

A FINITELY PRESENTED GROUP WITH TRANSCENDENTAL SPECTRAL RADIUS

Corentin Bodart

April 30, 2024

Abstract

In this short note, we prove the existence of a finitely presented group with transcendental spectral radius. The proof relies on links between decidability of the Word Problem and semi-computability of the spectral radius.

Throughout the paper, we consider *marked groups*, that is, pairs (G, S) with G a finitely generated group and S a finite symmetric generating set (i.e., $S = S^{-1}$). We define the *cogrowth sequence*¹ and the *spectral radius* of (G, S) as

$$c(n) = \#\{w \in S^* : \ell(w) = n \text{ and } \bar{w} = e_G\},$$

$$\rho(G, S) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|S|^n} \sqrt[n]{c(n)}.$$

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1. *There exists a finitely presented group G such that, for all finite symmetric generating sets S , the spectral radius $\rho(G, S)$ is transcendental.*

This answers a question of Kassabov and Pak [KP24, Question 7.2]. Our proof uses crucially that G has undecidable Word Problem. (In particular, balls in its Cayley graph are not “explicit” in the sense of [HLW06, §2.1].) We propose the refined question:

Question. Does there exist a finitely presented (or recursively presented) group (G, S) with decidable Word Problem and transcendental spectral radius $\rho(G, S)$?

Of course, we still expect a positive answer, starting with $G = \pi_1(\Sigma_2)$ a surface group.

1. SEMI-COMPUTABLE NUMBERS

The first ingredient in our proof is the following definition:

Definition 2. A number $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is *lower semi-computable* (resp. *upper semi-computable*) if there exists an algorithm enumerating an increasing (resp. decreasing) sequence (x_k) of real algebraic numbers² such that $x_k \rightarrow x$.

¹The “cogrowth sequence” usually refers to $c_n = \#\{w \in F_S \mid \ell(w) = n, \bar{w} = e_G\}$ where $\bar{\cdot} : F_S \rightarrow G$

²Real algebraic numbers x_k can be specified as triplets $(P_k(X), a_k, b_k) \in \mathbb{Q}[X] \times \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}$ such that x_k is the only root of $P_k(X)$ in the interval $[a_k, b_k]$.

Lemma 3. *Let G be a recursively presented group, then $\rho(G, S)$ is lower semi-computable. Moreover, the result is effective: there exists an algorithm with specifications*

Input: A recursively presented marked group (G, S) , specified via a finite set S and an algorithm enumerating a set of defining relations.

Output: An algorithm enumerating an increasing sequence of real algebraic numbers (x_k) such that $x_k \rightarrow \rho(G, S)$.

Proof. Note that $c(m+n) \geq c(m) \cdot c(n)$, therefore Fekete's lemma ensures that

$$\rho(G, S) = \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{|S|^n} \sqrt[n]{c(n)}.$$

As G is recursively presented, its Word Problem (i.e., the set of words $w \in S^*$ such that $\bar{w} = e_G$) is recursively enumerable. Let $(v_i)_{i \geq 1} \subseteq S^*$ be a computable enumeration of the Word Problem, and let us define the “partial cogrowth sequence”

$$c_k(n) = \#\{v_i : \ell(v_i) = n \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

Observe that $c_k(n) \nearrow c(n)$ pointwise as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In particular

$$x_k = \max_{1 \leq n \leq k} \frac{1}{|S|^n} \sqrt[n]{c_k(n)}$$

is a computable increasing sequence such that $x_k \rightarrow \rho(G, S)$, as promised. \square

Remark 4. The analogous result for “upper semi-computable” doesn't hold, even under the additional assumption that the Word Problem is decidable (with a Word Problem algorithm as part of the input). Indeed, this would imply that amenability is a co-semi-decidable property, contradicting [Rau23, Theorem 10.6].

As will become clear in the proof of Theorem 1, there exists finitely presented groups (with undecidable Word Problem) whose spectral radius is not upper semi-computable.

2. FROM COMPUTABLE SPECTRAL RADIUS TO DECIDABLE WORD PROBLEM

Our main observation is the following:

Theorem 5. *Let (G, S) be a recursively presented group such that the spectral radius $\rho(G, S)$ is upper semi-computable. Consider a subset $W \subseteq S^*$ such that, for each $w \in W$, either $\bar{w} = e_G$ or the normal subgroup generated $\langle\langle \bar{w} \rangle\rangle_G$ is non-amenable. Then there exists an algorithm which, given a word $w \in W$, decides whether $\bar{w} = e_G$ or not.*

(In particular, if $W = S^*$, then G has decidable word problem.) This theorem relies crucially on a classical result due to Kesten.

Theorem 6 ([Kes59]). *Let (G, S) be a marked group and $N \trianglelefteq G$ a non-amenable normal subgroup, then we have $\rho(G, S) < \rho(G/N, S)$.*

Proof of Theorem 5. Suppose that G is presented as $\langle S \mid R \rangle$. Take $w \in W$, we run two parallel processes to decide whether $\bar{w} = e_G$ or not.

- As G is recursively presented, we can enumerate all words $v \in S^*$ such that $\bar{v} = e_G$. If at any point $v = w$, we stop the algorithm and conclude that $\bar{w} = e_G$.
- The group $G_w = G / \langle\langle \bar{w} \rangle\rangle_G = \langle S \mid R, w \rangle$ is recursively presented, hence $\rho(G_w, S)$ is lower semi-computable. We can compute two sequences (x_k) and (y_k) such that

$$x_k \searrow \rho(G, S) \quad \text{and} \quad y_k \nearrow \rho(G_w, S).$$

As x_k and y_k are real algebraic, we can compare them. If at any point $x_k < y_k$, we stop the algorithm and conclude that $\bar{w} \neq e_G$. It should be noted that, if $\bar{w} \neq e_G$, then the inequality $x_k < y_k$ will hold eventually as $\langle\langle \bar{w} \rangle\rangle_G$ is non-amenable and therefore $\rho(G, S) < \rho(G / \langle\langle \bar{w} \rangle\rangle_G, S) = \rho(G_w, S)$.

In both cases, the algorithm finishes and decides correctly if $\bar{w} = e_G$ or not. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We propose two different constructions, relying both on Theorem 5.

1. We recall a family of groups introduced by Higman [Hig61]: for each $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$,

$$H_I := \langle a, b, c, d \mid a^i b a^{-i} = c^i d c^{-i} \ (i \in I) \rangle.$$

This is an amalgamated free product $A *_C B$ with $A = F(a, b)$, $B = F(c, d)$ and $C = F(\{g_i\}_{i \in I})$ (with injections $g_i \mapsto a^i b a^{-i}$ and $g_i \mapsto c^i d c^{-i}$ respectively). We define

$$w_i = a^i b a^{-i} c^i d^{-1} c^{-i}.$$

Lemma 7. *If $i \notin I$, then $\langle\langle \bar{w}_i \rangle\rangle_{H_I}$ contains a non-abelian free group.*

Proof. The subgroup $\langle w_i, b w_i b^{-1} \rangle$ is non-abelian free. This follows directly from the Normal Form Theorem for amalgamated free products, see eg. [LS77, p. 186-187]. \square

Consider $I \subset \mathbb{Z}$ which is recursively enumerable (hence H_I is recursively presented), but not recursive. Using Higman's embedding theorem [Hig61], we can embed H_I into a finitely presented group G (as Higman did). For any finite symmetric generating set S of G , we consider a monoid homomorphism $\varphi: \{a^\pm, b^\pm, c^\pm, d^\pm\}^* \rightarrow S^*$ such that $\varphi(v) = \bar{v}$ for all $v \in \{a^\pm, b^\pm, c^\pm, d^\pm\}$, and let $W = \{\varphi(w_i) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset S^*$.

- Using the lemma, either $\bar{w}_i = e_G$ or $\langle\langle \bar{w}_i \rangle\rangle_G \geq \langle\langle \bar{w}_i \rangle\rangle_{H_I}$ is non-amenable.
- As I is not recursive, there does not exist any algorithm which, given $\varphi(w_i) \in W$ (equivalently $i \in \mathbb{Z}$) decides whether $\bar{w}_i = e_G$ or not (equivalently $i \in I$ or not).

Therefore $\rho(G, S)$ cannot be upper semi-computable, hence cannot be algebraic. \square

Remark 8. Using Karrass-Solitar theorem on amalgamated free products [KS70], one should be able to prove that $\langle\langle g \rangle\rangle_{H_I}$ contains a non-abelian free group for all $g \in H_I \setminus \{e\}$.

Remark 9. The family $(H_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies the conclusions of Lemma 1.11 of [KP24]. In particular, we recover that the set of values $\{f(H_I, S) : I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a continuum for every strictly monotone parameter f , simplifying part of the proof of [KP24, Theorem 1.1]. That being said, it doesn't allow to reprove their Theorem 1.2 (“No isolated point”).

2. Consider $H = \langle S_0 \mid R \rangle$ a finitely presented group with unsolvable Word Problem. We consider $G = H * \langle t \rangle$ with generating set $S = S_0 \sqcup \{t^\pm\}$, and $W = S_0^*$.

For all $w \in W$, either \bar{w} is trivial, or the normal subgroup it generates satisfies

$$\langle\langle \bar{w} \rangle\rangle_G \geq \langle \bar{w}, t\bar{w}t^{-1}, t^2\bar{w}t^{-2} \rangle \simeq C_n * C_n * C_n \geq F_2$$

where $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the order of \bar{w} . Again, Theorem 5 implies that $\rho(G, S)$ cannot be upper semi-computable, hence is transcendental.

In particular, we can take H defined by 10 generators and 27 relators [Col86], and therefore G defined by as little as 11 generators and 27 relators. \square

Acknowledgments. I'd like to Tatiana Nagnibeda and Igor Pak for comments and encouragements. The author was supported by the Swiss NSF grant 200020-200400.

REFERENCES

- [Col86] Donald J. Collins. “A simple presentation of a group with unsolvable word problem”. In: *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* 30.2 (1986), pp. 230–234.
- [Hig61] Graham Higman. “Subgroups of finitely presented groups”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 262.1311 (1961), pp. 455–475.
- [HLW06] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson. “Expander Graphs and their Applications”. In: *Bulletin of the American Math. Society* 43 (2006), pp. 439–561.
- [KS70] Abraham Karrass and Donald Solitar. “The Subgroups of a Free Product of Two Groups with an Amalgamated Subgroup”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 150.1 (1970), pp. 227–255.
- [KP24] Martin Kassabov and Igor Pak. *Monotone parameters on Cayley graphs of finitely generated groups*. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.10870>. (2024).
- [Kes59] Harry Kesten. “Symmetric Random Walks on Groups”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 92.2 (1959), pp. 336–354.
- [LS77] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp. *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (1977).
- [Rau23] Emmanuel Rauzy. *Computable analysis on the space of marked groups*. Preprint at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.01179>. (2023).

SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE, SWITZERLAND

E-mail address: corentin.bodart@unige.ch

URL: <https://sites.google.com/view/corentin-bodart>