

Algebraic extensions in free groups

E. Ventura

(Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya)

SATA, Lisboa
September 5, 2008

Everybody knows the

Steinitz Lemma: In a vector space K^n , every set of L.I. vectors can be extended to a basis of K^n . Or, equivalently, every subspace $U \leq K^n$ is a direct summand, $K^n = U \oplus V$ for some complement $V \leq K^n$.

Everybody knows the

Steinitz Lemma: In a vector space K^n , every set of L.I. vectors can be extended to a basis of K^n . Or, equivalently, every subspace $U \leq K^n$ is a direct summand, $K^n = U \oplus V$ for some complement $V \leq K^n$.

In free abelian groups, the same is **almost** true:

Proposition: Let $U \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$. If U is **pure** ($\lambda u \in U \Rightarrow u \in U$) then $\mathbb{Z}^n = U \oplus V$, for some complement $V \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$.

More precisely: for every $U \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$ there exists $U' \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $U \leq_{\text{fi}} U'$ and $\mathbb{Z}^n = U' \oplus V$ for some $V \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Everybody knows the

Steinitz Lemma: In a vector space K^n , every set of L.I. vectors can be extended to a basis of K^n . Or, equivalently, every subspace $U \leq K^n$ is a direct summand, $K^n = U \oplus V$ for some complement $V \leq K^n$.

In free abelian groups, the same is **almost** true:

Proposition: Let $U \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$. If U is **pure** ($\lambda u \in U \Rightarrow u \in U$) then $\mathbb{Z}^n = U \oplus V$, for some complement $V \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$.

More precisely: for every $U \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$ there exists $U' \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $U \leq_{\text{fi}} U'$ and $\mathbb{Z}^n = U' \oplus V$ for some $V \leq \mathbb{Z}^n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (2, 0, 4), (3, 3, 6) \rangle &\leq_6 \langle (1, 0, 2), (1, 1, 2) \rangle \\ &\leq \langle (1, 0, 2), (1, 1, 2) \rangle \oplus \langle (0, 0, 1) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{Z}^3. \end{aligned}$$

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

Proofs: • M. Takahasi, Note on chain conditions in free groups, *Osaka Math. Journal* **3**, 2 (1951), 221-225.

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

- Proofs:**
- M. Takahasi, Note on chain conditions in free groups, *Osaka Math. Journal* **3**, 2 (1951), 221-225.
 - E. V., 1997.

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

Proofs: • M. Takahasi, Note on chain conditions in free groups, *Osaka Math. Journal* **3**, 2 (1951), 221-225.

• E. V., 1997.

• S. Margolis, M. Sapir and P. Weil, 2001.

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

Proofs: • M. Takahasi, Note on chain conditions in free groups, *Osaka Math. Journal* **3**, 2 (1951), 221-225.

- E. V., 1997.
- S. Margolis, M. Sapir and P. Weil, 2001.
- I. Kapovich and A. Miasnikov, 2002.

Takahasi's Theorem: Let $F(A)$ be the free group on A and $H \leq F(A)$ a f.g. subgroup. Then, there exists a **finite computable** collection of f.g. extensions of H , say $H \leq H_1, \dots, H_n \leq F(A)$, s.t. every $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ is a free multiple of one of the H_i 's,

$$H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i * L = K \leq F(A).$$

The set $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is called the **fringe** or the **set of overgroups** of H .

Proofs: • M. Takahasi, Note on chain conditions in free groups, *Osaka Math. Journal* **3**, 2 (1951), 221-225.

- E. V., 1997.
- S. Margolis, M. Sapir and P. Weil, 2001.
- I. Kapovich and A. Miasnikov, 2002.
- A. Miasnikov, E. V., P. Weil, Algebraic extensions in free groups, *Algebra and Geometry in Geneva and Barcelona*, Trends in Mathematics, Birkhäuser (2007), 225-253.

The modern proof of Takahasi's Theorem:

The modern proof of Takahasi's Theorem:

- Let $\Gamma(H)$ be the Stallings automata associated to H , which is the **core of the covering space** of the bouquet, corresponding to the subgroup $H \leq F(A)$.

The modern proof of Takahasi's Theorem:

- Let $\Gamma(H)$ be the Stallings automata associated to H , which is the **core of the covering space** of the bouquet, corresponding to the subgroup $H \leq F(A)$.
- Now, take $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{\text{quotients of } \Gamma(H)\}$.

The modern proof of Takahasi's Theorem:

- Let $\Gamma(H)$ be the Stallings automata associated to H , which is the **core of the covering space** of the bouquet, corresponding to the subgroup $H \leq F(A)$.
- Now, take $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{\text{quotients of } \Gamma(H)\}$.
- From covering space theory it is clear that, for every $H \leq K$, $\Gamma(K)$ contains one of these quotients as a subgraph. \square

The modern proof of Takahasi's Theorem:

- Let $\Gamma(H)$ be the Stallings automata associated to H , which is the **core of the covering space** of the bouquet, corresponding to the subgroup $H \leq F(A)$.
- Now, take $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{\text{quotients of } \Gamma(H)\}$.
- From covering space theory it is clear that, for every $H \leq K$, $\Gamma(K)$ contains one of these quotients as a subgraph. \square

Example: The fringe of $H = \langle ab, acba \rangle$ as a subgroup of $F = \langle a, b, c \rangle$ is

$$\mathcal{O}(H) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} H_1 = \langle ab, acba \rangle, & H_2 = \langle ab, ac, ba \rangle, \\ H_3 = \langle ab, a^2, acba \rangle, & H_4 = \langle ab, aca, acba \rangle, \\ H_5 = \langle ab, a^2, ab^{-1}, ac \rangle, & H_6 = \langle a, b, c \rangle. \end{array} \right\}$$

Definition: Take $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ and $x \in K$. We say that x is K -algebraic over H if every free factor of K containing H , $H \leq L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$, satisfies $x \in L$. Otherwise, we say that x is K -transcendental over H .

Definition: Take $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ and $x \in K$. We say that x is K -algebraic over H if every free factor of K containing H , $H \leq L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$, satisfies $x \in L$. Otherwise, we say that x is K -transcendental over H .

Examples: • If $H \leq K$, then every element $x \in H$ is obviously K -algebraic over H .

Definition: Take $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ and $x \in K$. We say that x is **K -algebraic over H** if every free factor of K containing H , $H \leq L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$, satisfies $x \in L$. Otherwise, we say that **x is K -transcendental over H** .

Examples: • If $H \leq K$, then every element $x \in H$ is obviously K -algebraic over H .

• If x is **primitive** in K (that is, $\langle x \rangle \leq_{\text{ff}} K$), then every element of $K \setminus \langle x \rangle$ is K -transcendental over $\langle x \rangle$.

Definition: Take $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ and $x \in K$. We say that x is **K -algebraic over H** if every free factor of K containing H , $H \leq L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$, satisfies $x \in L$. Otherwise, we say that **x is K -transcendental over H** .

Examples: • If $H \leq K$, then every element $x \in H$ is obviously K -algebraic over H .

• If x is **primitive** in K (that is, $\langle x \rangle \leq_{\text{ff}} K$), then every element of $K \setminus \langle x \rangle$ is K -transcendental over $\langle x \rangle$.

• Every element $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over $\langle x^n \rangle$ (i.e. if x^n lies in a free factor of K , then so does x).

Definition: Take $H \leq K \leq F(A)$ and $x \in K$. We say that x is **K -algebraic over H** if every free factor of K containing H , $H \leq L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$, satisfies $x \in L$. Otherwise, we say that **x is K -transcendental over H** .

Examples: • If $H \leq K$, then every element $x \in H$ is obviously K -algebraic over H .

• If x is **primitive** in K (that is, $\langle x \rangle \leq_{\text{ff}} K$), then every element of $K \setminus \langle x \rangle$ is K -transcendental over $\langle x \rangle$.

• Every element $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over $\langle x^n \rangle$ (i.e. if x^n lies in a free factor of K , then so does x).

• The notion of algebraicity over H is relative to K :

$$\langle a^2 b^2 \rangle \leq \langle a^2, b^2 \rangle \leq \langle a, b \rangle$$

→ in $\langle a^2, b^2 \rangle$, a^2 is transcendental over $\langle a^2 b^2 \rangle$ (in fact, primitive),

→ in $\langle a, b \rangle$, a^2 is algebraic over $\langle a^2 b^2 \rangle$.

Observation: Let $H \leq K \leq F(A)$. TFAE:

- (a) H is contained in no proper free factor of K ;
- (b) every $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over H ;
- (c) $K = \langle H, k_1, \dots, k_t \rangle$ for some k_i 's K -algebraic over H .

In this case, we say that the extension $H \leq K$ is **algebraic**, denoted $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.

Observation: Let $H \leq K \leq F(A)$. TFAE:

- (a) H is contained in no proper free factor of K ;
- (b) every $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over H ;
- (c) $K = \langle H, k_1, \dots, k_t \rangle$ for some k_i 's K -algebraic over H .

In this case, we say that the extension $H \leq K$ is **algebraic**, denoted $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.

The set of **algebraic extensions** of H is denoted $\mathcal{AE}(H)$.

Observation: Let $H \leq K \leq F(A)$. TFAE:

- (a) H is contained in no proper free factor of K ;
- (b) every $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over H ;
- (c) $K = \langle H, k_1, \dots, k_t \rangle$ for some k_i 's K -algebraic over H .

In this case, we say that the extension $H \leq K$ is **algebraic**, denoted $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.

The set of **algebraic extensions** of H is denoted $\mathcal{AE}(H)$.

- Examples:**
- $H \leq_{\text{fi}} K$ implies $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.
 - $\langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle \leq_{\text{alg}} \langle a, b \rangle$ (in fact, $(\text{rk } 2) \leq_{\text{alg}} (\text{rk } 2)$).

Observation: Let $H \leq K \leq F(A)$. TFAE:

- (a) H is contained in no proper free factor of K ;
- (b) every $x \in K$ is K -algebraic over H ;
- (c) $K = \langle H, k_1, \dots, k_t \rangle$ for some k_i 's K -algebraic over H .

In this case, we say that the extension $H \leq K$ is **algebraic**, denoted $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.

The set of **algebraic extensions** of H is denoted $\mathcal{AE}(H)$.

- Examples:**
- $H \leq_{\text{fi}} K$ implies $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K$.
 - $\langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle \leq_{\text{alg}} \langle a, b \rangle$ (in fact, $(\text{rk } 2) \leq_{\text{alg}} (\text{rk } 2)$).

Theorem: For every extension $H \leq K$ of f.g. subgroups of $F(A)$ there exists a unique L such that $H \leq_{\text{alg}} L \leq_{\text{ff}} K$. This is called the **algebraic K -closure of H** .

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ?

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ? YES, OF COURSE !!

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ? YES, OF COURSE !!

Theorem: Let $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$. Then,

- (a) $\mathcal{AE}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(H)$;
- (b) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is finite (i.e., H admits only finitely many algebraic extensions);
- (c) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is computable.

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ? **YES, OF COURSE !!**

Theorem: Let $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$. Then,

(a) $\mathcal{AE}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(H)$;

(b) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is finite (i.e., H admits only finitely many algebraic extensions);

(c) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is computable.

Proof: (a) Let $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K \leq F(A)$. Then, $H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} K$ for some $H_i \in \mathcal{O}(H)$. But K is algebraic over H so, $H_i = K$.

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ? **YES, OF COURSE !!**

Theorem: Let $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$. Then,

- (a) $\mathcal{AE}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(H)$;
- (b) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is finite (i.e., H admits only finitely many algebraic extensions);
- (c) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is computable.

Proof: (a) Let $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K \leq F(A)$. Then, $H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} K$ for some $H_i \in \mathcal{O}(H)$. But K is algebraic over H so, $H_i = K$.

(b) Immediate.

Is $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ finite ? computable ? **YES, OF COURSE !!**

Theorem: Let $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$. Then,

- (a) $\mathcal{AE}(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(H)$;
- (b) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is finite (i.e., H admits only finitely many algebraic extensions);
- (c) $\mathcal{AE}(H)$ is computable.

Proof: (a) Let $H \leq_{\text{alg}} K \leq F(A)$. Then, $H \leq H_i \leq_{\text{ff}} K$ for some $H_i \in \mathcal{O}(H)$. But K is algebraic over H so, $H_i = K$.

(b) Immediate.

(c) Given H ,
→ compute $\Gamma(H)$,
→ compute all quotients, $\mathcal{O}(H) = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$,
→ clean H_i if $H \leq_{\text{ff}} H_i$ (using Roig-V.-Weil in polynomial time).

An application

An application

Let \mathcal{V} be a pseudo-variety of finite groups (i.e. a class closed by subgroups, quotients and finite direct products). One can define the **pro- \mathcal{V}** topology in $F(A)$.

An application

Let \mathcal{V} be a pseudo-variety of finite groups (i.e. a class closed by subgroups, quotients and finite direct products). One can define the **pro- \mathcal{V}** topology in $F(A)$.

Proposition (Ribes-Zaleskii): Suppose \mathcal{V} is extension closed, and let $H \leq_{\text{ff}} K \leq F(A)$. If K is \mathcal{V} -closed then H is \mathcal{V} -closed.

An application

Let \mathcal{V} be a pseudo-variety of finite groups (i.e. a class closed by subgroups, quotients and finite direct products). One can define the **pro- \mathcal{V}** topology in $F(A)$.

Proposition (Ribes-Zaleskii): Suppose \mathcal{V} is extension closed, and let $H \leq_{\text{ff}} K \leq F(A)$. If K is \mathcal{V} -closed then H is \mathcal{V} -closed.

Corollary: The pro- \mathcal{V} closure of $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$, denoted $cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$, is an algebraic extension of H , i.e. $H \leq_{\text{alg}} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$.

An application

Let \mathcal{V} be a pseudo-variety of finite groups (i.e. a class closed by subgroups, quotients and finite direct products). One can define the **pro- \mathcal{V}** topology in $F(A)$.

Proposition (Ribes-Zaleskii): Suppose \mathcal{V} is extension closed, and let $H \leq_{\text{ff}} K \leq F(A)$. If K is \mathcal{V} -closed then H is \mathcal{V} -closed.

Corollary: The pro- \mathcal{V} closure of $H \leq_{\text{fg}} F(A)$, denoted $cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$, is an algebraic extension of H , i.e. $H \leq_{\text{alg}} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$.

Theorem (Ribes-Zaleskii, Margolis-Sapir-Weil) For every prime p , there is an algorithm to compute the pro- p closure of f.g. subgroups of $F(A)$.

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Estrange situation:

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Estrange situation:

→ for \mathcal{V} extension closed and $H \leq_{fg} F(A)$, $H \leq_{alg} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$,

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Estrange situation:

- for \mathcal{V} extension closed and $H \leq_{fg} F(A)$, $H \leq_{alg} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$,
- there are countably many H 's,

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Estrange situation:

- for \mathcal{V} extension closed and $H \leq_{fg} F(A)$, $H \leq_{alg} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$,
- there are countably many H 's,
- there are uncountably many \mathcal{V} 's,

Open problem: Compute pro-solvable closures.

This is open even knowing that $cl_{sol}(H) \in \mathcal{AE}(H)$!!!

Estrange situation:

- for \mathcal{V} extension closed and $H \leq_{fg} F(A)$, $H \leq_{alg} cl_{\mathcal{V}}(H)$,
- there are countably many H 's,
- there are uncountably many \mathcal{V} 's,

So, there are uncountably many \mathcal{V} 's which are indistinguishable by means of closures of f.g. subgroups (!)

Thank you