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Abstract. We show that every oriented \( n \)-dimensional Poincaré duality group over a \(*\)-ring \( R \) is amenable or satisfies a linear homological isoperimetric inequality in dimension \( n - 1 \). As an application, we prove the Tits alternative for such groups when \( n = 2 \). We then deduce a new proof of the fact that when \( n = 2 \) and \( R = \mathbb{Z} \) then the group in question is a surface group.

1. Introduction

The classification of 2-dimensional Poincaré duality groups over \( \mathbb{Z} \) is a milestone in group theory built on a careful case analysis of Eckmann’s student Müller [Müll79] and the subsequent joint work of Eckmann and Müller [EM80]. The latter paper gives a characterization of such groups relying only on the Poincaré duality property and the assumption of positive first Betti number. A remarkable argument of Linnell shows that positive first Betti number is also a consequence of Poincaré duality, see [EL82,EL83]. Linnell’s insight calls the Bass Conjecture, already established for groups of low cohomological dimension in various cases, and with positive first Betti number established it then follows quickly that 2-dimensional Poincaré duality groups are HNN-extensions over a base that is free of finite rank. In sum, there is the following classification theorem:

Theorem 1.1. Let \( G \) be a group. Then the following are equivalent.

1. \( G \) is a 2-dimensional Poincaré duality group over \( \mathbb{Z} \).
2. \( G \) has a presentation of one of the following two kinds:
   
   (a) \( G \cong \langle g_1, \ldots, g_{2n}; \prod_{i=1}^{n}[g_{2i-1}, g_{2i}] = 1 \rangle \) for some \( n \geq 1 \), or
   
   (b) \( G \cong \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n; \prod_{i=1}^{n} g_i^2 = 1 \rangle \) for some \( n \geq 2 \).
3. \( G \) is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed surface of genus \( \geq 1 \).

Of course the equivalence of (2) and (3) and the implication (3)⇒(1) are classical. The Eckmann–Müller strategy for proving the implication (1)⇒(2) involves an intricate analysis of cases which runs, in spirit, parallel to the classical case analysis required to prove (3)⇒(2).

Subsequently it has been of interest to study groups which satisfy Poincaré duality over a field. For example, if \( G \) is a 3-dimensional Poincaré duality group with non-trivial centre \( Z \) (as arises for the fundamental group of a closed Seifert fibered 3-manifold) then one might be able to deduce, in favourable circumstances, that \( G/Z \) satisfies Poincaré duality over \( \mathbb{Q} \) even though one cannot expect the result to hold over \( \mathbb{Z} \) because, for example, \( G/Z \) might not be torsion-free. Therefore an important next step is found in the work of Bowditch [Bow04] in which a much more general result is proved of which the following is a special case.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose that \( G \) is a 2-dimensional Poincaré duality group over some field \( F \). Then \( G \) is a virtual surface group.

Bowditch necessarily has to deal with some formidable difficulties and it is a considerable achievement even to be able to exclude infinite torsion groups or Tarski...
monsters from the story, and his 51 page paper is no light reading matter. Looking back from the present day perspective, there is some attraction to researching if modern methods could be used to simplify or provide new insights.

In this paper we provide a very short and quick argument for the following. While this does not come close to Bowditch’s definitive result for commutative rings, given the modern day interest in both the class of hyperbolic groups and the class of amenable groups it may be of interest to see a succinct and direct argument even in the commutative case.

**Theorem 1.3.** Suppose that $G$ is a 2-dimensional Poincaré duality group over a commutative ring $R$, or an oriented 2-dimensional Poincaré duality group over a $\ast$-ring $R$. Then either $G$ is non-elementary hyperbolic or $G$ is amenable.

(See Definition 3.2 for the definition of a $\ast$-ring.)

Of course, the importance of this is that in the case of hyperbolic or amenable groups one has a chance of rather more direct strategies of completing the original Eckmann–Müller analysis and showing directly that these groups are surface groups, at least when $R = \mathbb{Z}$. In this article we focus on the above theorem and we deduce it from a result about Poincaré duality groups of arbitrary dimension that concerns homological isoperimetric inequalities. We then proceed to outline a relatively short proof of a variant of Theorem 1.1 following from Theorem 1.3.
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2. Homological isoperimetric inequalities.

Throughout, $G$ denotes a discrete group, $R$ denotes an associative unital ring with at least 2 elements, and $RG$ denotes the usual group ring of $G$ with coefficients in $R$. All modules are left modules.

**Definition 2.1.** A projective resolution $C_\bullet = (C_k, \partial_k)$ of the trivial $RG$-module $R$ is $n$-admissible if and only if $C_n$ and $C_{n+1}$ are finitely generated free $RG$-modules equipped with free bases.

Note that every group of type $\text{FP}_{n+1}$ over $R$ admits an $n$-admissible resolution of $R$.

**Definition 2.2.** For an element $x \in RG$ we define $|x|$ to be the cardinality of the support of $x$. For a finite matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j}$ over $RG$ we define $|A| = \sum_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$.

**Definition 2.3** (Homological isoperimetric inequality). Let $C_\bullet$ be an $n$-admissible projective resolution of the trivial $RG$-module $R$. We say that $C_\bullet$ satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n$ if and only if there exists $\kappa \geq 0$ such that for every $n$-boundary $\gamma \in C_n$ there exists an $(n+1)$-chain $d \in C_{n+1}$ such that

$$\partial d = \gamma \quad \text{and} \quad |d| \leq \kappa |\gamma|$$

We say that a group $G$ satisfies a linear $R$-homological isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n$ if and only if it admits an $n$-admissible resolution of the trivial $RG$-module $R$ which satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n$.

The following lemma shows that this property is independent of the resolution used.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $C_\bullet$ and $C'_\bullet$ be two $n$-admissible resolutions of the trivial $RG$-module $R$. If $C_\bullet$ satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n$, then so does $C'_\bullet$. 
Proof. Since $C_ \bullet$ and $C'_ \bullet$ are both resolutions of $R$, there exist $RG$-chain maps $\xi: C_ \bullet \to C'_ \bullet$ and $\xi': C'_ \bullet \to C_ \bullet$ such that $\xi \circ \xi'$ is chain homotopic to the identity via an $RG$-chain homotopy $h$.

Let $\gamma \in C'_ n$ be a boundary. Since $\xi$ is a chain map, $\xi(\gamma)$ is also a boundary. Moreover, since $C'_ n$ and $C_ n$ are finitely generated free $RG$-modules, the map $\xi: C'_ n \to C_ n$ can be represented by a finite matrix $Z$ over $RG$, and we immediately see that

$$|\xi(\gamma)| \leq |Z| |\gamma|$$

Now $C_ \bullet$ satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n$ by assumption. Let $\kappa$ be the constant given by the definition, and let $d \in C_{n+1}$ be such that

$$\partial d = \xi(\gamma)$$

and $|d| \leq \kappa |\xi(\gamma)| \leq \kappa |Z| |\gamma|$.

Now let $d' = \xi_{n+1}(d) \in C'_{n+1}$. Observe that

$$\partial d' = \partial \xi(d) = \xi(\partial d) = \xi \circ \xi(\gamma) = \gamma - \partial h(\gamma)$$

Observe also that $\xi_n$ and $h_n$ are represented by finite matrices over $RG$; let us denote the matrices by $X$ and $H$ respectively. We have

$$|d' + h(\gamma)| \leq |d'| + |h(\gamma)| \leq |X||d| + |H||\gamma| \leq (\kappa |X||Z| + |H|)|\gamma|$$

which proves the claim. \qed

Note that our definition is not the usual notion of homological isoperimetric inequality: Mineyev [Min00, Min02], and Groves–Manning [GM08, Section 2.7] consider only the cases of $R \in \{Z, Q, R, C\}$, and use the usual absolute value on $R$ and the resulting $L^1$-norm on $RG$. Gersten [Ger98, Section 13] however does consider all rings $R$ endowed with an abelian group norm. Our notion of $| \cdot |$ is such a norm, since such norms are not required to be $Z$-multiplicative, and hence we are working with a particular example of what Gersten allows.

Mineyev [Min00] and Lang [Lan00] showed that every hyperbolic group satisfies homological linear isoperimetric inequalities in all dimensions when the coefficients lie in $R$ or $Z$, respectively (note that Lang uses yet another definition of isoperimetric inequalities). Thus, the reader is invited to think of the linear inequalities as some (very weak) form of negative curvature.

Before proceeding further, we will need a simple observation about non-amenable groups.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $G$ be a group with a finite generating set $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$. Let $\partial: RG \to RG^m$ be given by the $m \times 1$ matrix $(1 - v_iN_i)$, where $v_i \in R$ for every $i$. If $G$ is not amenable, then there exists $\kappa \geq 0$ such that for every $\gamma \in \text{im} \partial$ and every $d \in RG$ with $\partial(d) = \gamma$ we have

$$|d| \leq \kappa |\gamma|$$

Proof. Assume that $G$ is not amenable; the (negation of the) Følner criterion tells us that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every finite subset $F \subseteq G$ we have $|B(F)| \geq \epsilon |F|$ where

$$B(F) = \{g \in F \mid gs_1^{-1} \not\in F \text{ for some } i\}$$

($B(F)$ is the boundary of $F$).

Now, take $d \in RG$ and set $\gamma = \partial(d)$, as in the statement. Let $F$ be the support of $d$. Every element of $B(F)$ appears in the support of at least one of the entries of $\partial(d)$, and therefore we have $|\gamma| \geq \epsilon |d|$. Setting $\kappa = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ finishes the proof. \qed
3. Poincaré duality groups

The following is an extension of the definition of Poincaré duality groups due to Johnson–Wall [JW72]; note that we do not assume $G$ to be finitely presented.

**Definition 3.1.** A group $G$ is called a Poincaré duality group of dimension $n \geq 1$ over $R$, or a $\text{PD}_R^n$ group, if and only if $G$ is of type $\text{FP}$ over $R$ and we have

$$H^k(G; RG) = \begin{cases} R & \text{if } k = n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where the equality holds as $R$-modules.

The $\text{PD}_R^n$ group is oriented if and only if $H^k(G; RG) = R$ is the trivial $RG$-module.

It is classical (and can be proven along the lines of [Bro82, Proposition 6.7]) that the dimension $n$ coincides with the cohomological dimension of $G$ over $R$.

**Definition 3.2.** The ring $R$ is a $\ast$-ring if and only if it comes equipped with an involutive antiautomorphism $R \to R, r \mapsto r^\ast$.

Every commutative ring is a $\ast$-ring with $\ast$ being the identity operation. In the case of $\mathbb{C}$ one usually takes $\ast$ to be the complex conjugation. A more interesting example is provided by quaternions, where $\ast$ is the quaternion conjugation.

Note that if $R$ is a $\ast$-ring then so is $RG$, with

$$(\sum_g r_g g)^\ast = \sum_g r_g^\ast g^{-1}$$

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $n$ be a positive integer, and let $G$ be a $\text{PD}_R^n$ group. Suppose that additionally one of the following holds:

1. $R$ is a $\ast$-ring and $G$ is an oriented;
2. $R$ is commutative.

If $G$ is not amenable, then $G$ satisfies a linear $R$-homological isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n - 1$.

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a $\text{PD}_R^n$ group. Since $G$ is in particular of type $\text{FP}_1$ over $R$, it is generated by a finite set, say $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_m\}$. Recall that the cohomological dimension of $G$ over $R$ is $n$. If $n = 1$ then Dunwoody [Dun79] shows that $G$ is the fundamental group of a finite graph of finite groups, and hence the group $G$ is virtually free. Dunwoody states his theorem for a commutative ring $R$, but his proof works also for non-commutative ones, as he remarks at the end of the paper. A finite-index free subgroup $H$ of $G$ must also be a $\text{PD}_R^n$ group – this follows from the proof of [JW72, Theorem 2]. Note that Johnson–Wall work with $R = \mathbb{Z}$, but the proof readily adapts to a more general $R$. The only free group which is a $\text{PD}_R^n$ group is $\mathbb{Z}$, as can be seen by looking at the first cohomology with $RH$ coefficients. This forces $G$ into being virtually cyclic, and hence amenable.

Now assume that $n > 1$ and that $G$ is not amenable. Since the cohomological dimension of $G$ is $n$, there is a projective resolution

$$0 \to P_n \to P_{n-1} \to \cdots \to P_1 \to P_0 \to R \to 0$$

where $P_0 = RG$, $P_1 = RG^m$ (row vectors of length $m$), and the map $P_1 \to P_0$ is given by right multiplication by the $m \times 1$-matrix (or column vector) $(1-s_1, \ldots, 1-s_m)^T$.

For a left $RG$-module $M$ we define $M'$ to be the left $RG$-module $\text{Hom}_{RG}(M, RG)$ on which $x \in RG$ acts by the formula

$$x \theta(m) = \theta(x^* m)$$

(When $R$ is commutative, we take $\ast$ to be the identity on $R$, and so $(rg)^\ast = rg^{-1}$.)

In this way, the operation $(-)'$ defines a contravariant functor from left $RG$-modules
to left $RG$-modules. Since $G$ satisfies Poincaré duality over $R$, we obtain the exact sequence

$$(\dagger) \quad 0 \to P'_0 \to P'_1 \to \cdots \to P'_{n-1} \to P'_n \to D \to 0$$

on applying the functor $(-)'$ to the resolution above, where $D = H^n(G; RG)$ (see [JW72], again adapting the argument to a general $R$).

Suppose that we are in case (1). Since $G$ is oriented, we have $D = R$ as an $RG$-module. Hence, the resolution $(\dagger)$ is an $(n-1)$-admissible resolution of the trivial $RG$-module $R$. It also clearly satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n-1$ by Lemma 2.5, which proves the claim.

Now suppose that we are in the (more involved) case (2). Since $D \cong R$ as an $R$-module, it is immediate that there exists a group homomorphism $\rho: G \to R$ such that the $G$-action on $D$ is given by $g \mapsto \rho(g)r$. Let $E$ denote $R$ endowed with the $G$-action $gr = \rho(g^{-1})r$. We now see that the diagonal action of $G$ on $D \otimes_R E$ is trivial, as

$$g(r \otimes r') = gr \otimes gr' = \rho(g)r \otimes \rho(g^{-1})r' = \rho(g^{-1})\rho(g)r \otimes r' = r \otimes r'$$

Hence $D \otimes E = R$, the trivial $RG$-module.

We tensor $(\dagger)$ with $E$ over $R$ (and tensor the differentials with $id_E$) and obtain a chain complex $C_\bullet$ where the module structure on the chains is given by diagonal action. Since $E \cong R$ as an $R$-module, it is immediate that $C_\bullet$ is exact.

We have a classical isomorphism of $RG$-modules $RG \to RG \otimes_R E$ induced by $g \mapsto g \otimes \rho(g^{-1})$ and with inverse induced by $g \otimes 1 \mapsto gp(g)$. The existence of such an isomorphism implies that $C_k$ is a projective module for every $k$; it tells us also that $C_n = P'_0 \otimes_R E$ and $C_{n-1} = P'_n \otimes_R E$ are free $RG$-modules. Thus, $C_\bullet$ is an $(n-1)$-admissible projective resolution of the trivial module $R$. Direct computation shows that $\partial: C_n \to C_{n-1}$ is equal to the column vector

$$(1 - \rho(s_1)s_1, \ldots, 1 - \rho(s_m)s_m)^T$$

and so $C_\bullet$ satisfies a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension $n-1$ by Lemma 2.5. $\square$

4. Dimension 2

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $X$ be a simply connected 2-dimensional cocompact $G$-CW-complex. Suppose that $G$ satisfies a linear $R$-homological isoperimetric inequality in dimension 1. Then the 1-skeleton of $X$ with the combinatorial metric is Gromov hyperbolic.

**Proof.** The proof is essentially identical to the Bridson–Haefliger proof of the corresponding fact for the usual, homotopic isoperimetric inequality – see [BH99, Chapter III.H Theorem 2.9]. We sketch it here for the convenience of the reader.

We start by fixing a constant $N$ to be the maximal number of edges contained in the image of the attaching map of any 2-cell in $X$. Since the action of $G$ on $X$ is cocompact, the number $N$ is a well-defined integer.

The cellular chain complex of $X$ can easily be extended to a 1-admissible projective resolution of $R$, which in turn must satisfy a linear isoperimetric inequality in dimension 1 by Lemma 2.4. The isoperimetric inequality gives us a constant $\kappa$ such that every 1-cycle in $X$ supported on $l$ edges is the boundary of a 2-chain supported on at most $\kappa l$ faces. For convenience, we take $\kappa$ to be an integer. We set $k = \kappa N^2 + 1$ and $m = \kappa N$.

We aim at showing that for some $n$, every geodesic triangle in $X$ is $(n+1)$-slim (for this notion, as well as other background information on Gromov hyperbolic spaces, we refer the reader to [BH99]). We argue by contradiction, and let $\Delta$ be a
geodesic triangle in \( X \) which is not \((n+1)\)-slim, which amounts to saying that there exists a vertex \( v \) on one of the sides of \( \Delta \) which does not lie in the \( n \)-neighbourhood of the other two sides. We may assume that \( n > 6k \).

The first part of the proof of [BH99, Chapter III.H Theorem 2.9] shows that by either 'cutting the corners' or 'cutting a corner and the opposite edge' of \( \Delta \) we arrive at one of the following situations (see Figure 4.2).

**Case 1:** There exists a geodesic hexagon \( H \) in \( X \) with vertices (written cyclically) \( u'', u', u, w, w', w'' \), such that (denoting the combinatorial distance in the 1-skeleton of \( X \) by \( d \)):

- \( d(u, u') = d(w', w'') = 2k \), and
- the \((k-1)\)-neighbourhoods of the segments \([u, w] \), \([u', u''] \), and \([w', w''] \) are pairwise disjoint, and
- there exists a point \( v \in [u, w] \) such that the ball around \( v \) of radius \( n - k + 1 \) is disjoint from the \((k-1)\)-neighbourhoods of \([w', w''] \) and \([u', u''] \).

We let \( \alpha, \beta \), and \( \gamma \) denote the lengths of the segments \([u, w] \), \([u', u''] \), and \([w', w''] \), respectively.

Orienting the edges of \( H \) in a coherent manner, and putting the weight 1 on every edge we obtain an \( R \)-cycle \( h \) (note that the ring \( R \) plays no role here). Since \( X \) is simply connected, the cycle \( h \) is a boundary. Consider a 2-chain \( p \) with \( \partial p = h \) which minimises the value \( |p| \), and let \( P \) denote the support of \( p \).

Set \( h_{[u,w]} \) to be the 1-chain obtained from putting the weight 1 only on edges in \([u, w] \). Let \( D_0 \) denote the set of all the 2-cells in \( P \) whose boundary contains an edge from the segment \([u, w] \). Since every 2-cell has at most \( N \) faces, and since every edge in the segment \([u, w] \) has to appear in the boundary of some cell in \( P \), we conclude that \( |D_0| \geq \alpha / N \). Let \( p_0 \) denote the 2-chain obtained from \( p \) by setting the coefficient of 2-cells not lying in \( D_0 \) to 0.

Observe that the 1-chain

\[ \partial p_0 - h_{[u,w]} \]

contains in its support an edge path connecting \( u \) to \( w \), which does not contain any edges of the segment \([u, w] \).

We will now recursively define pairwise-disjoint subsets \( D_1, \ldots, D_{m-1} \) of \( P \) and 2-chains \( p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1} \) as follows: suppose that for some \( i \) the 1-chain

\[ q_i = \partial(\sum_{j=0}^{i} p_j) - h_{[u,w]} \]

contains an edge path connecting \( u \) to \( w \) (we know this to hold for \( i = 0 \)). We set \( D_{i+1} \) to be subset of \( P \setminus \bigcup_{j=0}^{i} D_i \) containing all 2-cells whose boundaries contain at
least one edge of \( \text{supp} q_i \). We set \( p_{i+1} \) to be 2-chain obtained from \( p \) by restricting the support to \( D_{i+1} \).

One key observation is that the faces of \( D_i \) lie entirely in the \( N(i+1) \)-neighbourhood of the segment \([u, w]\), and therefore the 2-cells in \( D_{[u, w]} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} D_i \) lie in the \( Nm \)-neighbourhood. But \( Nm = \kappa N^2 = k - 1 \), and so the union lies in the \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhood.

Another is that the boundaries of faces in \( D_i \) have to include every edge in the support of \( q_i \), with the possible exception of the edges on the segments \([u, u']\) and \([w, w']\). But there are at most \(2k - 2\) such edges, and so \(|D_i| \geq \frac{n - 2k + 2}{N}\), and thus

\[
|D_{[u, w]}| \geq m(\alpha - 2k + 2) = \kappa(\alpha - 2k + 2)
\]

We repeat the argument for the other segments, and obtain a subset \( D_{[u', w'']} \subseteq P \) of cardinality at least \( \frac{m(\delta - 2k - 2)}{N} \) whose elements lie in the \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhood of the segment \([u', u'']\), and a subset \( D_{[w', w'']} \subseteq P \) of cardinality at least \( \frac{m(\gamma - 2k - 2)}{N} \) whose elements lie in the \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhood of the segment \([w', w'']\). Since the three \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhoods are disjoint, we conclude that

\[
|P| \geq \kappa(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 6k + 6)
\]

We are now going to find further 2-cells in \( P \) not contained in the union

\[
D_{[u, w]} \cup D_{[u', w'']} \cup D_{[w', w']}
\]

Note that every edge in \( \text{supp} q_{m-1} \) is of distance at most \( k - 1 \) from the segment \([u, w]\). Consider a function taking every edge in \( \text{supp} q_{m-1} \) to its closest vertex on \([u, w]\) (if there are more than one closest vertices, we choose one). Now the support of \( q_{m-1} \) contains a path \( f \) connecting \( u \) to \( w \), and two adjacent edges in \( f \) are sent to vertices at most \(2k\) apart (since \([u, w]\) is a geodesic segment), and therefore the \(2k\)-neighbourhood of \( v \) contains some edges in \( \text{supp} f \). This implies that the \(n - 2k\)-neighbourhood of \( v \) contains at least \(2(n - 4k)\) edges of \( \text{supp} f \). But each such edge must lie in the boundary of some 2-cell in \( P \setminus (D_{[u, w]} \cup D_{[u', w'']} \cup D_{[w', w']}) \), and we conclude that

\[
|P| \geq \kappa(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 6k + 6) + \frac{2n - 8k}{N}
\]

Now we observe that \(|h| = \alpha + \beta + \gamma + 6k\), and the linear isoperimetric inequality yields

\[
\kappa(\alpha + \beta + \gamma + 6k) \geq |P| \geq \kappa(\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 6k + 6) + \frac{2n - 8k}{N}
\]

which is impossible for large \( n \), as \( k \) and \( N \) do not depend on \( n \).

**Case 2:** There exists a geodesic quadrilateral \( H \) in \( X \) with vertices (written cyclically) \( u', u, w, w' \), such that

- \( d(u, u') = 2k, d(w, w') = 4k \), and
- the \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhoods of the segments \([u, w]\) and \([u', w']\) are disjoint, and
- there exists a point \( v \in [u, w] \) such that the ball around \( v \) of radius \( n - 2k \) is disjoint from the \((k - 1)\)-neighbourhood of \([u', w']\).

We let \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) denote the lengths of the segments \([u, w]\), and \([u', w']\), respectively.

We argue in a completely analogous manner, and establish first that

\[
|P| \geq \kappa(\alpha + \beta - 4k + 4)
\]

and then that

\[
|P| \geq \kappa(\alpha + \beta - 4k + 4) + \frac{n - 4k}{N}
\]
We then observe that $|h| = \alpha + \beta + 6k$, and the isoperimetric inequality leads to a bound on $n$ as before.

**Corollary 4.3** (Tits alternative). Every oriented $\text{PD}^2_R$ group with $R$ being a $*$-ring and every $\text{PD}^2_R$ group with $R$ commutative is either amenable or non-elementary hyperbolic.

**Proof.** It follows immediately from Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 4.1 that such a group $G$ is amenable or hyperbolic. If $G$ is both (which is in particular the case when $G$ is elementary hyperbolic), then it is either finite or virtually $\mathbb{Z}$. Hence, $G$ acts on a CW-complex $X$ of dimension at most 1 with finite stabilisers – the space $X$ is a point when $G$ is finite, and a line when $G$ is not (we are using Stallings’s theorem on groups with at least 2 ends here [Sta68]).

If the orders of the stabiliser subgroups are invertible in $R$, then the $R$-cellular chain complex of $X$ gives a projective resolution of $R$, and so the $R$-cohomological dimension of $G$ is at most 1. Otherwise, $G$ contains a cyclic group of order $p$ not invertible over $R$, and so the $R$-cohomological dimension of $G$ is infinite. In either case, the dimension is not 2, which is a contradiction.

From the above corollary one can easily obtain a more common formulation of a (weak) Tits alternative, namely that every subgroup of a $\text{PD}^2_R$ group is amenable or contains a non-abelian free subgroup.

**Remark 4.4.** Corollary 4.3 becomes false if one relaxes the assumption on the group from being a Poincaré duality group to being only a duality group with formal dimension 2: every non-uniform lattice of the real Lie group $\text{SO}(2,2)$ of $\mathbb{Q}$-rank 2 provides a counterexample when $R = \mathbb{Z}$.

We will now look at $\text{PD}^2_R$ groups which are amenable or hyperbolic. We start with the amenable case, where we assume $R = \mathbb{Z}$. The following proposition is an adaption of the work of Degrijse [Deg].

**Proposition 4.5** (Amenable case). Suppose that $G$ is an amenable $\text{PD}^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$-group. Then $G$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$.

**Proof.** As explained by Eckmann [Eck96, Section 4.1], the usual complex Euler characteristic $\chi(G)$ of $G$ coincides with its $L^2$-Euler characteristic. Note that $G$ is non-trivial, since the trivial group is not a $\text{PD}^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group. We also know that $G$ is torsion-free, and hence it is infinite. The $L^2$-Euler characteristic of infinite amenable groups vanishes by [Lück02, Theorem 7.2(1)] of Lück.

We have $H_0(G; \mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C}$. But, since $G$ is of type $\text{FP}_2$ over $R$, we have

$$0 = \chi(G) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H_0(G; \mathbb{C}) + \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H_2(G; \mathbb{C}) - \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H_1(G; \mathbb{C})$$

and so $H_1(G; \mathbb{C})$ has rank at least 1. Since $G$ is finitely generated, this implies the existence of a non-trivial homomorphism $G \to \mathbb{Z}$; let $K$ denote its kernel. Strebel’s result [Str77] tells us that $K$ is of $\mathbb{Z}$-cohomological dimension at most 1, and so it is free by a result of Stallings [Sta68]. It is also amenable, and therefore is either trivial or isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. In the former case we have $G = \mathbb{Z}$, which is not a $\text{PD}^2_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group. In the latter case we have proven the claim.

**Proposition 4.6** (Hyperbolic case). Suppose that $G$ is a hyperbolic oriented $\text{PD}^2_R$ group. Then $G$ contains a finite index subgroup isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed oriented surface of genus at least 2.

**Proof.** By [Bes96, Theorem 2.8 and Remark 2.9] of Bestvina, the Gromov boundary of $G$ is a closed 1-manifold, that is, the circle. Now the convergence theorem of Tukia, Gabai, and Casson–Jungreis [Tuk88, Gab92, CJ94] informs us that $G$ is
virtually Fuchsian, and so virtually isomorphic to the fundamental group of an oriented surface of genus at least 2. Were the surface not closed, $G$ would be virtually free, and hence not PD$_2$. This finishes the proof.

\[\square\]

**Theorem 4.7.** Every orientable PD$_2$ group $G$ is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface of positive genus.

**Proof.** We first apply Corollary 4.3 and conclude that $G$ is either amenable or hyperbolic. Now Propositions 4.5 and 4.6 tell us that $G$ is either isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ or is virtually as claimed. It now suffices to observe that both groups of the form $\mathbb{Z} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ contain the torus group $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ as a finite index subgroup. We conclude that $G$ is virtually a surface group of positive genus.

The group $G$ has finite cohomological dimension over $\mathbb{Z}$, and hence is torsion free; it is also non-trivial. Now, if a torsion-free group contains a finite index subgroup isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface, then it is itself such a surface group (except perhaps non-orientable) – this follows for surfaces of genus at least 2 from Nielsen realisation (proven by Kerckhoff [Ker80,Ker83]), and for surfaces of genus 1 from the corresponding (classical) statement that every finite subgroup of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ fixes a point in the symmetric space associated to $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Once we have shown the group to be a surface group, orientability comes directly from the fact that the group is an oriented PD$_2$ group.

\[\square\]
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