Automorphic orbits in free groups

Alexei G. Myasnikov   **Vladimir Shpilrain**

ABSTRACT. Let F_n be the free group of a finite rank n. We study orbits $Orb_\phi(u)$, where u is an element of the group F_n, under the action of an automorphism ϕ. If an orbit like that is finite, we determine precisely what its cardinality can be if u runs through the whole group F_n, and ϕ runs through the whole group $Aut(F_n)$.

Another problem that we address here is related to Whitehead's algorithm that determines whether or not a given element of a free group of finite rank is an automorphic image of another given element. It is known that the first part of this algorithm (reducing a given free word to a free word of minimum possible length by elementary Whitehead automorphisms) is fast (of quadratic time with respect to the length of the word). On the other hand, the second part of the algorithm (applied to two words of the same minimum length) was always considered very slow. We give here an improved algorithm for the second part, and we believe this algorithm always terminates in polynomial time with respect to the length of the words. We prove that this is indeed the case if the free group has rank 2.

1. Introduction

Let F_n be the free group of a finite rank $n \geq 2$ with a set $X = \{x_i\}, 1 \leq i \leq n$, of free generators. Denote by $Orb_\phi(u)$ the orbit of an element u of the free group F_n under the action of an automorphism ϕ. That is, $Orb_\phi(u) = \{v \in F_n, \ v = \phi^m(u)$ for some $m \in \mathbf{Z}_+\}$.

One of the problems that we address here is: how many elements can a *finite* orbit like that possibly have if u runs through the whole group F_n, and ϕ runs through the whole group $Aut(F_n)$? The answer is provided by the following theorem, in combination with a result of McCool [9] (see also [4]):

Theorem 1.1. In the free group F_n, there is an orbit $Orb_\phi(u)$ of cardinality k if and only if there is an element of order k in the group $Aut(F_n)$.

Thus, the question above is reduced to another question, of finding out what possible order can a torsion element of the group $Aut(F_n)$ have. The latter was answered by McCool [9]; more general results were obtained later by Khramtsov [4]. We cite the relevant result in Section 2, after the proof of Theorem 1.1.

It should be pointed out that the "only if" part of our Theorem 1.1 is no longer valid if ϕ is an arbitrary endomorphism. The following example is based on the idea suggested by C. Sims.

Example. In the free group F_3, let ϕ be the endomorphism that takes x_1 to $x_2^{-1}x_3$; x_2 to x_1; x_3 to 1. Let $u = x_1x_2x_3$; then the cardinality of $Orb_\phi(u)$ is 5, but there is no element of order 5 in the group $Aut(F_3)$.

Another problem that we consider here, is the following.

Let u be an element of the free group F_n, whose length $|u|$ cannot be decreased by any automorphism of F_n. Let $A(u)$ denote the set of elements $\{v \in F_n; |v| = |u|, f(v) = u$ for some $f \in Aut(F_n)\}$. How fast does the cardinality of $A(u)$ grow as a function of $|u|$?

The set $A(u)$ is therefore an "abridged" orbit $Orb_{Aut(F_n)}(u)$, that includes only those automorphic images of u that have the same length as u does.

The problem above was motivated by complexity issues for Whitehead's algorithm that determines whether or not a given element of a free group of finite rank is an automorphic image of another given element. It is known that the first part of this algorithm (reducing a given free word to a free word of minimal possible length by "elementary" Whitehead automorphisms) is pretty fast (of quadratic time with respect to the length of the word). On the other hand, the second part of the algorithm (applied to two words of the same minimum length) was always considered very slow. In fact, the procedure outlined in the original paper by Whitehead (see e.g. [7]), suggested this part of the algorithm to be of superexponential time with respect to the length of the words. However, a standard trick in graph theory shows that there is an algorithm of at most exponential time (see Proposition 3.1 in Section 3). Moreover, in the case where the free group has rank 2, we were able to prove

Theorem 1.2. Let $u \in F_2$ be a word whose length is irreducible by any automorphism of F_2 (in particular, u is cyclically reduced). Then the number of automorphic images of u that have the same length as u does, is bounded by a polynomial function of $|u|$.

In fact, experimental data suggest that the number in the statement of Theorem 1.2 has the (exact!) bound of $8m^2 - 40m$ for $m \geq 9$, where $m = |u|$, but we were unable to prove that.

Theorem 1.2 has the following

Corollary 1.3. In the group F_2, Whitehead's algorithm terminates in polynomial time with respect to the maximum length of the two words in question.

We do not know whether or not Theorem 1.2 and, therefore, Corollary 1.3 hold for free groups of bigger ranks. However, experimental data kindly provided by C. Sims allowed us to make the following

Conjecture. In the free group F_n, the cardinality of $A(u)$ is bounded by a polynomial of degree $2n - 2$ in $|u|$, provided the length of u is irreducible by any automorphism of F_n.

A most amazing thing is that, according to the experimental data mentioned above, the *maximum* cardinality of $A(u)$ that can actually occur under the irreducibility assumption in the Conjecture, appears to be *precisely* a polynomial of degree $2n - 2$ in $m = |u|$ for sufficiently large m. For $n = 2$, this polynomial, as we have already mentioned, is $8m^2 - 40m$ if $m \geq 9$. For $n = 3$, the polynomial is

$48m^4 - 480m^3 + 1104m^2 - 672m$ if $m \geq 11$. A particular element $u \in F_3$ of length m whose orbit $A(u)$ has the cardinality given by the latter polynomial, is, according to the same experimental data, $u = x_1^k x_2 x_1 x_2^{-1} x_1 x_2^2 x_3^2$, where $k = m - 8$.

We also note that, in the case where the free group has rank 2 (but not in the general case), the condition on $|u|$ to be irreducible by any automorphism can be relaxed to u just being cyclically reduced. If however we drop this latter condition, the situation changes, and the number of automorphic images might become exponential:

Proposition 1.4. The number of primitive elements of length m in the group F_2 (and therefore, in any group $F_n, n \geq 2$) is:

(a) more than $\frac{8}{3\sqrt{3}} \cdot (\sqrt{3})^m$ if m is odd.

(b) more than $\frac{4}{3} \cdot (\sqrt{3})^m$ if m is even.

(c) The number of *cyclically reduced* primitive elements of length $m \geq 1$ in the group F_2 is $4m \cdot \Phi(m)$, where $\Phi(m)$ is the Euler function of m, i.e., the number of positive integers $< m$ relatively prime to m. (Clearly, $\Phi(m) < m$).

Informally speaking, "most" primitive elements in F_2 are conjugates of primitive elements of smaller length. This is not the case in F_n for $n > 2$, where "most" primitive elements are of the form $u \cdot x_i^{\pm 1} \cdot v$ where u, v are arbitrary elements that do not depend on x_i.

Proof of Proposition 1.4 is given in Section 4.

2. Finite orbits

We start with

Proof of Theorem 1.1.

(1) The "only if" part is a combination of an observation due to G.Levitt (see [5]) with a result of Bestvina and Handel [2]. Here is the argument. Suppose that for some automorphism φ of the group F_n, one has $\varphi^k(g) = g$ and $\varphi^q(g) \neq g$ for $0 < q < k$.

Consider the action of φ on the subgroup $H = Fix(\varphi^k)$ of all elements fixed by φ^k. (This subgroup is clearly invariant under φ since $\varphi^k(\varphi(h)) = \varphi(\varphi^k(h)) = \varphi(h)$.) Then φ is an automorphism of H. Indeed, φ is obviously surjective on H since for any $h \in H$, we have $h = \varphi(\varphi^{k-1}(h))$. If φ were not injective on H, then we would have $\varphi(h) = 1$ for some $h \in H$, in which case h could not be fixed by φ^k.

Finally, φ clearly has order k as an element of the automorphism group $Aut(H)$. Since H has rank at most n by [2], this yields the "only if" part of the theorem. $\square$

(2) To prove the "if" part we need the following definition. A group G satisfies the *big powers* condition if for any tuple of elements $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ from G with $[u_i, u_{i+1}] \neq 1$ $(i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$, there is an integer K such that for any integers $M_1, \ldots, M_n \geq K$, the following inequality holds:
$$u_1^{M_1} \ldots u_n^{M_n} \neq 1.$$

It is known that every free group satisfies the big powers condition [1]. Now comes

Lemma 2.1. Let ϕ be a nonidentical automorphism of F_n. Then there exists an integer $K \geq 1$ such that for any $M_1, \ldots, M_n \geq K$ the following inequality holds:

$$\phi(x_1^{M_1} \ldots x_n^{M_n}) \neq x_1^{M_1} \ldots x_n^{M_n}.$$

Proof. Suppose, by way of contradiction, that for any integer $K > 0$, there are integers $M_1(K), \ldots, M_n(K) \geq K$ such that

$$\phi(x_1^{M_1(K)} \ldots x_n^{M_n(K)}) = x_1^{M_1(K)} \ldots x_n^{M_n(K)}.$$

It follows that

$$\phi(x_1)^{M_1(K)} \ldots \phi(x_n)^{M_n(K)} x_n^{-M_n(K)} \ldots x_1^{-M_1(K)} = 1 \tag{1}$$

for all positive integers K. As we have mentioned above, the free group F_n satisfies the big powers condition, therefore there are two commuting consecutive factors in (1). Since ϕ is an automorphism, the only consecutive factors which can possibly commute are $\phi(x_n)^{M_n(K)}$ and $x_n^{M_n(K)}$. It follows that $\phi(x_n) = x_n$ and (1) takes the form

$$\phi(x_1)^{M_1(K)} \ldots \phi(x_{n-1})^{M_{n-1}(K)} x_{n-1}^{-M_{n-1}(K)} \ldots x_1^{-M_1(K)} = 1.$$

Upon repeating the argument above, we get $\phi(x_i) = x_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$, i.e., ϕ is identical. This contradiction proves the lemma. $\square$

We now continue with our proof of the "if" part. Given $k > 1$ and an automorphism φ of order k of the group F_n, we are going to find an element $u \in F_n$, so that the orbit $Orb_\varphi(u)$ has cardinality k.

If φ is a permutation on the set $\{x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_n^{\pm 1}\}$, then any element of the form $u = x_1^{M_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot x_n^{M_n}$, $M_i \neq 0$, would do. If not, then there is at least one free generator, say, x_1, such that $\varphi(x_1)$ has length at least 2. Let $u = x_1^{M_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot x_n^{M_n}$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, for some choice of $K \geq 1$, for any $M_1, \ldots, M_n \geq K$ we have $\varphi(u) \neq u$.

Similarly, for any m, $1 < m < k$, we can construct an element u_m such that $\varphi^m(u_m) \neq u_m$. Every u_m, $m \geq 2$, is chosen to be of the form $u_m = x_1^{M_{1,m}} \cdot \ldots \cdot x_n^{M_{n,m}}$ with $\min_i M_{i,m} > \max_i M_{i,m-1}$, and $\varphi^m(u_m) \neq u_m$ (the latter is possible by Lemma 2.1).

Obviously, with this choice of $M_{i,j}$ we will also have $\varphi^j(u_j) \neq u_j$ for any $j \leq m$. Therefore, for $u = u_k$, the orbit $Orb_\varphi(u)$ will have cardinality k. $\square$

We note that possible values of the order of a torsion element of the group $Aut(F_n)$ are described, according to [9] and [4], as follows. Pick a positive integer $k = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_s^{\alpha_s}$, where $p_1, \ldots, p_s$ are different primes. There is an element of order k in the group $Aut(F_n)$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^{s}(p_i^{\alpha_i} - p_i^{\alpha_i - 1}) \leq n$. For example, if $k = 15 = 3 \cdot 5$; then the sum above becomes (3-1)+(5-1) =6. Therefore, there is an automorphism of order 15 in the group $Aut(F_n)$ for $n \geq 6$, but not for $n \leq 5$.

We also note that Levitt and Nicolas [6] proved that the *maximum* order (call it $H(n)$) of a torsion element of $Aut(F_n)$ is the same as that of a torsion element of $GL_n(\mathbf{Z})$, with the exception of $n =2$, 6, and 12. They also established the asymptotic of this function by showing $log H(n) \sim \sqrt{n \cdot log\ n}$.

3. Whitehead's algorithm revised

In this section, we study complexity of Whitehead's algorithm that determines whether or not a given element of a free group of finite rank is an automorphic image of another given element.

It is known that the first part of this algorithm (reducing a given free word to a free word of minimum possible length by "elementary" Whitehead automorphisms) is pretty fast (of quadratic time with respect to the length of the word). On the other hand, the second part of the algorithm (applied to two words of the same minimum length) was always considered very slow. In fact, the procedure outlined in the original paper by Whitehead [11], suggested this part of the algorithm to be of superexponential time with respect to the length of the words. Indeed, given a word u, the procedure calls for constructing a graph whose vertices correspond to all words of length $|u|$. That means, the number of vertices is an exponential function of $|u|$. After that, for every vertex of the graph, one constructs edges incident to this vertex as follows: an edge connects this particular vertex to another vertex if and only if there is an elementary Whitehead automorphism that takes one of the corresponding words to the other. Finally, to find out if there is an automorphism that takes the word u to another given word v of the same length, one has to check all the paths in the graph that start at the vertex that corresponds to u, and see if some of them leads to the vertex that corresponds to u. The number of paths in a graph is, in general, an exponential function of the number of vertices, therefore this algorithm is, in general, of superexponential complexity with respect to the length of the word u.

It is possible however to skip some steps in this algorithm and get the following

Proposition 3.1. Let N be the number of automorphic images of $u \in F_n$ that have the same length as u does. Then, given an element v of length $|u|$, one can decide in linear time with respect to N, whether or not v is an automorphic image of u.

Proof. We are going to use the *backtracking* method which is a well-known procedure in graph theory for searching a tree.

Starting with the vertex that corresponds to $u = u_0$, we are building a tree as follows. (We use the same notation for words and corresponding vertices when there is no ambiguity).

(1) Apply an arbitrary elementary Whitehead automorphism to u_0; if a new word u_1 of the same length is obtained, plot the corresponding vertex and connect it to u_0. If not, then apply another elementary Whitehead automorphism, until you get a new word u_1 of the same length. (Note that the total number of those automorphisms $C = C(n)$ is finite and depends on the rank n of the group F_n only).

(2) Continue the same process. That is, suppose we have obtained a word u_i, $i > 0$, at the previous step. This time "a new word" would mean a word different from all the words obtained at previous steps.

If none of the elementary Whitehead automorphisms produces a new word, then do "backtracking", i.e., return to the word obtained at the immediately preceding step, and repeat the same process.

In the end (i.e., when no new word can be obtained from any of the "old" words), we shall obviously have a *spanning tree* of the graph described before the statement of Proposition 3.1. It will therefore have N vertices and $N-1$ edges. Furthermore, in the course of constructing this tree, we did not traverse any of the edges more than twice (once in each direction).

Thus, the time we need to construct this tree, is no more than $C \cdot N$, where C is the constant mentioned above. Once the tree is constructed, it will take just N more steps to find out if the vertex corresponding to the word v is among the vertices. Or, we can perform the check every time we get a new vertex, because once we get v, we can stop. $\square$

Thus, the speed of Whitehead's algorithm is determined by the number of automorphic images of an element $u \in F_n$ that have the same length as u does. Therefore, Theorem 1.2 will imply that, in the case where the free group has rank 2, Whitehead's algorithm does, in fact, terminate in polynomial time with respect to the length of the words in question.

We are now ready for

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Throughout the proof, we shall call "length-preserving" those automorphisms of F_2 that are permutations on the set $\{x, x^{-1}, y, y^{-1}\}$. There are 8 of them, so whenever we count the number of automorphic images of a particular element "up to a length-preserving automorphism", it means the upper bound for such a number should be multiplied by 8.

Let $M = |u|$. Let k be the sum of exponents on x in the word u, and l the sum of exponents on y. Upon applying a length-preserving automorphism if necessary, we may assume that $k, l \geq 0$. First, we are going to establish the result of Theorem 1.2 for $u \notin [F_2, F_2]$, so we assume that k, l are not both 0. In this case, the result will follow from the following observations.

(1) For a word of length M, there are $\sum_{i=0}^{M}(i+1) = \frac{1}{2}(M+1)(M+2)$ possible pairs (k, l) with $k, l \geq 0$; $k + l \leq M$.

(2) It is well known (see e.g. [8]) that the group $Aut(F_2)$ is generated by inner automorphisms, by 3 length-preserving automorphisms $\pi : x \to y$, $y \to x$; $\sigma_x : x \to x^{-1}$, $y \to y$; $\sigma_y : x \to x$, $y \to y^{-1}$, and by the following two: $\alpha : x \to xy$, $y \to y$, and $\beta : x \to x$, $y \to yx$. The subgroup H of $Aut(F_2)$ generated by α and β can be mapped onto $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$. Under this epimorphism, α and β correspond to the matrices $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, respectively. The kernel of this epimorphism is generated

(as a normal subgroup) by the inner automorphism induced by the element $[x, y]$; in particular, every automorphism in the kernel is inner.

Furthermore, relations between generators of $Aut(F_k)$ given in [8, Section 3.5, Theorem N1] show that in any product of automorphisms $\alpha^{\pm 1}$, $\beta^{\pm 1}$, π, σ_x, and σ_y, automorphisms $\alpha^{\pm 1}$ and $\beta^{\pm 1}$ can be collected on the right. This, together with the fact that the subgroup of inner automorphisms of F_2 is normal in $Aut(F_2)$, implies that applying an automorphism of F_2 amounts to first applying an automorphism from the subgroup H generated by α and β, then a length-preserving automorphism, and, finally, an inner automorphism.

Therefore, to bound the number of cyclically reduced automorphic images of u with the same non-zero vector (k, l) of exponent sums, it is sufficient to bound the number of matrices from $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ that fix the vector (k, l) acted upon by right multiplication, and then multiply this number by M (the number of cyclic permutations of a word of length M). Furthermore, up to a length-preserving automorphism, every automorphism from the group H corresponds to a matrix from $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ whose elements in the first row are of different signs, say, the element in the upper left corner is non-negative, and the element in the upper right corner is non-positive. (Elements in the first row correspond to the image of x).

(3) Thus, what is left to do now is to count the number of matrices in $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ whose elements in the first row are of different signs, that fix a given non-zero vector (k, l) with $k, l \geq 0$. The computation here is straightforward. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ be a matrix from $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ with $a_{11} \geq 0, a_{12} \leq 0$, which fixes a vector (k, l). Then we have the following system of equations in a_{ij}:

$k \cdot a_{11} + l \cdot a_{21} = k$; $k \cdot a_{12} + l \cdot a_{22} = l$; $a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21} = 1$.

Suppose first that both $k, l \neq 0$. Then from the first equation we get $a_{21} = \frac{k}{l} - \frac{k}{l} \cdot a_{11}$, and from the second equation $a_{22} = 1 - \frac{k}{l} \cdot a_{12}$. Plug this into the third equation and simplify: $l \cdot a_{11} - k \cdot a_{12} = l$. Since $k, l > 0$, $a_{11} \geq 0, a_{12} \leq 0$, this gives either $a_{12} = 0, a_{11} = 1$, or $a_{11} = 0$, $a_{12} = -\frac{l}{k}$. In the former case, we get $a_{22} = 1, a_{21} = 0$. In the latter case, $a_{21} = \frac{k}{l}, a_{11} = 0, a_{22} = 2$.

Now suppose, say, $k = 0$. Then $a_{21} = 0, a_{22} = 1, a_{11} = 1$, whereas a_{12} can be arbitrary. However, we can show that, should the automorphism corresponding to the matrix A preserve the length of u, the absolute value of a_{12} cannot be greater than $2|u|$. Indeed, let $K = a_{12}$; then the automorphism corresponding to the matrix A is α^K, i.e., it takes x to xy^K, y to y. Suppose $K > 2|u|$; we may assume that u has at least one occurence of x. Then $\alpha^K(u)$ has a subword xy^K (before cancellation). Since we have assumed that $\alpha^K(u)$ has the same length as u does, more than half of y^K should cancel out. This implies that, in the word u itself, there is a subword y^{-N} with $N \geq \frac{K+1}{2}$. This is a contradiction since $K > 2|u|$.

Thus, in any of the considered cases, we have no more than $2|u|$ different matrices from $SL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ that fix a given non-zero vector (k, l).

Summarizing the observations (1), (2), (3), we see that the number of cyclically

reduced automorphic images of u of length $M = |u|$ is no more than $c \cdot M^4$ for some constant c independent of u. This completes the proof in the case where $u \notin [F_2, F_2]$.

Now let $u \in [F_2, F_2]$. In this case, we are going to use induction on the length of u. To make the induction work, we are going to prove the following somewhat stronger claim.

Proposition 3.2. Let $u \in [F_2, F_2]$ be cyclically reduced. For any positive integer K, the number of elements $v \in F_2$ such that $v = \phi(u)$ for some $\phi \in Aut(F_2)$ and $|v| = |u| + K$, is less than $c \cdot 3^K \cdot (|u| + K)^4$ for some constant c independent of u and K.

Proof. The basis of induction $u = [x, y]$ is almost obvious. This element is fixed by any automorphism from H (recall that H is the subgroup of $Aut(F_2)$ generated by two automorphisms, $\alpha : x \to xy$, $y \to y$, and $\beta : x \to x$, $y \to yx$), and therefore, to count the number of elements $v \in F_2$ such that $v = \phi(u)$ for some $\phi \in Aut(F_2)$ and $|v| = |u| + K$, we just have to count (up to a length-preserving automorphism) the number of conjugates of u of length up to $|u| + K$. This latter number is no bigger than the number of different elements of length $[K/2]$ in the group F_2, i.e., equals $3^{[K/2]}$.

For the induction step, we first assume that u has a subword of the form $[x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}]$. Then, upon applying a length-preserving automorphism if necessary, we may assume that u has a subword $[x, y]$. Then a cyclic permutation of u has the form $[x, y]w$, with no cancellation between $[x, y]$ and w. Thus, by the remarks in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.2, we may assume that $u = [x, y]w$. Let ϕ be an arbitrary automorphism from H. Recall that every automorphism in H fixes $[x, y]$.

Assume first that w is cyclically reduced. We have two possibilities:

(1) $[x, y]$ is entirely canceled out by $\phi(w)$. Then, since $\phi(u) = [x, y]\phi(w)$, we see that, if $|\phi(u)| = |u| + K$, we must have $|\phi(w)| = |w| + K + 4$. By the inductive assumption, the number of automorphic images of w with this property is no more than $c \cdot 3^{K+4} \cdot |w + K + 4|^4$ for some constant c independent of w and K. Similar result for u now follows.

(2) Only part of $[x, y]$ cancels out (this includes the case where nothing cancels out). Then, since $\phi(u) = [x, y]\phi(w)$ and since an element of the commutator subgroup must have an even length, we see that, if $|\phi(u)| = |u| + K$, then either $|\phi(w)| = |w| + K + 2$, or $|\phi(w)| = |w| + K$. By the inductive assumption, the number of automorphic images of w with this property is no more than $c \cdot 3^{K+2} \cdot |w + K + 2|^4$ (respectively, $c \cdot 3^K \cdot |w + K|^4$) for some constant c independent of w and K. Similar result for u now follows.

If w is not cyclically reduced, i.e., if $u = [x, y]gw'g^{-1}$, then we consider a cyclic permutation of u: $u' = g^{-1}[x, y]gw' = [x^{g^{-1}}, y^{g^{-1}}]w'$, where we can assume w' to be cyclically reduced. Now we apply essentially the same argument to u' as we have just applied to u, upon replacing the subgroup H of automorphisms by the left coset $i_g H$, where i_g is the inner automorphism induced by the element g. (Applying an automorphism from $i_g H$ is equivalent to first applying conjugation by g, and then applying an automorphism from H.)

Since the group of inner automorphisms is normal in $Aut(F_2)$, observation (2) in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1.2 remains valid upon replacing H by $i_g H$. That is, every automorphism from $Aut(F_2)$ is a product of an automorphism from the coset $i_g H$ and an inner automorphism. Since every automorphism from $i_g H$ fixes the element $[x^{g^{-1}}, y^{g^{-1}}]$, the same argument as above completes the proof in this case.

Suppose now that u does not have a subword of the form $[x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}]$, but does have a subword of the form $x^{\pm 1} y^{\pm 1} x^{\mp 1}$. Then, upon applying a length-preserving automorphism if necessary, we may assume that u has a subword xyx^{-1}. Thus, a cyclic permutation of u has the form $xyx^{-1} w$, with no cancellation. Then we can write u as $u = [x, y] y w$. Note that the word yw has smaller length than u does, and we can assume that yw is cyclically reduced, for if it was not, w would end with y^{-1}, and then a cyclic permutation of u would be of the form $y^{-1} xyx^{-1} w' = [y^{-1}, x] w'$, and therefore this case would be reduced to the previous one.

Thus, we can apply the inductive assumption to this word w, and the same argument as above will work in this case as well.

Finally, suppose that u does not have a subword of the form $x^{\pm 1} y^{\pm 1} x^{\mp 1}$. Then u must have a subword of the form $x^{\pm 1} y^k x^{\mp 1}$ for some $k \neq 0, \pm 1$. We can assume, upon applying a length-preserving automorphism and a cyclic permutation if necessary, that $u = xy^k x^{-1} w$, $k > 1$. Then we can write $u = [x, y] y x y^{k-1} x^{-1} w$. Now the word $yxy^{k-1} x^{-1} w$ has the same length as u does, but it has the subword $xy^{k-1} x^{-1}$. Also, we can assume that yw is cyclically reduced, for if it was not, w would end with y^{-1}, and then a cyclic permutation of u would be of the form $y^{-1} xy^k x^{-1} w'$, i.e., it would begin with $y^{-1} xy$, and therefore this case would be reduced to one of the previously considered. An obvious inductive argument now completes the proof. $\square$

4. Primitive elements of F_2

In this section, we give bounds for the total number of primitive elements of a given length m in the group F_2, and a precise number of *cyclically reduced* primitive elements of length m. (Note that the total number of elements of length m in the group F_2 is $\frac{4}{3} \cdot 3^m$).

Proof of Proposition 1.4. Let x and y be generators of F_2.
(a) Suppose m is odd. Then any conjugate of $x^{\pm 1}$, as well as of $y^{\pm 1}$, by an element of length $k = (m-1)/2$, is a primitive element of length m (assuming there are no cancellations in the middle). The number of elements like that in the group F_2 is $2 \cdot 3^{k-1}$, whence the result.

(b) If m is even, then counting conjugates of $x^{\pm 1} y$ and $xy^{\pm 1}$ by elements of length $(m-2)/2$ yields the result.

(c) The result of this part will follow from a well-known fact about primitive elements of F_2 (see [3] or [10]):
– for any pair $\{k, l\}$ of integers with $(k, l) = 1$, there is exactly one cyclically reduced primitive element of F_2 whose exponent sum on x is k and the exponent sum on y is l.

Thus, the number of cyclically reduced primitive elements of F_2 of length m is 8 times the number of pairs $\{k, l\}$ of *positive* integers with $(k, l) = 1$, $k < l$, $k + l = m$. The latter number is obviously equal to $\frac{1}{2}\Phi(m)$, where $\Phi(m)$ is the number of positive integers $< m$ relatively prime to m. $\square$

Acknowledgement

References

[1] G. Baumslag, *On generalised free products*, Math. Z. **78** (1962), 423–438.

[2] M. Bestvina and M. Handel, *Train tracks and automorphisms of free groups*, Ann. of Math. **135** (1992), 1–53.

[3] M. Cohen, W. Metzler and B. Zimmermann, *What does a basis of $F[a, b]$ look like?*, Math. Ann. **257** (1981), 435–445.

[4] D. G. Khramtsov, *Finite groups of automorphisms of free groups*, Math. Notes **38** (1985), 721–724.

[5] G. Levitt, M. Lustig, *Periodic ends, growth rates, Hölder dynamics for automorphisms of free groups*, Comm. Math. Helv. **75** (2000), 415–429.

[6] G. Levitt, J.-L. Nicolas, *On the maximum order of torsion elements in* $\mathrm{GL}(n, Z)$ *and* $\mathrm{Aut}(F_n)$, J. Algebra **208** (1998), 630–642.

[7] R. Lyndon and P. Schupp, *Combinatorial Group Theory*. Reprint of the 1977 edition. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[8] W. Magnus, A. Karrass, and D. Solitar, *Combinatorial Group Theory*, Wiley, New York, 1966.

[9] J. McCool, *A characterization of periodic automorphisms of a free group*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **260** (1980), 309–318.

[10] R. P. Osborne, H. Zieschang, *Primitives in the free group on two generators*, Invent. Math. **63** (1981), 17–24.

[11] J. H. C. Whitehead, *On equivalent sets of elements in a free group*, Ann. of Math. **37** (1936), 782–800.

Department of Mathematics, The City College of New York, New York, NY 10031

e-mail addresses: alexeim@att.net, shpil@groups.sci.ccny.cuny.edu

http://www.grouptheory.info