

Automorphisms of free groups and train tracks

Gilbert Levitt

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Nicolas Oresme
Université de Caen

September 2008

F_n is the free (non-abelian) group of rank n .

For topologists: the fundamental group of a finite graph, or a compact surface with boundary.

In $F_3 = F(a, b, c)$:

Product: $(a^2b^{-1}a^{-3}c^2)(c^{-2}acb^2) = a^2b^{-1}a^{-2}cb^2$

Inverse: $(a^2b^{-1}a^{-3}c^2)^{-1} = c^{-2}a^3ba^{-2}$

We want to understand automorphisms of free groups.

- Individual automorphisms
- The global structure of $Aut(F_n)$ and $Out(F_n) = Aut(F_n)/Inn(F_n)$

A remark for topologists: the natural object associated to a homeomorphism $f : X \rightarrow X$ is $f_* \in Out(\pi_1(X))$.

Dehn-Nielsen: $MCG(\Sigma_g) \simeq Out^+(\pi_1(\Sigma_g))$, with Σ_g the closed orientable surface of genus g .

Two famous results:

- the Scott conjecture (Bestvina-Handel)
- the Tits alternative (Bestvina-Feighn-Handel)

Train tracks (not quite the same as Thurston's) are the basic tool used in the proofs.

The Scott conjecture

$\alpha \in \text{Aut}(F_n)$

Its fixed subgroup is $\text{Fix}(\alpha) = \{g \in F_n \mid \alpha(g) = g\}$.

Theorem (Bestvina-Handel 1992)

$\text{Fix}(\alpha)$ has rank at most n .

In case you're wondering...

Fact

A subgroup of F_n is free (Nielsen-Schreier), but its rank may be $> n$ (even infinite).

Example

The commutator subgroup $[F_2, F_2] = \ker(F_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2)$ has infinite rank.

The Scott conjecture

$\alpha \in \text{Aut}(F_n)$

Its fixed subgroup is $\text{Fix}(\alpha) = \{g \in F_n \mid \alpha(g) = g\}$.

Theorem (Bestvina-Handel 1992)

$\text{Fix}(\alpha)$ has rank at most n .

Example

$a \mapsto a$

$b \mapsto ba$

$\text{Fix}(\alpha) = \langle a, bab^{-1} \rangle$

Check: $bab^{-1} \mapsto ba a a^{-1}b^{-1} = bab^{-1}$

Similar results:

- Free abelian groups
If $\alpha \in GL(n, \mathbb{Z}) = \text{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}^n)$, then $\text{Fix}(\alpha) \simeq \mathbb{Z}^p$ with $p \leq n$.
- Surface groups
Let $G = \pi_1(\Sigma_g)$, and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ be induced by a homeomorphism $f : \Sigma_g \rightarrow \Sigma_g$.
Nielsen: $\text{Fix}(\alpha)$ is cyclic or is the fundamental group of an incompressible subsurface.
In particular, $\text{Fix}(\alpha)$ is free of rank $\leq 2g$ if $\alpha \neq id$.
Dehn-Nielsen: every automorphism of G is induced by a homeomorphism of Σ_g .

- Nielsen's theorem about $Fix(\alpha)$ also applies to homeomorphisms of a compact surface Σ with boundary (Jaco-Shalen 1977).

In this case $\pi_1(\Sigma) \simeq F_n$ with $n = 1 - \chi(\Sigma)$, and $Fix(\alpha)$ has rank $\leq n$.

Example: Dehn twist on a punctured torus

The Tits alternative

Theorem (Tits 1972)

If $H \subset GL(n, \mathbb{C})$, then either H contains F_2 or H is virtually solvable.

virtually solvable = has a solvable subgroup of finite index

Theorem (Ivanov, Birman-Lubotzky-McCarthy 1983)

If $H \subset MCG(\Sigma_g)$, then either H contains F_2 or H is virtually abelian.

The proof uses Nielsen-Thurston theory: the classification of individual elements of $MCG(\Sigma_g)$.

Theorem (Bestvina-Feighn-Handel 2000)

If $H \subset \text{Out}(F_n)$, then either H contains F_2 or H is virtually abelian.

- The proof is muuuch harder, because there is no Jordan form or Nielsen-Thurston classification for automorphisms of F_n .
- The best replacement (so far) is **Train tracks** (relative, improved, completely split, β -train tracks)
- Much of the work on automorphisms of free groups is motivated by analogies with linear groups and mapping class groups.

Geometric automorphisms

Definition

$\Phi \in \text{Out}(F_n)$ is *geometric* if $\Phi = f_*$, where Σ is a compact surface with $\pi_1(\Sigma) \simeq F_n$ and $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ is a homeomorphism.

Example (n=2)

Every $\Phi \in \text{Out}(F_2)$ is geometric, realized on a punctured torus.

$$\text{Out}(F_2) = \text{Out}(\mathbb{Z}^2) = \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) = \widehat{\text{MCG}}(T^2 \setminus \{*\}).$$

Up to isotopy, f is

- of finite order
- (a root of) a Dehn twist
- pseudo-Anosov.

A simple pseudo-Anosov map

$A = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ has eigenvalues $\frac{1}{\lambda} < 1 < \lambda$. It acts on \mathbb{R}^2 with two invariant foliations (by lines parallel to the eigenvectors).

If K is compact, then $A^N(K)$ looks like a very thin segment of length $\sim \lambda^N$ for N large.

A induces a homeomorphism \bar{A} of the torus $T^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$. Images by \bar{A}^N are almost dense in T^2 .

Removing the fixed point and adding a boundary yields a pseudo-Anosov homeomorphism on a punctured torus.

Nielsen-Thurston theory

Nielsen-Thurston in general: a power of $f : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$ is isotopic to a homeomorphism f' with the following property:

it preserves a decomposition of Σ into subsurfaces such that on each subsurface the restriction of f' is

- the identity
- a Dehn twist on an annulus
- pseudo-Anosov.

For $n \geq 3$, not every automorphism of F_n is geometric.

Example

$a \mapsto a$
 $b \mapsto ba$
 $c \mapsto cb$

is not
geometric.

Why?

Iterate c :

$c \mapsto cb \mapsto cbba \mapsto cbbaba^2 \mapsto cbbaba^2ba^3 \mapsto \dots$ grows quadratically.

If $\Phi = f_*$, the growth of (the conjugacy class of) c is the growth of a closed curve under iteration of f , hence linear or exponential.

Automorphisms of finite order

If Γ is a finite graph with $\pi_1(\Gamma) \simeq F_n$, any symmetry $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ induces $f_* \in \text{Out}(F_n)$ of finite order.

Example

If Γ is a “Theta graph” Θ , then $\text{Sym}(\Gamma)$ is a subgroup of order 12 of $\text{Out}(F_2) \simeq \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ (which does not lift to $\text{Aut}(F_2)$).

Theorem (Zimmermann, Culler, Khramtsov)

Every finite subgroup $F \subset \text{Out}(F_n)$ is realized on a finite graph Γ .

Corollary

For a given n , there are finitely many conjugacy classes of finite subgroups of $Out(F_n)$.

Corollary (Dyer-Scott)

If $\alpha \in Aut(F_n)$ has finite order, then $Fix(\alpha)$ is cyclic or is a free factor of F_n .

In particular, $Fix(\alpha)$ has rank $\leq n$.

Idea of proof: $Fix(\alpha)$ is a free factor because it is the fundamental group of a subgraph of Γ .

Towards train tracks

Every $\Phi \in Out(F_n)$ is represented by a map f (a homotopy equivalence, but not a homeomorphism) on a rose (wedge of circles).

The petals are labelled by the generators of F_n .

In all previous examples, the automorphism α was positive: there were no a^{-1}, b^{-1}, c^{-1} in images of generators.

Consequence: no cancellation when computing $\alpha^P(a), \alpha^P(b), \alpha^P(c)$.

Geometrically: no cancellation in $f^P(\text{edge})$.

But cancellation occurs in iterated images of other words.

Example

$$a \mapsto aba$$

$$b \mapsto ba$$

$$aba^{-1}b^{-1} \mapsto ab \mathbf{a} \mathbf{ba} \mathbf{a^{-1}b^{-1}a^{-1}} a^{-1}b^{-1} = aba^{-1}b^{-1}$$

This is unavoidable. But we would like to have the non-cancellation property on generators (edges) for general automorphisms.

This is the basic idea behind train tracks: [represent \$\Phi\$ by a map on a graph whose cancellation is as controlled as possible.](#)

Applying this idea to surface homeomorphisms leads to a quick algorithmic proof of Nielsen-Thurston (and an invariant train track à la Thurston in the pseudo-Anosov case).

An example

Example

$$a \mapsto c$$

$$b \mapsto c^{-1}a$$

$$c \mapsto c^{-1}b \mapsto b^{-1}c \mathbf{c^{-1}} a$$

$c^{-1}b$ is an **illegal turn**.

The previous example had plenty of illegal turns, for instance ab^{-1} . The problem is that $c^{-1}b$ appears in the image of c .

Answer to the problem: fold.

- We get a map f_1 on a graph Γ_1 with 4 edges a, b_1, c_1, d

$$a \mapsto dc_1$$

$$b_1 \mapsto a$$

$$c_1 \mapsto db_1$$

$$d \mapsto c^{-1}d^{-1}$$
- Γ_1 has 2 vertices, no preferred basepoint.
 f_1 represents Φ via $\pi_1(\Gamma_1) \simeq F_3$.
- Are we done? Or is there cancellation in iterated images of edges?
- The image of a contains the illegal turn dc_1 , so we fold again.

- We get a map f_2 on a graph Γ_2 with 5 edges a, b_1, c_2, d_2, e .
$$a \mapsto d_2c_2$$

$$b_1 \mapsto a$$

$$c_2 \mapsto b_1$$

$$d_2 \mapsto c_2^{-1}e^{-1}$$

$$e \mapsto d_2e^{-1}$$
- After collapsing e , we get a train track map f' .
$$a' \mapsto d'c'$$

$$b' \mapsto d'^{-1}a'$$

$$c' \mapsto b'$$

$$d' \mapsto c'^{-1}$$

Definition

$f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is a train track map if:

- 1 Γ is a finite graph (with no vertex of valence 1)
- 2 f maps a vertex to a vertex, an edge to a non-trivial edge-path
- 3 for $p \geq 1$, there is no cancellation in $f^p(\text{edge})$

f represents $\Phi \in \text{Out}(F_n)$ if there is an isomorphism $j : \pi_1(\Gamma) \simeq F_n$ such that $j \circ f_* = \Phi \circ j$ (everything is up to inner automorphisms).

Example

f' as above, the obvious map on the rose for positive automorphisms.

The important condition is 3 (no cancellation).

Maps satisfying 1 and 2 are called topological representatives.

f, f_1, f_2 were topological representatives.

Every Φ has a topological representative (on a rose).

Why do train tracks exist?

They don't always exist.

What always exists is a relative train track.

One tries to construct a train track by folding and cleaning up a topological representative (as before). Why should it stop?

Key ideas (Bestvina-Handel):

- A topological representative has a transition matrix, with spectral radius $\lambda \geq 1$.
- λ cannot increase during the process.
- λ belongs to a discrete set, so can only take finitely many values.
- When λ is minimal, one gets a train track map or a reduction (in a sense to be defined).

In particular:

Theorem

Any irreducible automorphism has a train track representative.

Reducible automorphisms have [relative train track representatives](#).

Surface homeomorphisms

These ideas apply to surface homeomorphisms (creating a puncture and using a spine).

- A reduction gives a periodic subsurface. The map is reducible (in Thurston's sense).
- In the irreducible case, the map has finite order (if $\lambda = 1$), is pseudo-Anosov (if $\lambda > 1$).

The transition matrix

A topological representative f has a transition matrix M , which records how many times the image of the i -th edge crosses the j -th edge (in either direction).

$$f : \begin{cases} a \mapsto c \\ b \mapsto c^{-1}a \\ c \mapsto c^{-1}b \end{cases} \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$f' : \begin{cases} a' \mapsto d'c' \\ b' \mapsto d'^{-1}a' \\ c' \mapsto b' \\ d' \mapsto c'^{-1} \end{cases} \quad M' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The ℓ^1 -norm of a column is the length of the image of the corresponding edge.

Perron-Frobenius theory

Let M be a non-negative integral square matrix.

- M has an eigenvalue $\lambda \in \{0\} \cup [1, \infty)$, such that every eigenvalue μ satisfies $|\mu| \leq \lambda$.
- If v is a positive vector, then $\|M^p(v)\|^{1/p} \rightarrow \lambda$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ (exponential growth rate).

λ is called the **Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue**, or largest eigenvalue, or spectral radius.

Given d , the set of Perron-Frobenius eigenvalues of matrices of size d is discrete

because the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial may be bounded in terms of λ and d .

λ does not increase

$$f : \begin{cases} a \mapsto c \\ b \mapsto c^{-1}a \\ c \mapsto c^{-1}b \end{cases} \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda$$

$$f' : \begin{cases} a' \mapsto d'c' \\ b' \mapsto d'^{-1}a' \\ c' \mapsto b' \\ d' \mapsto c'^{-1} \end{cases} \quad M' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \lambda'$$

Claim: λ does not increase during the “fold and clean up” process.
In particular, $\lambda' \leq \lambda$.

Suppose that $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ and $f' : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma'$ both represent Φ , with f' a train track map. Then $\lambda' \leq \lambda$.

In particular, any two train track maps give rise to the same λ .

Idea (on the example).

- The loops a and a' represent the same element of F_3 , so have similar growth under iteration of f (resp. f').
- λ represents the growth rate of a if we don't do the cancellations, so is an upper bound for the actual growth rate.
- λ' represents the actual growth rate of a' because there is no cancellation. So $\lambda' \leq \lambda$.

In general:

- Let e_i be the i -th edge of Γ . The ℓ^1 -norm of the i -th column of M^p is the length of $f^p(e_i)$, before cancellation.
- It has exponential growth rate at most λ , and there is an edge e_{i_0} for which it equals λ .
- In particular, the exponential growth rate of any $|f_{\#}^p(e_i)|$ (after cancellation) is at most λ . But it may be smaller for every i , even i_0 , because of cancellation...
unless f is a train track map,

- Since f' is a train track map, there is an edge $e' \subset \Gamma'$ such that the actual length $|f'^p(e')|$ (after cancellation) has growth rate λ' .
- In fact, there is a loop γ' such that $|f'^p(\gamma')|$ has growth rate λ' . (In the case of f_3 , we can take γ' to be the loop $a \subset \Gamma_3$).
- γ' represents an element (or conjugacy class) g of F_3 whose growth rate under Φ is that of γ' under f' , namely λ' .
- But g is represented by a loop $\gamma \subset \Gamma$, and the growth rate of g is bounded by the growth rate of γ under f , hence by λ . Thus $\lambda' \leq \lambda$. □

Back to the “fold and clean up” process.

If f is arbitrary and f' is a train track map, $\lambda - \lambda'$ measures the amount of cancellation that takes place in f . Since the process is designed to reduce cancellation, λ cannot increase.

By discreteness, we reach a point where λ cannot change anymore.

But this does not mean that we have a train track map.

Example

$$\begin{aligned}a &\mapsto aba \\ b &\mapsto ba \\ c &\mapsto caba^{-1}b^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

View this as a map f on the rose. The matrix $M = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} 2 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right)$ is block-triangular. It has the same Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue as $\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

This eigenvalue is the exponential growth rate of a , so it cannot be decreased. There is no train track representative: the cancellation in $f^2(c)$ won't go away.

The subgraph consisting of the first two petals is f -invariant. Algebraically, we get an invariant free factor $\langle a, b \rangle$.

Definition

An automorphism is **reducible** if there is a periodic free factor (different from F_n and the trivial group).

The process yields a map with λ minimal. Such a map is a **train track map** or shows a **reduction** (a non-trivial periodic subgraph).

We get:

Theorem

Any irreducible automorphism admits a train track representative.

These ideas apply to surface homeomorphisms (creating a puncture and using a spine).

- A reduction gives a periodic subsurface. The complementary subsurface is also periodic, and the map is reducible (in Thurston's sense).
- In the irreducible case, the map has finite order (if $\lambda = 1$), is pseudo-Anosov with dilation factor λ (if $\lambda > 1$).

Reducible automorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} a &\mapsto aba \\ b &\mapsto ba \\ c &\mapsto caba^{-1}b^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad \text{is reducible.}$$

$\langle a, b \rangle$ is an invariant free factor. But there is no invariant complementary free factor: one cannot write $F_3 = G_1 * G_2$ with G_1 and G_2 invariant.

This is a key difference with the surface case: if a surface homeomorphism is reducible, Σ is the union of two invariant subsurfaces.

Unlike in the surface case, it is not true that every automorphism can be built out of irreducible ones. This is a major problem.

Compare representation theory: a *unitary* representation is a direct sum of irreducible representations (if V is invariant, so is V^\perp). But this is not true in general.

Towards relative train tracks

In other words, we cannot stop once we've found a reduction, so let's keep going.

If there is a reduction, the matrix becomes block-triangular after raising f to a power and reordering edges.

Do this so as to get as many blocks as possible. For instance, replace $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ by its square $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Strata

$$\begin{array}{l} a \mapsto aba \\ b \mapsto ba \\ c \mapsto caba^{-1}b^{-1} \end{array} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & | & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & | & 2 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & | & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

- The block-triangular structure partitions the set of edges into **strata** (one stratum per block). In the example, there are two strata: one contains a and b , the other c .
- The set of strata is linearly ordered: the c stratum is higher than the (a, b) -stratum. The image of an edge cannot contain edges from a higher stratum.

$$\begin{array}{l} a \mapsto a \\ b \mapsto ba \\ c \mapsto cb \end{array} \quad \text{has 3 strata}$$

What about cancellation?

In the first example, there is no cancellation in the iterated images of a and b .

There is some in the images of c :

$$c \mapsto caba^{-1}b^{-1} \mapsto caba^{-1}b^{-1}ababaa^{-1}b^{-1}a^{-1}a^{-1}b^{-1}.$$

But all cancellation takes place in the stratum below c .

Relative train track maps (slightly simplified definition)

Definition

$f : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is a relative train track map if:

- 1 Γ is a finite graph, with edges grouped into strata H_1, H_2, \dots, H_r
- 2 f maps a vertex to a vertex, an edge to a non-trivial edge-path
- 3 the image of an edge in H_j contains no edge from a higher stratum H_k with $k > j$
- 4 given an edge $e \subset H_j$ and $p \geq 1$, all cancellation in $f^p(e)$ takes place in lower strata H_k with $k < j$

Theorem (Bestvina-Handel)

Given $\Phi \in \text{Out}(F_n)$, some power of Φ has a relative train track representative.

The proof uses moves as in the absolute case, but one has to decrease all Perron-Frobenius eigenvalues...

Having a relative train track map makes it possible to prove results by induction, from the lowest stratum up.

An application

Train tracks are a basic tool in the study of automorphisms of free groups. Here is a baby application.

Theorem

Given $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(F_n)$ and $g \in F_n$, the length of $\alpha^p(g)$ grows like $\lambda^p p^m$ for some $\lambda \geq 1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, as $p \rightarrow \infty$.

“Grows like” means the ratio is bounded away from 0 and ∞ .

The theorem is better stated in terms of conjugacy classes.

I do not know how to prove the theorem without improved relative train tracks.

(Improved train tracks were introduced by Bestvina-Feighn-Handel in the first of their Tits papers.)

The problem, of course, is cancellation: if there is no cancellation, $\alpha^p(g)$ grows like entries of M^p , as if the group were abelian.

The theorem is true in free abelian groups. What can be said in a general finitely generated (finitely presented) group?

Examples

We have seen that the growth is linear or exponential if α is geometric (represented by a surface homeomorphism). We have seen quadratic growth. Here is an example with growth $p\lambda^p$.

Start with

$$a \mapsto aba$$

$$b \mapsto ba$$

$$c \mapsto cdc$$

$$d \mapsto dc$$

There are two strata, whose order is arbitrary. All four generators have the same growth λ^p under iteration of the map.

$a \mapsto aba$
 $b \mapsto ba$
 $c \mapsto cdc$ **a**
 $d \mapsto dc$

c and d grow like $p\lambda^p$.

More generally, one may achieve growth $p^k \lambda^p$ in F_{2k+2} .

It is important for this example that both strata have the same eigenvalue $\lambda_{ab} = \lambda_{cd}$.

Otherwise c grows like λ_{ab}^p if $\lambda_{ab} > \lambda_{cd}$, like λ_{cd}^p if $\lambda_{ab} < \lambda_{cd}$.

Proof of the growth theorem

If f is a relative train track map, the transition matrix M is block-triangular. Each diagonal block M_j corresponds to a stratum H_j .

Since we have created as many blocks as possible, there are only two possibilities (three, actually):

- M_j is a positive matrix of size ≥ 2 with eigenvalue $\lambda > 1$: exponential stratum
- M_j is a single 1: polynomial (NEG, parabolic) stratum. It consists of a single edge.

Definition

$\gamma = \gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2$ is a **splitting** if $f_{\#}^p(\gamma) = f_{\#}^p(\gamma_1) \cdot f_{\#}^p(\gamma_2)$ for every $p \geq 1$.

$f_{\#}$ denotes the tightened image (after cancellations).

In words: γ_1 and γ_2 don't interact when we apply powers of f .

In particular, if γ_1 or γ_2 becomes long, so does γ . If we know the growth of γ_1 and γ_2 , we know that of γ .

Selected properties of improved relative train track maps

Exponential strata

- If e belongs to an exponential stratum H_j , then $f(e)$ splits into edges of H_j and lower paths δ_i . (lower = contained in strata H_k with $k < j$)
- No $f_{\#}^p(\delta_i)$ is trivial.

It follows that $f_{\#}^p(e)$ splits into edges of H_j and lower paths $f_{\#}^q(\delta_i)$ with $q < p$.

The δ_i 's appear in the image by f of an edge of H_j , so they belong to a finite set.

Polynomial strata

- If e is a polynomial stratum, then $f(e)$ splits as $f(e) = e \cdot u$ with u a loop in strata lower than e .
- If u is non-trivial, no $f_{\#}^p(u)$ is trivial.

It follows that $f_{\#}^2(e)$ splits as $e \cdot u \cdot f_{\#}(u)$, etc.

This implies splitting for images of arbitrary paths.

Splitting lemma

Given an edge-path γ of height j , there exists p_0 such that $f_{\#}^{p_0}(\gamma)$ splits into:

- Edges of H_j .
- Paths lower than H_j .
- Paths whose growth is at most linear (Nielsen paths, exceptional paths).

(The **height** of γ is the index of the highest stratum that it meets.)

Nielsen path

$$\begin{aligned} a &\mapsto aba \\ b &\mapsto ba \end{aligned}$$

$aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ is a Nielsen path

Exceptional path

$$\begin{aligned} a &\mapsto a \\ b &\mapsto ba^2 \\ c &\mapsto ca \end{aligned}$$

bc^{-1} is an exceptional path

These paths don't split, but we don't care since we know their growth.

To show that elements (or conjugacy classes) of F_n grow like some $\lambda^p p^m$ under α , we show that any path (loop) γ has this type of growth under f . The proof is by induction on the height of γ .

Since we understand the growth of lower paths by induction, the splitting lemma implies that we only have to understand the growth of an edge e . There are two cases.

- If e is a polynomial stratum H_j , then $f(e) = e.u$ with u of height $< j$, and $f_{\#}^p(e) = e.u.f_{\#}(u).f_{\#}^2(u) \dots f_{\#}^{p-1}(u)$. By induction, we know how u grows.
 - If u grows exponentially, e has the same growth.
 - If u grows as a polynomial of degree m , then e grows as a polynomial of degree $m + 1$.

- If e is in an exponential stratum H_j , then $f_{\#}^p(e)$ consists of
 - edges of H_j
 - lower paths $f_{\#}^q(\delta_i)$, where $q < p$ and δ_i is a lower path which appears in $f(e')$ for some e' in H_j .

There are only finitely many types of δ_i 's, and by induction we know how they grow.

When we apply powers of f to e , two things happen.

- The number of edges in H_j grows.
- Lower paths appear and grow.

In $f_{\#}^p(e)$, the number of edges in H_j is $\sim \lambda_j^p$, where λ_j is the eigenvalue of H_j .

Passing from $f_{\#}^q(e)$ to $f_{\#}^{q+1}(e)$ creates $\sim \lambda_j^q$ lower paths δ_i .

The growth of e depends on comparing the growth of the δ_i 's to λ_j^p .

- If every δ_i has growth $< \lambda_j^p$, then e grows like λ_j^p (as if there were no δ_i 's).
- If some δ_i has exponential growth rate $> \lambda_j$, then e grows like the fastest-growing δ_i (what matters is how the δ_i 's grow, not how fast they are created).
- If the fastest growth of a δ_i is $\lambda_j^p p^m$, then e grows like $\lambda_j^p p^{m+1}$ (the rate of growth and the rate of creation both matter). \square

Attracting laminations

Given $\Phi \in \text{Out}(F_n)$, (relative) train track representatives are not unique. But they have certain features in common.

In particular, the number of exponential strata and their λ 's only depend on Φ . In fact, each exponential stratum gives rise to an attracting lamination, a set of unordered pairs of distinct elements of $\partial F_n \times \partial F_n$. These laminations are intrinsic.

The interpretation in the surface case is the following. Let f be a pseudo-Anosov homeomorphism on Σ_g . It has an attracting (stable) lamination. Lift it to the universal covering of Σ , the Poincaré disc. Every geodesic defines a pair of points on the circle at infinity, which is the boundary of $\pi_1(\Sigma_g)$.

There are bounds for certain numerical invariants attached to Φ .

We have seen that elements of F_n grow like $\lambda^p p^m$. The degree m is bounded by $\frac{n}{2} - 1$ if $\lambda > 1$, as in the example given above. If the growth is polynomial ($\lambda = 1$), the degree is bounded by n for elements of F_n , by $n - 1$ for conjugacy classes.

The number of exponential strata is at most $\lceil \frac{3n-2}{4} \rceil$ (L.-Lustig). This bound is achieved by geometric automorphisms induced by homeomorphisms whose Nielsen-Thurston reduction consists of pseudo-Anosov maps on once-punctured tori and four-punctured spheres.

References

- The original Bestvina-Handel paper: Annals of Maths, 1992
Application to surfaces: BH, Topology, 1995
- Bogopolski's book: Introduction to group theory, EMS
textbooks in mathematics 2008
- Surveys about automorphisms of free groups:
Vogtmann: Automorphisms of free groups and outer space
Bridson-Vogtmann: Automorphism groups of free groups,
surface groups and free abelian groups
- Catherine Pfaff's notes from a short course I gave at MSRI,
available from <http://www.math.cornell.edu/~vogtmann/>
- The growth theorem is proved in the appendix of
arXiv:0801.4844.