ we also consider the corresponding non-relative presentation (8). Given a collection $\mathfrak{N} = \{N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$, where

N_λ is a normal subgroup of H_λ , we denote by N the normal closure of $\bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} N_\lambda$ in G . Recall that $G(\mathfrak{N}) = G/N$. We fix the following presentation for $G(\mathfrak{N})$

$$G(\mathfrak{N}) = \langle X \cup \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{R} \rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{Q} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{Q}_\lambda$ and \mathcal{Q}_λ consists of all words (not necessary reduced) in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ representing elements of N_λ in G .

In this section we consider van Kampen diagrams over (8) of a certain type. More precisely, we denote by \mathcal{D} the set of all diagrams Δ over (8) such that:

(D1) Topologically Δ is a disc with $k \geq 0$ holes. More precisely, the boundary of Δ is decomposed as $\partial\Delta = \partial_{ext}\Delta \sqcup \partial_{int}\Delta$, where $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ is the boundary of the disc and $\partial_{int}\Delta$ consists of disjoint cycles (*components*) c_1, \dots, c_k that bound the holes.

(D2) For any $i = 1, \dots, k$, the label $\mathbf{Lab}(c_i)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and this word represents an element of N_λ in G .

The following lemma relates diagrams of the described type to the group $G(\mathfrak{N})$.

Lemma 4.1. *A word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ represents 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$ if and only if there is a diagram $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial_{ext}\Delta) \equiv W$.*

Proof. Suppose that Σ is a disc van Kampen diagram over (19). Then by cutting off all essential cells labeled by words from \mathcal{Q} (\mathcal{Q} -cells) and passing to a 0-refinement if necessary we obtain a van Kampen diagram $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ with $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial_{ext}\Delta) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Sigma)$. Conversely, each $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ may be transformed into a disk diagram over (19) by attaching \mathcal{Q} -cells to all components of $\partial_{int}\Delta$. \square

In what follows we also assume the diagrams from \mathcal{D} to be endowed with an additional structure.

(D3) Each diagram $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ is equipped with a *cut system* that is a collection of disjoint paths (*cuts*) $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_k\}$ without self-intersections in Δ such that $(t_i)_+, (t_i)_-$ belong to $\partial\Delta$, and after cutting Δ along t_i for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ we get a connected simply connected diagram $\tilde{\Delta}$.

By $\varkappa: \tilde{\Delta} \rightarrow \Delta$ we denote the natural map that 'sews' the cuts. We also fix an arbitrary point O in $\tilde{\Delta}$ and denote by μ the map provided by Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$. Let a, b be two vertices on $\partial\Delta$, \tilde{a}, \tilde{b} some vertices on $\partial\tilde{\Delta}$ such that $\varkappa(\tilde{a}) = a$, $\varkappa(\tilde{b}) = b$. Then for any paths r in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ such that $r_- = \mu(\tilde{a})$, $r_+ = \mu(\tilde{b})$, there is a diagram $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ endowed with a cut system T_1 such that the following conditions hold:*

1. Δ_1 has the same boundary and the same cut system as Δ . By this we mean the following. Let Γ_1 (respectively Γ) be the subgraph of the 1-skeleton of Δ_1 (respectively of the 1-skeleton of Δ) consisting of $\partial\Delta_1$ (respectively $\partial\Delta$) and all cuts from T_1 (respectively T). Then there is a graph isomorphism $\Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Gamma$ that preserves labels and orientation and maps cuts of Δ_1 to cuts of Δ and $\partial_{ext}\Delta_1$ to $\partial_{ext}\Delta$.
2. There is a paths q in Δ_1 without self-intersections such that $q_- = a$, $q_+ = b$, q has no common vertices with cuts $t \in T_1$ except for possibly a, b , and $\mathbf{Lab}(q) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(r)$.




Figure 7:

Proof. Let us fix an arbitrary path \tilde{t} in $\tilde{\Delta}$ without self-intersections that connects \tilde{a} to \tilde{b} and intersects $\partial\tilde{\Delta}$ at the points \tilde{a} and \tilde{b} only. The last condition can always be ensured by passing to a 0-refinement of Δ and the corresponding 0-refinement of $\tilde{\Delta}$. Thus $t = \varkappa(\tilde{t})$ connects a to b in Δ and has no common points with cuts $t \in T$ except for possibly a, b . Note that

$$\mathbf{Lab}(t) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(\tilde{t}) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(\mu(\tilde{t}))$$

as both \varkappa, μ preserve labels and orientation.

Since $\mu(\tilde{t})$ connects $\mu(\tilde{a})$ to $\mu(\tilde{b})$ in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, $\mathbf{Lab}(\mu(\tilde{t}))$ represents the same element of G as $\mathbf{Lab}(r)$. Hence there exists a disk diagram Σ_1 over (8) such that $\partial\Sigma_1 = p_1q^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{Lab}(p_1) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(t)$ and $\mathbf{Lab}(q) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(r)$. Let Σ_2 denote its mirror copy. We glue Σ_1 and Σ_2 together by attaching q to its mirror copy. Thus we get a new diagram Σ with boundary $p_1p_2^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{Lab}(p_1) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(p_2) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(t)$. The path in Σ corresponding to q in Σ_1 and its mirror copy in Σ_2 is also denoted by q .

We now perform the following surgery on the diagram Δ . First we cut Δ along t and denote the new diagram by Δ_0 . Let t_1 and t_2 be the two copies of the path t in Δ_0 . Then we glue Δ_0 and Σ by attaching t_1 to p_1 and t_2 to p_2 (Fig. 7) and get a new diagram Δ_1 . This surgery does not affect cuts of Δ as t had no common points with cuts from T except for possibly a and b . Thus the system of cuts in Δ_1 is inherited from Δ and Δ_1 satisfies all requirements of the lemma. \square

Definition 4.3. By an H_λ -path in $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ or in $\tilde{\Delta}$ we mean any paths whose label is a (nontrivial) word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. We say that two such paths p and q in $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ are *connected* if they are H_λ -paths for the same $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and there are H_λ -paths a, b in $\tilde{\Delta}$ such that $\varkappa(a)$ is a subpaths of p , $\varkappa(b)$ is a subpaths of q , and $\mu(a), \mu(b)$ are connected in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$, i.e., there is a path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ that connects a vertex of $\mu(a)$ to a vertex of $\mu(b)$ and is labelled by a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. We stress that the equalities $\varkappa(a) = p$ and $\varkappa(b) = q$ are not required. Thus the definition makes sense even if the paths p and q are cut by the cuts of Δ into several pieces.

Definition 4.4. We also define the *type* of a diagram $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ by the formula

$$\tau(\Delta) = \left(k, \sum_{i=1}^k l(t_i) \right),$$

where k is the number of holes in Δ . We fix the standard order on the set of all types by assuming $(m, n) \leq (m_1, n_1)$ is either $m < m_1$ or $m = m_1$ and $n \leq n_1$.

For a word W in the alphabet $X \cup \mathcal{H}$, let $\mathcal{D}(W)$ denote the set of all diagrams $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial_{ext}\Delta) \equiv W$. In the proposition below we say that a word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ is *geodesic* if any (or, equivalently, some) path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ labelled by W is geodesic.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose that W is a word in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, Δ is a diagram of minimal type in $\mathcal{D}(W)$, T is the cut system in Δ , and c is a component of $\partial_{int}\Delta$. Then:*


1. *For each cut $t \in T$, the word $\mathbf{Lab}(t)$ is geodesic.*
2. *The label of c represents a nontrivial element in G .*
3. *The path c can not be connected to an H_λ -subpath of a cut.*
4. *The path c can not be connected to another component of $\partial_{int}\Delta$*

Proof. Assume that for a certain path $t \in T$, $\mathbf{Lab}(t)$ is not geodesic. Let \tilde{a}, \tilde{b} be vertices in $\tilde{\Delta}$ such that $\varkappa(\tilde{a}) = t_-, \varkappa(\tilde{b}) = t_+$. Let also r be a geodesic paths in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ that connects $\mu(\tilde{a})$ to $\mu(\tilde{b})$. Applying Lemma 4.2, we may assume that there is a path q in Δ such that $q_- = t_-, q_+ = t_+$, and $\mathbf{Lab}(q) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(r)$, i.e., $\mathbf{Lab}(q)$ is geodesic. In particular, $l(q) < l(t)$. Now replacing t with q in the cut system we reduce the type of the diagram. This contradicts the choice of Δ .


The second assertion is obvious. Indeed if $\mathbf{Lab}(c)$ represents 1 in G , there is a disk diagram Π over (8) with boundary label $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Pi) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(c)$. Attaching Π to c does not affect $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ and reduces the number of holes in the diagram. This contradicts the minimality of $\tau(\Delta)$ again.

Further assume that c is connected to an H_λ -subpath e of some $r \in T$. Then c is an H_λ -path for the same $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Let $r = uev$. Cutting Δ along e (to convert e into a boundary component), applying Lemma 4.2, and gluing the copies of e back, we may assume that there is a path s without self-intersections in Δ such that $s_- = e_-, s_+ \in c$, and $\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. Moreover passing to a 0-refinement, we may assume that s has no common vertices with the boundary of the diagram, paths from $T \setminus \{r\}$, u , and v except for s_- and s_+ . Now we cut Δ along s and e . Let s_1, s_2 be the copies of s in the obtained diagram Δ_1 . The boundary component of Δ_1 obtained from c and e has label $\mathbf{Lab}(c)\mathbf{Lab}(s)^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(e)\mathbf{Lab}(e)^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ that is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ representing an element of N_λ in G . Note also that our surgery does not affect cuts of Δ except for r . Thus the system of cuts T_1 in Δ_1 may be obtained from T as follows. Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is connected and simply connected, there is a unique sequence

$$c = c_0, t_1, c_1, \dots, t_l, c_l = \partial_{ext}\Delta,$$



a)



b)

Figure 8:

where c_0, \dots, c_l are (distinct) components of $\partial\Delta$, $t_i \in T$, and (up to orientation) t_i connects c_{i-1} to c_i , $i = 1, \dots, l$ (Fig. 8a). We set $T_1 = (T \setminus \{r, t_1\}) \cup \{u, v\}$. Thus $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{D}(W)$ and $\tau(\Delta_1) < \tau(\Delta)$. Indeed Δ_1 and Δ have the same number of holes and $\sum_{t \in T_1} l(t) \leq \sum_{t \in T} l(t) - 1$.

This contradicts the choice of Δ .

Finally suppose that c is connected to another component d of $\partial_{int}\Delta$, $d \neq c$. To be definite, assume that c and d are labelled by words in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. Again without loss of generality we may assume that there is a path s without self-intersections in Δ such that $s_- \in d$, $s_+ \in c$, $\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$, and s has no common points with $\partial\Delta$ and paths from T except for s_- and s_+ . Let us cut Δ along s and denote by Δ_1 the obtained diagram (Fig. 8b). This transformation does not affect $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ and the only changed internal boundary component has label $\mathbf{Lab}(c)\mathbf{Lab}(s)^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(d)\mathbf{Lab}(s)$, which is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. This word represents an element of N_λ in G as $N_\lambda \triangleleft H_\lambda$. We now fix an arbitrary system of cuts in Δ_1 . Then $\Delta_1 \in \mathcal{D}(W)$ and the number of holes in Δ_1 is smaller than the number of holes in Δ . We get a contradiction again. \square

5 Proofs of the main results

Recall that Ω denotes the set provided by Lemma 2.7. Let $D = D(2, 0)$ be the constant from Proposition 3.2. We set

$$\mathcal{F} = \{g \in \langle \Omega \rangle : |g|_\Omega \leq 4D\} \setminus \{1\}.$$

Throughout the rest of the section we assume that $N_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Definition 5.1. Given a word W in the alphabet $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, we denote by $q(W)$ the minimal number of holes among all diagrams from $\mathcal{D}(W)$. Further we define the *type* of W by the formula $\theta(W) = (q(W), \|W\|)$. The set of types is endowed with the natural order (as in Definition 4.4).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is divided into a sequence of lemmas. We begin with the first assertion of the theorem. Recall that a word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ is called (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic (in G) for some $\lambda \geq 1$, $c \geq 0$, if some (or, equivalently, any) path in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ labelled by W is (λ, c) -quasi-geodesic. The following three results are proved by common induction on $q(W)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that W is a word in the alphabet $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$ and Δ is a diagram of minimal type in $\mathcal{D}(W)$. Then:*

1. *Assume that for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$, p and q are two connected H_λ -subpaths of the same component c of $\partial_{int}\Delta$, then there is an H_λ -component r of $\partial\Delta$ such that p and q are subpaths of $\varkappa(r)$.*
2. *If W is $(2, 0)$ -quasi-geodesic and $q(W) > 0$, then some component of $\partial_{int}\Delta$ is connected to an H_λ -subpath of $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$.*
3. *If W is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$, then W represents an element of N_λ in G .*




Figure 9:

Proof. For $q(W) = 0$ the lemma is trivial. Assume that $q(W) > 0$.

Let us prove the first assertion. Let x (respectively y) be an ending vertex of a certain essential edge of p (respectively q). Passing to a 0-refinement of Δ , we may assume that x and y do not belong to any cut from the cut system T of Δ . Applying Lemma 4.2 we get a path s in Δ connecting x to y such that $\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ and s does not intersect any path from T . Let us denote by Ξ the subdiagram of Δ bounded by s and the segment $u = [x, y]$ of $c^{\pm 1}$ such that Ξ does not contain the hole bounded by c (Fig. 9).

Note that $V \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(\partial\Xi)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ and $q(V) < q(W)$. By the third assertion of our lemma, V represents an element of N_λ . Up to a cyclic shift, the label of the external boundary component of the subdiagram $\Sigma = \Xi \cup c$ of Δ is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ representing the same element as $\mathbf{Lab}(c^{\pm 1})\mathbf{Lab}(u)^{-1}V^{\pm 1}\mathbf{Lab}(u)$ in G . As N_λ is normal in H_λ and $\mathbf{Lab}(u)$ represents an element of H_λ in G , $\mathbf{Lab}(\partial_{ext}\Sigma)$ represents an element of N_λ in G . If Ξ contains at least one hole, we replace Σ with a single hole bounded by $\partial_{ext}\Sigma$ (Fig. 9). This reduces the number of holes in Δ and we get a contradiction. Therefore Ξ is simply connected. In particular, the path u does not intersect any cut from T . This means that p and q are covered by the image of the same H_λ -component of $\partial\tilde{\Delta}$.

To prove the second assertion we suppose that for every component c_i of $\partial_{int}\Delta$, no H_λ -subpath of $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ is connected to c . Then Proposition 4.5 and the first assertion of our lemma imply that each component c_i of $\partial_{int}\Delta$ gives rise to H_λ -components a_{i1}, \dots, a_{il} of $\partial\tilde{\Delta}$ for some $l = l(i)$ such that $\varkappa(a_{ij}) \in c_i$, $j = 1, \dots, l$, and $\mu(a_{i1}), \dots, \mu(a_{il})$ are isolated H_λ -components of the cycle $\mathcal{P} = \mu(\partial\tilde{\Delta})$ in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$.

Recall that for an element $g \in G$, the Ω -lengths $|g|_\Omega$ is defined to be the word lengths of g with respect to Ω if $g \in \langle \Omega \rangle$ and ∞ otherwise. For each component c_i of $\partial_{int}(\Delta)$, we fix a vertex $o_i \in c_i$ such that $o_i = t_-$ or $o_i = t_+$ for some $t \in T$ and denote by g_i the element represented by $\mathbf{Lab}(c_i)$ when we read this label starting from o_i . Clearly

$$|g_i|_\Omega \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l(i)} l_\Omega(\mu(a_{ij})). \quad (20)$$

The path \mathcal{P} may be considered as an $n \leq 4q(W)$ -gon whose sides (up to orientation)

are of the following three types:

- (1) sides corresponding to parts of $\partial_{ext}\Delta$;
- (2) sides corresponding to cuts in Δ ;
- (3) components corresponding to $\partial_{int}\Delta$.

The sides of \mathcal{P} of type (1) are $(2, 0)$ -quasi-geodesic in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ as W is $(2, 0)$ -quasi-geodesic. The sides of type (2) are geodesic in $\Gamma(G, X \cup \mathcal{H})$ by the first assertion of Proposition 4.5. Hence we may apply Proposition 3.2 to the n -gon \mathcal{P} , where the set of components I consists of sides of type (3). Taking into account (20), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{q(W)} |g_i|_\Omega \leq \sum_{p \in I} l_\Omega(p) \leq Dn \leq 4Dq(W),$$

where $D = D(2, 0)$ is provided by Proposition 3.2. Hence at least one element g_i satisfies $|g_i|_\Omega < 4D$. According to our choice of \mathcal{F} and \mathfrak{N} , we have $g_i = 1$ in G . However this contradicts the second assertion of Proposition 4.5.

To prove the last assertion we note that it suffices to deal with the case when W is geodesic as any element of H_λ can be represented by a single letter. Let Δ be a diagram of minimal type in $\mathcal{D}(W)$. By the second assertion of the lemma, some component c of $\partial_{int}\Delta$ labelled by a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ is connected to $\partial_{ext}\Delta$. Applying Lemma 4.2 yields a path s in Δ connecting $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ to c such that $\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. Let us cut Δ along s and denote the new diagram by Δ_1 . Obviously the word

$$\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta_1) \equiv \mathbf{Lab}(s)\mathbf{Lab}(c)\mathbf{Lab}(s^{-1})\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta)$$

is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ and $q(\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta_1)) < q(W)$. By the inductive assumption, $\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta_1)$ represents an element of N_λ in G . Since $\mathbf{Lab}(c)$ represents an element of N_λ and $N_\lambda \triangleleft H_\lambda$, the word $\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta)$ also represents an element of N_λ . \square

The third assertion of Lemma 5.2 obviously implies the first assertion of Theorem 1.1. Let us prove the second one. For a word W in the alphabet $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, we set

$$Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W) = \min_{\Delta \in \mathcal{D}(W)} N_{\mathcal{R}}(\Delta).$$

It is easy to see that for any two words U and V in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, we have

$$Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(UV) \leq Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(U) + Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(V). \quad (21)$$

Lemma 5.3. *For any word W in $X \cup \mathcal{H}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, we have $Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W) \leq 3C\|W\|$, where C is the relative isoperimetric constant of (5).*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $\theta(W)$ (see Definition 5.1). If $q(W) = 0$, then $W = 1$ in G and the required estimate on $Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W)$ follows from the relative hyperbolicity of G . We now assume that $q(W) > 1$.

First suppose that the word W is not $(2, 0)$ -quasi-geodesic in G . That is, up to a cyclic shift $W \equiv W_1W_2$, where $W_1 = U$ in G and $\|U\| < \|W_1\|/2$. Note that $q(W_1U^{-1}) = 0$, $q(UW_2) = q(W)$, and $\|UW_2\| \leq \|W\| - \|W_1\|/2$. Hence $\theta(UW_2) < \theta(W)$. Using the inductive assumption and (21), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W) &\leq Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W_1U^{-1}) + Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(UW_2) < \\ &\frac{3}{2}C\|W_1\| + 3C(\|W\| - \frac{1}{2}\|W_1\|) = 3C\|W\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that W is $(2, 0)$ -quasi-geodesic. Let Δ be a diagram of minimal type in $\mathcal{D}(W)$. By the second assertion of Lemma 5.2, some component c of $\partial_{int}\Delta$ is connected to an H_λ -subpath p of $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$. According to Lemma 4.2, we may assume that there is a path s in Δ connecting c to p_+ such that $\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ is a word in the alphabet $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$. We cut Δ along s and denote by Δ_1 the obtained diagram. Up to cyclic shift, we have $W \equiv W_0\mathbf{Lab}(p)$ and

$$\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta_1) \equiv W_0\mathbf{Lab}(p)\mathbf{Lab}(s)^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(c)\mathbf{Lab}(s).$$

Let h be the element of H_λ represented by $\mathbf{Lab}(p)\mathbf{Lab}(s)^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(c)\mathbf{Lab}(s)$ in G . Observe that $q(W_0h) = q(\mathbf{Lab}(\Delta_1)) < q(W)$. Further since $h^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(p)$ is a word in $H_\lambda \setminus \{1\}$ representing 1 in $G(\mathfrak{N})$, we have $h^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(p) \in \mathcal{Q}$ and hence $Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(h^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(p)) = 0$. Applying the inductive assumption we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W) &= Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W_0h) + Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(h^{-1}\mathbf{Lab}(p)) = \\ &Area_{G(\mathfrak{N})}^{rel}(W_0h) \leq 3C\|W_0h\| \leq 3C\|W\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

It is easy to see that the second assertion of Theorem 1.1 follows from Lemma 5.3. Indeed, let $\varepsilon_1: F(\mathfrak{N}) \rightarrow G(\mathfrak{N})$ be the natural homomorphism, where $F(\mathfrak{N}) = F(X) * (*_{\lambda \in \Lambda} H_\lambda/N_\lambda)$. Let ε_0 denote the natural homomorphism $F \rightarrow F(\mathfrak{N})$, where F is given by (4). The first assertion of Theorem 1.1 implies that $Ker \varepsilon_1 = \langle \varepsilon_0(\mathcal{R}) \rangle^{F(\mathfrak{N})}$. Now let U be an element of $F(\mathfrak{N})$ such that $\varepsilon_1(U) = 1$, $W \in F$ a preimage of U such that $\|W\| = \|U\|$. Lemmas 5.3 and 4.1 imply that

$$W =_F \prod_{i=1}^k f_i^{-1} R_i^{\pm 1} f_i, \tag{22}$$

where $f_i \in F$, $R_i \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{Q}$, and the number of multiples corresponding to $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ is at most $3C\|W\|$. Applying ε_0 to the both sides of (22) and taking into account that $\varepsilon_0(f_i^{-1}R_i^{\pm 1}f_i) = 1$ in $F(\mathfrak{N})$ whenever $R_i \in \mathcal{Q}$, we obtain

$$U =_{F(\mathfrak{N})} \prod_{i=1}^l g_i^{-1} P_i^{\pm 1} g_i,$$

where $g_i \in F(\mathfrak{N})$, $P_i \in \varepsilon_0(\mathcal{R})$, and $l \leq 3C\|W\| = 3C\|U\|$. By definition this means that $G(\mathfrak{N})$ is hyperbolic relative to $\{H_\lambda/N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$.

Let us prove the last assertion of the theorem. Since S is finite, without loss of generality we may assume that for any two elements $s, t \in S$, we have $st^{-1} \in X$. Thus it suffices to prove the following.

Lemma 5.4. *For any element $x \in X$, $x = 1$ in $G(\mathfrak{N})$ implies $x = 1$ in G .*

Proof. Suppose that $x = 1$ in $G(\mathfrak{N})$ for some $x \in X$. Assume that $x \neq 1$ in G . Then $q(x) > 0$. Let Δ be a diagram of minimal type in $\mathcal{D}(x)$. Since x is a geodesic word in G , some component of $\partial_{int}\Delta$ is connected to an H_λ -subpath of $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda$ by the second assertion of Lemma 5.2. However $\partial_{ext}\Delta$ contains no H_λ -subpaths at all and we get a contradiction. \square

Finally, to prove Corollary 1.6, we need some results about elementary subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups obtained in [26]. Recall that an element $g \in G$ is called *hyperbolic* if it is not conjugate to an element of one of the subgroups H_λ , $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let g be a hyperbolic element of infinite order in G . Then*

1. *The element g is contained in a unique maximal elementary subgroup $E_G(g)$ of G .*
2. *The group G is hyperbolic relative to the collection $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup \{E_G(g)\}$.*

The next result is also proved in [26, Corollary 4.5]. (For finitely generated group it can also be proved by using the action of G on its boundary, see [35].)

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that all subgroups $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ are proper. Then G contains a hyperbolic element of infinite order.*

Recall that two elements $f, g \in G$ are called *commensurable* if f^k is conjugate to g^l in G for some $k, l \neq 0$. The lemma below is a particular case of [25, Theorem 1.4].

Lemma 5.7. *For any $t \in G$, and any distinct $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, the intersection $H_\alpha \cap H_\beta^t$ is finite. In particular, if $a \in H_\alpha$ and $b \in H_\beta$ are elements of infinite order, then a and b are not commensurable in G .*

Proof of Corollary 1.6. We assume that G is non-elementary and H_λ is proper for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$. (Otherwise the corollary is obvious.) By Lemma 5.6 there is a hyperbolic element of infinite order $g \in G$. By Lemma 5.5, G is hyperbolic relative to $\{H_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \cup \{E_G(g)\}$. Thus without loss of generality we may assume that H_{λ_1} is infinite elementary for some $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$. Note that H_{λ_1} is proper as G is non-elementary. Applying the same arguments again, we may assume that there is $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda$, $\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_1$, such that H_{λ_2} is also infinite and elementary.

Let S be a subset of G and let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(S)$ be the set provided by Theorem 1.1. For each $\lambda \notin \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$, let N_λ be a normal subgroup in H_λ such that H_λ/N_λ is hyperbolic and the natural homomorphism $H_\lambda \rightarrow H_\lambda/N_\lambda$ is injective on $(H_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F}) \cup \{1\}$. We also set $N_{\lambda_1} = N_{\lambda_2} = \{1\}$. In particular, $N_\lambda \cap \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

By Theorem 1.1 the group $G(\mathfrak{N})$ is hyperbolic relative to a collection of hyperbolic subgroups, i.e., it is hyperbolic itself as observed in Corollary 1.2. Moreover, the restriction

of the natural homomorphism $G \rightarrow G(\mathfrak{N})$ to S is injective. To show that $G(\mathfrak{N})$ is non-elementary, it suffices to note that $G(\mathfrak{N})$ contains at least two non-commensurable elements of infinite order. Indeed any two elements of infinite order $h_1 \in H_{\lambda_1}/N_{\lambda_1} \cong H_{\lambda_1}$ and $h_2 \in H_{\lambda_1}/N_{\lambda_2} \cong H_{\lambda_2}$ are not commensurable according to Lemma 5.7. \square

References

- [1] J. Alonso, M. Bridson, Semihyperbolic groups, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) **70** (1995), no. 1, 56–114.
- [2] M.T. Anderson, Dehn filling and Einstein metrics in higher dimensions, prep., 2003; available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.DG/0303260>.
- [3] W.J. Blok, D. Pigozzi, On the congruence extension property, *Algebra Universalis* **38** (1997), no. 4, 391–394.
- [4] B.H. Bowditch, Relatively hyperbolic groups, prep., 1999.
- [5] M. Bridson, A. Haefliger, Metric spaces of non-positive curvature, Springer, 1999.
- [6] C. Druţu, M. Sapir, Tree-graded spaces and asymptotic cones of groups. With an appendix by D. Osin and M. Sapir. *Topology* **44** (2005), no. 5, 959–1058.
- [7] P. Eberlein, Lattices in spaces of nonpositive curvature, *Annals of Math.*, **111** (1980), 435–476.
- [8] B. Farb, Relatively hyperbolic groups, *GAF* **8** (1998), 810–840.
- [9] M. Gromov, Hyperbolic groups, Essays in Group Theory, MSRI Series, Vol.8, (S.M. Gersten, ed.), Springer, 1987, 75–263.
- [10] D. Groves, Limits of (certain) CAT(0) groups, II: The Hopf property and the shortening argument, prep., 2004; available at arXiv: math.GR/0408080.
- [11] D. Groves, Limits of (certain) CAT(0) groups, I: Compactification, prep., 2004; available at arXiv: math.GR/0404440.
- [12] D. Groves, J. Manning, Dehn filling in relatively hyperbolic groups, prep., 2006; available at arXiv: math.GR/0601311.
- [13] D. Groves, J. Manning, Fillings, finite generation, and direct limits of relatively hyperbolic groups, prep., 2006; available at arXiv: math.GR/0606070.
- [14] V. Guirardel, Limit groups and groups acting freely on \mathbb{R}^n -trees, *Geometry & Topology* **8** (2004), 1427–1470.
- [15] Ph. Hall, The Edmonton notes on nilpotent groups. Queen Mary College Mathematics Notes. Mathematics Department, Queen Mary College, London 1969.

- [16] G. Higman, B.H. Neumann, H. Neumann, Embedding theorems for groups, *J. London Math. Soc.* **24** (1949), 247–254.
- [17] S.V. Ivanov, A. Yu. Olshanskii, Hyperbolic groups and their quotients of bounded exponents, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **348** (1996), no. 6, 2091–2138.
- [18] A. Karrass, W. Magnus, D. Solitar, D. Elements of finite order in groups with a single defining relation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **13** (1960), 57–66.
- [19] O. Kharlampovich, A. Myasnikov, Description of fully residually free groups and irreducible affine varieties over a free group. Summer School in Group Theory in Banff, 1996, 71–80, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 17, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [20] R.C. Lyndon, P.E. Shupp, Combinatorial Group Theory, Springer–Verlag, 1977.
- [21] A. Yu. Olshanskii, Geometry of defining relations in groups. Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), 70. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1991.
- [22] A.Yu. Olshanskii, Periodic quotients of hyperbolic groups, *Math. USSR Sbornik* **72** (1992), no. 2, 519–541.
- [23] A.Yu. Olshanski, SQ-universality of hyperbolic groups, (Russian), *Mat. Sb.* **186** (1995), no. 8, 119–132; translation in *Sb. Math.* **186** (1995), no. 8, 1199–1211.
- [24] A. Yu. Olshanskii, M.V. Sapir, Non-amenable finitely presented torsion-by-cyclic groups, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes tudes Sci.* **96** (2002), 43–169.
- [25] D.V. Osin, Relatively hyperbolic groups: Intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems, *Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear; available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.GR/0404040>.
- [26] D.V. Osin, Elementary subgroups of hyperbolic groups and bounded generation, *Int. J. Alg. Comp.*, to appear; available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.GR/0404118>.
- [27] D.V. Osin, Asymptotic dimension of relatively hyperbolic groups, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* (2005), no. 35, 2143–2162.
- [28] N. Ozawa, Boundary Amenability of Relatively Hyperbolic Groups, prep., 2005; available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.GR/0501555>.
- [29] Y.D. Rebbeci, Algorithmic Properties of Relatively Hyperbolic Groups, PhD thesis, Rutgers Univ. (Newark); available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.GR/0302245>.
- [30] D. Rolfsen, Knots and Links, Math. Lect. Series **7**, Publish or Perish Inc., Houston, Texas, 1976.
- [31] Z. Sela, Diophantine geometry over groups I: Makanin – Razborov diagrams, *IHES Publ. Math.*, **93** (2001), 31–105.
- [32] J. Stallings, Group theory and three-dimensional manifolds. Yale Mathematical Monographs, 4. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.-London, 1971.

- [33] X. Tang, Semigroups with the congruence extension property, *Semigroup Forum* **56** (1998), no. 2, 228–264.
- [34] W.P. Thurston, Three-dimensional manifolds, Kleinian groups and hyperbolic geometry. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **6** (1982), no. 3, 357–381.
- [35] P. Tukia, Convergence groups and Gromov’s metric hyperbolic spaces, *New Zealand J. Math.* **23** (1994), no. 2, 157–187.
- [36] D. Wise, The residual finiteness of negatively curved polygons of finite groups, *Invent. Math.* **149** (2002), no. 3, 579–617.
- [37] M. Wu, The fuzzy congruence extension property in groups, *JP J. Algebra Number Theory Appl.* **2** (2002), no. 2, 153–160.
- [38] A. Yaman, A topological characterization of relatively hyperbolic groups, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **566** (2004), 41–89.
- [39] G. Yu, The Novikov conjecture for groups with finite asymptotic dimension, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **147** (1998), no. 2, 325–355.

Denis Osin
 Department of Mathematics
 The City College of New York
 138th street and Convent Ave.
 New York, NY 10031

E-mail address: *denis.osin@gmail.com*