

## A weak Zassenhaus Lemma for discrete subgroups of $\text{Diff}(I)$

AZER AKHMEDOV

We prove a weaker version of the Zassenhaus Lemma for subgroups of  $\text{Diff}(I)$ . We also show that a group with commutator subgroup containing a non-Abelian free subsemigroup does not admit a  $C_0$ -discrete faithful representation in  $\text{Diff}(I)$ .

37C05; 20F65

In this paper, we continue our study of discrete subgroups of  $\text{Diff}_+(I)$ ; the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of the closed interval  $I = [0, 1]$ . Following recent trends, we try to view the group  $\text{Diff}_+(I)$  as an analogue of a Lie group, and we study still basic questions about discrete subgroups of it. This paper can be viewed as a continuation of Akhmedov [1] although the proofs of the results of this paper are independent of [1].

Throughout the paper, the letter  $G$  will denote the group  $\text{Diff}_+(I)$ . Assume  $G$  has the metric induced by the standard norm of the Banach space  $C^1[0, 1]$ . We will denote this metric by  $d_1$ . Sometimes, we also will consider the metric on  $G$  that comes from the standard sup norm  $\|f\|_0 = \sup_{x \in [0, 1]} |f(x)|$  of  $C[0, 1]$ , which we will denote by  $d_0$ . However, unless specified, the metric in all the groups  $\text{Diff}_+^r(I)$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $r \geq 1$  will be assumed to be  $d_1$ .

The central theme of the paper is the Zassenhaus Lemma. This lemma states that in a connected Lie group  $H$  there exists an open non-empty neighborhood  $U$  of the identity such that any discrete subgroup generated by elements from  $U$  is nilpotent (see Raghunathan [6]). For example, if  $H$  is a simple Lie group (such as  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ ), and  $\Gamma \leq H$  is a lattice, then  $\Gamma$  cannot be generated by elements too close to the identity.

In this paper we prove weak versions of the Zassenhaus Lemma for the group  $G = \text{Diff}_+(I)$ . Our study leads us to showing that finitely generated groups with exponential growth that satisfy a very mild condition do not admit faithful  $C_0$ -discrete representations in  $G$ :

**Theorem A** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of  $G$ , and  $f, g \in [\Gamma, \Gamma]$  such that  $f$  and  $g$  generate a non-Abelian free subsemigroup. Then  $\Gamma$  is not  $C_0$ -discrete.*

We also study the Zassenhaus Lemma for the relatives of  $G$  such as  $\text{Diff}_+^{1+c}(I)$ ,  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $c > 0$ ; the group of orientation-preserving diffeomorphisms of regularity  $1 + c$ . In the case of  $\text{Diff}_+^{1+c}[0, 1]$ , combining Theorem A with the results of [3], we show that  $C_0$ -discrete subgroups are more rare.

**Theorem B** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a  $C_0$ -discrete subgroup of  $\text{Diff}_+^{1+c}[0, 1]$ . Then  $\Gamma$  is solvable with solvability degree at most  $k(c)$ .*

Theorem B can be strengthened if the regularity is increased further; combining Theorem A with the results of Navas [3], Plante and Thurston [5] and Szekeres [7] we obtain the following:

**Theorem C** *If  $\Gamma$  is  $C_0$ -discrete subgroup of  $\text{Diff}_+^2[0, 1]$  then  $\Gamma$  is meta-Abelian.*

It follows from the results of [1], as remarked there, that the Zassenhaus Lemma does not hold either for  $\text{Diff}_+(I)$  or for  $\text{Homeo}_+(I)$  in metrics  $d_1$  and  $d_0$  respectively.

In the increased regularity the lemma still fails: given an arbitrary open neighborhood  $U$  of the identity diffeomorphism in  $G$ , it is easy to find two  $C^\infty$  “bump functions” in  $U$  that generate a discrete group isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z} \wr \mathbb{Z}$ ; thus the lemma fails for  $\text{Diff}_+^\infty(I)$ .

Because of the failure of the lemma, it is natural to consider strongly discrete subgroups, which we have defined in [1]. Indeed, for strongly discrete subgroups, we are able to obtain positive results that are natural substitutes for the Zassenhaus Lemma.

Let us recall the definition of strongly discrete subgroup from [1]:

**Definition 1** Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of  $\text{Diff}_+(I)$ .  $\Gamma$  is called *strongly discrete* if there exists  $C > 0$  and  $x_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $|g'(x_0) - 1| > C$  for all  $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ . Similarly, we say  $\Gamma$  is  *$C_0$ -strongly discrete* if  $|g(x_0) - x_0| > C$  for all  $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ .

Let us note that a strongly discrete subgroup of  $G$  is discrete, and a  $C_0$ -strongly discrete subgroup of  $G$  is  $C_0$ -discrete.

For the convenience of the reader, let us recall several basic notions on the growth of groups: if  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated group, and  $S$  a finite generating set, we will define  $\omega(\Gamma, S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n]{|B_n(1; S, \Gamma)|}$ , where  $B_n(1; S, \Gamma)$  denotes the ball of radius  $n$  around the identity element. (Often we will denote this ball simply by  $B_n(1)$ .) We will also write  $\omega(\Gamma) = \inf_{|S| < \infty, \langle S \rangle = \Gamma} \omega(\Gamma, S)$ , where the infimum is taken over all finite generating sets  $S$  of  $\Gamma$ . If  $\omega(\Gamma) > 1$  then one says that  $\Gamma$  has uniform exponential growth.

Now we are ready to state weak versions of the Zassenhaus Lemma for the group  $G$ . First, we state a theorem about  $C_0$ -strongly discrete subgroups.

**Theorem 2** *Let  $\omega > 1$ . Then there exists an open non-empty neighborhood  $U$  of the identity  $1 \in \text{Diff}_+^1[0, 1]$  such that if  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated  $C_0$ -strongly discrete subgroup of  $\text{Diff}_+^1[0, 1]$  with  $\omega(\Gamma) \geq \omega$ , then  $\Gamma$  cannot be generated by elements from  $U$ .*

By increasing the regularity, we can prove a similar version for strongly discrete subgroups

**Theorem 3** *Let  $\omega > 1$ . Then there exists an open non-empty neighborhood  $U$  of the identity  $1 \in \text{Diff}_+^1[0, 1]$  such that if  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated strongly discrete subgroup of  $\text{Diff}_+^2[0, 1]$  with  $\omega(\Gamma) \geq \omega$ , then  $\Gamma$  cannot be generated by elements from  $U$ .*

**Remark 4** In regard to the Zassenhaus Lemma, it is interesting to ask a reverse question, ie, given an arbitrary open neighborhood  $U$  of the identity in  $G$ , is it true that any finitely generated torsion free nilpotent group  $\Gamma$  admits a faithful discrete representation in  $G$  generated by elements from  $U$ ? In Farb and Franks [2], it is proved that any such  $\Gamma$  does admit a faithful representation into  $G$  generated by diffeomorphisms from  $U$ . Also, it is proved in Navas [4] that any finitely generated nilpotent subgroup of  $G$  indeed can be conjugated to a subgroup generated by elements from  $U$ .

**Remark 5** Because of the assumptions about uniform exponential growth in Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, it is natural to ask whether or not every finitely generated subgroup of  $G$  of exponential growth has uniformly exponential growth. This question has already been raised in [3].

## Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Andrés Navas for his remarks and for bringing [4] to our attention. We also would like to thank the two anonymous referees for many helpful remarks and suggestions.

## Proofs of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3

**Proof of Theorem 2** We can choose  $\lambda > 1$  such that  $\lambda < \omega(\Gamma)$ . Then the cardinality of the sphere of radius  $n$  of  $\Gamma$  with respect to any fixed finite generating set is bigger than the exponential function  $\lambda^n$ , for infinitely many  $n$ .

Then let  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $(1 - 10\epsilon)\lambda > 1$ . We let  $U$  be the  $\epsilon$ -neighborhood of the identity in  $G$  with respect to  $d_1$  metric (we always assume  $d_1$  metric in  $G$  unless otherwise stated).

Let  $\Gamma$  be generated by finitely many non-trivial diffeomorphisms  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_s \in U$ . We fix this generating set and denote it by  $S$ , ie,  $S = \{f_1, f_1^{-1}, \dots, f_s, f_s^{-1}\}$ .

We want to prove that  $\Gamma$  is not  $C_0$ -strongly discrete. Assuming the opposite, let  $x_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that for some  $C > 0$ ,  $|g(x_0) - x_0| > C$  for all  $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ .

Let  $B_n(1)$  be the ball of radius  $n$  around the identity in the Cayley graph of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $S$ . Then  $\text{Card}(B_n(1) \setminus B_{n-1}(1)) > \lambda^n$  for infinitely many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $A$  denote the set of all such  $n$ .

Let  $\Delta$  be a closed subinterval of  $(0, 1)$  of length less than  $C$  such that  $x_0$  is the left end of  $\Delta$ .

We denote the right-invariant Cayley metric of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $S$  by  $|\cdot|$ . For all  $g \in \Gamma$ , let  $\Delta_g = g(\Delta)$ . Thus we have a collection  $\{\Delta_g\}_{g \in G}$  of closed subintervals of  $(0, 1)$ .

Notice that if  $g = sw, s \in S$  then by mean value theorem,  $|\Delta_{sw}| > (1 - 10\epsilon)|s(\Delta_w)|$ . Then, necessarily, for all  $n \in A$ , we have  $\sum_{|g|=n} |\Delta_g| > (1 - 10\epsilon)^n \lambda^n |\Delta| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Then there exist  $g_1, g_2 \in \Gamma, g_1 \neq g_2$  such that  $g_2(x_0) \in \Delta_{g_1}$ . Then  $g_1^{-1}g_2(x_0) \in \Delta$ . Since  $|\Delta| < C$ , we obtain a contradiction. □

Now we prove a better result by assuming higher regularity for the representation.

**Proof of Theorem 3** Let  $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$  be constants such that  $1 < \lambda < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \omega(\Gamma)$ . Then the cardinality of the sphere of radius  $n$  of  $\Gamma$  with respect to any fixed finite generating set is bigger than the exponential function  $\lambda_2^n$ , for infinitely many  $n$ .

We choose  $\epsilon > 0, \eta > 0$  to be such that  $1 < \eta < \frac{\lambda}{1+\epsilon}$  and  $\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} < \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda}$ . Let  $U$  be the ball of radius  $\epsilon$  around the identity diffeomorphism.

We again assume that  $\Gamma$  is generated by finitely many non-trivial diffeomorphisms  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_s \in U$ , and we fix the generating set  $S = \{f_1, f_1^{-1}, \dots, f_s, f_s^{-1}\}$ . Let  $B_n(1)$  be the ball of radius  $n$  around the identity in the Cayley graph of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $S$ . Then we have  $\text{Card}(B_n(1) \setminus B_{n-1}(1)) > \lambda_2^n$  for infinitely many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $A$  denote the set of all such  $n$ .

We need to show that  $\Gamma$  is not strongly discrete. Assuming the opposite, let  $x_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that for some  $C > 0$ ,  $|g'(x_0) - 1| > C$  for all  $g \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ .

Let  $C_1$  be a positive number such that

$$1 - C < (1 - C_1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 + C > (1 + C_1)^2.$$

Let also  $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any  $n \geq N_1$ , we have

$$1 - C_1 < \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right)^n < \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right)^n < 1 + C_1.$$

Notice that for all  $n \in A$ ,  $g \in B_n(1) \setminus B_{n-1}(1)$ , and  $x \in [0, 1]$ , we have  $(1 - \epsilon)^n < g'(x) < (1 + \epsilon)^n$ . Since  $\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} < \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda}$ , there exists  $n \in A$  and  $g_1, g_2 \in \Gamma$  such that

$$n > N_1, \quad g_1 \neq g_2, \quad |g_1| = |g_2| = n$$

but

$$|g_1(x_0) - g_2(x_0)| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^n} (\star_1) \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - C_1 < \frac{g'_1(x_0)}{g'_2(x_0)} < 1 + C_1 (\star_2).$$

Indeed, by the pigeonhole principle, for all  $n \in A$ , there exists  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, [\lambda^n]\}$  such that

$$\text{Card}\left\{g \in B_n(1) \setminus B_{n-1}(1) \mid g(x_0) \in \left[\frac{j}{\lambda^n}, \frac{j+1}{\lambda^n}\right)\right\} \geq \frac{\lambda_2^n}{\lambda^n + 1}.$$

For all  $n \in A$ ,  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, [\lambda^n]\}$ , let

$$D(n, j) = \left\{g \in B_n(1) \setminus B_{n-1}(1) \mid g(x_0) \in \left[\frac{j}{\lambda^n}, \frac{j+1}{\lambda^n}\right)\right\}.$$

Then, for sufficiently big  $n \in A$ , there exists  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, [\lambda^n]\}$  such that

$$\text{Card}(D(n, j)) \geq \frac{\lambda_1^n}{\lambda^n} (\star_3).$$

For all  $n \in A$ , let

$$J(n) = \left\{j \in \{0, 1, \dots, [\lambda^n]\} \mid \text{Card}(D(n, j)) \geq \frac{\lambda_1^n}{\lambda^n}\right\}.$$

Recall also that for all  $g \in D(n, j)$ , we have

$$(1 - \epsilon)^n < g'(x_0) < (1 + \epsilon)^n$$

Then, since  $\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} < \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda}$ , for sufficiently big  $n \in A$  and  $j \in J(n)$ , applying the pigeonhole principle to the set  $D(n, j)$ , we obtain that (besides the inequality  $(\star_3)$ ) there exist distinct  $g_1, g_2 \in D(n, j)$  such that the inequality

$$1 - C_1 < \frac{g'_1(x_0)}{g'_2(x_0)} < 1 + C_1$$

holds. On the other hand, by definition of  $D(n, j)$ , we have  $|g_1(x_0) - g_2(x_0)| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda^n}$ ; thus we established the desired inequalities  $(\star_1)$  and  $(\star_2)$ .

Let now  $y_0 = g_1(x_0)$ ,  $z_0 = g_2(x_0)$ ,  $W = g_1^{-1}$ ,  $V = g_1^{-1}g_2$ , and let  $W = h_n h_{n-1} \cdots h_1$  where  $W$  is a reduced word in the alphabet  $S$  of length  $n$  and  $h_i \in S, 1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Let also  $W_k$  be the suffix of  $W$  of length  $k$ ,  $y_k = W_k(y_0)$ ,  $z_k = W_k(z_0)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

Furthermore, let

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq s} \sup_{0 \leq y \neq z \leq 1} \frac{|f'_i(y) - f'_i(z)|}{|y - z|} = M \quad \text{and} \quad L = 1 + \epsilon.$$

Then we have  $|y_k - z_k| \leq L^k / \lambda^n$ ,  $|h'_{k+1}(y_k) - h'_{k+1}(z_k)| \leq ML^k / \lambda^n, 0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ .

Then

$$1 - \frac{ML^{k+1}}{\lambda^n} \leq \frac{h'_{k+1}(y_k)}{h'_{k+1}(z_k)} \leq 1 + \frac{ML^{k+1}}{\lambda^n}$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . From here we obtain that

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{ML^{k+1}}{\lambda^n}\right) \leq \prod_{k=0}^n \frac{h'_{k+1}(y_k)}{h'_{k+1}(z_k)} \leq \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{ML^{k+1}}{\lambda^n}\right).$$

Then, for sufficiently big  $n$  in  $A$

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right)^n = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right) \leq \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{h'_{k+1}(y_k)}{h'_{k+1}(z_k)} \leq \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\eta^n}\right)^n.$$

Since, by the chain rule,

$$\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{h'_{k+1}(y_k)}{h'_{k+1}(z_k)} = \frac{(g_1^{-1})'(y_0)}{(g_1^{-1})'(z_0)},$$

we obtain that  $1 - C_1 < (g_1^{-1})'(y_0)/(g_1^{-1})'(z_0) < 1 + C_1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} V'(x_0) &= (g_1^{-1})'(g_2(x_0))g'_2(x_0) \\ &= \frac{(g_1^{-1})'(g_2(x_0))g'_2(x_0)}{(g_1^{-1})'(g_1(x_0))g'_1(x_0)}(g_1^{-1})'(g_1(x_0))g'_1(x_0) \\ &= \frac{(g_1^{-1})'(g_2(x_0))g'_2(x_0)}{(g_1^{-1})'(g_1(x_0))g'_1(x_0)} \\ &= \frac{(g_1^{-1})'(g_2(x_0))}{(g_1^{-1})'(g_1(x_0))} \frac{g'_2(x_0)}{g'_1(x_0)} \in ((1 - C_1)^2, (1 + C_1)^2) \subset (1 - C, 1 + C). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we proved that  $1 - C < V'(x_0) < 1 + C$ , which contradicts our assumption.  $\square$

**Remark 6** The same proof, with slight changes, works for representations of  $C^{1+c}$ -regularity for any real  $c > 0$ .

### Proofs of Theorems A, B, C

In the proofs of Theorem 2 and of Theorem 3, we consider the orbit of the point  $x_0$  under the action of  $\Gamma$ . By using exponential growth, we find two distinct elements  $g_1, g_2$  such that  $g_1(x_0)$  and  $g_2(x_0)$  are very close. Then we “pull back”  $g_2(x_0)$  by  $g_1^{-1}$ , ie, we consider the point  $g_1^{-1}g_2(x_0)$  and show that this point is sufficiently close to  $x_0$ . It is at this stage that we heavily use the condition that  $\Gamma$  is generated by elements from the small neighborhood of  $1 \in G$ , ie, derivatives of the generators are uniformly close to 1. However, if  $\Gamma$  is an arbitrary subgroup of the commutator group  $[G, G]$ , not necessarily generated by elements close to the identity element, then for any  $x_0 \in (0, 1)$ ,  $f \in \Gamma$  and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $W \in \Gamma$  such that  $|f'(W(x_0)) - 1| < \epsilon$ ; we simply need to find  $W$  such that  $W(x_0)$  is sufficiently close to 1 (or to 0). This fact provides a new idea of taking  $x_0$  close to 1, then considering the part of the orbit that lies in a small neighborhood of 1, then using exponential growth to find points close to each other in that neighborhood, and then perform the “pull back”.

The following proposition is a special case of Theorem A, and answers [1, Question 2]. For simplicity, we give a separate proof of it.

**Proposition 7**  $\mathbb{F}_2$  does not admit a faithful  $C_0$ -discrete representation in  $G$ .

**Proof** Since the commutator subgroup of  $\mathbb{F}_2$  contains an isomorphic copy of  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , it is sufficient to prove that  $\mathbb{F}_2$  does not admit a faithful  $C_0$ -discrete representation in  $G^{(1)} = [G, G]$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  be a subgroup of  $G^{(1)}$  isomorphic to  $\mathbb{F}_2$  generated by diffeomorphisms  $f$  and  $g$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\Gamma$  has no fixed point on  $(0, 1)$ . Let also  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M = \max_{0 \leq x \leq 1} (|f'(x)| + |g'(x)|)$ .

We choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}, \delta > 0$  and  $\theta_N$  such that  $1/N < \epsilon, 1 < \theta_N < \sqrt[2N]{2}$ , and for all  $x \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ , the inequality  $1/\theta_N < \phi'(x) < \theta_N$  holds where  $\phi \in \{f, g, f^{-1}, g^{-1}\}$ .

Let  $W = W(f, g)$  be an element of  $\Gamma$  such that  $W(1/N) \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ ,  $m$  be the length of the reduced word  $W$ . Let also  $x_i = i/N, 0 \leq i \leq N$ .

For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$S_n = \{H \in B_n(1) \mid u(W(x_1)) \geq W(x_1) \text{ for all suffixes } u \text{ of } H\}.$$

(Here we view  $H$  as a reduced word in the alphabet  $\{f, g, f^{-1}, g^{-1}\}$ .) Then  $|S_n| \geq 2^n$ .

Then (assuming  $N \geq 3$ ) we can choose and fix a sufficiently big  $n$  such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (i) There exist  $g_1, g_2 \in S_n$  such that  $g_1 \neq g_2$ , and

$$|g_1 W(x_i) - g_2 W(x_i)| < \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N - 1.$$

- (ii)  $M^m(\theta_N)^n \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n} < \epsilon.$

Indeed, let  $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{N-1}, c_N)$  be a sequence of real numbers such that  $2^N \sqrt{2} = c_N < c_{N-1} < \dots < c_1 < c_0 = 2$  and  $c_i > 2^N \sqrt{2} c_{i+1}$ , for all  $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ . Then, by the pigeonhole principle, for sufficiently big  $n$ , there exists a subset  $S_n(1) \subseteq S_n$  such that  $|S_n(1)| \geq c_1^n$  and  $|g_1 W(x_1) - g_2 W(x_1)| < 1/2^N \sqrt{2}^n$ , for all  $g_1, g_2 \in S_n(1)$ .

Suppose now  $1 \leq k \leq N - 2$ , and  $S_n \supseteq S_n(1) \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_n(k)$  such that for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $|S_n(j)| \geq c_j^n$  and for all  $g_1, g_2 \in S_n(j)$  we have

$$|g_1 W(x_i) - g_2 W(x_i)| < \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq j.$$

Then by applying the pigeonhole principle to the set  $S_n(k)$  for sufficiently big  $n$ , we obtain  $S_n(k+1) \subseteq S_n(k)$  such that  $|S_n(k+1)| \geq c_{k+1}^n$ , and for all  $g_1, g_2 \in S_n(k+1)$  we have

$$|g_1 W(x_i) - g_2 W(x_i)| < \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k + 1.$$

Then, for  $k = N - 2$ , we obtain the desired inequality (condition (i)).

Now, let

$$h_1 = g_1 W, \quad h_2 = g_2 W, \quad y_i = W(x_i), \quad z'_i = g_1(y_i), \quad z''_i = g_2(y_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Without loss of generality, we may also assume that  $g_2(y_1) \geq g_1(y_1)$ .

Then for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, N - 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_1^{-1} h_2(x_i) - x_i| &= |(g_1 W)^{-1}(g_2 W)(x_i) - x_i| \\ &= |(g_1 W)^{-1}(g_2 W)(x_i) - (g_1 W)^{-1}(g_1 W)(x_i)| \\ &= |W^{-1} g_1^{-1} g_2(y_i) - W^{-1} g_1^{-1} g_1(y_i)| \\ &= |W^{-1} g_1^{-1}(z''_i) - W^{-1} g_1^{-1}(z'_i)|. \end{aligned}$$



Let  $u$  be a prefix of the reduced word  $g_1$ , and  $g_1 = uv$  (so a reduced word  $v$  is a suffix of  $g_1$ ). Then, since  $g_1, g_2 \in S_n$ , we have

$$u^{-1}(z'_i) = v(y_i) \geq v(y_1) \geq y_1,$$

$$u^{-1}(z''_i) = u^{-1}(g_2(y_i)) \geq u^{-1}(g_2(y_1)) \geq u^{-1}(g_1(y_1)) \geq v(y_1) \geq y_1.$$

Then by the mean value theorem, we have

$$|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| \leq M^m(\theta_N)^n |z'_1 - z''_1| < M^m(\theta_N)^n \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n}.$$

Then, by condition (ii), we obtain  $|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| < \epsilon$ . Then we have  $|h_1^{-1}h_2(x) - x| < 2\epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Indeed, let  $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]$ . Then

$$|h_1^{-1}h_2(x) - x| \leq \max\{|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x|, |h_1^{-1}h_2(x_{i+1}) - x|\}.$$

But  $|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x| \leq |h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| + |x_i - x| < 2\epsilon$ , and similarly,

$$|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_{i+1}) - x| \leq |h_1^{-1}h_2(x_{i+1}) - x_{i+1}| + |x_{i+1} - x| < 2\epsilon.$$

Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we obtain that  $\Gamma$  is not  $C_0$ -discrete. □

By examining the proof of Proposition 7, we will now prove Theorem A, thus obtaining a much stronger result. The inequality  $|S_n| \geq 2^n$  is a crucial fact in the proof of Proposition 7; we need the cardinality of  $S_n$  to grow exponentially. If  $\Gamma$  is an arbitrary finitely generated group with exponential growth, this exponential growth of  $S_n$  is not automatically guaranteed. But we can replace  $S_n$  by another subset  $S_n$  that still does the job of  $S_n$  and that grows exponentially, if we assume a mild condition on  $\Gamma$ .

First we need the following easy lemma.

**Lemma 8** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in G, z_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that  $z_0 \leq \alpha(z_0) \leq \beta\alpha(z_0)$ . Then  $U\beta\alpha(z_0) \geq z_0$ , where  $U = U(\alpha, \beta)$  is any positive word in letters  $\alpha, \beta$ .* □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem A.

**Proof of Theorem A** Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\Gamma$  has no fixed point on  $(0, 1)$ . Let again  $\epsilon > 0, N \in \mathbb{N}, \delta > 0, \theta_N > 0$ ,

$$M = 2 \sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} (|f'(x)| + |g'(x)|)$$

such that  $1/N < \epsilon, 1 < \theta_N < \sqrt[2N]{2}$ , and for all  $x \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ , the inequality  $1/\theta_N < \phi'(x) < \theta_N$  holds where  $\phi \in \{f, g, f^{-1}, g^{-1}\}$ .

Let  $W = W(f, g)$  be an element of  $\Gamma$  such that

$$\{f^i W(1/N) \mid -2 \leq i \leq 2\} \cup \{g^i W(1/N) \mid -2 \leq i \leq 2\} \subset [1 - \delta, 1]$$

and let  $m$  be the length of the reduced word  $W$ . Let also  $x_i = i/N, 0 \leq i \leq N$  and  $z = W(1/N)$ .

By replacing the pair  $(f, g)$  with  $(f^{-1}, g^{-1})$  if necessary, we may assume that  $f(z) \geq z$ . Then at least one of the following cases is valid:

**Case 1**  $f(z) \leq gf(z)$

**Case 2**  $z \leq gf(z)$

**Case 3**  $gf(z) \leq z$

If Case 1 holds then we let  $\alpha = f, \beta = g, z_0 = z$ . If Case 1 does not hold but Case 2 holds, then we let  $\alpha = gf, \beta = f, z_0 = z$ . Finally, if Case 1 and Case 2 do not hold but Case 3 holds, then we let  $\alpha = f^{-1}g^{-1}, \beta = g^{-1}, z_0 = gf(z)$ .

In all the three cases, we will have  $z_0 \in [1 - \delta, 1], z_0 \leq z$ , and  $\alpha, \beta$  generate a free subsemigroup, and conditions of Lemma 8 are satisfied, ie, we have  $z_0 \leq \alpha(z_0) \leq \beta\alpha(z_0)$ . Moreover, we notice that  $\sup_{0 \leq x \leq 1} (|\alpha'(x)| + |\beta'(x)|) \leq M^2$ , and the length of  $W$  in the alphabet  $\{\alpha, \beta, \alpha^{-1}, \beta^{-1}\}$  is at most  $2m$ .

Now, for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let

$$\mathbb{S}_n = \{U(\alpha, \beta)\beta\alpha W \mid U(\alpha, \beta) \text{ is a positive word in } \alpha, \beta \text{ of length at most } n\}.$$

Applying Lemma 8 to the pair  $\{\alpha, \beta\}$  we obtain that  $VW^{-1}(z_0) \geq z_0$  for all  $V \in \mathbb{S}_n$ .

Then  $|\mathbb{S}_n| \geq 2^n$ . After achieving this inequality, we proceed as in the proof of Proposition 7 with just a slight change: there exists a sufficiently big  $n$  such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) There exist  $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{S}_n$  such that  $g_1 \neq g_2$ , and

$$|g_1 W(x_i) - g_2 W(x_i)| < \frac{1}{2N\sqrt{2}^n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N - 1.$$

(ii)  $M^{2m+4}(\theta_N)^n \frac{1}{2N\sqrt{2}^n} < \epsilon$ .

Let

$$h_1 = g_1 W, \quad h_2 = g_2 W, \quad y_i = W(x_i), \quad z'_i = g_1(y_i), \quad z''_i = g_2(y_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

Without loss of generality, we may also assume that  $g_2(y_1) \geq g_1(y_1)$ .

Then for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, N - 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| &= |(g_1W)^{-1}(g_2W)(x_i) - x_i| \\ &= |(g_1W)^{-1}(g_2W)(x_i) - (g_1W)^{-1}(g_1W)(x_i)| \\ &= |W^{-1}g_1^{-1}g_2(y_i) - W^{-1}g_1^{-1}g_1(y_i)| \\ &= |W^{-1}g_1^{-1}(z''_i) - W^{-1}g_1^{-1}(z'_i)|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{S}_n$ , by the mean value theorem, we have

$$|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| \leq M^{2m+4}(\theta_N)^n |z'_1 - z''_1| < M^{2m+4}(\theta_N)^n \frac{1}{2^N \sqrt{2}^n}.$$

By condition (ii), we obtain that  $|h_1^{-1}h_2(x_i) - x_i| < \epsilon$ . Then we have  $|h_1^{-1}h_2(x) - x| < 2\epsilon$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, we obtain that  $\Gamma$  is not  $C_0$ -discrete.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem B** Let  $H$  be an arbitrary finitely generated subgroup of  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ . If  $H$  contains a non-Abelian free subsemigroup then we are done by Theorem A. If  $H$  does not contain a non-Abelian free subsemigroup then by the result from [3],  $H$  is virtually nilpotent. Then again by the result of [3],  $H$  is solvable of solvability degree at most  $l(c)$ . Since the natural number  $l(c)$  depends only on  $c$ , and not on  $H$ , and since  $H$  is an arbitrary finitely generated subgroup of  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$  we obtain that  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$  is solvable of solvability degree at most  $l(c)$ . Hence  $\Gamma$  is solvable with a solvability degree at most  $l(c) + 1$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem C** Let again  $H$  be an arbitrary finitely generated subgroup of  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ . Again, if  $H$  contains a non-Abelian free subsemigroup then we are done by Theorem A. If  $H$  does not contain a non-Abelian free subsemigroup then by the result from [3]  $H$  is virtually nilpotent. Then, by the result of Plante and Thurston [5],  $H$  is virtually Abelian. Then, by the result of Szekeres [7],  $H$  is Abelian. Since  $H$  is an arbitrary finitely generated subgroup of  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ , we conclude that  $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$  is Abelian, hence  $\Gamma$  is meta-Abelian.  $\square$

## References

- [1] **A Akhmedov**, *On free discrete subgroups of  $\text{Diff}(I)$* , *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 10 (2010) 2409–2418 MR2748336
- [2] **B Farb, J Franks**, *Groups of homeomorphisms of one-manifolds, III: Nilpotent subgroups*, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 23 (2003) 1467–1484 MR2018608
- [3] **A Navas**, *Growth of groups and diffeomorphisms of the interval*, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 18 (2008) 988–1028 MR2439001

- [4] **A Navas**, *Sur les rapprochements par conjugaison en dimension 1 et classe  $C^1$*  (2013) arXiv:1208.4815v3
- [5] **J F Plante, W P Thurston**, *Polynomial growth in holonomy groups of foliations*, Comment. Math. Helv. 51 (1976) 567–584 MR0436167
- [6] **MS Raghunathan**, *Discrete subgroups of Lie groups*, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. 68, Springer, New York (1972) MR0507234
- [7] **G Szekeres**, *Regular iteration of real and complex functions*, Acta Math. 100 (1958) 203–258 MR0107016

*Mathematics Department, North Dakota State University  
Fargo, ND 58102, USA*

azer.akhmedov@ndsu.edu

Received: 28 November 2012      Revised: 13 August 2013