arXiv:2101.02193v1 [math.GR] 6 Jan 2021

JSJ DECOMPOSITIONS AND POLYTOPES FOR TWO-GENERATOR ONE-RELATOR GROUPS

GILES GARDAM, DAWID KIELAK, AND ALAN D. LOGAN

ABSTRACT. We provide a direct connection between the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$ (or essential) JSJ decomposition and the Friedl–Tillmann polytope of a hyperbolic two-generator one-relator group with abelianisation of rank 2.

We deduce various structural and algorithmic properties, like the existence of a quadratic-time algorithm computing the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of such groups.

Dedicated to the memory of Stephen J. Pride

1. INTRODUCTION

A two-generator one-relator group is a group which admits a presentation of the form $\langle a, b \mid R\rangle$. One-relator groups are a cornerstone of Geometric Group Theory (see, for example, the classic texts in combinatorial group theory [MKS04] [LS77] or the early work of Magnus [Mag30] [Mag32]), and they continue to have applications today, for example in 3-dimensional topology and knot theory. In particular, motivated by the Thurston norm of a 3-manifold, Friedl–Tillmann introduced a polytope for presentations $\langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a, b)'$ [FT20], which has subsequently been shown to be a group invariant [HK] (another proof of this fact follows from the work of Friedl–Lück [FL17] combined with a more recent result of Jaikin-Zapirain–López-Álvarez on the Atiyah conjecture [JZLA20]).

In this paper we focus on hyperbolic one-relator groups, and also an algebraic generalisation of these groups. JSJ-theory rose to prominence due to Sela's work on $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions (originally called "essential" JSJ decompositions) of hyperbolic groups, which are graph of

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20E34, 20F05, 20F65, 20F67, 20J05.
Key words and phrases. One-relator group, JSJ decomposition, polytope.

groups decompositions encoding all the "important" virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ splittings of the group. These $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are significant because they are a group invariant (up to certain moves), and they govern for example the model theory [Sel09] and (coarsely) the outer automorphism group [Sel97] [Lev05a] of the group. Moreover, computing $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions is a key step in the algorithm to solve the isomorphism problem for hyperbolic groups [Sel95] [DG08] [DG11].

Our main theorem connects $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions and Friedl–Tillmann polytopes [FT20]. This gives a connected between JSJ decompositions and these polytopes, as JSJ decompositions are refinements of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions [GL17, Section 9.5]. This connection is significant because it means that, under our assumptions, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of $\langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ can be understood simply by investigating the relator R, which yields fast algorithmic results (see below).

We say that a one-ended group has *trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition* if it has a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition which is a single vertex with no edges, and *non-trivial* otherwise (see Convention 2.7).

Theorem A (Theorem 5.4)**.** *Let G be a hyperbolic group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a, b)' \setminus \{1\}$. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) There exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$-orbit of R such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ but T is not conjugate to $[a, b]^k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(3) The Friedl–Tillmann polytope of $\mathcal{P}$ is a straight line, but not a single point.

We illustrate this theorem with an example.

Example 1.1. *Let G be the group defined by the presentation $\langle a, b \mid (a^2b^2a^{-1}b^{-1}a^{-1}b^{-1})^n\rangle$ where $n > 1$. By using Whitehead's algorithm, it can be see that (2) of Theorem A does not hold, and so G has trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition. Alternatively one can consider the Friedl–Tillmann polytope, which we see from Figure 1 is a triangle. Therefore, (3) of Theorem A does not hold, and so G has trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.*

The proof of Theorem A splits into two cases: either G is a one-relator group with torsion, or is torsion-free. The difficulty lies in the torsion-free case, and here Theorem A is a special case of Theorem 5.4, which applies more generally to "restricted Gromov groups", or "RG




FIGURE 1. To obtain the Friedl–Tillmann polytope, trace the word $(a^2b^2a^{-1}b^{-1}a^{-1}b^{-1})^n$ on the ab-plane to obtain a closed loop γ, as in the first diagram (this is independent of n). Take the convex hull of γ, as in the second diagram; this is a polytope P'. Then take the bottom-left corner of all squares in γ that touch the vertices of P', as in the third diagram. The Friedl–Tillmann polytope P is the polytope with these points as vertices, as in the fourth diagram.

Note that the Friedl–Tillmann polytope is in fact a "marked" polytope, but we only care about the shape so we have omitted these details from this example. In the third diagram we took the bottom-left corner of the squares; this is different from Friedl and Tillmann who take the centre points of these squares, but this is not an issue because the polytope is only well-defined up to translation.

groups". Such groups generalise torsion-free hyperbolic groups, and they have a pleasingly simple algebraic definition (see below).

If G does not have $\mathbb{Z}^2$ abelianisation, so $R \notin F(a,b)'$, then the Friedl–Tillmann polytope is less useful (it is *always* a straight line!). However, we can still ask if (1) and (2) from Theorem A are equivalent. To prove this, we could try to apply the machinery underlying these polytopes, which is that of the universal L^2 torsion, but unfortunately this lies beyond our current understanding of these L^2 invariants. We can however use more classical techniques to prove this equivalence for one-relator groups with torsion.

One-relator groups with torsion. The easier case in the proof of Theorem A is that of one relator groups with torsion. Such groups are characterised by having presentations $\langle \mathbf{x} \mid S^n \rangle$ where $n > 1$. They are always hyperbolic [LS77, Theorem IV.5.5] (Brodda has put this fact in a historical context [Bro20]), and as such these groups are of great interest as test-cases for both hyperbolic groups and one-relator groups. For example, one-relator groups with torsion are residually

finite [Wis12], while it is an open problem of Gromov whether or not all hyperbolic groups are residually finite, and one-relator groups with torsion are coherent [LW21], while it is an open problem of G. Baumslag whether or not all one-relator groups are coherent.

Our results for one-relator groups with torsion include the case of $R \notin F(a,b)'$. A *primitive element* of $F(a,b)$ is an element which is part of a basis for $F(a,b)$.

Theorem B (Theorem 3.4)**.** *Let G be a group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ where $R = S^n$ in $F(a,b)$ with $n > 1$ maximal and $S \in F(a,b)$ is non-empty and non-primitive. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) There exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of S such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ but T is not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$.

The conditions on S are because $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are only meaningful for one-ended groups, and if S is primitive or empty then the group defined by $\langle a, b \mid S^n\rangle$ is not one-ended (it is a free product of cyclic groups, $\mathbb{Z} * C_n$ or $\mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}$). In contrast, all the groups in Theorem A are one-ended.

Forms of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. The following corollary describes the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of the groups from Theorems A and B as HNN-extensions of one-relator groups; this description is essentially a reworking of (2) from these theorems.

In the torsion-free case, a result of Kapovich and Weidmann describes such $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions as HNN-extensions [KW99a, Theorem A]; Corollary C further says that the base groups are one-relator groups, which is new and surprising. In the corollary, $T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$ corresponds to the word T in the above theorems, and we view R as a power S^n for $n \geqslant 1$ maximal. We view R like this because Theorem B deals with the root S of the relator $R = S^n$. We lose nothing by doing this as if the group in the corollary is torsion-free then $n = 1$ and $R = S$. We use $|W|$ to denote the length of a word $W \in F(\mathbf{x})$.

Corollary C (Corollary 6.1)**.** *Let the group G and the presentation $\mathcal{P}$ be as in Theorem A or B, and write $R = S^n$ for $n \geqslant 1$ maximal. Suppose that G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Then the graph underlying $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ consists of a single rigid vertex and a single loop edge. Moreover, the corresponding HNN-extension has vertex group*

$\langle a, y \mid T_0^n(a, y)\rangle$, stable letter b, and attaching map given by $y = b^{-1}ab$, where $T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$ is the word T from the theorem. Finally, $|T_0| < |S|$.

In the case of Theorem B, the base group $\langle a, y \mid T_0(a, y)\rangle$ also satisfies the conditions of Theorem B. Therefore, the "$|T_0| < |S|$" condition gives a strong accessability result, similar to the more general result of Louder–Touikan [LT17], but where all the groups involved are one-relator groups. If we are in the case of Theorem A then $T_0(a, y)$ may not be in the derived subgroup, and so we do not obtain the analogous result.

Example 1.2. *Set $G = \langle a, b \mid (a^{-2}b^{-1}a^2b)^n\rangle$, $n > 1$. Clearly, G is an HNN-extension of the group $H = \langle a, y \mid (a^{-2}y^2)^n\rangle$, with attaching map $y = b^{-1}ab$. In fact, this obvious decomposition of G as an HNN-extension corresponds to its $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition, by Corollary C.*

This example illustrates an important point: we can spot $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of the groups in Theorem A or B, since if a decompositions "looks" like a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition then it is indeed a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition (see Theorems 2.8 and 3.2). Now, the group G from Example 1.2 can also be viewed as an HNN-extension of the group $H' = \langle a, z \mid (a^{-2}z)^n\rangle$, with attaching map $z = b^{-1}a^2b$. This is not a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splitting (as $\langle z\rangle$ is not maximal in G), but it "looks" like it is a JSJ decomposition of G. However, we were unable to prove analogues of Theorems 2.8 and 3.2 for JSJ decompositions, and so we are unable to conclude that this splitting is in fact a JSJ decomposition.

Algorithmic consequences. Computing $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions has implications for the isomorphism problem, gives information about outer automorphism groups, and is potentially an important first step for many algorithmic questions about the elementary theory of hyperbolic groups [DG08]. However, current algorithms for computing JSJ decompositions or $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions have bad computational complexity.

For example, algorithms of Barrett [Bar18], Dahmani–Groves [DG08], Dahmani–Guirardel [DG11], and Dahmani–Touikan [DT19] work in very general settings, but when applied to hyperbolic groups they each have no recursive bound on their time complexity. For the algorithms of Barrett, Dahmani–Groves, and Dahmani–Guirardel, this is because they require computation of the hyperbolicity constant δ, and there is no recursive bound on the time complexity for computing δ (as hyperbolicity is undecidable). The algorithm of Dahmani–Touikan requires a solution to the word problem, but all known general solutions for hyperbolic groups require preprocessing for which there is no recursive

bound on the time complexity (for example, computing an automatic structure or Dehn presentation). Even if we assume an oracle gives us δ, these algorithms each proceed by detecting a splitting and then searching blindly through all presentations of the given group to find some presentation which realises the detected splitting, and this procedure clearly has an awful time complexity. So far as the authors are aware, the only algorithm which computes the JSJ decompositions for a class of hyperbolic groups and which has a known (reasonable) bound on its time complexity is due to Suraj Krishna [SK20], but here the computed bound is doubly exponential and is not in general applicable to one-relator groups.

Theorems A and B can be applied to give fast algorithms for both detecting and computing $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions in our setting. Firstly, there is a quadratic-time algorithm to find the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of a given group (essentially, the algorithm is to compute all of the shortest possible element of the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of the relator R).

Corollary D (Corollary 6.2)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem A or B, and with output the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G.*

This algorithm terminates in $O(|R|^2)$-steps.

In the case of Theorem A, the polytope allows us to detect a non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition in linear time (essentially, the algorithm is to draw the Friedl–Tillmann polytope).

Corollary E (Corollary 6.3)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem A, and with output* `yes` *if the group G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition and* `no` *otherwise.*

This algorithm terminates in $O(|R|)$-steps.

Detecting non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions is useful in its own right. We demonstrate this with the following application of Corollaries D and E.

Corollary F (Corollary 6.4)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem A or B, and which detemines if the outer automorphism group of G is finite, virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$, or $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.*

If G is as in Theorem A, this algorithm terminates in $O(|R|)$-steps. Else, it terminates in $O(|R|^2)$-steps.

Relationships between outer automorphism groups. Write G_k

for the group defined by $\langle a, b \mid S^k \rangle$, where $k \geqslant 1$ is maximal and S is fixed. In general there is very little relationship between $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ and $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ for $n > 1$. For example, if $S = b^{-1}a^2ba^{-4}$ then $G_1 = \mathrm{BS}(2, 4)$ has non-finitely generated outer automorphism group [CL83], while $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ for $n \geqslant 2$ is virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ [Log16b]. In contrast, Theorems A and B imply that if $S \in F(a, b)'$ and G_1 is hyperbolic then the triviality of the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G_k depends solely on the word S; the exponent k is irrelevant. We can then apply the relationship between $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions and outer automorphism groups to see that $\mathrm{Out}(G_m)$ and $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ are commensurable for $m, n \geqslant 1$. Our next corollary says that this relationship is much stronger.

Corollary G (Corollary 6.5)**.** *Write G_k for the group defined by $\langle a, b \mid S^k \rangle$, where $k \geqslant 1$ is maximal. If $S \in F(a, b)'$ and G_1 is hyperbolic then:*

(1) $\mathrm{Out}(G_m) \cong \mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ *for all* $m, n > 1$.

(2) $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ *embeds with finite index in* $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$.

The isomorphism of (1) is essentially already known, and holds under the more general restriction that S is non-primitive [Log16b]; we include it for completeness. All the maps here are extremely natural, and in particular the embedding $\mathrm{Out}(G_n) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ is induced by the natural map $G_n \to G_1$ with kernel normally generated by S.

What about JSJ decompositions? Most of our main results can be stated in terms of JSJ decompositions, but we state them in terms of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions as this gives a smoother exposition. Nothing is lost by doing this as $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions encode all the information we are interested in and motivated by (outer automorphism groups, isomorphism problem), and in fact we gain Corollary D, which we are unable to rephrase in terms of JSJ decompositions. Additionally, when we rephrase Corollary C in these terms then the phrase "$T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$ is the word T from the theorem" is replaced with "$T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$ is some word", so we lose the nice connection with the theorems.

Restricted Gromov groups. It is unclear how intrinsic hyperbolicity is to this paper. Indeed, an analogue of Theorem A will hold for any class of one-relator groups for which Theorem 4.1 on Friedl–Tillmann polytopes is applicable, and which satisfies a certain description of splittings given by Kapovich–Weidmann [KW99a, Theorem 3.9]. (Indeed, $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are not required. They just give context and a convenient language for our results, which instead can be stated in terms of "essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings", as in Theorem 2.8.)

In their aforementioned work, Kapovich–Weidmann's main technical result is for a more general class of groups than torsion-free hyperbolic groups, and most of the above results extend to this class too: A *restricted Gromov group*, or *RG group*, is a finitely generated, torsion-free group G such that for all $g, h \in G$ either $\langle g, h\rangle$ is cyclic or there exists some $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\langle g^i, h^i\rangle$ is free of rank two, and every element of G is contained in a maximal cyclic subgroup of G. Torsion-free hyperbolic groups are RG groups, as are their finitely generated subgroups (so there are finitely presented RG groups which are non-hyperbolic [Bra99]).

This paper proves results for RG groups, and obtains the above results as special cases. The only exceptions are Theorem B (as RG groups are torsion-free), and Corollaries F and G, on outer automorphism groups.

Therefore, it seems like hyperbolicity is *not* intrinsic to this paper. On the other hand, it is a famous conjecture of Gersten that every one-relator group with no Baumslag–Solitar subgroups is hyperbolic. RG groups contain no Baumslag–Solitar subgroups, and so Gersten's conjecture suggests that hyperbolicity *is* intrinsic to this paper.

On balance, because the results of this paper are so strong and readily generalise to RG groups, we claim that our results give evidence towards the following weak form of Gersten's conjecture:

Conjecture 1.3 (Weak Gersten conjecture)**.** *Every one-relator RG group is hyperbolic.*

Outline of the paper. In Section 2 we build a theory of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions applicable to two-generated RG groups, and we prove a useful theorem which allows us to "spot" $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of two-generated RG groups (Theorem 2.8). In Section 3 we prove Theorem B. In Section 4 we prove our main technical result involving polytopes, Theorem 4.1, which takes as input a pair of "compatible" presentations of some group G, one having the form $\langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a, b)'$ and the other the form $\langle a, b \mid \mathbf{s}\rangle$ with $\mathbf{s} \subset \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$, and proves that the Friedl–Tillmann polytope of G is a straight line. In Section 5 we prove our main theorem, Theorem 5.4, which is a general form of Theorem A incorporating RG groups. In Section 6 we prove general versions of Corollaries C–F, again incorporating RG groups.

Acknowledgements. We are very grateful to Nicholas Touikan for several helpful comments and suggestions. This work has received

funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, Grant agreement No. 850930, from the UK's Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), grant EP/R035814/1, and from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 427320536 – SFB 1442, as well as under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044–390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure.

2. JSJ-theory and RG groups

JSJ-theory plays a key role in the theory of hyperbolic groups [RS97] [Sel95] [Lev05a] [Sel09] [DG11]. Mirroring the JSJ decomposition of 3-manifolds, the JSJ and $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of a one-ended hyperbolic group are a graph of groups decompositions where all edge groups are virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$, and are (in an appropriate sense) unique if certain vertices, called "flexible vertices", are treated as pieces to be left intact and not decomposed. $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions were originally called "essential JSJ decompositions" by Sela, and they contain all the important information used in the applications of JSJ-theory cited above. We refer the reader to Guirardel–Levitt's monograph for further background and motivation [GL17], in particular their Section 9.5 on $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions.

In this section we define JSJ decompositions and $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. We then build a theory of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions relevant to the RG groups considered in this paper. Our main result here is Theorem 2.8, which can be summarised by: when a decomposition looks like a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition, it is indeed a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.

$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are a certain kind of graph of groups splitting. In a graph Γ, every edge e, with intial and terminal vertices $\iota(e)$ and $\tau(e)$, respectively has an associated reverse edge $\overline{e}$ such that $\iota(\overline{e}) = \tau(e)$ and $\tau(\overline{e}) = \iota(e)$. We use $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ to denote a graph of groups, with a connected underlying graph Γ, associated *vertex groups* (or *vertex stabilisers*) $\{G_v \mid v \in V_\Gamma\}$ and *edge groups* (or *edge stabilisers*) $\{G_e \mid e \in E_\Gamma, G_e = G_{\overline{e}}\}$, and set of monomorphisms $\theta_e : G_e \to G_{\iota(e)}$. For notation and background on graphs of groups we refer the reader to Serre's book [Ser03].

JSJ decompositions. A *$\mathcal{VC}$-tree of G* is a tree T equipped with an action of G whose edge stabilisers are virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$. We define *$\mathbb{Z}$-trees* analogously, by requiring the edge stabilisers to be infinite cyclic. A subgroup $H \leqslant G$ is *elliptic* in T if it fixes a point in T (and hence

is contained in a vertex stabiliser of T), and *universally elliptic* if it is elliptic in every $\mathcal{VC}$-tree of G. A $\mathcal{VC}$-tree T is *universally elliptic* if its edge stabilisers are universally elliptic. A $\mathcal{VC}$-tree T *dominates* the $\mathcal{VC}$-tree T' if every subgroup of G which is elliptic in T is elliptic in T'. A *$\mathcal{VC}$-JSJ tree T of G* is a $\mathcal{VC}$-tree such that:

(1) T is universally elliptic, and
(2) T dominates every other universally elliptic $\mathcal{VC}$-tree T'.

The quotient graph of groups $\Gamma = T/G$ is a *$\mathcal{VC}$-JSJ decomposition of G*. All the trees we consider are $\mathcal{VC}$, so we shall abbreviate "$\mathcal{VC}$-tree", "$\mathcal{VC}$-JSJ tree" and "$\mathcal{VC}$-JSJ decomposition" to simply *tree*, *JSJ tree* and *JSJ decomposition*, respectively.

A vertex of a tree T is *elementary* if its group is virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$, while a non-elementary vertex is *rigid* if its group is universally elliptic, and *flexible* otherwise. Flexible vertices are the "pieces to be left intact and not decomposed" mentioned above and understanding their vertex groups plays a central role in JSJ-theory, although in this paper flexible vertices play a very minor role.

$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. A *$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-subgroup of G* is a maximal virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ subgroup of G with infinite centre. A *$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree of G* is a tree T equipped with an action of G where edge stabilisers are in $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$. A $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree T is *universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic* if its edge stabilisers are elliptic in every $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree of G. A *$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree T of G* is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree such that:

(1) T is universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic, and
(2) T dominates every other universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic tree T'.

The quotient graph of groups $\Gamma = T/G$ is a *$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G*. In this context, a non-elementary vertex of a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree is *rigid* if its group is universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic, and *flexible* otherwise.

The theory of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions for hyperbolic groups is especially powerful because there are canonical structures: for each group G there is a unique "deformation space" of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees, and there is a canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree [GL17, Section 9.5]. We wish to extend these results to $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees of RG groups. To facilitate this, we consider $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups.

2.1. **$\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups.** A *CSA group* is a group G with the property that every maximal abelian subgroup of G is malnormal. A *$\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group* is a CSA group where every non-trivial abelian subgroup is infinite cyclic. We are interested in $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups because, as we shall soon see, RG groups are $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and because we can readily study their $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ

decompositions. The starting point for this study is the existing theory of JSJ decompositions of CSA groups [GL17, Theorem 9.5].

We have kept this section short, and only prove the few results we need. In particular, we focus on $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups rather than CSA groups, and we only prove that $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions exist under certain conditions. We suspect that this section can be extended into a complete $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ theory for CSA groups. As these results are already known for hyperbolic groups, the reader who is only interested in hyperbolic groups may skip this section.

Existence. We start by proving that certain $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups have $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. To do this we follow the analogous existence proof for hyperbolic groups [GL17, Section 9.5] [DG11, Section 4]. We restrict ourselves to those $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ groups whose JSJ decompositions have no flexible vertices. This sidesteps subtleties in the proof for hyperbolic groups (see the discussion following Remark 9.29 of [GL17], or [DG11, Remark 4.13]), and is the only situation used in this paper. Our existence result actually gives the existence of a canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ which has certain nice properties (e.g. invariant under group automorphisms).

Let C be a non-trivial cyclic subgroup of a $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group G. Zorn's lemma guarantees the existence of a maximal abelian subgroup A of G containing C. Since G is $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, the group A is infinite cyclic. Let A' be another maximal abelian subgroup of G containing C. Take $a \in A'$. As a centralises C, we have that C is a non-trivial subgroup of aAa^{-1}, and so by malnormality of A we have that $a \in A$. Hence $A' = A$, and we have shown that if C is a non-trivial cyclic subgroup of a $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group G then there exists the unique maximal cyclic subgroup containing C; we will denote this subgroup by $\hat{C}$.

Given two distinct edges e_1, e_2 of a tree T such that $\iota(e_1) = \iota(e_2)$ then we can *fold* these edges together by identifying $\tau(e_1)$ to $\tau(e_2)$, e_1 to e_2, and the reverse edges $\overline{e}_1$ to $\overline{e}_2$, and we obtain a new tree $T/[e_1 = e_2]$ [Sta83]. If G acts on T and E is some set of edges of T with the same initial vertex then an *orbit-fold* of the edges E is the tree $T/[G \curvearrowright E]$ obtained by folding all the edges in $g \cdot E$ for all $g \in G$. This ensures that G acts on the new tree $T/[G \curvearrowright E]$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let G be a one-ended $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group whose JSJ trees have no flexible vertices. Then G has a canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$, and this tree has no flexible vertices.*

Proof. The group G admits a canonical JSJ tree T_c, namely the (abelian) "tree of cylinders" of Guirardel–Levitt [GL17, Theorem 9.5]. This is a

bipartite tree with vertex set $V_0(T_c) \sqcup V_1(T_c)$, where $V_0(T_c)$ consists of rigid vertices and $V_1(T_c)$ consists of elementary vertices. Note that edge groups are subgroups of finite index in the vertex groups of elementary vertices, essentially since non-trivial subgroups of $\mathbb{Z}$ are of finite index.

Let T_c' be the the quotient of T_c by the smallest equivalence relation such that, for all edges e of T and all $h \in \hat{G}_e$, we have $h \cdot e \sim e$. We shall use a contructive definition of T_c', which is equivalent [GL17, Proof of Lemma 9.27] (see also the "$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-fold" of [DG11, Section 4.3]). The tree T_c' is the G-tree constructed from T_c by iteratively orbit-folding together edges as follows: Let e be an edge such that $G_e \neq \hat{G}_e$. If one of the endpoints of e is fixed by $\hat{G}_e$, then orbit-fold together the set of edges in the $\hat{G}_e$-orbit of e. If not, then as $\hat{G}_e$ is cyclic with generator x, say, such that x^n fixes an edge for some $n \geqslant 1$ (specifically, $G_e = \langle x^n \rangle$), we have that the subtree $\mathrm{Fix}(\hat{G}_e)$ fixed by $\hat{G}_e$ is non-empty [Ser03, Proposition 25]. Let e' be the first edge in the shortest path joining $\mathrm{Fix}(\hat{G}_e)$ to e, so $\iota(e') \in \mathrm{Fix}(\hat{G}_e)$ but $\iota(e') \notin \mathrm{Fix}(\hat{G}_e)$. Then orbit-fold together the set of edges in the $\hat{G}_{e'}$-orbit of e'. The first description of T_c' gives us that, because T_c is canonical, the tree T_c' is canonical. Now, let $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ be the minimal G-invariant subtree of T_c'; this tree again is canonical, and we shall see that it is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree with the required properties.

The tree $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ is universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic [GL17, Lemma 9.27.(3)]. It is also a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree: Orbit-folds preserve the bipartite structure of the graph, and so every edge of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}} \subseteq T_c'$ is adjacent to a non-elementary vertex, and hence every edge has stabiliser which is a maximal infinite cyclic subgroup of G [DG11, Lemma 4.10.1].

We now prove that $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ dominates every other universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic tree S, and that it has no flexible vertices. If v' is an elementary vertex of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}} \subseteq T_c'$ then consider a vertex $v \in T_c$ such that v' is the image of v under the natural map $T_c \to T_c'$. As orbit-folds preserve the group action, the vertex v satisfies $G_v \leqslant G_{v'}$, so $G_{v'}$ contains an edge stabiliser G_e of T_c with finite index. As T_c is a JSJ-tree, G_e is elliptic in S, and so $G_{v'}$ is elliptic in S [GL17, Remark 9.26]. If v' is not an elementary vertex, then there exists a vertex $v \in T_c$ with adjacent edges $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ such that $G_{v'}$ has stabiliser a multiple amalgam (i.e. a tree of groups) $G_{v'} = G_v(*_{G_{e_i}} \hat{G}_{e_i})_{i=1}^n$ [DG11, Lemma 4.10.3]. The group G_v is elliptic in S as v is rigid, and so $G_{v'}$ is also elliptic in S [GL17, Remark 9.26]. This also implies that the vertex v' is rigid, and the result follows. □

Uniqueness. JSJ trees or $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees are not in general unique,

but instead unique up to certain moves. More formally: The *deformation space* of a tree T is the set of trees T' such that T dominates T' and T' dominates T. Equivalently, two trees are in the same deformation space if and only if they have the same elliptic subgroups. Elements of a deformation space are connected by moves of a certain type [GL17, Remark 2.13] [CF09, Theorem 1.1]. Therefore, the following says that $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of a $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group are unique, up to the moves cited above. The proof is clear because, by the definition of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees, they pairwise dominate one another and so all lie in the same deformation space.

Proposition 2.2. *Let G be a finitely generated one-ended $CSA_{\mathbb{Z}}$ group. If G has a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree, then all $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees of G lie in the same deformation space $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$.*

2.2. **RG groups.** The remainder of this section relies on work of Kapovich–Weidmann, who studied cyclic splittings of two-generated torsion-free hyperbolic groups, but their main result is for RG groups as defined in the introduction [KW99a, Theorem 3.9]. Within the class of torsion-free groups, we have the following:

$$\text{hyperbolic} \subset \mathrm{RG} \subset \mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$$

The first inclusion, that torsion-free hyperbolic groups are RG, is due to Kapovich–Weidmann [KW99a, Lemma 3.6.1]. The second inclusion is similar to one of their observations [KW99a, Proposition 3.4.3], but we include it for completeness. This second inclusion means that there exists a JSJ-theory of RG groups.

Lemma 2.3. *RG groups are $CSA_{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Proof. Let G be an RG group, and A an abelian subgroup of G. Every pair of elements of A generate a cyclic subgroup, and so A is locally cyclic. As every element of G is contained in a maximal cyclic subgroup of G, we further have that A is cyclic, generated by an element $a \in A$. Finally, A is malnormal as if $g \in G$ is such that $g^{-1}a^m g = a^n$ where $m, n \neq 0$, then no non-trivial powers of g and a generate a non-cyclic free subgroup, and so $\langle a, g \rangle$ is cyclic, hence $g \in A$ by maximality of A. □

As RG groups are $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, they have JSJ decompositions. However, we wish to study their $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. Existence of these decompositions for two-generated one-ended RG groups is obtained by applying Proposition 2.1 to the following. The proof uses the canonical JSJ tree T_c of G [GL17, Theorem 9.5] which we previously used in the proof of Proposition 2.1. However, here we have no restriction on

flexible vertices so our description changes slightly: The canonical JSJ tree T_c is a bipartite tree with vertex set $V_0(T_c) \sqcup V_1(T_c)$, where $V_0(T_c)$ consists of rigid and flexible vertices, and $V_1(T_c)$ consists of elementary vertices.

Lemma 2.4. *Let G be a two-generated one-ended RG group. Then no JSJ tree of G has a flexible vertex.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.3, G is $\mathrm{CSA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and so has a (canonical) JSJ tree T_c [GL17, Theorem 9.5]. This tree can be altered to give a new tree $\overline{T}_c$ which has no elementary vertices: on the level of T_c/G, slide every elementary vertex of degree 1 into the unique adjacent vertex group, while as G is an RG group every elementary vertex v of T_c which is of degree > 1 has an incident edge e with $\iota(e) = v$ and such that $G_e = G_v$, so slide every such elementary vertex v into the vertex $\tau(e)$. The quotient graph $\overline{T}_c$ either consists of a single vertex and no edges, or a single vertex and a single loop edge [KW99a, Theorem 3.9].

Then by reversing the above moves, and using the bipartite structure of T_c, we have that T_c/G consists of a single non-elementary vertex v, possibly an elementary vertex u with incident edges e, f each connected to v (this corresponds to the loop edge), and possibly some elementary vertices of degree one each connected to v.

It follows that the vertex group G_v is two-generated [KW99a, Propositions 3.7 & 3.8] (we apply one of these citations for each elementary vertex). Suppose v is flexible. Then G_v is the fundamental groups of a compact surface [GL17, Theorem 9.5], and hence is a Fuchsian group. This is a contradiction as every two-generated Fuchsian group contains torsion [Ros86, Lemma 1], but G_v is torsion-free. Therefore, T_c does not have a flexible vertex, and as flexible vertices are defined by a universal property it follows that no JSJ tree of G has a flexible vertex. □

We now summarise what we know so far.

Proposition 2.5. *Let G be a two-generated one-ended RG group. Then G has a canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$, and all $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees of G lie in the same deformation space $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$.*

Moreover, no $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree of G has a flexible vertex.

Proof. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, we can apply Proposition 2.1 to get a canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ for G, and this tree has no flexible vertices. The result then follows by Proposition 2.2, and because one $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree has a flexible vertex if and only if they all have a flexible vertex. □

2.3. **Two-generated groups.** We now consider two-generated groups. Firstly, we define *the* $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of a two-generated one-ended RG group, and of a two-generator one-relator group with torsion; this is Convention 2.7, but we require a result first which justifies the word "the", above. We then prove a result which allows us to determine if a given splitting is, in fact, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of such an RG group.

An *essential* $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$*-tree* is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree such that no edge group has finite index in an adjacent vertex group, while an *essential* $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$*-splitting* of a group is a corresponding graph of groups decomposition. We define *essential* $\mathbb{Z}$*-trees* and *essential* $\mathbb{Z}$*-splittings* analogously, for $\mathbb{Z}$-trees. Note that a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition with no elementary vertices is an essential $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splitting.

The following proof uses a connection between outer automorphism groups and essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings. (Really this connection is for essential $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splittings, which is well-studied for hyperbolic groups [Lev05a], but we only need it for $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings.) Every edge e of an essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting of a group G corresponds to a single-edge graph of groups splitting by collapsing all the other edges of the graph. These splittings have two forms, and in each case we can define an automorphism of G:

$$\begin{array}{lll} A *_{g=h} B & & A*_{t^{-1}gt=h} \\ \phi_e : a \mapsto a & \forall a \in A & \phi_e : a \mapsto a \quad \forall a \in A \\ \quad b \mapsto b^h & \forall b \in B & \quad t \mapsto gt \end{array}$$

The maps ϕ_e are called *Dehn twists* about edges, and Dehn twists of single-edge splittings generate infinite order subgroups of $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ which pairwise intersect trivially. As flexible vertices of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions have groups which are not elliptic in every $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree, they contribute at least two Dehn twists to $\mathrm{Out}(G)$. In particular, if a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G contains a flexible vertex then $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is not virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let G be a two-generated one-ended RG group, or a two-generator one-relator group with torsion which is not isomorphic to $\langle a, b \mid [a, b]^n \rangle$ for any $n > 1$.*

If G has an essential $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree T which contains at least one edge, then this tree is unique and is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree of G. The $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition T/G consists of a single rigid vertex with a single loop edge.

Proof. If G is a one-relator group with torsion then every edge group of T is infinite cyclic [Log16a, Lemmas 5.1 & 5.5], while the same is

clearly true if G is an RG group as G is torsion-free. Recall from Proposition 2.5 that if G is an RG group then no $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree of G has a flexible vertex. The same is true if G is a one-relator group with torsion, as here $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ [Log16b, Theorem A], but if T_{JSJ} is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree with a flexible vertex then $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is not virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ as the multiple splittings at this vertex contribute multiple Dehn twists to $\mathrm{Out}(G)$, a contradiction.

Let T be as in the statement. We first prove that T/G consists of a single vertex v and a single loop edge. If G is an RG group then this is known [KW99a, Theorem 3.9], so suppose G is a two-generator one-relator groups with torsion. Here, $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ [Log16b, Theorem A], and as noted above every $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splitting is a $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting [Log16a, Lemmas 5.1 & 5.5]. If T/G contains more than one edge then $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is not virtually-$\mathbb{Z}$ as both splitting contribute Dehn twists to $\mathrm{Out}(G)$, a contradiction. Therefore, T/G consists of a single vertex with a single loop edge.

We now apply a result of Levitt on *reduced* trees, which are trees T where if an edge e has the same stabiliser as one of its endpoints, then both endpoints of e are in the same G-orbit of T (so e projects onto a loop in the quotient graph T/G). If G is a hyperbolic or RG group and the tree is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree then being reduced is equivalent to being an essential splitting (as if T is a reduced non-essential $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree then T/G contains a loop edge with endpoints an elementary vertex, which gives a Baumslag–Solitar (in fact $\mathbb{Z}^2$) subgroup of G). Writing v for the vertex of T/G, and e and $\overline{e}$ for the directed edges, because G is either hyperbolic or an RG group, and because edge stabilisers are infinite cyclic, we have that there exists no $g \in G_v$ such that $g^{-1}G_e g \cap G_{\overline{e}}$ is non-trivial, and therefore T is the unique reduced tree in its deformation space [Lev05b, Theorem 1] (see also [DG11, Theorem 5.13] for hyperbolic groups), and hence T is the unique essential tree in its deformation space.

We now prove that any tree T as in the statement is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree. Let $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ be the canonical $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree guaranteed to exist by Proposition 2.5. As this is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree, if e is an edge incident to an elementary vertex v of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ then $G_e = G_v$. Therefore, we can slide an orbit of elementary vertex of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$ into an orbit of adjacent vertices (so on the level of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}/G$, slide a single elementary vertex into an adjacent vertex), and the resulting tree is still a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree of G. As there are finitely many orbits of elementary vertices of $T_{\mathcal{Z}_{\max}}$, this process terminates at a tree T_{JSJ} which has no elementary vertices. There are then two options: either T_{JSJ} consists of a single rigid vertex, or T_{JSJ} contains at least one edge. If T_{JSJ} consists of a single rigid vertex

then then the whose group G is elliptic in every $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splitting of G, and therefore G has no $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-splittings, contradicting the existence of the tree $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree T which has an edge. Therefore, T_{JSJ} contains an edge, so is as in the statement, and so by the above T_{JSJ}/G consists of a single rigid vertex and a single loop edge. As T_{JSJ} is universally-$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$ elliptic, it is elliptic with respect to T, and so there exists a refinement $\hat{T}_{JSJ}$ of T_{JSJ} which dominates T and such that every edge stabiliser of T contains an edge stabiliser of $\hat{T}_{JSJ}$ [GL17, Proposition 2.2], and moreover this tree is itself a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree [GL17, Discussion following Definition 9.25]. However, we have already seen that T_{JSJ} has no flexible vertices, so as $\hat{T}_{JSJ}$ is a refinement of T_{JSJ} it is obtained by adding elementary vertices to T_{JSJ}. Therefore, as T_{JSJ} and $\hat{T}_{JSJ}$ are both $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-trees, the edge stabilisers of $\hat{T}_{JSJ}$ are precisely the edge stabilisers of T_{JSJ}, and therefore every edge stabiliser of T contains an edge stabiliser of T_{JSJ}. As these edge stabilisers are $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$, it follows that edge stabilisers of T are edge stabilisers of T_{JSJ}, and so T is universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic. Then T is elliptic with respect to T_{JSJ}, so as above but with T and T_{JSJ} swapped we obtain a refinement $\hat{T}$ of T which dominates T_{JSJ} and which is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree. Now, every edge stabiliser of $\hat{T}$ fixes an edge of T or of T_{JSJ} [GL17, Proposition 2.2], and so as $\hat{T}$ is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-tree every edge stabiliser is equal to an edge stabiliser of one of these two trees, and therefore $\hat{T}$ is universally $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-elliptic. As it dominates T_{JSJ}, we have that $\hat{T}$ is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree, and so contains a single non-elementary vertex. As $\hat{T}$ is a refinement of T across $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-subgroups, this means that T itself is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree, as required.

Therefore, if T is as in the statement then it is the unique essential tree in its deformation space, and is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree. As argued above, T/G consists of a single vertex and a single loop edge, and as T is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree the vertex is rigid. Now, $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ trees always lie in the same deformation space (as they dominate one another), and so T is the unique essential $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree, and the result follows. □

Fuchsian groups are treated differently in the theory of JSJ decompositions. For example, Bowditch excludes these groups from his main theorem [Bow98, Theorem 0.1]. These groups play a minor role in this article, and it is easiest if, similarly to Bowditch, we simply define such groups have trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.

Convention 2.7. *Let G be a two-generated one-ended RG group, or a two-generator one-relator group with torsion. If G is isomorphic to $\langle a, b \mid [a, b]^n \rangle$ for $n > 1$, then "the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G" is*

the graph of groups consisting a single vertex and no edges. Otherwise, "the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G" is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition with no elementary vertices; by Proposition 2.6 this is unique (up to conjugation).

Such a group G has trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition *it is Fuchsian or its $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition (as above) consists of a single vertex and no edges.*

Spotting $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. Is next result is only for RG groups; the analogous result for one-relator groups with torsion has a stronger statement bespoke for one-relator groups, so we postpone it until the next section. These results give conditions which are equivalent to one of our groups have non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition, and these conditions work well with algorithms. In particular, algorithms can easily detect Conditions (2) and (3) of the following theorem, and hence can detect a non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition, while crucially Condition (4) says that Condition (3) actually finds, rather than just detects, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G.

Theorem 2.8. *Let G be a two-generated one-ended RG group with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ abelianisation. The following are equivalent.*

1. *G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.*
2. *G has an essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting.*
3. *G admits a presentation $\langle a, b \mid \mathbf{t}(a, b^{-1}ab)\rangle$ for some subset $\mathbf{t}(a, y) \subset F(a, y)$.*
4. *G has $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition with a single rigid vertex and a single loop edge, corresponding to an HNN-extension with stable letter b:*
$$\langle a, y, b \mid \mathbf{t}(a, y), y = b^{-1}ab\rangle$$
for some subset $\mathbf{t}(a, y) \subset F(a, y)$.

Moreover, the presentations in (3) and (4) are related in the obvious way, so in each presentation the letters a, b represent the same group elements of G and the subsets $\mathbf{t}(a, y)$ are the same subsets of $F(a, y)$.

Proof. We prove the chain of inclusions (4) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) $\Rightarrow$ (4).

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (2) The splitting given by (4) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting, and is essential as the base group $H = \langle a, y\rangle$ of the HNN-extension is torsion-free and non-cyclic [KW99a, Proposition 3.8].

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) This follows from Proposition 2.6.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) By Proposition 2.6, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G consists of a single rigid vertex v and a single loop edge e, as claimed. This

corresponds to an HNN-extension $\langle H, t \mid t^{-1}p^n t = q^m\rangle$ where $\langle p\rangle$ and $\langle q\rangle$ are maximal cyclic in G. As this is a $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition we have $|m| = |n| = 1$, so without loss of generality we may assume $m = n = 1$. Now, there exists some $h \in H$ such that $G = \langle th, p\rangle$ and $H = \langle p, h^{-1}qh\rangle$ [KW99a, Proposition 3.8], and so by taking $a = p$, $b = th$ and $y = h^{-1}qh$ we obtain the following presentation for G, as an HNN-extension with stable letter b:

$$\langle a, y, b \mid \mathbf{t}(a, y), y = b^{-1}ab\rangle$$

This still corresponds to the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G as the Bass–Serre tree is the same for the two HNN-extensions, and this tree is precisely the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ tree (that this is the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition also follows from Proposition 2.6). Hence, (4) holds.

Finally we prove (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) First, apply the Tietze transformation corresponding to adding the new generator y as $b^{-1}ab$ to get from the presentation in (3) to the presentation in (4):

$$\langle a, b \mid \mathbf{t}(a, b^{-1}ab)\rangle \cong \langle a, y, b \mid \mathbf{t}(a, y), y = b^{-1}ab\rangle.$$

As G has $\mathbb{Z}^2$ abelianisation, both the subgroups $\langle a\rangle$ and $\langle y\rangle$ are maximal infinite cyclic subgroups of G. Therefore, the resulting presentation describes an HNN-extension, with base group $H = \langle a, y \mid \mathbf{t}(a, y)\rangle$ and stable letter b, as claimed. Now, this HNN-extension corresponds to some essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting, because H is one-ended as G is one-ended [KW99a, Proposition 3.8], and so by Proposition 2.6 the vertex is rigid and this splitting is in fact the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G. Hence, (4) holds.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) This is obvious, by reversing the Tietze transformation from the above equivalence. □

3. One-relator groups with torsion

A one-relator group $\langle \mathbf{x} \mid S^n\rangle$, where $n \geq 1$ is maximal, contains torsion elements if and only if $n > 1$ [LS77, Proposition II.5.18]. Therefore, a *one relator group with torsion* is precisely a one-relator group $\langle \mathbf{x} \mid S^n\rangle$ where $n > 1$; such groups are always hyperbolic [LS77, Theorem IV.5.5], and so when they are one-ended we can discuss their $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions.

In this section we prove Theorem 3.2; we also prove a result about the automorphic orbits of elements in the subgroup $\langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ which is also used in the proof of Theorem A.

$\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are only defined for one-ended groups, while Fuchsian groups must be treated with care. The following classification of when two-generator one-relator groups are one-ended and are Fuchsian is therefore useful. Recall that a primitive element of $F(a,b)$ is an element which is part of a basis for $F(a,b)$. We say a free product $A * B$ is *trivial* if either A or B is trivial, and is *non-trivial* otherwise.

Proposition 3.1. *The group defined by $\langle a, b \mid S^n \rangle$, $n \geq 1$ maximal, is:*

(1) one-ended if and only if S is non-primitive and non-empty.
(2) one-ended and Fuchsian if and only if $n > 1$ and S is conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$.

Proof. Let $G = \langle a, b \mid S^n \rangle$, $n \geq 1$ maximal.

For (1), if S is empty then G is free and so not one-ended, while if S is primitive then $G \cong \langle a, b \mid a^n \rangle$, so G is either two-ended (if $n = 1$) or infinitely ended (if $n > 1$). Hence, if G is one-ended then S is non-primitive and non-empty. For the other direction, if S is non-primitive and non-empty then the group G_1 defined by $\langle a, b \mid S \rangle$ does not split non-trivially as a free product [LS77, Proposition II.5.13] and is not cyclic [LS77, Proposition II.5.11], but is torsion-free [LS77, Proposition II.5.18]. Hence, G_1 is one-ended, and so also G is one-ended [Log16a, Lemma 3.2].

For (2), the group G is one-ended and Fuchsian if and only if $n > 1$ and $G \cong \langle a, b \mid [a,b]^n \rangle$ [Ros86, Lemma 1], if and only if there exists an automorphism $\phi \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ such that $\phi(S^n) = [a,b]^{\pm n}$ [Pri77], if and only if S is conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$ [MKS04, Theorem 3.9], as required. □

Next we prove the analogue of Theorem 2.8 for two-generator one-relator groups with torsion. The main difference is that the set $\mathbf{t}(a,y)$ is replaced with a single word $T(a,y)^n$, and that Condition (3) gives information about this word. The restrictions on the word S in this theorem correspond precisely to G being one-ended and non-Fuchsian, by Proposition 3.1. In the theorem, the pair of letters (a,b) in (4) and (5) represent the same pair of group elements of G. However, the pair (a,b) from $\mathcal{P}$ are different, and are related to those in (4) and (5) via the map ψ.

Theorem 3.2. *Let G be a group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R \rangle$ where $R = S^n$ with $n > 1$ maximal and where $S \in F(a,b)$ is non-empty, non-primitive, and not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) G has an essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting.

(3) *There exists an automorphism* $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ *such that* $\psi(S) \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$.
(4) G *admits a presentation* $\langle a, b \mid T(a, b^{-1}ab)^n\rangle$ *for some word* $T \in F(a, y)$.
(5) G *has* $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$*-JSJ decomposition with a single rigid vertex and a single loop edge, corresponding to an HNN-extension with stable letter* b*:*

$$\langle a, y, b \mid T(a, y)^n, y = b^{-1}ab\rangle$$

Moreover, the presentations in (4) and (5) are related in the obvious way, so in each presentation the letters a, b *represent the same elements of* G *and the words* $T(a, y)$ *are the same, and indeed may be taken to be such that* $T(a, b^{-1}ab) = \psi(S)$*, with* ψ *as in (3).*

Proof. We start with (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (2).

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) This is immediate from the definitions (see Convention 2.7).

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) This follows from Proposition 2.6.

Next we prove (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4).

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) It is a standard result in the theory of group presentations that $\langle a, b \mid S^n\rangle \cong \langle a, b \mid \psi(S^n)\rangle$, so the result follows by taking $T(a, y) \in F(a, y)$ such that $T(a, b^{-1}ab) = \psi(S)$.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) This holds as the word $S' := T(a, b^{-1}ab) \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ is in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$-orbit of S [Pri77], as required.

Finally we prove (5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5).

(5) $\Rightarrow$ (1) This is clear as the stated $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition is non-trivial.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) Suppose G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition. Then G admits an essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting [Log16a, Theorem A], and hence has infinite outer automorphism group [Lev05a, Theorem 5.1]. Therefore, there exists $S' \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ such that $G \cong \langle a, b \mid S'\rangle$ [Log16b, Lemma 5.1]. Setting $T(a, y)$ to be the word such that $T(a, b^{-1}ab) = S'$ gives the result.

(4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) The group G has presentation

$$\langle a, b \mid T(a, b^{-1}ab)^n\rangle \cong \langle a, b, y \mid T(a, y)^n, y = b^{-1}ab\rangle$$

which has the claimed form. This is an HNN-extension with base group $H = \langle a, y \mid T(a, y)^n\rangle$ and stable letter b as the subgroups $\langle a\rangle$ and $\langle y\rangle$ of H are isomorphic, because a, and hence its conjugate $y = b^{-1}ab$, have infinite order in G by the B.B.Newman Spelling Theorem [LS77, Theorem IV.5.5]. Indeed, G has presentations $\langle a, b \mid T(a, b^{-1}ab)^n\rangle$ and

$\langle y, b \mid T(byb^{-1}, y)^n \rangle$, whence it follows that the subgroups $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle y \rangle$ are maximal cyclic subgroups of G [New73, Lemma 2.1].

Therefore, the HNN-extension describes a graph of groups decomposition $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ of G with a single vertex and a single loop edge, and where the edge groups are maximal cyclic in G. By Proposition 2.6, the vertex is rigid and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G, as required. □

Before proving Theorem 3.4 (which corresponds to Theorem B) we need the following result about automorphic orbits of elements of $\langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle$. We also use this result in the proof of Theorem 5.4 (Theorems 3.4 and 5.4 combine to prove Theorem A).

Proposition 3.3. *Let $W \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle$. Then there exists a cyclic shift W' of W such that W' has shortest length in its* $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$*-orbit, and $W' \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle$.*

Proof. For a conjugacy class $[U]$ of an element $U \in F(a,b)$, we write $|[U]| := \min\{|V| \mid V \in [U]\}$. So $|[U]|$ is simply the length of U after cyclic reduction. Therefore, the proposition says in particular that for $W \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle$, there is no automorphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ such that $|[\alpha(W)]| < |[W]|$. Clearly the result is true if $[W]$ contains some power of a. Therefore, assume that $[W] \cap \langle a \rangle = \emptyset$, and suppose that there exists an automorphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ such that $|[\alpha(W)]| < |[W]|$. We seek a contradiction.

By the "peak reduction" lemma from Whitehead's algorithm [LS77, Proposition I.4.20], there exists a Whitehead automorphism β of the second kind (so a Whitehead automorphism which is not a permutation of $\{a, b\}^{\pm 1}$) such that $|[\beta(W)]| < |[W]|$. Writing $\gamma_b \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ for conjugation by b, the only four such Whitehead automorphisms which do not fix $[W]$ are $\beta_1 \colon a \mapsto ab$, $b \mapsto b$, $\beta_{-1} \colon a \mapsto ab^{-1}$, $b \mapsto b$, $\gamma_b\beta_1$, and $\gamma_b\beta_{-1}$.

We find a contradition for the automorphisms β_1 and β_{-1}; the cases of $\gamma_b\beta_1$ and $\gamma_b\beta_{-1}$ follow immediately as $[\gamma_b\beta_1(W)] = [\beta_1(W)]$ and $[\gamma_b\beta_{-1}(W)] = [\beta_{-1}(W)]$. Consider a cyclically reduced conjugate W' of W which begins with a and ends with b. Then $W' \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab \rangle$, and we write this word as a reduced word $U(a, b^{-1}ab)$. Let X denote the total number of x-terms in $U(x,y)$, and Y the number of y-terms, and $\mathrm{Syl}(Y)$ the total number of y-syllables in $U(x,y)$ (a *y-syllable* is a maximal subword of the form y^i). Then $|W'| = X + Y + 2\,\mathrm{Syl}(Y)$. Now, $[\beta_1(W')] = [U(ba, ab)]$ and $[\beta_{-1}(W')] = [U(ab^{-1}, b^{-1}a)]$, and no free reduction or cyclic reduction happens when forming $U(ba, ab)$ or $U(ab^{-1}, b^{-1}a)$, and so $|[\beta_1(W')]| = 2X + 2Y = [\beta_{-1}(W')]$. Now, clearly $Y \geq \mathrm{Syl}(Y)$, while $\mathrm{Syl}(X) = \mathrm{Syl}(Y)$ as $U(x,y)$ starts with an x-syllable

and ends with a y-syllable, by our choice of W', and so $X \geq \mathrm{Syl}(Y)$. Therefore, $2X + 2Y \geq X + Y + 2\,\mathrm{Syl}(Y)$. However, by assumption $2X+2Y < X+Y+2\,\mathrm{Syl}(Y)$, so we have our promised contradiction. □

We now prove Theorem B.

Theorem 3.4 (Theorem B)**.** *Let G be a group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ where $R = S^n$ in $F(a, b)$ with $n > 1$ maximal and where S is non-empty and not a primitive element of $F(a, b)$. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) There exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$-orbit of S such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ but T is not conjugate to $[a, b]^{\pm 1}$.

Proof. Suppose (1) holds. Then G is not Fuchsian and so, by Proposition 3.1, S is not conjugate to $[a, b]^{\pm 1}$. Then by Theorem 3.2 there exists an automorphism $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$ such that $\psi(S) \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$. By Proposition 3.3, there exists a cyclic shift T of $\psi(S)$ which has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$-orbit, and $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$. Moreover, as S is not conjugate to $[a, b]^{\pm 1}$, neither is T [MKS04, Theorem 3.9]. Hence, the word T satisfies (2).

If (2) holds then (1) follows from Theorem 3.2. □

4. Splittings and Friedl–Tillmann polytopes

Theorem 2.8 gives a clear link between $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions and presentations of the form $\mathcal{P}' = \langle x, y \mid \mathbf{t}(x, y^{-1}xy)\rangle$ for subsets $\mathbf{t}(x, y^{-1}xy)$ of $\langle x, y^{-1}xy\rangle$. In this section we suppose that this JSJ-presentation $\mathcal{P}'$ for a group G is "close" to being one-relator (specifically, the generating pair (x, y) also admits a one-relator presentation $\langle x, y \mid S\rangle$), and we prove that the Friedl–Tillmann polytope of G is a straight line (Theorem 4.1), and hence that any one-relator presentation for G has this JSJ-form $\langle a, b \mid R_0(a, b^{-1}ab)\rangle$, up to a Nielsen transformation (Lemma 4.2).

In Section 5 we prove that Theorem 4.1 applies to RG groups, and hence torsion-free hyperbolic groups. The proof of Theorem 4.1 reviews the notion of a Friedl–Tillmann polytope.

Theorem 4.1. *Let G be a torsion-free two-generator one-relator group with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ abelianisation, and let $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ be any one-relator presentation of G. Suppose there exist a normal subgroup N of $F(x, y)$ such that:*

(1) $F(x, y)/N \cong G$,

(2) *N can be normally generated by a single element $R_N \in F(x,y)$,*
(3) *There exists a subset $\mathbf{t}_N$ of $\langle x, y^{-1}xy\rangle$ such that $\mathbf{t}_N$ normally generates N.*

Then the Friedl–Tillmann polytope FT *of $\mathcal{P}$ is a straight line.*

Proof. Let X denote the Cayley 2-complex associated to the one-relator presentation $\langle x, y \mid R_N\rangle$ of G. Since G is torsion-free, X is aspherical [Coc54]. As G is finitely presentable, there exists a finite subset $\mathbf{t}'_N$ of $\mathbf{t}_N$ which also normally generates N. Therefore, G admits a finite presentation

$$\langle x, y \mid \mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy), R_N\rangle,$$

and let Y be the Cayley 2-complex of this presentation . Note that X is a subcomplex of Y. Moreover, since every relator r in $\mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)$ corresponds to a closed loop γ_r in X, we can form a 3-complex Z from Y by G-equivariantly gluing in 3-cells, one G orbit for each element in $\mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)$, in such a way that the boundary of the 3-cell is the union of two 2-discs glued along their boundary, where the first disc fills in the relator r in Y, and the second fills in the loop γ_r in X. It is clear that Z is a 3-dimensional cofinite G-complex which retracts onto X, and hence is aspherical.

We will now use Z, together with the fact that G satisfies the Atiyah conjecture [JZLA20] and that it is L^2-acyclic [DL07], and compute the L^2-torsion polytope $P^{(2)}(G)$ of G, as defined by Friedl–Lück [FL17]. Note that, in general, $P^{(2)}$ is not necessarily a polytope, but a formal difference of two polytopes. Nevertheless, when G is a one-relator group then $P^{(2)}(G)$ coincides with the Friedl–Tillmann polytope by [FL17, Remark 5.5], and is a single polytope.

We start by looking at the cellular chain complex $C_\bullet$ of Z. For every n, the n-chains C_n form a free $\mathbb{Z}G$-module. We pick a natural cellular basis for $C_\bullet$, namely: the vertex 1 forms the basis for C_0; the edges connecting 1 to y and x form the basis of C_1; the discs filling-in R_N in X and the relators from $\mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)$ in Y form the basis for C_2; and finally the 3-cells attached to the basic discs filling-in relators from $\mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)$ form the basis of C_3.

We may now identify $C_\bullet$ with

$$\mathbb{Z}G^\alpha \to \mathbb{Z}G^{\alpha+1} \to \mathbb{Z}G^2 \to \mathbb{Z}G$$

where $\alpha = |\mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)|$.

Before proceeding any further, we need to deal with the special case in which the Fox derivatives $\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}$ are zero for all $r \in \mathbf{t}'_N(x, y^{-1}xy)$. The

fundamental formula of Fox calculus [Fox53] tells us that

$$\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}(1-x)+\frac{\partial r}{\partial y}(1-y)=1-r=0$$

in $\mathbb{Z}G$. Hence $\frac{\partial r}{\partial y}(1-y)=0$, which forces $\frac{\partial r}{\partial y}=0$, as G satisfies the Atiyah conjecture and hence $\mathbb{Z}G$ has no non-trivial zero divisors. (A careful reader might observe that for this argument we need $y\neq 1$ in G, which is true since otherwise the abelianisation of G would not be $\mathbb{Z}^2$.) In fact, we can conclude that $\mathbb{Z}G$ does not have non-trivial zero-divisors from an earlier work of Lewin–Lewin [LL78]. Now, since both Fox derivatives of r vanish, the 1-cycle corresponding to r is trivial.

Since R_N lies in the normal closure of $\mathbf{t}'_N(x,y^{-1}xy)$, the 1-cycle given by R_N must also be trivial. Hence, the differential $C_2\to C_1$ is zero. We know that $C_\bullet$ is L^2-acyclic. For torsion-free groups satisfying the Atiyah conjecture, like G, this amounts to saying that $\mathcal{D}(G)\otimes_{\mathbb{Z}G}C_\bullet$ is acyclic, where $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is the *Linnell skew-field*, a skew-field which contains $\mathbb{Z}G$. In our case, if the differential $C_2\to C_1$ is trivial, then tensoring $C_\bullet$ with $\mathcal{D}(G)$ yields the chain

$$\mathcal{D}(G)^\alpha\longrightarrow\mathcal{D}(G)^{\alpha+1}\xrightarrow{0}\mathcal{D}(G)^2\longrightarrow\mathcal{D}(G)$$

which cannot be acyclic for dimension reasons. This is a contradiction.

Let $r\in\mathbf{t}'_N(x,y^{-1}xy)$ be such that the Fox derivative $\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}$ is not zero. Let d denote the 2-chain given by the disc filling-in r in Y; note that d is a basis element of C_2. We now look at the commutative diagram with exact columns

(†)
$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0\\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow\\
0 & \longrightarrow & \langle d\rangle & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G^2 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G\\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}}\\
\mathbb{Z}G^\alpha & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G^{\alpha+1} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G^2 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G\\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow\\
\mathbb{Z}G^\alpha & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G^{\alpha+1}/\langle d\rangle & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0\\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow\\
0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

where $\langle d\rangle$ denotes the $\mathbb{Z}G$-span of d. Note that (†) is really a short exact sequence of chain complexes.

By assumption, the middle row of (†) is L^2-acyclic. We claim that the second row, which we will denote by $B_\bullet$, is also. To prove the claim, we need to look at the chain complex $B_\bullet$ in more detail:

$$\langle d\rangle \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix}\frac{\partial r}{\partial y} & \frac{\partial r}{\partial x}\end{pmatrix}} \mathbb{Z}G^2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1-y \\ 1-x\end{pmatrix}} \mathbb{Z}G$$

Since G is not cyclic, we have $1-y \neq 0$; we also have $\frac{\partial r}{\partial x} \neq 0$ by assumption. Now $B_\bullet$ fits into the exact sequence of chain complexes

(‡)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G & \xrightarrow{(1-y)} & \mathbb{Z}G \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}} \\
\langle d\rangle & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G^2 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}G \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\langle d\rangle & \xrightarrow{(\frac{\partial r}{\partial x})} & \mathbb{Z}G & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

where the middle column represents the inclusion of the first coordinate into $\mathbb{Z}G^2$ and then the projection onto the second coordinate. Since both horizontal differentials labelled in the diagram are multiplications by non-zero elements of $\mathbb{Z}G$, they are invertible over $\mathcal{D}(G)$, and hence the second and fourth rows of this commutative diagram are exact upon tensoring with $\mathcal{D}(G)$. By [FL17, Lemma 2.9], the middle row also becomes exact upon tensoring with $\mathcal{D}(G)$. This proves the claim.

We are now back to examining (†). We have just shown that the second row is L^2-acyclic, and hence [FL17, Lemma 2.9] tells us that so is the fourth row, and that

$$P^{(2)}(C_\bullet) = P^{(2)}(B_\bullet) + P^{(2)}(D_\bullet)$$

where $D_\bullet$ denotes the fourth row of (†). We can split $P^{(2)}(B_\bullet)$ further using diagram (‡) and [FL17, Lemma 1.9], and obtain

$$P^{(2)}(B_\bullet) = P - Q$$

where $-P$ is the L^2-torsion polytope of

$$\mathbb{Z}G \xrightarrow{1-y} \mathbb{Z}G$$

and $-Q$ of

$$\mathbb{Z}G \xrightarrow{\frac{\partial r}{\partial x}} \mathbb{Z}G$$

Now we need to recall how the polytope $P^{(2)}$ is actually constructed, at least in the above (simple) cases. When considering a chain complex of the form

$$\mathbb{Z}G \xrightarrow{z} \mathbb{Z}G$$

with $z \in \mathbb{Z}G \setminus \{0\}$, the polytope is obtained by first taking the support $\operatorname{supp}(z) \subseteq G$, then taking the image of this set in $H_1(G;\mathbb{R})$, and then taking the convex hull. At the end the polytope is given a sign, negative in this situation, and in general depending on whether the single non-trivial differential starts in an even or an odd dimension.

With the construction in mind, it is now immediate that, since r is a word in x and $y^{-1}xy$, the polytope P is contained within the strip $[-1,0] \times \mathbb{R}$. The polytope Q is obtained from $1-y$, and hence it is the segment $[0,1] \times \{0\}$.

Since $D_\bullet$ is concentrated around a single differential from odd to even degree chains, $P^{(2)}(D_\bullet) = -R$ where R is some polytope. Hence

$$P^{(2)}(G) = P^{(2)}(C_\bullet) = P - Q - R$$

Since G is a one-relator group, $P^{(2)}(G)$ is actually a single polytope. Hence, in particular, $P - Q$ must be a single polytope, and therefore it must lie on the line $\{-1\} \times \mathbb{R}$. Subtracting a further polytope from such a polytope does not alter this fact, and hence we have finished the proof. □

Next, we prove the converse to Theorem 4.1. This is applied to prove that (3) implies (2) in the proof of Theorem 5.4.

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be a group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a,b)' \setminus \{1\}$. The Friedl–Tillmann polytope of $\mathcal{P}$ is a straight line if and only if there exists a word T of shortest length in the $\operatorname{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$.*

Proof. Suppose that the Friedl–Tillmann polytope (which coincides with $P^{(2)}$) is a line. By applying a suitable Nielsen automorphism, we may assume that G is given by the presentation $\langle x, y \mid S\rangle$ and that the polytope lies on the line $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$.

The polytope is obtained either as described in the proof of Theorem 4.1, following the Friedl–Lück procedure, or in a more direct fashion: first we form a polytope P by simply tracing the closed loop the word S gives in the Cayley graph of the free part of the abelianisation of G taken with respect to the image of $\{x, y\}$ as a generating set, and then

taking the convex hull of the image of the loop in $H_1(G;\mathbb{R})$. Then we observe that P has to be the Minkowski sum of another polytope, say P', and the square $[-1,0]\times[-1,0]$. The polytope P' is precisely the Friedl–Tillmann polytope. (Note that the polytope is only well-defined up to translation, so it does not matter which square we choose.)

Now, we know that P' is a line, which forces P to lie inside the strip $[-1,0]\times\mathbb{R}$. Hence, the loop given by S must also lie in this strip. Since $S \in F(x,y)'$, it can be written as a product of right conjugates of x by powers of y. We now see that the only conjugates of x appearing can be x and $y^{-1}xy$. Therefore, there exists a word T' in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R such that $T' \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$, and so by Proposition 3.3 there exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R with $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$, as required.

Now suppose that there exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$. Then we may assume that G is given by a presentation $\langle a, b \mid T'\rangle$ with $T' \in \langle a, bab^{-1}\rangle$. It follows that the loop given by T must lie inside the strip $[-1,0]\times\mathbb{R}$, and so P also lies inside this strip. As P is the Minkowski sum of P' and the square $[-1,0]\times[-1,0]$, we see that P' is a straight segment. □

If the polytope is a single point then the conditions on the relator are much stronger. We use this lemma in the proof of Theorem A.

Lemma 4.3. *Let G be a group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a,b)' \setminus \{1\}$. The Friedl–Tillmann polytope of $\mathcal{P}$ is a point if and only if R is conjugate to $[a,b]^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Suppose the Friedl–Tillmann polytope P' of $\mathcal{P}$ is a point. As in the proof of Lemma 4.2, we may assume that G is given by the presentation $\langle x, y \mid S\rangle$ and that the polytope lies on the line $\{0\}\times\mathbb{R}$. As P' is a point, the polytope P is the square $[0,1]\times[0,1]$ (up to translation). This means precisely that $S = [a,b]^k$ for some non-zero $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Now suppose that R is conjugate to $[a,b]^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we may assume that G is given by the presentation $\langle a, b \mid (aba^{-1}b^{-1})^k\rangle$, and this presentation is easily seen to have Friedl–Tillmann polytope a point. □

5. The main theorem

We now prove Theorem 5.4, which is a more general form of Theorem A applying also to RG groups. Our first lemma allows us to apply Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Let G be a two-generator one-relator RG group with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ abelianisation. Suppose G admits an HNN-presentation $\langle H, t \mid t^{-1}p^n t = q\rangle$ where p, q are nontrivial elements of H and the subgroups $\langle p\rangle$ and $\langle q\rangle$ are malnormal in H. Then there exist a normal subgroup N of $F(x,y)$ such that:*

(1) $F(x,y)/N \cong G$,
(2) N can be normally generated by a single element $R_N \in F(x,y)$,
(3) There exists a finite subset $\mathbf{t}_N$ of $\langle x, y^{-1}xy\rangle$ such that $\mathbf{t}_N$ normally generates N.

Proof. Suppose that G admits a one-relator presentation $\langle a, b \mid R\rangle$. The subgroups $\langle p\rangle$ and $\langle q\rangle$ are "conjugacy separated" in H [KW99a, Lemma 3.6.2], and so there exists a Nielsen transformation ψ of $F(a,b)$ and some $g \in G$ such that $\psi(a) =_G g^{-1}p^i g$ and $\psi(b) =_G g^{-1}thg$ for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and some $h \in H$ [KW99b, Corollary 3.1]. Therefore, writing $x := p$ and $y := th$, the pair (x,y) generates G. But also the pair (x^i, y) generates G, and as G has abelianisation $\mathbb{Z}^2$ we have that $|i| = 1$. Note that as the generating pair (a,b) of G admits a one-relator presentation, and as ψ is a Nielsen transformation, we have that the pair (x,y) also admits a one-relator presentation $\langle x, y \mid R_N\rangle$. Hence, points (1) and (2) of the theorem hold for some subgroup $N \leq F(x,y)$.

We now establish (3) for $N \leq F(x,y)$. Firstly, note that $H = \langle p, h^{-1}qh\rangle$ by [KW99a, Proposition 3.8], and so H has presentation $\langle x, z \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z)\rangle$ where $x := p$ (as above) and $z := h^{-1}qh$. Therefore, G has presentation $\langle x, z, t \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z), t^{-1}x^n t = w(x,z)zw(x,z)^{-1}\rangle$ where $w(x,z)$ represents the element $h \in H$. As remarked above the theorem, because G is finitely presentable we may assume that the set $\mathbf{s}(x,z)$ is finite. As $y = th$, we can apply Tietze transformations as follows, where the generators x and y correspond precisely to the generators x and y in the previous paragraph:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle x, z, t \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z), t^{-1}x^n t = w(x,z)zw^{-1}(x,z)\rangle \\
&\cong \langle x, y, z, t \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z), t^{-1}x^n t = w(x,z)zw^{-1}(x,z), y = tw(x,z)\rangle \\
&\cong \langle x, y, z, t \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z), y^{-1}x^n y = z, y = tw(x,z)\rangle \\
&\cong \langle x, y, z \mid \mathbf{s}(x,z), y^{-1}x^n y = z\rangle \\
&\cong \langle x, y \mid \mathbf{s}(x, y^{-1}x^n y)\rangle \\
&= \langle x, y \mid \mathbf{t}_N\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for some finite subset $\mathbf{t}_N$ of $\langle x, y^{-1}xy\rangle$. As the symbols x and y in this presentation of G and the one-relator presentation $\langle x, y \mid R_N\rangle$ of G

both represent the same elements of G, it follows that N is the normal closure of the set $\mathbf{t}_N$ in $F(x,y)$, as required. □

Our next result is the torsion-free part of our main theorem. It is worth stating separately because it does not include the exceptional cases of points (2) and (3).

Theorem 5.2. *Let G be an RG group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a,b)' \setminus \{1\}$. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) There exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$.
(3) The Friedl–Tillmann polytope of $\mathcal{P}$ is a straight line.

Proof. (2) and (3) are equivalent by Lemma 4.2.
(2) ⇒ (1) The word T gives a presentation for G:

$$\langle a, b \mid T\rangle = \langle a, b \mid T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)\rangle.$$

Then (1) follows by Theorem 2.8.

(1) ⇒ (3) By Theorem 2.8 the conditions of Lemma 5.1 are satisfied, so we may apply Theorem 4.1, and (3) follows. □

We wish to combine Theorems 5.2 and Theorem B to prove our main theorem, Theorem 5.4. However, if $R = S^n$ with $n > 1$ in Theorem 5.4 then we cannot immediately apply Theorem B, as this theorem deals with the root S rather than the relator $R = S^n$. The following observation is therefore useful.

Lemma 5.3. *If $n > 1$ and $S \in F(a,b)$, then S has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit if and only if S^n has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit.*

Proof. Note that such shortest-length elements are cyclically reduced, so $|S^n| = n|S|$ and also $|\alpha(S^n)| = n|\alpha(S)|$ for any automorphism taking S or S^n to the shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit. Therefore, if S has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit then $|S| = |\alpha(S)|$, and so $|S^n| = |\alpha(S^n)|$ by these equalities. On the other hand, if S^n has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit then $|S^n| = |\alpha(S^n)|$, and so $|S| = |\alpha(S)|$ by these equalities. □

We now combine Theorems 5.2 and Theorem B to prove our main theorem, which immediately implies Theorem A as torsion-free hyperbolic groups are RG.

Theorem 5.4 (Theorem A)**.** *Let G be a hyperbolic group or an RG group admitting a two-generator one-relator presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ with $R \in F(a,b)' \setminus \{1\}$. The following are equivalent.*

(1) G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition.
(2) There exists a word T of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R such that $T \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ but T is not conjugate to $[a,b]^k$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(3) The Friedl–Tillmann polytope of $\mathcal{P}$ is a straight line, but not a single point.

Proof. If there exists a word T in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R which is conjugate to $[a,b]^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then G is either abelian (when $|k| = 1$) or contains torsion (when $k > 1$). Applying this to Lemma 4.3, we also have that if $\mathcal{P}$ is a single point that G is either abelian or contains torsion. Therefore, if G is an RG group then the result follows by Theorem 5.2.

If G is not RG then G contains torsion, so $R = S^n$ in $F(a,b)$ for some $n > 1$ maximal.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) This follows from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) If G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition then, by Theorem B, there exists a word T' of shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of S such that $T' \in \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ but T' is not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$. Then the word $T := (T')^n$ has shortest length in its $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit, by Lemma 5.3, and hence in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of R, is contained in $\langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$, and is not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm n}$ (we are using uniqueness of roots in free groups here). As n is maximal, T is not conjugate to any other power of $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$, and so (2) holds.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) For T as in (2) , write $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$ for the automorphism such that $\psi(R) = T$, and set $T' := \psi(S)$. Then T' has shortest length in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a,b))$-orbit of S, by Lemma 5.3, is in $\langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$ and is not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$. Therefore, by Theorem B, (1) holds. □

6. Consequences of the main theorem

We now prove corollaries of Theorems 5.4 and B. These corollaries corresponds to Corollaries C–F from the introduction, but in most cases they additionally apply to RG groups. Therefore, most of these corollaries refer to Theorem 5.4 in their statement, rather than Theorem A.

Forms of $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. We first prove Corollary C, which describes the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions of our groups.

Corollary 6.1 (Corollary C)**.** *Let the group G and the presentation $\mathcal{P}$ be as in Theorem 5.4 or B, and write $R = S^n$ for $n \geq 1$ maximal. Suppose that G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Then the graph underlying $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ consists of a single rigid vertex and a single loop edge. Moreover, the corresponding HNN-extension has vertex group $\langle a, y \mid T_0^n(a, y)\rangle$, stable letter b, and attaching map given by $y = b^{-1}ab$, where $T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$ is the word T from the respective theorem. Finally, $|T_0| < |S|$.*

Proof. By (2) of Theorem 5.4 or B, as appropriate, G admits a presentation of the form $\langle a, b \mid T_0^n(a, b^{-1}ab)\rangle$, $n \geq 1$, where $T_0^n(a, b^{-1}ab)$ and $T^n(a, b)$ are the same words. Hence, G has a presentation

$$\langle a, b, y \mid T_0^n(a, y), b^{-1}ab = y\rangle,$$

which is an HNN-extension with stable letter b, and corresponds to a graph of groups decomposition $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ as in the statement of the corollary. This decomposition corresponds to the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G and has rigid vertex by Theorem 2.8, if G is as in Theorem 5.4, and by Theorem 3.2 otherwise.

Finally, as T is not a power of a primitive we have that $|T_0| < |T|$, and so $|T_0| < |T| \leq |S|$, as required. □

Algorithmic consequences. We now prove Corollary D, on computing $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions. Note that it is possible to calculate a precise bound for the time complexity of this algorithm, as the constants are known for the time complexity of Whitehead's algorithm in $F(a, b)$ [Kha04] [CR15, Theorem 1.1].

Corollary 6.2 (Corollary D)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem 5.4 or B, and with output the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition for G.*

This algorithm terminates in $O(|R|^2)$-steps.

Proof. Write R as S^n with $n \geq 1$ maximal. Write $\mathcal{O}_S$ for the set of shortest elements in the $\mathrm{Aut}(F(a, b))$-orbit of S.

Firstly, use Whitehead's algorithm to compute the set $\mathcal{O}_S$; this takes $O(|S|^2) \leq O(|R|^2)$ steps [Kha04]. Then compute $\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{O}_S \cap \langle a, b^{-1}ab\rangle$; Khan gave a linear bound on the cardinality of $\mathcal{O}_S$ [Kha04], so this takes $O(|S|) \leq O(|R|)$ steps. If the intersection $\mathcal{T}$ is empty then, by Theorem 5.4 or B as appropriate, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G is trivial. Therefore, output as the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G the graph of groups consisting of a single vertex, with vertex group G, and no edges.

If $\mathcal{T}$ is non-empty then take some $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Rewrite this word T as a word $T_0(a, b^{-1}ab)$; this takes $O(|T|) \leq O(|R|)$ steps. By Corollary 6.1, the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G is the graph of groups with a single vertex, a single loop edge, vertex group $\langle a, y \mid T_0^n(a, y)\rangle$ and the attaching map $a = byb^{-1}$, and so output this as the $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition of G. □

We next prove Corollary E, on detecting non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions.

Corollary 6.3 (Corollary E)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem 5.4, and with output* `yes` *if the group G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition and* `no` *otherwise.*

This algorithm terminates in $O(|R|)$-steps.

Proof. It takes $O(|R|)$ steps to draw the Friedl–Tillmann polytope of G, and $O(|R|)$-steps to further determine if it is a straight line, but not a point. The result then follows from Theorem 5.4. □

Finally, we prove Corollary F, on determining the commensurability classes of outer automorphism groups.

Corollary 6.4 (Corollary F)**.** *There exists an algorithm with input a presentation $\mathcal{P} = \langle a, b \mid R\rangle$ of a group G from Theorem A or B, and which determines if the outer automorphism group of G is finite, virtually $\mathbb{Z}$, or $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.*

If G is as in Theorem A, this algorithm terminates in $O(|R|)$-steps. Else, it terminates in $O(|R|^2)$-steps.

Proof. If R is conjugate to $[a, b]^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $\mathrm{Out}(G) \cong \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ [Log16b, Theorem A]. Else if G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition then, by Theorems 2.8 and 3.2, G has an essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splitting, and so $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is virtually $\mathbb{Z}$ [Lev05a, Theorem 5.1]. Else, by Theorems 2.8 and 3.2, G admits no essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings, and so $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is finite [Lev05a, Theorem 5.1].

Our algorithm is therefore as follows: Firstly, determine whether R is conjugate to $[a, b]^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$; this takes $O(|R|)$ steps. If it is, then $\mathrm{Out}(G) \cong \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Otherwise determine whether G has trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$ JSJ decomposition; this takes $O(|R|)$ steps if $R \in F(a, b)'$, by Corollary E, and otherwise takes $O(|R|^2)$ steps, by Corollary D. If G has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is virtually $\mathbb{Z}$, else $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is finite. □

Relationships between outer automorphism groups. We now prove Corollary G, on embeddings of outer automorphism groups.

Corollary 6.5 (Corollary G)**.** *Write G_k for the group defined by $\langle a, b \mid S^k \rangle$, where $k \geq 1$ is maximal. If $S \in F(a,b)'$ and G_1 is hyperbolic then:*

(1) $\mathrm{Out}(G_m) \cong \mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ *for all* $m, n > 1$.
(2) $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ *embeds with finite index in* $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$.

Proof. We first prove (1). For $k > 1$, every automorphism ϕ of G_k is induced by a Nielsen transformation ϕ_t of $F(a,b)$ [Pri77, Principal Lemma]. This gives a homomorphism $\theta_k : H_k \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Out}(G_k)$ for some subgroup H_k of $\mathrm{Out}(F(a,b))$. Now, such a map ϕ_t sends S to a conjugate of S or of S^{-1} in $F(a,b)$ [MKS04, Theorem N5], so the maps are dependent only on the word S, and independent of the exponent k in S^k, and therefore $H_m = H_n$ for all $m, n > 1$. Moreover, the maps θ_k are all isomorphisms [Log16b, Theorem 4.2], and so we have $\mathrm{Out}(G_m) \cong H_m = H_n \cong \mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ as required.

For (2), as we observed in the previous paragraph, the automorphisms of G_n depend solely on S and so we have a sequence of homomorphisms $H_n \xrightarrow{\theta_n} \mathrm{Out}(G_n) \xrightarrow{\xi_n} \mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ where θ_n is injective (it is an isomorphism in fact). Then $\xi_n\theta_n$ is injective, by an identical proof to the proof that θ_n is injective [Log16b, Lemma 4.4], and so ξ_n is injective. To see that $\mathrm{im}(\xi_n)$ has finite index in $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ note that because G_1 is hyperbolic, S is not conjugate to $[a,b]^{\pm 1}$, and so G_1 has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition if and only if G_n has non-trivial $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition by Theorems A and B. If both $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are non-trivial then, by Corollary C, both $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decomposition are essential $\mathbb{Z}$-splittings consisting of a single rigid vertex with a single loop edge, and so both $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ and $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ are virtually $\mathbb{Z}$ [Lev05a, Theorem 5.1], and the result follows. If both $\mathcal{Z}_{\max}$-JSJ decompositions are trivial then both $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ and $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ are finite [Lev05a, Theorem 5.1], and the result follows. □

The above proof uses the fact that $S \in F(a,b)'$ in two places; firstly to prove that $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ embeds in $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ (which is hidden in the citation), and secondly to obtain finite index (by using Theorem A). If $S \notin F(a,b)'$ then we can still ask if $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ embeds in $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$. Indeed, we still obtain a sequence $H_n \xrightarrow{\theta_n} \mathrm{Out}(G_n) \xrightarrow{\xi_n} \mathrm{Out}(G_1)$, but here the proof that θ_n is injective does not extend to the map $\xi_n\theta_n$ [Log16b, Lemma 4.6] (as the proof uses the theory of one-relator groups with torsion, in the form of a strengthened version of the B.B. Newman

Spelling Theorem). Therefore, we are currently unable to prove that $\mathrm{Out}(G_n)$ embeds in $\mathrm{Out}(G_1)$ in general.

References

[Bar18] Benjamin Barrett, *Computing JSJ decompositions of hyperbolic groups*, J. Topol. **11** (2018), no. 2, 527–558. MR 3828057

[Bow98] Brian H. Bowditch, *Cut points and canonical splittings of hyperbolic groups*, Acta Math. **180** (1998), no. 2, 145–186. MR 1638764

[Bra99] Noel Brady, *Branched coverings of cubical complexes and subgroups of hyperbolic groups*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **60** (1999), no. 2, 461–480. MR 1724853

[Bro20] Carl-Fredrik Nyberg Brodda, *The B. B. Newman spelling theorem*, arXiv:2004.01484 (2020).

[CF09] Matt Clay and Max Forester, *Whitehead moves for G-trees*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **41** (2009), no. 2, 205–212. MR 2496498

[CL83] D.J. Collins and F. Levin, *Automorphisms and Hopficity of certain Baumslag-Solitar groups*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **40** (1983), no. 5, 385–400. MR 707725

[Coc54] W. H. Cockcroft, *On two-dimensional aspherical complexes*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **4** (1954), 375–384. MR 63042

[CR15] Bobbe Cooper and Eric Rowland, *Classification of automorphic conjugacy classes in the free group on two generators*, Algorithmic problems of group theory, their complexity, and applications to cryptography, Contemp. Math., vol. 633, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015, pp. 13–40. MR 3364219

[DG08] François Dahmani and Daniel Groves, *The isomorphism problem for toral relatively hyperbolic groups*, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. (2008), no. 107, 211–290. MR 2434694

[DG11] François Dahmani and Vincent Guirardel, *The isomorphism problem for all hyperbolic groups*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 2, 223–300. MR 2795509

[DL07] Warren Dicks and Peter A. Linnell, *L^2-Betti numbers of one-relator groups*, Math. Ann. **337** (2007), no. 4, 855–874. MR 2285740

[DT19] François Dahmani and Nicholas Touikan, *Deciding isomorphy using Dehn fillings, the splitting case*, Invent. Math. **215** (2019), no. 1, 81–169. MR 3904450

[FL17] Stefan Friedl and Wolfgang Lück, *Universal L^2-torsion, polytopes and applications to 3-manifolds*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **114** (2017), no. 6, 1114–1151. MR 3661347

[Fox53] Ralph H. Fox, *Free differential calculus. I. Derivation in the free group ring*, Ann. of Math. (2) **57** (1953), 547–560. MR 53938

[FT20] Stefan Friedl and Stephan Tillmann, *Two-generator one-relator groups and marked polytopes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **70** (2020), no. 2, 831–879. MR 4105952

[GL17] Vincent Guirardel and Gilbert Levitt, *JSJ decompositions of groups*, Astérisque (2017), no. 395, vii+165. MR 3758992

[HK] Fabian Henneke and Dawid Kielak, *The agrarian polytope of two-generator one-relator groups*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **n/a**, no. n/a.

[JZLA20] Andrei Jaikin-Zapirain and Diego López-Álvarez, *The strong Atiyah and Lück approximation conjectures for one-relator groups*, Math. Ann. **376** (2020), no. 3-4, 1741–1793. MR 4081128

[Kha04] Bilal Khan, *The structure of automorphic conjugacy in the free group of rank two*, Computational and experimental group theory, Contemp. Math., vol. 349, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 115–196. MR 2077762

[KW99a] Ilya Kapovich and Richard Weidmann, *On the structure of two-generated hyperbolic groups*, Math. Z. **231** (1999), no. 4, 783–801. MR 1709496

[KW99b] ———, *Two-generated groups acting on trees*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **73** (1999), no. 3, 172–181. MR 1705011

[Lev05a] Gilbert Levitt, *Automorphisms of hyperbolic groups and graphs of groups*, Geom. Dedicata **114** (2005), 49–70. MR 2174093

[Lev05b] ———, *Characterizing rigid simplicial actions on trees*, Geometric methods in group theory, Contemp. Math., vol. 372, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005, pp. 27–33. MR 2139674

[LL78] Jacques Lewin and Tekla Lewin, *An embedding of the group algebra of a torsion-free one-relator group in a field*, J. Algebra **52** (1978), no. 1, 39–74. MR 485972

[Log16a] Alan D. Logan, *The JSJ-decompositions of one-relator groups with torsion*, Geom. Dedicata **180** (2016), 171–185. MR 3451463

[Log16b] ———, *The outer automorphism groups of two-generator, one-relator groups with torsion*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (2016), no. 10, 4135–4150. MR 3531167

[LS77] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977, Reprint of the 1977 edition. MR 1812024

[LT17] Larsen Louder and Nicholas Touikan, *Strong accessibility for finitely presented groups*, Geom. Topol. **21** (2017), no. 3, 1805–1835. MR 3650082

[LW21] Larsen Louder and Henry Wilton, *One-relator groups with torsion are coherent*, Math. Res. Letters (to appear), arXiv:1805.11976 (2021).

[Mag30] Wilhelm Magnus, *Über diskontinuierliche Gruppen mit einer definierenden Relation. (Der Freiheitssatz)*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **163** (1930), 141–165. MR 1581238

[Mag32] ———, *Das Identitätsproblem für Gruppen mit einer definierenden Relation*, Math. Ann. **106** (1932), no. 1, 295–307. MR 1512760

[MKS04] Wilhelm Magnus, Abraham Karrass, and Donald Solitar, *Combinatorial group theory*, second ed., Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004, Presentations of groups in terms of generators and relations. MR 2109550

[New73] B. B. Newman, *The soluble subgroups of a one-relator group with torsion*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **16** (1973), 278–285, Collection of articles dedicated to the memory of Hanna Neumann, III. MR 0338188

[Pri77] Stephen J. Pride, *The isomorphism problem for two-generator one-relator groups with torsion is solvable*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **227** (1977), 109–139. MR 430085

[Ros86] Gerhard Rosenberger, *All generating pairs of all two-generator Fuchsian groups*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **46** (1986), no. 3, 198–204. MR 834836

[RS97] E. Rips and Z. Sela, *Cyclic splittings of finitely presented groups and the canonical JSJ decomposition*, Ann. of Math. (2) **146** (1997), no. 1, 53–109. MR 1469317

[Sel95] Z. Sela, *The isomorphism problem for hyperbolic groups. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **141** (1995), no. 2, 217–283. MR 1324134

[Sel97] ———, *Structure and rigidity in (Gromov) hyperbolic groups and discrete groups in rank* 1 *Lie groups. II*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **7** (1997), no. 3, 561–593. MR 1466338

[Sel09] ———, *Diophantine geometry over groups. VII. The elementary theory of a hyperbolic group*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **99** (2009), no. 1, 217–273. MR 2520356

[Ser03] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Trees*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, Translated from the French original by John Stillwell, Corrected 2nd printing of the 1980 English translation. MR 1954121

[SK20] Meda Satish Suraj Krishna, *Immersed cycles and the JSJ decomposition*, Algebr. Geom. Topol. **20** (2020), no. 4, 1877–1938. MR 4127086

[Sta83] John R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 3, 551–565. MR 695906

[Wis12] Daniel T. Wise, *From riches to raags: 3-manifolds, right-angled Artin groups, and cubical geometry*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 117, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. MR 2986461

Mathematisches Institut, Einsteinstr. 62, 48149 Münster, Germany
Email address: ggardam@uni-muenster.de

University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK
Email address: kielak@maths.ox.ac.uk

Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, EH14 4AS, UK
Email address: A.Logan@hw.ac.uk