

Balls in groups: volume, structure and growth

Romain Tessera and Matthew Tointon

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche

Email: romain.tessera@imj-prg.fr

School of Mathematics, University of Bristol

Email: m.tointon@bristol.ac.uk

In memory of Avinoam Mann

Abstract

We give sharp bounds in Breuillard, Green and Tao’s finitary version of Gromov’s theorem on groups with polynomial growth. Precisely, we show that for every non-negative integer d there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and $|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$ for some positive integer n then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is d -nilpotent (i.e. has a central series of length d with cyclic factors), and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(d)$, where $g(d)$ denotes the maximum order of a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$. The bounds on both the nilpotence and index are sharp; the previous best bounds were $O(d)$ on the nilpotence, and an ineffective function of d on the index. In fact, we obtain this as a small part of a much more detailed fine-scale description of the structure of G . These results have a wide range of applications in various aspects of the theory of vertex-transitive graphs: percolation theory, random walks, structure of finite groups, scaling limits of finite vertex-transitive graphs. . . . We obtain some of these applications in the present paper, and treat others in companion papers. Some are due to or joint with other authors.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Existing results	3
1.2	Sharp bounds in the Breuillard–Green–Tao polynomial-volume theorem	6
1.3	A fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem and finitary Mal’cev completions	7
1.4	Applications and extensions	12
1.5	Proof of Theorem 1.11: structure and highlights	18
2	Background and notation	21
2.1	Growth	21
2.2	Approximate groups	23
2.3	Nilpotent groups and commutators	23
2.4	Nilpotent Lie groups	25
2.5	The value of $g(d)$ and its optimality in our results	27

3	Lie progressions	29
3.1	Basic properties of Lie progressions	30
3.2	Rational and continuous progressions, and boxes in Lie algebras	32
3.3	Passing between arbitrary Lie progressions and integral Lie progressions	37
3.4	Powers of Lie progressions	41
3.5	Lower bounds on growth in Lie progressions	44
3.6	Growth of Lie progressions	47
3.7	Injectivity modulo the centre	50
4	A preliminary fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem	53
4.1	Construction of Lie progressions with large injectivity radius	54
4.2	A chain of Lie progressions	59
4.3	Proof of the preliminary fine-scale volume theorem	62
4.4	A fine-scale volume-doubling theorem	63
5	Effective index bounds	66
5.1	Large-scale simple connectedness and rough covering maps	68
5.2	Reduction to infinite injectivity radius	71
5.3	Reduction to the case of a normal torsion-free nilpotent subgroup	74
5.4	Effective index bounds	75
6	The fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem	77
6.1	Proof of Theorem 1.11	77
6.2	Uniqueness in the fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem	83
7	Applications	86
7.1	Finite groups	86
7.2	Vertex-transitive graphs	86
7.3	Growth of balls with polynomial volume	90
7.4	Uniform finite presentation for groups of polynomial growth	91

1 Introduction

The broad aim of this paper is to study the algebraic structure of balls in groups in terms of their volume. In particular, we provide completely sharp bounds in the conclusion of Breuillard, Green and Tao’s celebrated finitary refinement of Gromov’s polynomial-growth theorem (Theorems 1.6 and 1.7), and provide a significantly more refined description of the resulting algebraic structure (Theorem 1.11).

We believe our results to be interesting in their own right, but we are also strongly motivated by applications, of which there are several. In a companion paper [47], we present a number of applications to random walks on vertex-transitive graphs; these results have in turn already been applied by a number of other authors. In other forthcoming work [46, 49] we will present applications to graph scaling limits. We briefly describe these works, and give full details of several other corollaries, in Section 1.4 of the present paper.

The results of the present paper are mostly phrased as theorems about groups of polynomial growth, which is a rather restrictive class. However, in reality, much of the utility of our theorems lies in the fact that when phrased in the contrapositive they can be viewed as statements about groups that do *not* exhibit polynomial growth at a given scale. It is these extremely general statements that often turn out to be useful in the probabilistic applications, for example.

The proofs of these results require both a significant amount of deep theory and a number of substantial technical innovations. They also feature a number of ingredients that are of independent interest. For example, in Section 5.1 we study a quantitative, finitary notion of *large-scale simple connectedness* of graphs, and obtain quantitative, finitary discrete analogues of the path-lifting property and fact that a topological covering map with simply connected range is always a homeomorphism.

1.1 Existing results

We start by recalling Gromov's theorem, a foundational result in geometric group theory that has itself had numerous applications, for example in probability [59, 14] and differential geometry [23, §F₊]. The theorem was originally proved by Gromov [22] in the 1980s, and has since been given shorter proofs by both Kleiner [31] and Ozawa [38].

Theorem 1.1 (Gromov [22]). *Let d be a non-negative integer, and let G be a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity. Suppose*

$$|S^n| = o(n^{d+1}) \tag{1.1}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then G is virtually nilpotent with growth degree at most d .

Given a finitely generated group G , and a finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, we define the *growth degree* $\deg(G)$ of G by

$$\deg(G) = \inf\{d \in \mathbb{R} : \text{there exists } C > 0 \text{ such that } |S^n| \leq Cn^d \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

It is a widely known and straightforward exercise to check that this quantity is independent of the choice of generating set. Note that $\deg(G) = \infty$ is possible, and indeed by Gromov's theorem it is in some sense the norm. If $\deg(G) < \infty$ then G is said to have *polynomial growth*.

The conclusion that $\deg(G) \leq d$ is not normally included in the statement of Gromov's theorem, not least because it follows trivially from the well-known fact that if G is virtually nilpotent then $\deg(G) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for every finite symmetric generating set S of G containing the identity there exist $c, C > 0$ such that

$$cn^{\deg(G)} \leq |S^n| \leq Cn^{\deg(G)} \tag{1.2}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [1, 24]. We mention it here for comparison with the results below, which have weaker variants of the polynomial-growth hypothesis under which the implications for $\deg(G)$ are rather subtler.

There is no hope of bounding the index of a nilpotent subgroup of G in Theorem 1.1 as stated. For example, if G is a direct product of a finite simple group and $\mathbb{Z}^d$ then $|S^n| = o(n^{d+1})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any finite symmetric generating set S , but there is no uniform bound on the index of a nilpotent

subgroup. In a sense, however, this example captures the only obstruction to having such a bound, thanks to the following theorem of our late collaborator Avinoam Mann, to whose memory we dedicate this paper.

Theorem 1.2 (Mann [34, Theorem 9.8]). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose G is a virtually nilpotent group with growth degree at most d . Then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that H is finite, Γ/H is nilpotent, and $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(d)$, where $g(d)$ is the maximum order of a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$.*

It is known that $g(d)$ is finite for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and in fact an upper bound was given by Minkowski [36] back in 1887. It is known that $g(d) \leq (2d)!$ for all d [37, p. 175, eq. (16)], and that $g(d) \leq 2^d d!$ with equality achieved only by the orthogonal group $O_d(\mathbb{Z})$ for sufficiently large d [18]; see Section 2.5 for further information on $g(d)$. It is also well known that a finite-by-nilpotent group is virtually nilpotent, so Theorem 1.2 refines the conclusion of Gromov's theorem.

Remark 1.3. The upper bound $g(d)$ is the best possible bound on $[G : \Gamma]$ in terms of d in Theorem 1.2, as can be seen by considering the example of a semidirect product of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ of order $g(d)$; see Proposition 2.14.

We write $g(d)$ for the maximum order of a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ throughout the rest of this paper.

In his original paper, Gromov used a compactness argument to give a finitary version of his theorem [22, p. 71]. Precisely, he showed that for all $C, d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $n_0, k, c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $|S^n| \leq Cn^d$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots, n_0$ then G has a nilpotent subgroup of index at most k and class at most c . The quantities n_0, k, c are all ineffective.

Shalom and Tao [41] adapted Kleiner's proof of Gromov's theorem to obtain a stronger version of this result, with effective bounds in the conclusion and with a weaker hypothesis under which a polynomial upper bound on $|S^n|$ need only hold for a single value of n . In recent joint work with Lyons and Mann, we refined the conclusion of the Shalom–Tao theorem to obtain the following optimal bound on the growth degree.

Theorem 1.4 ([32, Corollary 1.3]). *For every non-negative integer d there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} \tag{1.3}$$

for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then G has a nilpotent subgroup of index $O_{n,d}(1)$ and growth degree at most d .

See [32, Theorem 1.6] for an explicit value of $\varepsilon(d)$ with which Theorem 1.4 holds.

We think of a condition such as (1.3), in which we have a bound on the volume of only a single ball in the group, as *polynomial-volume* condition, in contrast to the *polynomial-growth* condition (1.1). In particular, whilst Gromov's theorem is often referred to as his *polynomial-growth theorem*, we will refer to theorems such as Theorem 1.4 as *polynomial-volume theorems*. One notable consequence of Theorem 1.4 is that a polynomial-volume hypothesis implies polynomial growth.

Just as the index in Theorem 1.1 cannot be bounded, so the dependence on n of the index of the nilpotent subgroup in Theorem 1.4 is unavoidable. Indeed, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if G is a non-abelian finite

simple group of order at most $\varepsilon_d n^{d+1}$ and S is a symmetric generating set for G then S certainly satisfies (1.3), but G does not have a nilpotent subgroup with index bounded independently of n . However, again this is essentially the only obstruction to bounding the index independently of n , and Breuillard, Green and Tao [7] have given a qualitative refinement of Theorem 1.4 similar to Mann’s refinement of Gromov’s theorem, as follows.

Theorem 1.5 (Breuillard–Green–Tao [7, Corollary 11.5]¹). *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k^* = k^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq n^d |S| \quad (1.4)$$

for some $n \geq n_0^$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is $O(d)$ -nilpotent, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k^*$.*

Here and from now on in this paper we use asterisks to indicate bounds that are ineffective. Thus, for example, the quantities $n_0^*(d), k^*(d)$ appearing in Theorem 1.5 are both ineffective. Constants or bounds that are not adorned with asterisks could in principle be computed explicitly from our arguments, even if we do not always do so. See Chapter 2 for more details on this notation. We also follow Breuillard, Green and Tao [7, Remark 1.9] in defining a group to be ℓ -nilpotent if it admits a generating set $u_1, \dots, u_\ell$ such that $[u_i, u_j] \in \langle u_{j+1}, \dots, u_\ell \rangle$ whenever $i < j$. Note, in particular, that an ℓ -nilpotent group is nilpotent with rank, class and Hirsch length at most ℓ . Conversely, a nilpotent group of rank r and class c is $O_{r,c}(1)$ -nilpotent.

Remarks.

- (1) It follows from the Bass–Guivarc’h formula, as presented in Section 2.3, that if G is a virtually ℓ -nilpotent group then $\deg(G) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\ell(\ell - 1)$. The growth degree of the quotient G/H given by Theorem 1.5 is therefore at most $O(d^2)$. Note, however, that the nilpotence of a nilpotent group cannot be bounded in terms of its growth degree since e.g. $\mathbb{Z}_2^m$ has growth degree 0. The Hirsch length is always at most the growth degree, however.
- (2) It is shown in the proof of [7, Corollary 11.7] that if $H \trianglelefteq G$ is finite and G/H is nilpotent then G has a nilpotent subgroup of index $|H|!$, so the group G appearing in Theorem 1.5 has a nilpotent subgroup of index $O_d(|S^n|!)$ and growth degree at most $O(d^2)$.
- (3) The preceding remark explains why we described Theorem 1.5 as a *qualitative* refinement of Theorem 1.4: in contrast to Theorem 1.4, the dependence on d of the index of a nilpotent subgroup of G it gives is ineffective.

As well as the conclusion, another important sense in which Theorem 1.5 refines Theorem 1.4 is that the hypothesis (1.4) of Theorem 1.5 is in a weaker form than that of the hypothesis (1.3) of Theorem 1.4. In general, we call a bound of the form $|S^n| \leq f(n)$ such as (1.3) an *absolute* upper bound on $|S^n|$, and a bound of the form $|S^n|/|S| \leq f(n)$ such as (1.4) a *relative* upper bound.

The proof of Theorem 1.5 rests on the theory of *approximate groups*. Given $K \geq 1$, a subset A of a group G is said to be a K -approximate group if it is symmetric and contains the identity and

¹The fact that $\Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ is not mentioned in the statement of [7, Corollary 11.5], but it is mentioned explicitly in the proof (specifically in the proof of [7, Corollary 11.2]).

there exists $X \subseteq G$ of size at most K such that $A^2 \subseteq XA$. The relevance of approximate groups to polynomial growth comes from the standard fact, which follows for example from Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7 below, that if S satisfies (1.4) then there exists m with $n^{1/2} \leq m \leq n$ such that S^m is an $O_d(1)$ -approximate group.

1.2 Sharp bounds in the Breuillard–Green–Tao polynomial-volume theorem

It is natural to wonder whether one might hope to bound the growth degree by d as in Theorem 1.4 under the relative upper bound (1.4) assumed in Theorem 1.5. However, this turns out to be too much to ask for: in the Heisenberg group, which is 3-nilpotent and has growth degree 4, Tao gave an example of to show that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a generating set S_n satisfying $|S_n^n| \ll n^3 |S_n|$ [44, Example 1.11]. More generally, it is not hard to adapt this example to show that in a d -nilpotent filiform group G , which has growth degree $1 + \frac{1}{2}d(d-1)$, there exists, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a generating set S_n satisfying $|S_n^n| \ll_G n^d |S_n|$. The most that one could hope for under the bound (1.4) is therefore to bound the nilpotence of Γ/H by d .

In our first result we obtain both this optimal bound on the nilpotence of Γ/H and the optimal bound on the index of Γ in Theorem 1.5. The bound on the index, which is optimal for the same reason as given in Remark 1.3, is in stark contrast to the previous, ineffective bound given by Theorem 1.5. Moreover, the optimal nilpotence bound is crucial for some of our applications, in particular the results on random walks described in Section 1.4 below.

Theorem 1.6. *For every non-negative integer d there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_0^$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is d -nilpotent, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(d)$.*

In our first paper [50] we proved that if one replaces the relative bound (1.4) with the absolute bound (1.3) in Theorem 1.5 then as well as bounding the nilpotence of G/H by d , we can conclude that $\deg(G) \leq d$, which is of course best possible. This is not stated explicitly in [50], but it follows easily from the proof of the much more precise [50, Theorem 1.11]. In our next result, we supplement this with the best possible bound $g(d)$ on the index, which again was previously only ineffectively bounded (by Theorem 1.5).

Theorem 1.7. *For every non-negative integer d there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$$

for some $n \geq n_0^$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is d -nilpotent with growth degree at most d , and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(d)$.*

Remark 1.8. We could make Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 valid for all n as in the abstract, rather than $n \geq n_0^*$, at the expense of making ε ineffective: choosing $\varepsilon < 1/(n_0^*)^{d+1}$ would in each case ensure that the hypothesis was not satisfied for any $n < n_0^*$.

1.3 A fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem and finitary Mal'cev completions

An important precursor to Breuillard, Green and Tao's Theorem 1.5 that also played an important role in its proof (see [7, §3]) is the so-called *Lie model theorem* of Hrushovski [29]. This roughly asserts that an approximate group can, in a suitable ultralimit, be approximated in a certain precise sense by a precompact neighbourhood of the identity in a simply connected nilpotent Lie group.

Tao [44] exploited the Lie model theorem further to study the growth of the set S appearing in Theorem 1.5 at scales greater than n . To motivate his work, note that whilst the bounds of (1.2) are clearly sharp as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in the sense that they agree up to the constants c and C , this masks a certain amount of 'fine-scale' behaviour. For example, the group $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_m$ has growth degree 1, but for the standard generating set S the volume of S^n in the range $n < m$ is quadratic in n . Moreover, even in the group $\mathbb{Z}$, the volume at small scales can be polynomial of arbitrarily large degree with an appropriate choice of generating set; for instance, if we let $S = \{1, m, m^2, \dots, m^{d-1}\}$ for m very large then we have $|nS| \gg_d n^d$ for $n < m$.

Tao captured this phenomenon with a result showing that the 'local' growth rate of a group of polynomial growth can change boundedly many times. To make his result precise, define a function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to be *piecewise monomial* if there exist $1 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = \infty$ and $C_1, \dots, C_k$ and $d_1, \dots, d_k \geq 0$ such that $f(x) = C_i x^{d_i}$ whenever $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i)$. Call the x_i the *boundaries* of f , the restrictions $f|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i)}$ the *pieces* of f , and each d_i the *degree* of the piece $f|_{[x_{i-1}, x_i)}$.

Theorem 1.9 (Tao [44, Theorem 1.9]). *For every $d > 0$ there exists $n_0^* = n_0^*(d)$ such that if G is a group with finite generating set S containing the identity such that $|S^n| \leq n^d |S|$ for some $n \geq n_0^*$ then there exists a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ and at most $O_d(1)$ distinct pieces, each of degree a non-negative integer at most $O_d(1)$, such that $|S^{mn}| \asymp_d f(m) |S^n|$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Although not part of the statement, in proving this result Tao constructs a finite sequence of nilpotent Lie models of decreasing dimension that approximate the group G on different scales. For example, for very large m the group $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}_m$ 'looks like' $\mathbb{R}^2$ on scales $n < m$, and (modulo the finite subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_m$) 'looks like' $\mathbb{R}$ on scales $n \geq m$.

One of the central achievements of the present paper is to obtain a sequence of nilpotent Lie groups similar in spirit to the Lie models used by Tao, but which approximate G *finitarily*, rather than in an ultralimit, and with much more quantitative precision. This finiteness and precision is, for example, crucial in obtaining the optimal index bounds in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7, and also gives rise to various other applications, some of which we have already alluded to. It also in particular allows us to reprove Theorem 1.9 with various bounds optimised; we defer the statement until Corollary 1.16, below, so that we can formulate it more generally.

We think of these nilpotent Lie groups – or rather, certain compact subsets of them – as 'finitary Mal'cev completions' of the balls in G . Recall that an arbitrary torsion-free nilpotent group can be embedded as a lattice in an essentially unique simply connected nilpotent Lie group, called its *Mal'cev completion*. What our main result shows is that, in the context of Theorem 1.6, each S^m with $m \geq n$ can, modulo a 'small' finite subgroup and up to finite index, be embedded as a *generating subset* of a lattice in a simply connected nilpotent Lie group.

To make this precise we define an object called a *Lie progression*. We used a preliminary version of this notion in our first paper [50], but it turns out that in order to obtain the precision required

in the present paper we need to refine the definition somewhat. We start by defining a general notion of a *progression* in a group. Given elements $u_1, \dots, u_d$ of some group G and positive reals $L_1, \dots, L_d$, we define the *progression* $P(u; L) = P(u_1, \dots, u_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ via

$$P(u; L) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : \ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}, |\ell_i| \leq L_i\}.$$

Similarly, given elements $e_1, \dots, e_d$ of a real vector space V and positive reals $L_1, \dots, L_d$, for a subring $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ we define the *box* $B_A(e; L) = B_A(e_1, \dots, e_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ via

$$B_A(e; L) = \{\ell_1 e_1 + \cdots + \ell_d e_d : \ell_i \in A, |\ell_i| \leq L_i\}.$$

We will mostly be interested in the cases where G is a nilpotent Lie group, V is its Lie algebra, $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis of a V , and $u_i = \exp e_i$.

In general, if P is a progression then the sets P^n can grow exponentially in n , so it is not clear that such objects should have anything to do with polynomial growth. However, if we impose a certain additional technical condition called *upper-triangular form* on a progression then it turns out that it does exhibit polynomial growth (see Corollary 3.2, below). Given $C > 0$, we say that a tuple $(u; L) = (u_1, \dots, u_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ of group elements u_i and positive reals L_i is in *C-upper-triangular form* if, whenever $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, for all four choices of signs $\pm$ we have

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] \in P\left(u_{j+1}, \dots, u_d; \frac{CL_{j+1}}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{CL_d}{L_i L_j}\right).$$

In this case we also say that the progression $P(u; L)$ is in *C-upper-triangular form*. Similarly, we say that a tuple $(e; L) = (e_1, \dots, e_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ of elements e_i of a real vector space and positive reals L_i is in *C-upper-triangular form* over $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$, respectively, if whenever $1 \leq i < j \leq d$ we have we have

$$[e_i, e_j] \in B_A\left(e_{j+1}, \dots, e_d; \frac{CL_{j+1}}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{CL_d}{L_i L_j}\right).$$

with $A = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, given $Q \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that $(e; L)$ is in *Q-rational C-upper triangular form* to mean that it is in *C-upper-triangular form* over $\mathbb{Q}$ and the rationals ℓ_k needed to write each $[e_i, e_j] = \ell_{j+1} e_{j+1} + \cdots + \ell_d e_d$ have denominator at most Q . We say that a tuple is simply in *upper-triangular form* to mean that it is in *C-upper-triangular form* for some $C > 0$.

Definition 1.10 (Lie progression). Suppose that N is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of dimension d and homogeneous dimension D with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}$. Suppose further that $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{n}$, that $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$, and that the group elements $u_i = \exp e_i \in N$ are such that $(u; L)$ is in upper-triangular form. Then the progression $P = P(u; L)$ is called a *raw Lie progression* with *dimension* d and *homogeneous dimension* D .

If $(e; L)$ is in *C-upper-triangular form* over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $(u; L)$ is in *C-upper-triangular form* for a given $C > 0$, then we say P is in *C-upper-triangular form*. If $(e; L)$ is in *Q-rational upper-triangular form* then we say P is *Q-rational*. If $(e; L)$ is in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ (equivalently in 1-rational upper-triangular form) and $\exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle = \langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle$ then we call P *integral*. The elements e_i are called the *basis* of P , the elements u_i are called the *generators* of P , and the L_i are called the *lengths* of P .

Now suppose $\tilde{P}$ is a raw Lie progression in N , and let Γ be the subgroup of N generated by the generators of $\tilde{P}$. Suppose that G is a group, that $H \trianglelefteq G_0 \leq G$, and that $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow G_0/H$ is a homomorphism, and let P be the pullback to G_0 of $\pi(\tilde{P})$. Then P is called a *Lie progression projected from N* . The subgroup H is called the *symmetry group* of P , the raw Lie progression $\tilde{P}$ is called the *underlying raw progression* of P , the group Γ is called the *lattice* of P , and π is called the *projector* of P . The dimension, homogeneous dimension, basis and generators of $\tilde{P}$ are called, respectively, the *dimension*, *homogeneous dimension*, *basis* and *generators* of P . We say that P is in *C -upper-triangular form*, *Q -rational*, or *integral* if $\tilde{P}$ is in C -upper-triangular form, Q -rational, or integral, respectively. We define the *injectivity radius* of P , which we denote by $\text{inj } P$, to be the supremum of those $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that π is injective on $\tilde{P}^j$. In other words, $\text{inj } P = \sup\{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \ker \pi \cap \tilde{P}^j = \{1\}\}$. We define the *injectivity radius of P modulo the centre*, which we denote by $\text{inj}^Z P$, via $\text{inj}^Z P = \sup\{j \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \ker \pi \cap (\tilde{P}^j \tilde{P}^{-j}) \subseteq Z(\Gamma)\}$.

We say that a Lie progression P with symmetry group H in a group G is *normal* in G if $\langle P \rangle \trianglelefteq G$ and $H \trianglelefteq G$. Given a Lie progression P , we write $\tilde{P}$ for its underlying raw progression, $\dim P$ for its dimension, $\text{hdim } P$ for its homogeneous dimension, and $\text{inj } P$ for its injectivity radius.

Remarks.

- (1) A Lie progression of dimension 0 is simply a finite subgroup.
- (2) The symmetry group of a Lie progression P can depend on the parameterisation of P . For example, the set $\mathbb{Z}_n$ can be realised as a 0-dimensional Lie progression with symmetry group $\mathbb{Z}_n$, or as a 1-dimensional progression with trivial symmetry group. In particular, the symmetry group of P does not have to equal $\{g \in G : gP = P\}$ (though see Corollary 3.9 below for a proof that this is the symmetry group if $\text{inj } P \geq 2$).
- (3) If P is a Lie progression then $\deg(\langle P \rangle) \leq \text{hdim } P$, since a lattice in a finite dimensional simply connected nilpotent group N has growth degree $\text{hdim } N$.

If P is a Lie progression with injectivity radius at least 1 and underlying raw Lie progression $P(u; L)$ then we think of $P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : \ell_i \in \mathbb{R}, |\ell_i| \leq L_i\}$ as the ‘finitary Mal’cev completion’ of P .

The main result of this paper, which refines both Theorems 1.7 and 1.6, is as follows.

Theorem 1.11 (fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem). *For every $d, R \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$, $n_0^* = n_0^*(d, R) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M = M(d, R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_0$ then there exist non-negative integers $d' \leq d$ and $r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_{d'}$ such that $n^{1/2} \ll_{d,R} r_0 \leq n$ and $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , normal $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , and finite subsets $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_{d'} \subseteq G$ containing the identity such that writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) for each i and every integer $m \geq r_i$ we have $X_i P_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq X_i P_i^{O_d(m/r_i)}$;
- (ii) $|X_i| \leq g(\dim P_i)$ for each i ;
- (iii) $X_i \subseteq S^{g(\dim P_i)-1}$ for each i ;
- (iv) $X_0 \supseteq X_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq X_{d'}$;
- (v) for each i , distinct elements of X_i belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_i \rangle$;
- (vi) $\langle P_0 \rangle \leq \langle P_1 \rangle \leq \cdots \leq \langle P_{d'} \rangle$;
- (vii) $H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \cdots \leq H_{d'}$;
- (viii) for each $i = 1, \dots, d'$ there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) \subseteq \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_{i-1} \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_i \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

- (ix) $\text{inj } P_i \ll_d \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \ll_{d,R} \text{inj } P_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, d' - 1$, and $\text{inj } P_{d'} = \infty$;
- (x) $d \geq \dim P_0 > \dim P_1 > \cdots > \dim P_{d'}$;
- (xi) $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1 \geq \text{hdim } P_0 > \text{hdim } P_1 > \cdots > \text{hdim } P_{d'}$;
- (xii) for each i we have $m^{\dim P_i} \ll_{d,R} |S^m|/|S|$ for every $m \geq n$ with $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$;
- (xiii) for each i we have $m^{\text{hdim } P_i} \ll_{d,R} |S^m|$ for every $m \geq n$ with $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$;
- (xiv) for each i there exist a natural number $k_i \leq \text{hdim } P_i - \dim P_i + 1$, a sequence $r_i = r_{i,0} < r_{i,1} < \cdots < r_{i,k_i}$ with $r_{i,k_i} = \infty$ if $i = d'$ and $r_{i,k_i} = r_{i+1}$ otherwise and all other $r_{i,j} \in \mathbb{N}$, and a sequence $\dim P_i \leq d_{i,0} < d_{i,1} < \cdots < d_{i,k_i} \leq \text{hdim } P_i$ such that for every integer $m \in [r_{i,j}, r_{i,j+1})$ we have

$$\frac{|S^m|}{|S^{r_{i,j}}|} \asymp_{d,R} \left(\frac{m}{r_{i,j}} \right)^{d_{i,j}};$$

- (xv) if $|G| < \infty$ then P_i is abelian for all i with $r_{i+1} > M \text{diam}_S(G)^{\frac{1}{2}}$;
- (xvi) for each $i < d'$ we have $\text{inj}^Z P_i \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}^{c_i/(c_i-1)}/r_i$, where c_i is the class of P_i .

Remark. The ineffectiveness of n_0^* in Theorem 1.11 arises only from its dependence on d ; it depends effectively on R .

Proof of Theorems 1.6 and 1.7 given Theorem 1.11. Apply Theorem 1.11 with $R = 1$, set H to be the resulting group H_0 , and Γ to be the resulting group $\langle P_0 \rangle$. This immediately proves Theorem 1.6. To see that it also proves Theorem 1.7, note that Theorem 1.11 (xiii) implies that $n^{\text{hdim } P_0} \ll_d \varepsilon n^{d+1}$, which as long as ε is small enough gives $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq d$, and hence $\deg \langle P_0 \rangle \leq d$. $\square$

We also show that the sequence of Lie progressions P_i , scales r_i and other objects given by Theorem 1.11 is essentially unique, as follows. This can be seen as a finitary analogue of the uniqueness of the Mal'cev completion. See §6.2 for the proof.

Proposition 1.12. *Given $C, D, k, Q, t, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $R = R(C, D, k, Q, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S , and there are natural numbers $r_1 < \dots < r_d$ and $r'_1 < \dots < r'_{d'}$ such that $r'_1 < r_1$, subsets $X_1, \dots, X_d, X'_1, \dots, X'_{d'} \subseteq S^t$ of size at most k , and Q -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_d, P'_1, \dots, P'_{d'} \subseteq G$ of dimension at most D and injectivity radius at least R in C -upper-triangular form such that $X_i P_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq X_i P_i^{\eta m/r_i}$ for all $m \geq r_i$ and $X'_i (P'_i)^{\lfloor m/r'_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq X'_i (P'_i)^{\eta m/r'_i}$ for all $m \geq r'_i$, such that distinct elements of X_i belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_i \rangle$ and distinct elements of X'_i belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P'_i \rangle$, such that $\dim P_1 > \dots > \dim P_d$ and $\dim P'_1 > \dots > \dim P'_{d'}$, and such that $r_{i+1}/r_i \leq A \text{inj } P_i$ and $r'_{i+1}/r'_i \leq A \text{inj } P'_i$ for some $A \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

- (1) *there exists j such that the set $\{\log r_1, \dots, \log r_d\}$ is at Hausdorff distance at most $\log AR$ from $\{\log r'_j, \dots, \log r'_{d'}\}$; and*
- (2) *if $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ satisfies either $i = d$ or $r_{i+1} \geq (AR)^2 r_i$, then letting j be maximal such that $r'_j \leq AR r_i$, and writing N_i and N'_j for the respective nilpotent Lie groups from which P_i and P'_j are projected, Γ_i and Γ'_j for their respective lattices, H_i and H'_j for their respective symmetry groups, and π_i and π'_j for their respective projectors, the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i) $[H_i : H_i \cap H'_j] \leq |X'_j|$ and $[H'_j : H'_j \cap H_i] \leq |X_i|$;

(ii) $H_i \cap \langle P'_j \rangle = H_i \cap H'_j = \langle P_i \rangle \cap H'_j$, and there exist a sublattice Λ_i of index at most $|X'_j|$ in Γ_i such that

$$\pi_i(\Lambda_i) = \frac{(\langle P_i \rangle \cap \langle P'_j \rangle) H_i}{H_i},$$

a sublattice Λ'_j of index at most $|X_i|$ in Γ'_j such that

$$\pi'_j(\Lambda'_j) = \frac{(\langle P_i \rangle \cap \langle P'_j \rangle) H'_j}{H'_j},$$

and an isomorphism $\psi_{ij} : \Lambda_i \rightarrow \Lambda'_j$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Lambda_i & \xrightarrow{\psi_{ij}} & \Lambda'_j \\ \pi_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi'_j \\ \frac{(\langle P_i \rangle \cap \langle P'_j \rangle) H_i}{H_i} & \cong & \frac{\langle P_i \rangle \cap \langle P'_j \rangle}{H_i \cap H'_j} & \cong & \frac{(\langle P_i \rangle \cap \langle P'_j \rangle) H'_j}{H'_j} \end{array}$$

commutes;

(iii) $N_i \cong N'_j$.

1.4 Applications and extensions

One of the most important aspects of the theory we develop in this paper is the range of applications it provides. In this section we give a brief summary of some highlights. We leave most of the details until Chapter 7 and various forthcoming papers.

Probability. Some of the most striking applications to date of this work are those to probability on groups and graphs. We cover this aspect of our theory in much more detail in a companion paper [47], but to add some context to the present paper let us briefly describe a particular application to the *recurrence* or *transience* of the simple random walk on a vertex-transitive graph.

Given a graph $\mathcal{G}$, recall that the *return probability* of the simple random walk starting at some vertex x is the probability that the random walk returns to x at some point after its initial step. The walk is called *recurrent* if this probability is 1, and *transient* otherwise. A famous theorem of Varopoulos [58] (see also [21, §6]) states that the simple random walk on a vertex-transitive graph is recurrent if and only if the graph has polynomial growth of degree at most 2, the main content being the fact that if the growth is superquadratic then the random walk is transient.

In our companion paper [47] we prove a finitary refinement of this result, which roughly shows that if a ball in a vertex-transitive graphs has volume slightly superquadratic in its radius then the probability that a simple random walk starting at the centre of that ball returns to the centre before escaping the ball is bounded uniformly away from 1. As well as implying Varopoulos's theorem, a minor variation of this also verifies and strengthens a certain analogue of Varopoulos's result for *finite* graphs conjectured by Benjamini and Kozma [3]. We refer the reader to the companion paper [47] for full statements, but we take the opportunity now to advertise the following rather striking corollary; see [47] for a proof.

Corollary 1.13 (gap at 1 for return probabilities of random walks on vertex-transitive graphs). *There exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that the simple random walk on a connected, locally finite vertex-transitive graph is either recurrent or has return probability at most $1 - c$.*

Since we first circulated a preprint of [47], a number of other probabilistic applications of the results in it have also emerged, including universality theorems for cover-time fluctuations [4], a comparison between the mixing time of the interchange process and random walks on transitive graphs [28], and non-triviality of the supercritical phase for percolation on finite transitive graphs [30].

Finite groups. In the case that G is finite, a natural value of n at which to seek to apply Theorem 1.6 is the *diameter* of G with respect to S , denoted and defined by $\text{diam}_S(G) = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : S^n = G\}$. For $n = \text{diam}_S(G)$, the hypothesis of Theorem 1.6 translates to a condition of the form

$$\text{diam}_S(G) \geq A \left(\frac{|G|}{|S|} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}. \quad (1.5)$$

Breuillard and the second author [9] have studied groups satisfying (1.5), calling them *almost flat*. One of their main results used Theorem 1.5 to show that if $\delta > 0$ and G is a group with diameter large

enough in terms of d and δ and satisfying (1.5), then G has a normal subgroup $H \subseteq S^{\lfloor \text{diam}_S(G)^{1/2+\delta} \rfloor}$ such that G/H has an abelian subgroup of index and rank at most $O_{d,\delta}(1)$ [9, Theorem 4.1 (2)].

Using Theorem 1.11, we can remove the need for δ in this result, as well as giving the optimal bound on the rank and an explicit bound on the index, as follows (we parametrise the exponent as $2/(d+2)$ rather than $1/(d+1)$ purely to have a cleaner relationship between it and the bound on the rank).

Corollary 1.14. *For every non-negative integer d there exist $A = A(d)$ and $D^* = D^*(d)$ such that if G is a finite group with symmetric generating set S containing the identity such that $\text{diam}_S(G) \geq D^*$ and*

$$\text{diam}_S(G) \geq A \left(\frac{|G|}{|S|} \right)^{\frac{2}{d+2}}, \quad (1.6)$$

then there is a normal subgroup $H \trianglelefteq G$ contained in $S^{O_d(\text{diam}_S(G)^{1/2})}$ such that G/H has an abelian subgroup of rank at most d and index at most $g(d)$.

Remark. To see that the bound on the rank is sharp, consider the group $G = \mathbb{Z}_{n^2} \times \mathbb{Z}_{Cn}^{d-1}$ with respect to its standard generating set.

Vertex-transitive graphs. Trofimov [55] has famously given an extension of Gromov's theorem to vertex-transitive graphs of polynomial growth. Here, as usual, a vertex-transitive graph $\mathcal{G}$ is said to have *polynomial growth* if, writing $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for the number of vertices in a ball of radius n in $\mathcal{G}$, we have $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq Cn^d$ for some $C, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Trofimov's result can be stated in various ways (see e.g. [51, Theorem 2.1] or [61]), but a particularly simple formulation states that a vertex-transitive graph of polynomial growth is *quasi-isometric* to some locally finite Cayley graph, where, as usual, given $C \geq 1$ and $K \geq 0$ and metric spaces X, Y , a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be a (C, K) -*quasi-isometry* if

$$C^{-1}d(x, y) - K \leq d(f(x), f(y)) \leq Cd(x, y) + K$$

for every $x, y \in X$, and if every $y \in Y$ lies at distance at most K from $f(X)$. Since polynomial growth is preserved by quasi-isometries, this Cayley graph is in turn virtually nilpotent by Gromov's theorem.

Like Gromov, Trofimov also proved a finitary version of his result stating that for all $C, d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_0^* \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq Cn^d$ for all $n = 1, 2, \dots, n_0^*$ then $\mathcal{G}$ has polynomial growth [56]. In a previous paper of ours [51], we proved a stronger finitary refinement of Trofimov's theorem, analogous to the refinement of Gromov's theorem provided by Theorem 1.5. By inserting Theorem 1.11 into the proof of that result, we can immediately refine its conclusions further. The resulting statement requires some additional notation, which we defer until Section 7.2; we state the result as Corollary 7.1.

A particular corollary of our work on Trofimov's theorem was a certain extension to vertex-transitive graphs of Breuillard and the second author's original version of Corollary 1.14 [51, Corollary 2.5]. Amongst other things, this extension implies that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\delta > 0$ there exists $n_0^* = n_0^*(\varepsilon, \delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, finite vertex-transitive graph of diameter at least n_0^* satisfying

$$\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) \geq \left(\frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)} \right)^{\varepsilon}$$

then $\mathcal{G}$ is $(1, \text{diam}(\mathcal{G})^{\frac{1}{2}+\delta})$ -quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph of a group containing an abelian subgroup with rank and index at most $O_{\varepsilon, \delta}(1)$.

Using Corollary 1.14, we can remove the need for δ in this result, and give the optimal bound on the rank of the abelian subgroup and an explicit bound on its index, as follows.

Corollary 1.15. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $A = A(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, finite vertex-transitive graph such that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) \geq n_0$ and*

$$\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) \geq A \left(\frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)} \right)^{\frac{2}{d+2}}$$

then $\mathcal{G}$ is $(1, O_d(\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})^{\frac{1}{2}}))$ -quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph of a group containing an abelian subgroup with rank at most d and index at most $g(d)$.

See Corollary 7.3, below, for a more detailed version of Corollary 1.15 featuring a number of additional conclusions that we omitted from Corollary 1.15 for simplicity.

Growth of balls with polynomial volume. An important application of our previous paper on vertex-transitive graphs was an extension of Theorem 1.9 to that setting [51, Corollary 1.4]. Using Theorem 1.11 instead of Theorem 1.9 in the proof of that result, we can now obtain the optimal bound on the degrees of the pieces in the resulting piecewise-monomial function, as well as some further information on the changes in degree, as follows.

Corollary 1.16 (growth of balls with polynomial volume). *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, locally finite vertex-transitive graph such that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)$ for some $n \geq n_0$, then there exists a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ such that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m) \asymp_d f(m/n) \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for every $m \geq n$, and such that*

(i) *the pieces of f have degree at most $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$;*

(ii) *the number of boundaries of f across which the degree decreases is at most d ;*

(iii) *the number of boundaries of f across which the degree increases is at most $\frac{1}{6}d^3 - \frac{1}{2}d^2 + \frac{1}{3}d$.*

If $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$, then in fact

(i') *the pieces of f have degree at most d .*

Remark. The bounds in (i), (i') and (ii) are all sharp. Indeed, equality in (i') and (ii) is achieved in $\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_d}$ with respect to its standard generating set, and it is not hard to adapt [44, Example 1.11] to achieve equality in (i) in a lattice in a filiform Lie group of dimension d for arbitrary $d \geq 3$. This last example also shows that the bound in (iii) has to be at least quadratic in d .

An immediate consequence of Corollary 1.16 that is of particular interest for applications is the following result, in which the bounds $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$ and d on the degree of polynomial growth are both optimal by the same examples as in the previous remark.

Corollary 1.17 (polynomial volume implies polynomial growth). *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds for any connected, locally finite vertex-transitive graph $\mathcal{G}$.*

- (i) *If $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)$ for some $n \geq n_0$ then $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m) \ll_d (m/n)^{\frac{1}{2}d(d-1)+1} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for every $m \geq n$.*
- (ii) *If $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$ for some $n \geq n_0$ then $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m) \ll_d (m/n)^d \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for every $m \geq n$.*

The fact that we obtain the optimal $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1)+1$ bound on the growth degree in (i) is crucial for the results on random walks we described above.

Volume doubling. In his proof of Theorem 1.1, Gromov used the fact that if G has polynomial growth of degree d then there exists $K = K(d)$ such that, for any finite symmetric generating set S of G containing the identity, there exists an infinite set N of natural numbers such that

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n| \tag{1.7}$$

for all $n \in N$. A condition of the type (1.7) is called a *volume-doubling condition* at scale n , or for brevity a *doubling condition* at scale n .

In fact, as is well known and proved in Lemma 2.6 below, if $|S^n| \leq n^d |S|$ for a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sqrt{n} \leq m \leq n$ such that $|S^{2m}| \leq K|S^m|$. The proof of Theorem 1.5 also uses this observation, and in fact relies on the following similar result with a doubling hypothesis in place of the polynomial-volume hypothesis.

Theorem 1.18 (Breuillard–Green–Tao [7, Corollary 11.2]²). *For every $K \geq 1$ there exist $n_0^* = n_0^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k_2^* = k_2^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

for some $n \geq n_0^$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \triangleleft G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{O_K^*(n)}$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent of rank at most $O_K^*(1)$ and class at most $6 \log_2 K$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k_2^*$.*

Remark. One can obtain the improved bound of $H \subseteq S^{12n}$ at the expense of bounding the nilpotency class by $O(K^2 \log K)$ instead of $6 \log_2 K$; see [7, Theorem 2.12].

The same methods that allow us to optimise the bounds in Theorem 1.5 allow us to effectivise the bounds on the rank and index in Theorem 1.18, as follows.

Theorem 1.19. *For every $K \geq 1$ there exists $n_0^* = n_0^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

²The bound $H \subseteq S^{O_K^*(n)}$ and the explicit bound of $6 \log_2 K$ on the class of Γ/H are not stated in [7, Corollary 11.2], but they follow from using [7, Theorem 2.12] instead of [7, Corollary 1.7] in the proof. The fact that $\Gamma \triangleleft G$ is also not stated in [7, Corollary 11.2], but is mentioned explicitly in the proof.

for some $n \geq n_0^*$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{O_K^*(n)}$, such that Γ/H is $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ -nilpotent of class at most $6 \log_2 K$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(\exp(\exp(O(K^2))))$. If

$$|S^{3n}| \leq K|S^n|, \quad (1.8)$$

then we can in fact obtain that Γ/H is $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ -nilpotent and $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(\exp(O(\log^3 K)))$, without changing any of the other conclusions.

We also provide a more refined statement, along the lines of Theorem 1.11 but with the polynomial-growth assumption replaced by a volume-doubling assumption; see Theorem 4.8.

Remark 1.20. We believe it is within reach to bound the nilpotence by $O(\log K)$ in Theorem 1.19 under the small-tripling assumption (1.8). This would also lead to the bound $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(O(\log K))$. Such bounds should follow from the proof of Theorem 1.6 if one could show that if S is a symmetric generating set for a group with a bounded-index torsion-free d -nilpotent subgroup Γ then $A = S^n \cap \Gamma$ satisfies $|A^2| \geq 2^d |A|$ for sufficiently large n . Replacing Proposition 3.31 by such a result in the proof of Theorem 1.6 should lead to the desired bound; indeed, even the weaker bound $|A^2| \geq (1 + \varepsilon)^d |A|$ should suffice, although this would lead to a worse constant in the resulting $O(\log K)$.

In the case of a torsion-free *abelian* group, a result like this follows from the *Freiman 2ⁿ theorem* [45, Theorem 5.20], which states roughly that if $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a finite set with doubling constant $K < 2^d$ then there is a large subset of A contained in an affine subspace of dimension strictly less than d . We are not aware of a corresponding result for finite subsets of simply connected nilpotent Lie groups in general.

Despite the similarity between the conclusions of Theorems 1.5 and 1.18, an analogue of Theorem 1.9 for balls satisfying a doubling condition has so far proved elusive. The closest thing to such a result in the existing literature seems to be a theorem of Breuillard and the second author [9, Theorem 1.1], which does imply a polynomial upper bound on $|S^{mn}|$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, but only under a slightly stronger hypothesis than (1.7), namely $|S^{2n+1}| \leq K|S^n|$.

In a short companion paper [48], we show that the hypothesis of this result can in fact be weakened to $|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$, as follows.

Theorem 1.21 ([48, Theorem 1.2]). *Let $K \geq 1$. Suppose S is a symmetric subset of a group containing the identity, and $|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$ for some integer $n \geq 2K^2$. Then $|S^{3n}| \leq \exp(\exp(O(K^2)))|S^n|$, and S^{2n} is an $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ -approximate group.*

In the same paper, we prove similar results for locally compact groups and vertex-transitive graphs. Combining the result on vertex-transitive graphs with our other work, we can then also, at last, provide an analogue of Theorem 1.9 under a doubling hypothesis, generalised to the setting of vertex-transitive graphs and with effective bounds on the number and degree of the monomial pieces.

Corollary 1.22 (polynomial growth of balls with bounded doubling). *For every $K \geq 1$ there exists $n_0^* = n_0^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, locally finite vertex-transitive graph such that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(2n) \leq K\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for some $n \geq n_0$ then there exists a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ and at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ distinct pieces, each with degree a non-negative integer at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$, such that $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m) \asymp_d^* f(m/n)\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$*

for every $m \geq n$. If $\beta_G(3n) \leq K\beta_G(n)$ then the number of pieces and their degrees can be bounded above by $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$.

Uniform finite presentation for groups of polynomial growth. Easo and Hutchcroft [16] have very recently proved a uniform version of the classical fact that a group of polynomial growth is finitely presented. As well as being of independent interest, their result is a crucial ingredient in their resolution of Schramm's famous *locality conjecture* in percolation [15].

To state their result formally, we borrow some terminology from their paper. Let G be a group with finite generating set S , so that $G \cong F_S/R$ for some normal subgroup R of the free group F_S . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let R_n be the set of words of length at most 2^n in the free group F_S that are equal to the identity in G , and let $\langle R_n \rangle^{F_S}$ be the normal subgroup of F_S generated by R_n . Say that (G, S) has a *new relation on scale n* if $\langle R_{n+1} \rangle^{F_S} \neq \langle R_n \rangle^{F_S}$.

Theorem 1.23 (Easo–Hutchcroft [16]). *For each $K > 0$ there exist $n_0^* = n_0^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group and S is a finite symmetric generating set for G containing the identity and satisfying $|S^{3n}| \leq K|S^n|$ for some integer $n \geq n_0^*$ then*

$$\#\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m \geq \log_2 n \text{ and } (G, S) \text{ has a new relation on scale } m\} \ll_{K, |S|}^* 1.$$

Using Theorem 1.21, we can of course immediately weaken the hypothesis $|S^{3n}| \leq K|S^n|$ of Theorem 1.23 to $|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$. As it turns out, we can also obtain Theorem 1.23 as a fairly quick corollary of the arguments of the present paper, and with a stronger conclusion in which the bound is uniform in $|S|$; see Corollary 7.5. Proving this theorem in this way also leads to the following more quantitatively precise version under a polynomial-volume assumption.

Corollary 1.24. *Given $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some $n \geq n_0^$ then there exist $d' \leq d$ and compact intervals $U_1, \dots, U_{d'}$ of diameter at most $O_d(1)$ in $\mathbb{R}$ such that every scale greater than $\log_2 n$ on which (G, S) has a new relation lies in some U_i .*

Remarks.

- (1) Each interval U_i appearing in Corollary 1.24 is situated at a scale corresponding to the interface between the progressions P_{i-1} and P_i appearing in Theorem 1.11. In our proof of Theorem 1.23 (or more precisely of Corollary 7.5) we apply a result (Theorem 4.8) with a doubling hypothesis but a similar conclusion to Theorem 1.11, and again the scales at which new relations appear all lie near the interfaces between successive progressions in the conclusion of that theorem.
- (2) The bound of d on the number of intervals U_i in Corollary 1.24 is sharp, as can be seen by considering groups of the form $G = \prod_{i=1}^d (\mathbb{Z}/m_i\mathbb{Z})$ with respect to their standard generating sets.

Scaling limits. An early application of Theorem 1.5, by Benjamini, Finucane and the first author [2], was to *scaling limits* of sequences of vertex-transitive graphs. Briefly, a sequence of compact metric spaces $X_1, X_2, \dots$ is said to *Gromov–Hausdorff converge* or *GH converge* to a compact metric space X if there exist $(1 + o(1), o(1))$ -quasi-isometries $X_n \rightarrow X$. The *scaling limit* of the sequence (X_n) , if it exists, is the GH limit of the sequence $X'_1, X'_2, \dots$, in which each X'_n is the space X_n with the metric scaled by $\text{diam}(X_n)^{-1}$. Benjamini, Finucane and the first author’s main result shows that if $(\mathcal{G}_n)$ is a sequence of finite connected vertex-transitive graphs with diameters tending to infinity satisfying $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}_n) \geq |\mathcal{G}_n|^\delta$ then $(\mathcal{G}_n)$ has a subsequence with a scaling limit that is a torus of finite dimension with an invariant Finsler metric [2, Theorem 1]. An analogous result for infinite vertex-transitive graphs satisfying a relative polynomial-volume condition is given by [2, Theorem 3.2.2], and generalised in an earlier paper of ours [51, Remark 2.7]. See [2] for precise statements and definitions.

In the preprint [46], we obtain a number of refinements of these results, for example featuring the addition of sharp bounds on the dimensions of the limiting objects; that preprint is largely self contained, but borrows a number of arguments from the present paper. Furthermore, Corollary 1.15 can be seen as a finitary analogue of the result on scaling limits of finite vertex-transitive graphs (although neither one immediately implies the other), and in a forthcoming paper [49] we will use the results of the present paper to give even more precise finitary analogues of this and other scaling-limit results from [2].

1.5 Proof of Theorem 1.11: structure and highlights

The proof of 1.11 uses both a range of deep theory and a number of substantial new ingredients. Starting from Breuillard, Green and Tao’s Theorem 1.5 – to which we will refer hereafter in this discussion as the *BGT theorem* – the first step is to produce a preliminary *fine-scale* result along the lines of Theorem 1.11 – hereafter the *main theorem*. Precisely, once we assume the conclusion of the BGT theorem, the *nilpotent Freiman theorem* of the second author (quoted below as Theorem 3.3) can be used to show that S^n can be approximated by a Lie progression. There is then the substantial challenge of converting this single Lie progression into the sequence of Lie progressions with large injectivity radius required in our main theorem. The theory we developed in our first paper [50] points in this general direction, but to actually implement it in the proof of the main theorem requires a whole raft of supporting technical propositions concerning the structure and growth of Lie progressions. We prove most of these propositions in Chapter 3, and then combine all of the above ingredients to prove a preliminary fine-scale result in Chapter 4.

This is a good start, but the fine-scale result we end up with falls quantitatively well short of the optimal bounds we seek in our main theorem. One reason is technical, and involves losses that stem from passing to a subgroup of finite index in our first paper. We explain this issue in more detail, and also how to refine the results of our first paper to overcome it, in Section 3.3. A much more fundamental problem is that any fine-scale theorem obtained in this way will inherit the bounds of the BGT theorem we start with. Recalling that we obtain our optimal bounds in the BGT theorem as a corollary of the optimal bounds in our main theorem, this issue might at first glance appear to doom us to an eternity wandering backwards round a circular argument. However, and rather remarkably, it turns out that we are able to use our preliminary fine-scale theorem, with *ineffective* bounds inherited from the original BGT theorem, to obtain a BGT theorem with




Figure 1: Scheme of the proof of the main theorem (Theorem 1.11).

effective (though still not optimal) bounds. Feeding this in at the start and running the same argument again, we again obtain a fine-scale result, but this time with *effective* (though still not optimal) inherited bounds. Finally, the same magic that turned ineffective bounds in the fine-scale theorem into effective bounds in BGT now turns bounds these effective bounds into *optimal* bounds in the fine-scale theorem and, in particular, the BGT theorem. This ‘bootstrapping’ argument and its key ingredients – some of which we describe shortly – are illustrated in Fig. 1.

A key result that allows us to boost the bounds from ineffective to effective, and then from effective to optimal, is a certain quantitative finitary version of Mann’s Theorem 1.2. We present this result as Proposition 5.2. The *quantitative* aspects of this proposition mostly just emerge from Mann’s own proof of Theorem 1.2, which we reproduce in Proposition 5.4. The key innovation lies in its *finitary* nature, which can be summarised roughly as follows: whilst Mann’s theorem takes as its hypothesis the existence of a torsion-free nilpotent subgroup of finite index, our result takes as its hypothesis the existence of a Lie progression of large injectivity radius, finitely many

translates of which cover S^n and are ‘locally disjoint’. The large injectivity radius is a finitary analogue of Mann’s torsion-free hypothesis, whilst the ‘local disjointness’ is a finitary analogue of the disjointness of distinct cosets of a subgroup. (See the discussion around [48, Lemma 2.4] for another recent argument of ours in which we use a ‘local disjointness’ property to obtain coset-like behaviour from certain translates of a set.)

There are various reasons why we need this finitary version of Mann’s theorem. Most obvious is that our theorems have non-trivial content for finite groups, in which context Mann’s original theorem is trivial. A more subtle reason is that in order to bound the sizes of the sets X_i in our main theorem, we need to apply our quantitative Mann theorem to *every* Lie progression P_i ; in order to do this using the infinitary Mann theorem we would require the torsion subgroup of $\langle P_i \rangle$ to be exactly the symmetry group of P_i , and even in an infinite group, this is satisfied only by the last Lie progression, $P_{d'}$.

The key difficulty in *proving* our finitary Mann-type theorem arises from the potential for torsion at very large scales. The way we deal with this is to lift the progression to a certain discrete, large-scale analogue of a topological covering space. This entails a detailed study of large-scale simple connectedness of graphs, which we describe in Section 5.1. In particular, in Theorem 5.7 we prove a quantitative, discrete, large-scale analogue of the fact that a topological covering map with simply connected range is always a homeomorphism, and in Proposition 5.8 we prove a quantitative, discrete, large-scale analogue of the path-lifting property. We believe both of these results to be of independent interest, but they also lie at the heart of our finitary Mann-type theorem, as well as playing an important role in the proof of our uniqueness result, Proposition 1.12.

The finitary Mann theorem is crucial in obtaining the bounds in our fine-scale theorems, but it still leaves a significant amount of technical work to prove our main theorem. We undertake this work and complete the proof in Chapter 6. This is what we mean by ‘further refinement’ in the final step of Fig. 1.

Let us now briefly highlight some further results that are particularly important in our proofs and applications.

- In §3.2 we study the interplay between a Lie progression and its ‘finitary Mal’cev completion’.
- A crucial part of the proof of the main theorem is essentially to show that, for each $i < d'$, the power $P_i^{\text{inj } P_i}$ of the progression P_i can be approximated by a Lie progression of lower dimension – this lower-dimensional progression then becomes P_{i+1} . However, even the fact that $P_i^{\text{inj } P_i}$ can be approximated by a progression of the *same* dimension as itself is far from trivial, and turns out to be an important stepping stone on the way to producing P_{i+1} . We achieve this in Proposition 3.27, which shows that an arbitrary power of a Lie progression can be well approximated by another Lie progression projected from the same Lie group. This result makes extensive use of the material on finitary Mal’cev completions, as well as a result on the nilpotent geometry of numbers generalised from our first paper (Proposition 3.29).
- It is a well-known and easy fact that a normal discrete subgroup of a connected topological group must be central (see §3.7). This phenomenon has a finitary and quantitative analogue for Lie progressions, in the form of a lower bound on the radius of injectivity modulo the centre, which we derive in Proposition 3.42. This is essential to yield conclusions (xv) and (xvi) of Theorem 1.11, the first of which in turn allows us to obtain Corollary 1.14.

Remark. Strictly speaking, the first application of the nilpotent Freiman theorem indicated in Fig. 1, when we pass from the original BGT theorem to the first iteration of our fine-scale theorem, is probably not necessary, because the proof of the original BGT theorem implicitly gives a similar progression structure. However, by the time we arrive at the second iteration of the BGT theorem, with our preliminary effective bounds, this implicit progression structure has disappeared, and the nilpotent Freiman theorem appears to be crucial to recovering it.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Itai Benjamini for asking some of the questions that inspired this project, to Vladimir Trofimov for help with the references, and to Tom Hutchcroft for sharing an early draft of [16] with us.

2 Background and notation

We use the convention that the natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$ do not include 0, and write $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Recall that we write $g(d)$ for the maximum order of a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$.

In general, we use G to denote a group, and $\mathcal{G}$ to denote a graph, although in each case we will explicitly introduce the given object. We use the notation $\mathcal{G}(G, S)$ to denote the *Cayley graph* on a group G with respect to a generating set S , i.e. the graph with vertex set G , and with elements g and h connected by an edge exactly when $g \neq h$ and $g \in h(S \cup S^{-1})$.

Given a graph $\mathcal{G}$, a vertex $x \in \mathcal{G}$ and non-negative real $r \geq 0$, we write $B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, r)$ for the ball of radius r centred at x in the graph metric on $\mathcal{G}$. If $\mathcal{G}$ is transitive then we write $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(r)$ for the number of vertices in a ball of radius r , and $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}(n)$ for the number of vertices in a sphere of radius r .

We adopt a standard version of asymptotic notation, in which $O(X)$ means a quantity bounded above by a constant multiple of X ; $\Omega(X)$ means a quantity bounded below by a positive constant multiple of X ; $X \ll Y$ and $Y \gg X$ both mean that X is bounded above by a constant multiple of Y ; and $X \asymp Y$ means that $X \ll Y$ and $Y \ll X$ both hold. If the implied constant depends on some other parameters $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, we indicate this with subscripts, e.g. $O_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k}(X)$, $X \ll_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k} Y$.

Whenever we use this notation in this fashion, it means that the implied constant is *effective*, i.e. could be computed explicitly from our arguments. If the implied constant is ineffective, we use the same notation but with the addition of an asterisk, e.g. $O^*(X)$, $X \ll^* Y$. We caution that, for example, the notation $O_{\lambda}(X)$ means a quantity that is at most a constant multiple of X , with the constant depending effectively on the parameter λ . However, despite the absence of an asterisk, the quantity $O_{\lambda}(X)$ could still be ineffective if λ is itself an ineffective constant. This occurs on some occasions in our proofs, but never in the statements of our results.

Given elements $u_1, \dots, u_d$ of a group or Lie algebra and positive reals $L_1, \dots, L_d$, and given integers $i_1 < \dots < i_k \in [1, d]$, we often abbreviate $(u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_k}; L_{i_1}, \dots, L_{i_k})$ to simply $(u_{i_1}, \dots, u_{i_k}; L)$.

2.1 Growth

We have the following universal absolute lower bound on the growth of a connected vertex-transitive graph.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a connected vertex-transitive graph. Then $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \geq 2$ for every positive integer $n < \text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$. In particular, $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \geq 2n + 1$ for all $n < \text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$, and $|\mathcal{G}| \geq 2 \text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}(n) = 1$ and show that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) = n$. We show first that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) < 2n$. We prove the contrapositive: if there existed vertices x, y with $d(x, y) = 2n$ then there would be a vertex z at distance n from each of x and y , so that $\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \geq 2$.

Now let $o \in \mathcal{G}$. If $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) > n$ then the unique vertex at distance n from o is a cut point for $\mathcal{G}$, and hence by transitivity every vertex is a cut point for $\mathcal{G}$. However, we have already shown that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) < \infty$, and no vertex at distance $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$ from o can be a cut point. $\square$

The bounds of Lemma 2.1 are all tight, and attained by cycles of even length and the bi-infinite path.

We also have universal relative lower bounds on the growth of connected vertex-transitive graphs, or more generally connected regular graphs. Write $\text{rad}_x(\mathcal{G}) = \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} : B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, r) = \mathcal{G}\}$ for the *radius* of a connected graph Γ centred at $x \in \Gamma$. Note that if Γ is vertex-transitive then $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) = \text{rad}_x(\mathcal{G})$ for every $x \in \mathcal{G}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a connected k -regular graph, let $x \in \mathcal{G}$, and fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \leq \text{rad}_x(\mathcal{G})$. Then $|B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, n)| \geq \frac{1}{3}(k+1)n$.*

Proof. Since $n \leq \text{rad}_x(\mathcal{G})$ there is a geodesic of length n starting at x . Writing $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ for the vertices of this geodesic in increasing order of distance from x , the lemma follows from the fact that the balls $B_{\mathcal{G}}(x_{3m}, 1)$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $3m < n$ are disjoint subsets of $B_{\mathcal{G}}(x, n)$ of size $k+1$. $\square$

We now record two standard results about finite-index subgroups of finitely generated groups that are relevant to growth.

Lemma 2.3 ([26, Lemma 7.2.2]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose G is a group with a finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and H is a subgroup of index k in G . Then $H \cap S^{2k-1}$ generates H .*

Lemma 2.4 ([53, Lemma 11.2.1]). *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose G is a group with a finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and H is a subgroup of index at least k in G . Then S^{k-1} has non-empty intersection with at least k distinct left cosets of H .*

Finally, the next lemma shows that, in certain circumstances, if S^n is covered by a few translates of some set Q then the further growth of S is controlled by that of Q .

Lemma 2.5. *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose G is a group with symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and $X \subseteq S^k$ and $Q \subseteq G$ satisfy $S^{n+k} \subseteq XQ$. Then*

$$S^{mn+k} \subseteq XQ^m$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, if $X \subseteq S^n$ and $S^{2n} \subseteq XQ$ then

$$S^{mn} \subseteq XQ^{m-1}$$

for every integer $m \geq 2$.

Proof. The case $m = 1$ is true by hypothesis, and for $m > 1$ by induction we have $S^{mn+k} = S^n S^{(m-1)n+k} \subseteq S^n XQ^{m-1} \subseteq S^{n+k} Q^{m-1} \subseteq XQ^m$, as required. $\square$

2.2 Approximate groups

Given $K \geq 1$, a K -approximate group is a symmetric subset A of a group containing the identity and satisfying $A^2 \subseteq XA$ for some set X of cardinality at most K . As we described in the introduction, approximate groups play a central role in the proof of Theorem 1.5. They are also crucial in many of the arguments of the present paper.

In this section we record a number of specific results on approximate groups for use in later chapters. For more detailed background on approximate groups and information on some of their many other applications, see the second author's book [53] or the surveys [8, 19, 20, 27, 40].

At the most basic level, the relevance of approximate groups to the study of polynomial volume arises from the following results.

Lemma 2.6 ([50, Lemma 8.4]). *Let $M, D > 0$, let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$, and let $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $N = N_\alpha$ such that if S is a finite subset of a group with $|S^n| \leq Mn^D|S|$ for some $n \geq \max\{N, M(q\beta^{-1})^{\frac{D+1}{1-\alpha}}\}$ then there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $n^\alpha < k < \beta n$ such that $|S^{qk}| \leq q^{\frac{D+1}{1-\alpha}}|S^k|$.*

Lemma 2.7 ([51, Proposition 6.1]). *Let $K \geq 1$, and suppose A is a precompact symmetric open set in a locally compact group with a Haar measure μ . Suppose that $\mu(A^3) \leq K\mu(A)$. Then A^2 is a precompact open K^3 -approximate group.*

Proposition 2.8 (Tao [43, Theorem 4.6]). *Let $K \geq 1$, and suppose A is a precompact symmetric open set in a locally compact group with a Haar measure μ . Suppose that $\mu(A^2) \leq K\mu(A)$. Then there exists a precompact open $O(K^{O(1)})$ -approximate group U with measure $\mu(U) \leq O(K^{O(1)})\mu(A)$ and a finite set X of cardinality at most $O(K^{O(1)})$ such that $A \subseteq XU$.*

When A is finite, we have the following slightly more precise bounds in Proposition 2.8 (no doubt one can compute precise bounds from the proof of Proposition 2.8 as well, but such precision would have limited impact on our main results so we do not pursue this).

Proposition 2.9 ([53, Theorem 2.5.6]³). *Let $K \geq 1$, and suppose A is a finite subset of a group satisfying $|A^2| \leq K|A|$. Then there exists an $O(K^{18})$ -approximate group $U \subseteq A^2$ and a set $X \subseteq A$ of size at most K^2 such that $A \subseteq XU$.*

Finally, it will be useful to have the following standard result.

Lemma 2.10 ([53, Proposition 2.6.5]). *Suppose that A is a K -approximate group inside a group G and that $H \leq G$, and let $m \geq 2$ be an integer. Then $A^m \cap H$ is a K^{2m-1} -approximate group.*

2.3 Nilpotent groups and commutators

Given elements x, y of a group G , we adopt the convention that the commutator $[x, y] = x^{-1}y^{-1}xy$. Given elements $x_1, \dots, x_k$ of a group, we then define the *simple commutator* $[x_1, \dots, x_k]_k$ recursively via $[x_1]_1 = x_1$ and

$$[x_1, \dots, x_k]_k = [[x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}]_{k-1}, x_k]$$

³The reference states that U is an $O(K^{24})$ -approximate group, but the proof there actually gives an $O(K^{18})$ -approximate group.

for $k \geq 2$; thus, in particular, $[x_1, x_2]_2 = [x_1, x_2]$ by definition. We drop the subscript k from the brackets when it is clear from the context what value it takes, such as is the case for $[x_1, \dots, x_k] = [x_1, \dots, x_k]_k$, for example.

We define the commutator $[H_1, H_2]$ of two subgroups $H_i \leq G$ via $[H_1, H_2] = \langle [h_1, h_2] : h_i \in H_i \rangle$. Recall that the *lower central series* of G is the series

$$G = \gamma_1(G) \geq \gamma_2(G) \geq \dots$$

defined by setting $\gamma_1(G) = G$ and $\gamma_k = [\gamma_{k-1}(G), G]$ for all $k \geq 2$. The *upper central series* of G is the series

$$\{1\} = Z_0(G) \leq Z_1(G) \leq Z_2(G) \leq \dots$$

defined by setting $Z_0(G) = \{1\}$ and $Z_k(G) = \{z \in G : [z, g] \in Z_{k-1}(G) \forall g \in G\}$ for all $k \geq 2$; thus, each $Z_k(G)$ is defined so that $Z_k(G)/Z_{k-1}(G)$ is the centre of $G/Z_{k-1}(G)$.

Following [35], for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we also define the *generalised commutator subgroup* $\overline{G}_k$ by

$$\overline{\gamma}_k(G) = \{g \in G : (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(g^n \in \gamma_k(G))\}. \quad (2.1)$$

The generalised commutator subgroups are all characteristic in G , and if G is finitely generated then each $\overline{\gamma}_k(G)$ contains $\gamma_k(G)$ as a finite-index subgroup [35, Lemma 4.1]. Moreover, we have

$$[\overline{\gamma}_i(G), \overline{\gamma}_j(G)] \leq \overline{\gamma}_{i+j}(G) \quad (2.2)$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ [35, Lemma 4.5].

The group G is said to be *nilpotent* if there exists k such that $\gamma_k(G) = \{1\}$. The (*nilpotency*) *class* of G is then defined to be the (unique) $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma_c(G) \neq \gamma_{c+1} = \{1\}$. Equivalently (as it turns out), the class of G is the (unique) c such that $Z_{c-1}(G) \neq Z_c(G) = G$.

The *Bass–Guivarc’h formula* [1, 24] states that if G is nilpotent of class c then the growth degree of G can be expressed as

$$\deg(G) = \sum_{i=1}^c ir(i),$$

where $r(i)$ is the torsion-free rank of the abelian quotient $\gamma_i(G)/\gamma_{i+1}(G)$, i.e., the number of infinite factors in the decomposition of this quotient as a direct sum of cyclic groups.

The set of finite-order elements of a nilpotent group G form a subgroup $T(G) \leq G$, called the *torsion subgroup* of G . The torsion subgroup is trivially characteristic, and $G/T(G)$ is torsion-free. If G is finitely generated then $T(G)$ is finite.

We now follow a set up in [6, §1] that was in turn based on [26, §11.1] to define some more general commutators than just the simple ones described above. We define (*formal*) *commutators* in the letters $x_1, \dots, x_r$ recursively by defining each x_i and x_i^{-1} to be a formal commutator, and for every pair α, α' of commutators defining $[\alpha, \alpha']$ also to be a formal commutator. We also write $[\alpha', \alpha] = [\alpha, \alpha']^{-1}$. To each commutator α we assign a *weight vector* $\chi(\alpha) = (\chi_1(\alpha), \dots, \chi_r(\alpha))$, defined recursively by setting $\chi_i(x_j^{\pm 1}) = \delta_{ij}$ and, given two formal commutators α, α' in the x_j , defining $\chi([\alpha, \alpha']) = \chi(\alpha) + \chi(\alpha')$. We define the *total weight* $|\chi(\alpha)|$ of a commutator α to be $\|\chi(\alpha)\|_1$. We call $\chi_i(\alpha)$ the *weight* of x_i in α , or the x_i -*weight* of α . We define a commutator $[\alpha, \alpha']$ to be a *trivial commutator* if $\alpha = \alpha'$ or if either α or α' is trivial.

Of course, if the letters x_i are elements that generate a group G then we may interpret commutators recursively via $[\alpha, \beta] = \alpha^{-1}\beta^{-1}\alpha\beta$. It is easy to see that a trivial commutator always has the identity element as its interpretation. If G is nilpotent of class c then those commutators of total weight greater than c also have trivial interpretations in G .

Following [26, §11.1], we distinguish certain commutators, which we denote by $u_1, u_2, \dots$, as *basic commutators*. These are so called because in a free group F with free generators $x_1, \dots, x_r$ and lower central series $F = F_1 > F_2 > \dots$ the basic commutators total weight k in the x_i form a free basis of the free abelian group F_k/F_{k+1} (see [26, §11.1]).

We define the basic commutators recursively. For $i = 1, \dots, r$ we set $u_i = x_i$. Then, having defined the basic commutators $u_1, \dots, u_m$ of total weight less than k , we define a commutator α of total weight k to be basic if

1. $\alpha = [u_i, u_j]$ for some u_i, u_j with $i > j$, and
2. if $u_i = [u_s, u_t]$ then $j \geq t$.

We then label the basic commutators of total weight k as $u_{m+1}, \dots, u_{m'}$, ordered arbitrarily subject to the constraint that basic commutators with the same weight vector are consecutive. Note that the arbitrariness of the order implies that the list of basic commutators is not uniquely defined. Note, however, that if $r \geq 2$ the commutators $[\dots[[x_2, x_1], x_1] \dots], x_1]$ are always basic, so there are always basic commutators of every total weight, whereas if $r = 1$ then x_1 is the unique basic commutator.

2.4 Nilpotent Lie groups

Every finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group G embeds as a lattice in a simply connected nilpotent Lie group. This Lie group is unique up to isomorphism, and is called the *Mal'cev completion* of G [33, 39]. We sometimes denote the Mal'cev completion of G by $G^{\mathbb{R}}$. By the Mal'cev rigidity theorem [39, Theorem 2.11], every homomorphism from a torsion-free nilpotent group G to a simply connected nilpotent Lie group N uniquely extends to a Lie group homomorphism $G^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N$. In particular, if G and H are finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent groups with Mal'cev completions $G^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $H^{\mathbb{R}}$ then every homomorphism $G \rightarrow H$ extends to a homomorphism $G^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow H^{\mathbb{R}}$.

The Mal'cev completion of the free nilpotent group of class c on generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$ is the free nilpotent Lie group of class c on generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$. Indeed, let φ be the obvious homomorphism from the free nilpotent group of class c on generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$ to the free nilpotent Lie group of class c on generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$. By the Mal'cev rigidity theorem, φ uniquely extends to a Lie group homomorphism $\varphi^{\mathbb{R}}$ defined on the Mal'cev completion. By construction, this extended morphism is surjective, and since both Lie groups are simply connected and have the same dimension, $\varphi^{\mathbb{R}}$ must be an isomorphism.

Given a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ over $\mathbb{R}$, we define the *lower central series* of $\mathfrak{g}$ inductively by $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{k+1} = [\mathfrak{g}_k, \mathfrak{g}] = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{[X, Y] : X \in \mathfrak{g}_k, Y \in \mathfrak{g}\}$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is said to be *nilpotent* if there exists k such that $\mathfrak{g}_k = \{0\}$. The *class* of G is then defined to be the (unique) $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}_c \neq \mathfrak{g}_{c+1} = \{0\}$.

If G is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ then $\mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent of the same class [33]. There are mutually inverse diffeomorphisms $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ and $\log : G \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, and

one can describe the group operation in G in terms of addition and the Lie bracket in $\mathfrak{g}$ via the *Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula*, which states that for elements $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ we have

$$\exp(X)\exp(Y) = \exp\left(X + Y + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + \frac{1}{12}[X, [X, Y]] + \cdots\right) \quad (2.3)$$

[11, Theorem 1.2.1]. The terms in this expression are all iterated Lie brackets in X and Y multiplied by rational coefficients. The precise values of the rational coefficients are not important for our arguments; all that matters is that in a nilpotent Lie group the series has only finitely many non-zero terms, and these depend only on the class of the group.

Simply connected nilpotent Lie groups are *uniquely divisible*, which is to say that if G is such a group and $g \in G$ then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a unique $h \in G$ such that $h^n = g$.

We define the *dimension* of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group G , denoted $\dim G$, to be the dimension of its Lie algebra as a real vector space. The class of G is at most $\dim G$, so any bound that in principle depends on both the class and dimension of G can in fact be taken to depend only on the dimension.

We define the *homogeneous dimension* of G , denoted $\text{hdim } G$, by

$$\text{hdim } G = \sum_{k=1}^s k(\dim \mathfrak{g}_k - \dim \mathfrak{g}_{k+1}) = \sum_{k=1}^s \dim \mathfrak{g}_k.$$

If Γ is a lattice in G then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_k - \dim \mathfrak{g}_{k+1}$ is exactly the torsion-free rank of the abelian quotient $\gamma_k(\Gamma)/\gamma_{k+1}(\Gamma)$; in particular, if N is a finitely generated nilpotent group with torsion subgroup T then $\deg(N)$ is exactly the homogeneous dimension of the Mal'cev completion of N/T .

A basis $x_1, \dots, x_d$ for a nilpotent Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is called a *strong Mal'cev basis* if $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(x_i, \dots, x_d)$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$ for each i . It follows from [11, Proposition 1.2.7] that if $x_1, \dots, x_d$ is a strong Mal'cev basis for $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group G then, writing $u_i = \exp x_i$ for each i , every element of G has a unique expression in the form $u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}$ with $\ell_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Note in particular that the upper-triangular-form property of the basis of a Lie progression implies that it is a strong Mal'cev basis for the Lie algebra of the Lie group from which the progression is projected.

Lemma 2.11 ([50, Lemma 4.3]). *Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $n = n(c) \in \mathbb{N}$ if G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group of nilpotency class at most c , and Λ is an additive subgroup of the Lie algebra of G with $[\Lambda, \Lambda] \subseteq \Lambda$, then $\exp(n \cdot \Lambda)$ is a subgroup of G .*

Lemma 2.12 ([6, Lemma 5.1]). *Let $c, t \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist rational polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_m$ drawn from a finite list depending only on c , and indices $i_1, \dots, i_m \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, such that if $y_1, \dots, y_t$ are elements in a nilpotent Lie group of class c and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ then $(y_1 \cdots y_t)^\eta = y_{i_1}^{p_1(\eta)} \cdots y_{i_m}^{p_m(\eta)}$.*

Remarks on the proof. This is not quite the statement of [6, Lemma 5.1], but it follows from the proof as presented there. Specifically, it is not clear from the statement of [6, Lemma 5.1] that the same polynomials and indices work for arbitrary elements y_j in an arbitrary nilpotent Lie group of class c , but this follows from the proof (or alternatively from applying the statement there to the free nilpotent Lie group of class c on generators $y_1, \dots, y_t$). Moreover, in the statement of [6, Lemma 5.1] the exponent η is assumed to be rational, but the proof mentions explicitly that η may in fact be an arbitrary real. (One could also use a density argument to pass from the rationals to the reals.) $\square$

We define a framework for describing iterated Lie brackets in the Lie algebra, analogous to higher-weight commutators in a group. Specifically, given elements $v_1, \dots, v_r$ of a Lie algebra, we define every v_j to be a Lie bracket of weight 1 in the v_i , and for every pair α, α' of Lie brackets of weights ω, ω' , respectively, we define $[\alpha, \alpha']$ to be a Lie bracket in the v_i of weight $\omega + \omega'$. We again extend $v_1, \dots, v_r$ to a list $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_d$ of *basic Lie brackets* in the v_i ; these are defined in exactly the same way as the basic commutators in a group, except that the bracket now represents the Lie bracket instead of the commutator. We caution that if $v_i = \log x_i$ for each i then the basic commutators in the v_i are not in general equal to the logarithms of the basic commutators in the x_i .

The following is well known, but we are not aware of a reference.

Proposition 2.13. *Let N be a connected nilpotent Lie group, and suppose H is a compact subgroup of N . Then H is central in N .*

Proof. Let $\tilde{N}$ be the universal cover of N . Then N is the quotient of $\tilde{N}$ by a discrete normal subgroup $\Gamma \leq \tilde{N}$. Note that as a discrete normal subgroup of a connected group, Γ is central: the map $\tilde{N} \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ defined by $(g, \gamma) \mapsto [g, \gamma]$ is continuous, and hence constant with respect to g . It follows that Γ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Its Mal'cev completion $\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}$ is therefore a central subgroup of $\tilde{N}$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^d$. We therefore have a central extension $1 \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \tilde{N} \rightarrow \tilde{N}/\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow 1$, which induces a central extension $1 \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}/\Gamma \rightarrow N \rightarrow \tilde{N}/\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow 1$. Since $\tilde{N}/\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}$ is simply connected, any compact subgroup is contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbb{R}}/\Gamma$, and therefore is central. $\square$

2.5 The value of $g(d)$ and its optimality in our results

The exact value of $g(d)$ is apparently known for all d , but unfortunately not all of the details are published. According to Friedland [18, p. 3519] and Mann [34, p. 88], Feit computed $g(d)$ for all values of d and characterised those finite subgroups of maximal order in $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$, showing in particular that $g(d) = 2^d d!$ for $d = 1, 3, 5$ and $d \geq 11$. These results appear in an unpublished preprint [17], which we have not seen. For sufficiently large d , Friedland [18] proves this bound and shows that the unique subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ with maximum order is the orthogonal group $\mathrm{O}_d(\mathbb{Z})$. The best general bound we are aware of with a published proof is $g(d) \leq (2d)!$ [37, p. 175, eq. (16)].

It is perhaps worth providing a slight update to Friedland's account of Feit's work. Friedland reports that for large d , Feit's work depends on a certain bound on the *Jordan number* $j(d)$. The name and definition of this quantity come from Jordan's theorem, which states that for each $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $j(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that an arbitrary finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{C})$ contains a normal abelian subgroup with index at most $j(d)$. According to Friedland, for large d Feit's argument relies on the bound $j(d) \leq (d+2)!$ for $d \geq 64$, which appears in an unpublished manuscript left by Weisfeiler [60] when he disappeared hiking in Chile in 1985. However, since then, Collins [10] has computed the optimal value of $j(d)$ for all d , rendering Weisfeiler's unpublished work unnecessary.

In any case, our results as stated do not rely on knowledge of $g(d)$. Moreover, irrespective of its precise value, the fact that $g(d)$ is the optimal index bound in Theorem 1.2 and our main results follows from the following proposition.

Proposition 2.14. *Let K be a finite subgroup of maximum size in $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$, and let $G = \mathbb{Z}^d \rtimes K$. Suppose $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that H is finite, Γ/H is nilpotent and $[G : \Gamma] < \infty$. Then $H = \{1\}$ and $\Gamma \leq \mathbb{Z}^d$.*

To prove Proposition 2.14 it will be convenient to have the following straightforward lemma (which is trivial once we know that $K = O_n(\mathbb{Z})$).

Lemma 2.15. *Suppose $K \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ is a finite subgroup of maximum size. Then the action of K on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ has no non-zero fixed points.*

Proof. Suppose K has a non-zero fixed point $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We may assume without loss of generality that z is unimodular, and hence extend it to a basis for $\mathbb{Z}^d$, with respect to which every element of K will be of the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & * \\ \hline 0 & A \end{array} \right)$$

for some $A \in \mathrm{GL}_{d-1}(\mathbb{Z})$. We may then define a homomorphism $\varphi : K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_{d-1}(\mathbb{Z})$ by

$$\varphi \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & * \\ \hline 0 & A \end{array} \right) = A,$$

the kernel of which consists entirely of matrices of the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 1 & * \\ \hline 0 & I \end{array} \right).$$

Such a matrix is either the identity or of infinite order, so since K is finite we conclude that $\ker \varphi = I$ and hence that K is isomorphic to a subgroup $K' \leq \mathrm{GL}_{d-1}(\mathbb{Z})$. The matrices of the form

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} \pm 1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & A \end{array} \right)$$

with $A \in K'$ then form a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{Z})$ with size larger than that of K . □

Proof of Proposition 2.14. To see that $H = \{1\}$, suppose on the contrary that $(0, 1) \neq (w, k) \in H$. If $k = 1$ then $w \neq 0$, contradicting the finiteness of H . If $k \neq 1$ then there exists $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $k(z) \neq z$. We then have $(-z, 1)(w, k)(z, 1)(w, k)^{-1} = (k(z) - z, 1) \in H$ by normality, again contradicting the finiteness of H .

Suppose now that $\Gamma \leq G$ is a finite-index nilpotent subgroup. First, note that since G is virtually abelian, every quotient of Γ is virtually abelian, including in particular the quotient by the torsion subgroup $T(\Gamma)$. The quotient $\Gamma/T(\Gamma)$ is therefore both torsion-free nilpotent and virtually abelian, and hence torsion-free abelian. In particular, this shows that $[\Gamma, \Gamma] \leq T(\Gamma)$. Since Γ is a finitely generated nilpotent group, $T(\Gamma)$ is finite, so that $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$ is also finite.

Now suppose that, contrary to our claim, $\Gamma \not\leq \mathbb{Z}^d$, so that there exists $(w, k) \in \Gamma$ with $k \neq 1$. Since $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ has finite index in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, every non-trivial element of K has a non-trivial action on Γ' ; in particular, there exists $(z, 1) \in \Gamma'$ such that $k(z) \neq z$. We then have $(-z, 1)(w, k)(z, 1)(w, k)^{-1} = (k(z) - z, 1) \in [\Gamma, \Gamma]$, contradicting the finiteness of $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$. □

3 Lie progressions

Recall from the introduction that we define the *progression* $P(u; L)$ on *generators* $u_1, \dots, u_d \in G$ with *lengths* $L_1, \dots, L_d$ is to be

$$P(u; L) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : |\ell_i| \leq L_i\}.$$

We also extend this notation by defining

$$P(u; \infty) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : \ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We caution that in our previous paper [50] we used the term *ordered progression* and the notation $P_{\text{ord}}(u; L)$, to distinguish this notion of progression from various other notions of progression that played a more prominent role at the time we wrote that paper. We also insisted that the lengths L_i be integers in that paper.

Progressions are “almost” symmetric in the sense that for group elements $u_1, \dots, u_d$ and lengths $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ the progression $P(u, L)$ trivially satisfies

$$P(u, L)^{-1} \subset P(u, L)^d. \quad (3.1)$$

It is also not hard to see that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $L_i \geq 1$ we have

$$P(u; mL) \subset P(u, L)^{2dm}. \quad (3.2)$$

Recall from the introduction that the tuple $(u; L) = (u_1, \dots, u_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ is in *C-upper-triangular form* if, whenever $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, for all four choices of signs $\pm$ we have

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] \in P\left(u_{j+1}, \dots, u_d; \frac{CL_{j+1}}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{CL_d}{L_i L_j}\right). \quad (3.3)$$

In this case we also describe the progression $P(u; L)$ as being in *C-upper-triangular form*. Note that if $(u; L)$ is in upper-triangular form then $\langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle = P(u; \infty)$.

Given $\mu > 0$, we say that the progression $P(u; L)$ is μ -*proper* if the elements $u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}$ are all distinct as the ℓ_i range over those integers with $|\ell_i| \leq \mu L_i$.

We noted in our previous paper [50] that proper progressions in upper-triangular form have bounded doubling and polynomial growth. To state this precisely, we recall a definition from that paper. Given a progression $P = P(u_1, \dots, u_d; L)$ in upper-triangular form, for every pair i, j with $i < j$ and every one of the four possible choices of sign there is by definition some (not necessarily unique) expression $u_{j+1}^{\ell_{j+1}} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}$ for $[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}]$. For every pair i, j with $i < j$ and every one of the four possible choices of sign we fix arbitrarily one such expression, which we call the *P-expression* for $[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}]$. We then define *weights* $\zeta(k)$ of the u_k by setting $\zeta(k) = 1$ if u_k does not appear in the *P-expression* for any $[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}]$, and

$$\zeta(k) = \max\{\zeta(i) + \zeta(j) : u_k \text{ appears in the } P\text{-expression for some } [u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}]\}$$

otherwise. Note that this is recursively well-defined, although the definition may depend on the choice of *P-expression*.

Lemma 3.1 ([50, Lemma 2.1]⁴). *Suppose that $P = P(u_1, \dots, u_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ is a progression in C -upper triangular form. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $P^n \subseteq P(u; O_{C,d}(n^\zeta L))$, where we abbreviate $n^\zeta L = (n^{\zeta(1)} L_1, \dots, n^{\zeta(d)} L_d)$.*

Corollary 3.2 ([50, Corollary 2.2]). *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu, C > 0$. Suppose that P is a μ -proper progression of rank d in C -upper-triangular form. Then $|P^n| \leq O_{C,\mu,d}(n^{O_d(1)})|P|$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

One of the other notions of progression we used in [50], and which plays a brief role in the present paper, is a special kind of progression called a *nilpotent progression*, originally defined by Breuillard and Green [6, Definition 1.4]. Given elements a nilpotent group G of class s , we define the *nilpotent progression* with generators $x_1, \dots, x_r \in G$ and lengths $L_1, \dots, L_r > 0$ to be the progression $P = P(x_1, \dots, x_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ obtained by extending $x_1, \dots, x_r$ to a complete list $x_1, \dots, x_d$ of basic commutators in the x_i of weight at most s , and setting $L_i = L^{\chi(u_i)}$ for every $i > r$. Here we use the notation L^χ to denote the quantity $L_1^{\chi_1} \cdots L_r^{\chi_r}$. We define r to be the *rank* and s to be the *step* of P . We showed in our first paper [50, Proposition 3.4] that a nilpotent progression of rank r and step s is in $O_{r,s}(1)$ -upper-triangular form.

Nilpotent progressions enter this paper via the following result of the second author [52, 54].

Theorem 3.3 ([54, Corollary 1.9]). *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $K \geq 1$. Suppose G is an s -step nilpotent group and $A \subseteq G$ is a finite K -approximate group. Then there exist a subgroup $H \subseteq A^{K^{e^{O(s)}}}$ normalised by A and a nilpotent progression P of rank at most $e^{O(s^2)} K \log^{O(s)} 2K$ such that*

$$A \subseteq HP \subseteq HA^{e^{O(s^3)} K^{s+1} \log^{O(s^2)} 2K}.$$

The following result shows that the notion of Lie progression that we use in the present paper generalises the notion of nilpotent progression.

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose P is a nilpotent progression of rank r and step s . Then P is an $O_{r,s}(1)$ -rational Lie progression of dimension at most $(4r)^s$ in $O_{r,s}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with trivial symmetry group, projected from the free nilpotent Lie group of rank r and class s .*

Proof. Let $u_1, \dots, u_r$ be the standard generators of the free nilpotent group N of rank r and class s , and extend them to the list $u_1, \dots, u_d$ of basic commutators. The number d of basic commutators in this list is certainly at most the number of all commutators of weight at most s in r generators, of which there are at most $(4r)^s$ [53, Proposition 5.3.3]. Let $\pi : N \rightarrow \langle P' \rangle$ be the unique homomorphism such that $\pi(u_i) = x_i$ for each i . We showed in [50, Proposition 3.4] that $(u_1, \dots, u_d; L)$ is in $O_{r,s}(1)$ -upper-triangular form. Furthermore, embedding N in the free nilpotent Lie group of rank r and class s , it follows from [50, Proposition 4.4] that $(\log u_1, \dots, \log u_d; L)$ is in $O_{r,s}(1)$ -rational $O_{r,s}(1)$ -upper-triangular form. $\square$

3.1 Basic properties of Lie progressions

The following result shows that the symmetry group of a Lie progression behaves on scales within the injectivity radius like the torsion subgroup of a nilpotent group.

⁴In [50, Lemma 2.1] the L_i are assumed to be positive integers, but one can reduce to that case by replacing each L_i with $\lfloor L_i \rfloor$ and then disregarding those u_i with $L_i = 0$.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose P is a Lie progression with symmetry group H , and that $K \subseteq P^{[\text{inj } P/2]}$ is a finite subgroup. Then $K \leq H$.*

To prove this it will be convenient to introduce a variant of the classical notion of a *Freiman homomorphism*, which we will call a *local homomorphism*. Given groups G and H , a subset $A \subseteq G$ containing the identity, and a subset $B \subseteq G$ containing A^2 , we define a map $\varphi : B \rightarrow H$ to be a *local homomorphism* on A if $\varphi(ab) = \varphi(a)\varphi(b)$ for all $a, b \in A$. Note that if A is a subgroup of G then φ is a local homomorphism if and only if it is a genuine group homomorphism.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that G and H are groups and that $A \subseteq G$ contains the identity. Suppose further that $\varphi : A^2 \rightarrow H$ is injective on A^2 and a local homomorphism on A , and define $\psi : \varphi(A^2) \rightarrow A^2$ by $\psi(\varphi(a)) = a$. Then ψ is an injective local homomorphism on $\varphi(A)$.*

Remark. It is necessary in Lemma 3.6 to assume that φ is injective on A^2 and define ψ on $\varphi(A^2)$. For example, if $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/(2m+1)\mathbb{Z}$ is the quotient homomorphism then the restriction of φ to $A = \{-m, \dots, m\}$ is a local homomorphism, injective on A , but the map $\psi : \mathbb{Z}/(2m+1)\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow A$ given by $\psi(n) \mapsto n$ is not a local homomorphism, since $\psi(m+1) = -m \neq m+1 = \psi(m) + \psi(1)$. This in turn will be the reason why in Lemma 3.5 we have to assume $K \subseteq P^{[\text{inj } P/2]}$ rather than $K \subseteq P^{\text{inj } P}$.

Proof. Given $a, b \in A$ we have $\psi(\varphi(a)\varphi(b)) = \psi(\varphi(ab)) = ab = \psi(\varphi(a))\psi(\varphi(b))$. $\square$

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that G and H are groups and that $A \subseteq G$. Suppose further that $\varphi : A^2 \rightarrow H$ is injective on A^2 and a local homomorphism on A , and that $K \leq H$ is such that $K \subseteq \varphi(A)$. Then the map $K \rightarrow G$ defined by $\varphi(a) \mapsto a$ is an injective group homomorphism. In particular, $\varphi^{-1}(K)$ is a subgroup of G isomorphic to K .*

Proof. Define $\psi : \varphi(A^2) \rightarrow A^2$ by $\psi(\varphi(a)) = a$; this is injective by definition, and a local homomorphism on $\varphi(A)$ by Lemma 3.6. In particular, ψ is a local homomorphism on K , so that $\psi|_K : K \rightarrow G$ is in fact an injective group homomorphism. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Let $\tilde{P}$ be the underlying raw Lie progression of P , write Γ for its lattice, and write $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle P \rangle / H$ for its projector. Since π is injective on $(\tilde{P}^{[\text{inj } P/2]})^2$, Lemma 3.7 implies that $\pi^{-1}(KH/H)$ is a subgroup of Γ isomorphic to KH/H . In particular it is finite, and hence trivial because Γ has no torsion. $\square$

In particular, Lemma 3.5 can be used to show that the Lie progressions appearing in results like Theorem 1.11 are automatically normal, as follows.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose that G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, that $P \subseteq G$ is a Lie progression generating a normal subgroup of G , and that $X \subseteq G$ is a finite subset containing the identity such that $XP \subseteq S$, such that $S^2 \subseteq XP^\eta$ for some $\eta \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that $X \cap \langle P \rangle = \{1\}$. Suppose further that $\text{inj } P \geq 2\eta$. Then the symmetry group of P is normal in G .*

Proof. Write H for the symmetry group of P . Given $x \in X$ we have $xHx^{-1} \subseteq S^2 \subseteq XP^\eta$. Since $\langle P \rangle \trianglelefteq G$ and $X \cap \langle P \rangle = \{1\}$, this implies that $xHx^{-1} \subseteq P^\eta$, and hence by Lemma 3.5 that $xHx^{-1} \leq H$. Since P normalises H and G is generated by $X \cup P$, this proves the result. $\square$

The following result is for interest only.

Corollary 3.9. *If P is a Lie progression in a group G and $\text{inj } P \geq 2$ then the symmetry group of P is exactly the set $\{g \in G : gP = P\}$.*

Proof. The set $\{g \in G : gP = P\}$ is a subgroup contained in P and containing the symmetry group of P , so this follows from Lemma 3.5. $\square$

3.2 Rational and continuous progressions, and boxes in Lie algebras

In our first paper [50], we proved the following result for passing between boxes in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ in a nilpotent Lie algebra and progressions in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ in the corresponding Lie group.

Proposition 3.10 ([50, Proposition 4.1]). *Let $C > 0$. Suppose G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$ is a subgroup of G , and $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$. Then, writing $u_i = \exp e_i$, we have*

$$P(u; L) \subseteq \exp B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; O_{C,d}(L))$$

and

$$\exp B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; L) \subseteq P(u; O_{C,d}(L)).$$

Moreover, $P(u; L)$ is in $O_{C,d}(1)$ -upper-triangular form.

A particular consequence of this result, which we use repeatedly in this paper, is the following.

Corollary 3.11. *Suppose G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$ in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$ is a subgroup of G . Then, writing $u_i = \exp e_i$ for each i , we have $\exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle = \langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle = P(u; \infty)$.*

Proof. Since $(e; 1)$ is in C -upper-triangular form for some $C > 0$, Proposition 3.10 implies that $P(u; 1)$ is in upper-triangular form, and hence that $\langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle = P(u; \infty)$.

Clearly $\langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle \leq \exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$. On the other hand, an arbitrary element of $\exp\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$ belongs to $B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; L)$ for some $L_i \in \mathbb{N}$, and since $(e; L)$ is in C_L -upper-triangular form for some $C_L > 0$, Proposition 3.10 implies that $B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; L) \subseteq P(u; \infty)$. $\square$

In the present paper we will also need analogues of Proposition 3.10 over the rationals and reals. More precisely, given elements $u_1, \dots, u_d$ in a Lie group and positive reals $L_1, \dots, L_d$, we define the *rational progression* $P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L)$ via

$$P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : \ell_i \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [-L_i, L_i]\},$$

and the *continuous progression* $P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)$ via

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L) = \{u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} : \ell_i \in [-L_i, L_i]\}.$$

We say that $(u; L) = (u_1, \dots, u_d; L_1, \dots, L_d)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$ if for every $i < j \leq d$ and for all four choices of signs $\pm$ we have

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(u_{j+1}, \dots, u_d; \frac{CL_{j+1}}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{CL_d}{L_i L_j} \right),$$

and similarly over $\mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $C > 0$. Suppose G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$, and that $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, writing $u_i = \exp e_i$, we have*

$$P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L) \subseteq \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; O_{C,d}(L)) \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; L) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; O_{C,d}(L)). \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, $P_{\text{ord}}(u; L)$ is in $O_{C,d}(1)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Remark 3.13. By density of $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{R}$, the same result holds with $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}$, a fact that we use later without further explicit mention.

The proof of Proposition 3.12 is essentially the same as that of Proposition 3.10, and uses certain functions mapping a set of letters to a commutator or Lie bracket in those letters. We call these functions *bracket forms*. To define bracket forms, we momentarily treat brackets as formal objects that can be interpreted either as commutators or as Lie brackets depending on the context. Following [52, Definition 3.2], given letters $v_1, \dots, v_r$, the function α_i defined by $\alpha_i(v_1, \dots, v_r) = v_i$ is a bracket form of weight 1, and then given two bracket forms α, α' of weights ω, ω' , respectively, the function $[\alpha, \alpha']$ defined by $[\alpha, \alpha'](v_1, \dots, v_r) = [\alpha(v_1, \dots, v_r), \alpha'(v_1, \dots, v_r)]$ is a bracket form of weight $\omega + \omega'$. Thus, for example, the function $\alpha : (w_1, w_2) \mapsto [w_1, [w_1, w_2]]$ is a bracket form of weight 3, and if x_1, x_2 are elements of a group then $\alpha(x_1, x_2)$ is the commutator $[x_1, [x_1, x_2]]$, whilst if v_1, v_2 are elements of a Lie algebra then $\alpha(v_1, v_2)$ is the Lie bracket $[v_1, [v_1, v_2]]$.

Lemma 3.14 ([50, Lemma 4.6]). *Let α be a bracket form of weight m . Then there exists a sequence $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots$ of bracket forms of weight greater than m , of which at most finitely many have any given weight, and rationals $q_1, q_2, \dots$ such that if $x_1, \dots, x_m$ are elements of a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group, and $v_i = \log x_i$ are elements of the corresponding Lie algebra, then*

$$\log \alpha(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \alpha(v_1, \dots, v_m) + q_1 \beta_1(v_1, \dots, v_m) + q_2 \beta_2(v_1, \dots, v_m) + \dots,$$

with each β_j featuring each v_i at least once.

Lemma 3.15. *Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d$ are elements of a Lie algebra and $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let β be a bracket form of weight r . Then for every $i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_r$ we have*

$$\beta(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_r}) \in B_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(e_{i_r+1}, \dots, e_d; \frac{O_{C,d,r}(L_{i_r+1})}{L_{i_1} \dots L_{i_r}}, \dots, \frac{O_{C,d,r}(L_d)}{L_{i_1} \dots L_{i_r}} \right)$$

Proof. This is a routine induction on r . □

Lemma 3.16. *Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group G , and suppose $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then*

$$(\exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; L))^2 \subseteq \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; O_{C,d}(L)).$$

Proof. This follows from the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula (2.3) and Lemma 3.15. □

Proof of Proposition 3.12. The inclusion (3.4) follows from writing

$$P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L) = \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e_1; L_1) \cdots \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e_d; L_d)$$

and applying Lemma 3.16 repeatedly.

To prove (3.5), observe using the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula (2.3) that for $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ we have

$$\exp(-\ell_1 e_1) \exp(\ell_1 e_1 + \cdots + \ell_d e_d) \subseteq \exp \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(e_2, \dots, e_d).$$

Since $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ is bijective, this combines with Lemma 3.16 to imply that

$$\exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; L) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u_1; L_1) \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e_2, \dots, e_d; O_{C,d}(L_2), \dots, O_{C,d}(L_d)),$$

from which (3.5) follows by induction.

To see that $P_{\text{ord}}(u; L)$ is in $O_{C,d}(1)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$, note first that Lemmas 3.14 and 3.15 imply that for $i < j$ we have

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] \in \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(e_{j+1}, \dots, e_d; \frac{O_{C,d}(L_{j+1})}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{O_{C,d}(L_d)}{L_i L_j} \right).$$

It therefore follows from (3.5) applied to

$$B_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(e_{j+1}, \dots, e_d; \frac{O_{C,d}(L_{j+1})}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{O_{C,d}(L_d)}{L_i L_j} \right)$$

that

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] \in P_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(u_{j+1}, \dots, u_d; \frac{O_{C,d}(L_{j+1})}{L_i L_j}, \dots, \frac{O_{C,d}(L_d)}{L_i L_j} \right). \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.17. *Suppose G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Suppose $e_1, \dots, e_d \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $u_i = \exp e_i$ for each i . Then $P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L)^n \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; O_{C,d,n}(L))$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Remark 3.18. As with Proposition 3.12, by density of $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{R}$ we automatically have the same result with $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; L)^n &\subseteq (\exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; O_{C,d}(L)))^n && \text{(by Proposition 3.12)} \\ &\subseteq \exp B_{\mathbb{Q}}(e; O_{C,d,n}(L)) && \text{(by Lemma 3.16)} \\ &\subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; O_{C,d,n}(L)) && \text{(by Proposition 3.12).} \end{aligned}$$

□

In the next two results, just as in the definition of nilpotent progressions, given $L \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\chi \in \mathbb{N}^r$ we use the notation L^χ to denote the quantity $L_1^{\chi_1} \cdots L_r^{\chi_r}$. If $f_1, \dots, f_r$ are elements of some nilpotent Lie algebra of class c , extended to a list $\bar{f} = f_1, \dots, f_d$ of basic Lie brackets of weight at most c , and $L_1, \dots, L_r > 0$, then $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi)$ is the set of linear combinations of $\sum_i \lambda_i f_i$ where $|\lambda_i| \leq L^\chi(i)$. We also write $L\bar{f} = (L^{\chi(1)} f_1, \dots, L^{\chi(d)} f_d)$. We remark that $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi)$ is the continuous version of the *nilbox* $\mathfrak{B}(f_1, \dots, f_r; L)$ appearing in [6].

Lemma 3.19. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_r$ be elements of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of class c . Write $f_i = \log x_i$ for each i , and extend $f_1, \dots, f_r$ to a list $\bar{f} = f_1, \dots, f_d$ of basic Lie brackets of weight at most c . Then for every $L \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we have $[B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi), B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi)] \subseteq O_{r,c}(1)B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi)$.*

Proof. We may assume that $x_1, \dots, x_r$ freely generate the free nilpotent group of rank r and class c , embedded in the free nilpotent Lie group of rank r and class c . Since $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi) = B_{\mathbb{R}}(L\bar{f}; 1)$, we may assume that $L = 1$. The lemma then follows from the fact that $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; 1)$ is a compact neighbourhood of the origin. $\square$

Lemma 3.20. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_r$ be elements of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of class c . Write $f_i = \log x_i$ for each i , and extend $f_1, \dots, f_r$ to a list $\bar{f} = f_1, \dots, f_d$ of basic Lie brackets of weight at most c . Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $L \in \mathbb{N}^d$, we have*

- (i) $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (nL)^\chi)) \approx_{r,c} \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(f; nL))$,
- (ii) $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (nL)^\chi)) \approx_{r,c,n} \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi))$,
- (iii) $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; L^\chi))^n \subseteq \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (O_{r,c,n}(L))^\chi))$,
- (iv) $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^n \approx_{r,c} \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (nL)^\chi))$,
- (v) $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^n \approx_{r,c} \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(f; nL))$.

Proof. We may assume that $x_1, \dots, x_r$ freely generate the free nilpotent group of rank r and class c , embedded in the free nilpotent Lie group of rank r and class c . Observe that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; nL) = P_{\mathbb{R}}(x^L; n)$, $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (nL)^\chi) = B_{\mathbb{R}}(L\bar{f}; n^\chi)$, and $B_{\mathbb{R}}(f; nL) = B_{\mathbb{R}}(Lf; n)$, which reduces the the proof of these statements to the case where $L = 1$.

Moreover, for the proof of (i), we can similarly reduce to the case where both L and n equal 1, in which case it simply follows from the fact that $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(f; 1))$ and $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; 1))$ are both compact generating sets of the the free nilpotent Lie group of rank r and class c . The same argument applies to (ii). Taking logarithms on both sides, (iii) follows from the fact that every bounded set of the Lie algebra is contained in $B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; C^\chi)$ for a sufficiently large C . We now turn to the proof of (iv), which we have reduced to $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^n \approx_{r,c} \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; n^\chi))$. For $n = 1$, this follows from the fact that $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)$ and $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; 1))$ are compact generating sets. The proof of [25, Theorem II.1] gives the existence of constants $C = O_{r,c}(1)$ and $n_0 = O_{r,c}(1)$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$.

$$\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (n/C)^\chi)) \subset P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^n \subset \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{f}; (Cn)^\chi)).$$

We conclude by (ii) (applied with $n = C$). Finally (v) results from the combination of (i) and (iv). $\square$

Remark. Explicit constants can be obtained in Lemma 3.20 using the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula instead of the above “compact generating set” argument.

Proposition 3.21. *Let G be a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with strong Mal’cev basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$. Write $u_i = \exp e_i$ for each i , write $\Gamma = \langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle$, and let $L_1, \dots, L_d \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $(u; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form. Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$P(u, L)^k \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^k \cap \Gamma$$

and

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^k \cap \Gamma \subseteq P(u, L)^{O_{d,C}(k)}.$$

We first prove a version of Proposition 3.21 in a free nilpotent group.

Proposition 3.22. *Let $N_{d,s}$ be the free nilpotent group of class s on d generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$, embedded in the free nilpotent Lie group of class s on d generators, and let $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^k \subset P(x^L; 1)^{O_{d,s}(k)} P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^{O_{d,s}(1)} \subset P(x; L)^{O_{d,s}(k)} P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^{O_{d,s}(1)}. \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover,

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^k \cap N \subset P(x; L)^{O_{d,s}(k)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Proof. The second inclusion of (3.6) is trivial. To prove the first inclusion, note first that applying the automorphism of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ that maps $x_i^{L_i}$ to x_i reduces the statement to the case where $L_i = 1$, and so it suffices to prove that

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^k \subset P(x; 1)^{O_{d,s}(k)} P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^{O_{d,s}(1)}.$$

Let D be a compact subset such that $ND = N^{\mathbb{R}}$. Observe that the map $\phi : N_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow N$ that sends $g \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ to the unique $\gamma \in N$ such that $g \in \gamma D$ is a left-inverse of the inclusion $N \rightarrow N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since the latter is a quasi-isometry for the word metric associated to $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)$ and $P(x; 1)$, we deduce that ϕ itself is a quasi-isometry. In particular, the ball $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^k$ of radius k must be contained in the preimage by ϕ of a ball of radius $O_{d,s}(k)$. This implies that

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)^k \subset P(x; 1)^{O_{d,s}(k)} D,$$

and so the first inclusion of (3.6) follows from the fact that $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; 1)$ generates $N^{\mathbb{R}}$. The inclusion (3.7) then follows from the fact that $P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L) \cap N = P(x; L)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.21. The first conclusion is trivial.

Write s for the nilpotency class of Γ , noting that $s \ll_d 1$, and let $N_{d,s}$ be the free nilpotent group of class s on d generators $x_1, \dots, x_d$. Write $\pi : N_{d,s} \rightarrow \Gamma$ for the homomorphism mapping x_i to u_i for each i . Then note that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^k &\subseteq P(u; L)^{O_d(k)} P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^{O_d(1)} && \text{(by Proposition 3.22)} \\ &\subseteq P(u; L)^{O_d(k)} P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; O_{d,C}(L)) && \text{(by Lemma 3.17).} \end{aligned}$$

Since the e_i form a strong Mal’cev basis and $\Gamma = P(u; \infty)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^k \cap \Gamma &\subseteq P(u; L)^{O_d(k)} P(u; O_{d,C}(L)) \\ &\subseteq P(u; L)^{O_{d,C}(k)} && \text{(by (3.2)),} \end{aligned}$$

which gives the second conclusion. $\square$

3.3 Passing between arbitrary Lie progressions and integral Lie progressions

An important technical step implicit in our first paper was to show that a rational Lie progression can be covered by a few translates of an integral Lie progression. This allowed us to carry out the main arguments of that paper in that more specialised setting, where the geometry-of-numbers arguments in particular behave much better. This step can be captured explicitly in the following form; for completeness we provide a proof at the end of this section.

Proposition 3.23. *Suppose $P = P(u; L)$ is a Q -rational raw Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form with basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$. Then there exists a natural number $M \ll_d Q$ and a subset $X \subseteq P(u; M)$ such that $(Me; L)$ is in CM -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$, such that $(u^M; L)$ is in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, such that $\exp\langle Me_1, \dots, Me_d \rangle = \langle u_1^M, \dots, u_d^M \rangle = P(u^M; \infty)$, such that $X \cap P(u^M; \infty) = \{1\}$, and such that*

$$P^r \subseteq XP(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$XP(u^M; L)^r \subseteq P^{O_{d,Q}(r)} \quad (3.9)$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

In the present paper, where we want to have optimal bounds on the indices in Theorems 1.6 and 1.7, and more generally on the sizes of the sets X_i appearing in Theorem 1.11, we cannot afford for the set X arising in Proposition 3.23 to appear in our conclusions. The second, and most important, aim of this section is therefore to develop tools that will allow us to ‘undo’ Proposition 3.23 once we have applied the results of our first paper, passing back to a rational Lie progression and absorbing the error set X in the process.

The main tool we use for this is the following result, in which we have a raw Lie progression $P(u; L)$ (which for the sake of generality is assumed to be Q -rational in the proposition but in our applications will be integral) generating a lattice that has finite index in the lattice Γ' of primary interest, and we show that $P(u; L)$ can be well approximated by a rational progression $P(u', L')$ that generates the whole of Γ' .

Proposition 3.24. *Suppose that $P(u; L)$ is a Q -rational raw Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form in a simply connected nilpotent Lie group N . Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^d$, and suppose further that $P(u^{1/k}, \infty)$ is a group, and that Γ' is some other group satisfying $P(u; \infty) \leq \Gamma' \leq P(u^{1/k}, \infty)$. Then there exists an $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$ -rational raw Lie progression $P(u', L')$ in $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P(u'; \infty) = \Gamma'$, and such that*

$$(i) \ P(u; L) \subseteq P(u', O_{C,d,k}(L')),$$

$$(ii) \ P(u'; L') \subseteq P(u^{1/k}, O_{C,d,k}(L)).$$

Proof. We will prove by induction on d that the desired conclusions hold as well as

$$(i') \ P_{\mathbb{R}}(u, L) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', O_{C,d,k}(L')),$$

$$(ii') \ P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', L') \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u^{1/k}, O_{C,d,k}(L)),$$

with the list $L'_1, \dots, L'_d$ consisting of the same numbers as the list $L_1, \dots, L_d$, possibly reordered, and, writing $e_i = \log u_i$ and $e'_i = \log u'_i$, that each e'_i can be expressed in the form $\sum_{j=1}^d a_{ij} e_j$ for some $a_{ij} \in \{0, \frac{1}{k_j}, \dots, \frac{k_j-1}{k_j}\}$.

We may assume that $C \geq 1$. We claim that we may then also assume that

$$L_d \geq C^{i-d} L_i \quad (3.10)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$. Indeed, if this is not the case, then let i be maximal such that this inequality fails. If e_i is central then we may simply shift e_i and L_i to the far right (so that e_d becomes e_{d-1} and e_i becomes e_d) without affecting the upper-triangular form, after which this inequality holds for all i . On the other hand, if e_i is not central then there exists j such that $[e_i, e_j] \neq 0$, and then the upper triangular form implies that there exists $k > i$ such that $CL_k \geq L_i L_j$, and hence in particular $L_k \geq C^{-1} L_i > C^{d-i-1} L_d \geq C^{d-k} L_d$, contradicting the maximality of i .

Write $\pi : N \rightarrow N/u_d^{\mathbb{R}}$ for the quotient homomorphism, and $H = \Gamma' \cap u_d^{\mathbb{R}}$. Define $\bar{u}_i = \pi(u_i)$ and $\bar{e}_i = \log \bar{u}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, and note that $\pi(P) = P(\bar{u}; L)$ is a Q -rational raw Lie progression of dimension $d-1$ in C -upper-triangular form in the simply connected nilpotent Lie group $N/u_d^{\mathbb{R}}$. By induction, there therefore exists an $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$ -rational raw Lie progression $P(\bar{u}', \bar{L}')$ in $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P(\bar{u}', \infty) = \Gamma'/H$, such that

$$(iii) \quad P(\bar{u}, L) \subseteq P(\bar{u}', O_{C,d,k}(\bar{L}')),$$

$$(iv) \quad P(\bar{u}', \bar{L}') \subseteq P(\bar{u}'^{1/k}, O_{C,d,k}(L)),$$

such that

$$(iii') \quad P_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{u}, L) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{u}', O_{C,d,k}(\bar{L}')),$$

$$(iv') \quad P_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{u}', \bar{L}') \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{u}'^{1/k}, O_{C,d,k}(L)),$$

such that $\bar{L}'$ is a reordering of $L_1, \dots, L_{d-1}$, and such that, writing $\bar{e}_i = \log \bar{u}_i$ and $\bar{e}'_i = \log \bar{u}'_i$, we have $\bar{e}'_i = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} a_{ij} \bar{e}_j$ with $a_{ij} \in \{0, \frac{1}{k_j}, \dots, \frac{k_j-1}{k_j}\}$.

We start by defining e'_i , and hence $u'_i = \exp e'_i$, for $i < d$. By definition, $\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} a_{ij} e_j \in \log \Gamma' + \langle e_d/k_d \rangle$, so there exists $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{d-1} a_{ij} e_j + (q/k_d) e_d \in \log \Gamma'$. Since $e_d \in \log \Gamma'$, we may assume that $q \in \{0, \dots, k_d-1\}$, and then define $a_{id} = q/k_d$ and set

$$e'_i = \sum_{j=1}^d a_{ij} e_j.$$

We next define e'_d , and hence $u'_d = \exp e'_d$. Specifically, we set $e'_d = e_d/n$, with n the unique positive divisor of k_d such that u'_d is a generator of H . The set $e'_1, \dots, e'_d$ is then a basis for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{n}$, the set $u'_1, \dots, u'_d$ is a generating set for Γ' , and we have $a_{ij} \in \{0, \frac{1}{k_j}, \dots, \frac{k_j-1}{k_j}\}$ as required. Finally, we define $L' = (\bar{L}'_1, \dots, \bar{L}'_{d-1}, L_d)$, noting that this is a reordering of L as required.

We now verify the inclusions (i), (ii), (i') and (ii'), and the rationality and upper-triangularity of $P(u', L')$. First, note that by Proposition 3.12 and Lemma 3.17 (see Remarks 3.13 and 3.18), (iii') and (iv') give

$$(iii'') \quad B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; L) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}'; O_{C,d,k}(L')),$$

$$(iv'') \quad B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}'; L') \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; O_{C,d,k}(L)).$$

We claim moreover that

$$(i'') \quad B_{\mathbb{R}}(e; L) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'; O_{C,d,k}(L')),$$

$$(ii'') \quad B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'; L') \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e; O_{C,d,k}(L)).$$

Indeed, (iii'') implies that $B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}; L) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'_1, \dots, e'_{d-1}; O_{C,d,k}(L'))$ modulo $\mathbb{R}e_d$. Since $|a_{id}| \leq 1$ for each i , this in turn implies that

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_1, \dots, e_{d-1}; L) &\subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'_1, \dots, e'_{d-1}; O_{C,d,k}(L')) + B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'_d; O_{C,d,k}(\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} L'_i)) \\ &= B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'_1, \dots, e'_{d-1}; O_{C,d,k}(L')) + B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'_d; O_{C,d,k}(\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} L'_i)), \end{aligned}$$

and then (3.10) gives (i'') as claimed. The proof of (ii'') from (iv'') is similar.

We now claim that (e', L') is in $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$ -rational $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, as required by the proposition. The fact that $(\bar{e}'; \bar{L}')$ is in $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$ -rational $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form implies that

$$[e'_i, e'_j] = b_{j+1}e'_{j+1} + \dots + b_{d-1}e'_{d-1} + qe'_d$$

for some rationals

$$b_\ell \in \left[-\frac{O_{C,d,k}(L'_\ell)}{L'_i L'_j}, \frac{O_{C,d,k}(L'_\ell)}{L'_i L'_j} \right]$$

with denominators at most $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$, and some $q \in \mathbb{R}$. The fact that q is also rational with denominator at most $O_{Q,d,k}(1)$ follows from the fact that $[e'_i, e'_j] = \sum_{\ell, \ell'} a_{i\ell} a_{j\ell'} [e_\ell, e_{\ell'}]$, the Q -rational upper-triangular form of $(e; L)$, and the bounds on the denominators of the $a_{i\ell}$ and the b_ℓ . The fact that

$$q \in \left[-\frac{O_{C,d,k}(L'_d)}{L'_i L'_j}, \frac{O_{C,d,k}(L'_d)}{L'_i L'_j} \right]$$

follows because

$$\begin{aligned} L'_i L'_j [e'_i, e'_j] &\in [B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, O_{C,d,k}(L)), B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, O_{C,d,k}(L))] && \text{(by (ii''))} \\ &\subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, O_{C,d,k}(L)) && \text{(by the upper-triangular form of } (e, L)) \\ &\subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e', O_{C,d,k}(L')) && \text{(by (i''))}. \end{aligned}$$

We now claim that (u', L') is in $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$. It is in $O_{C,d,k}(1)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Q}$ by Proposition 3.12, so since $e'_1, \dots, e'_d$ is a strong Mal'cev basis it suffices to show that $[u'_i, u'_j] \in P(u', \infty)$ for each i, j . To see this, note first that $(\bar{u}', \bar{L}')$ is in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ by definition, which means that for an arbitrary given pair i, j of indices such that $1 \leq i < j < d$, we have

$$[u'_i, u'_j] = (u'_{j+1})^{\ell_{j+1}} \dots (u'_{d-1})^{\ell_{d-1}} (u'_d)^{a/b}$$

for some $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and some reduced fraction a/b . It follows that $(u'_d)^{1/b} \in \Gamma'$. Since u'_d generates $\Gamma' \cap u_d^{\mathbb{R}}$, this in turn implies that $b = 1$.

Finally, Proposition 3.12 implies that (i'') and (ii'') give (i') and (ii'), as required, and the fact that for all $T = (T_1, \dots, T_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we have

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u, T) \cap \Gamma' \supseteq P(u, T),$$

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', T) \cap \Gamma' = P(u', T)$$

and

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u^{1/k}, T) \cap \Gamma' \subseteq P(u^{1/k}, T)$$

means in particular that (i) and (ii) follow from (i') and (ii'). $\square$

In order to apply the above result, we need the lattice Γ' to be contained in a lattice of the form $P(u^{1/k}, \infty)$. Our next result is an auxiliary lemma showing that once we have $(u^{1/k}, L)$ in upper-triangular form, on increasing k we can assume that $P(u^{1/k}, \infty) = \exp\langle \frac{1}{k_1}e_1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_d}e_d \rangle$.

Lemma 3.25. *Let $C > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that G is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, that $e_1, \dots, e_d$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}$, and that $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$. Then, writing $n = n(d)$ for the natural number given by Lemma 2.11, setting $k_i = m^{2^{i-1}}n^{2^{i-1}-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, and writing $u_i = \exp e_i$ for each i , the following conditions hold:*

(i) $(\frac{1}{k}e; L)$ is in $O_{d,m}(C)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$;

(ii) $(u^{1/k}, L)$ is in $O_{C,d,m}(1)$ -upper-triangular form;

(iii) $\exp\langle \frac{1}{k_1}e_1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_d}e_d \rangle = \langle u_1^{1/k_1}, \dots, u_d^{1/k_d} \rangle = P(u^{1/k}; \infty)$.

Proof. First, note that

$$\left(\frac{1}{mn}e_1, \frac{1}{(mn)^2}e_2, \dots, \frac{1}{(mn)^{2^{d'}-1}}e_d; L \right)$$

is in $O_{m,d}(C)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $(\frac{1}{k}e; L)$ is in $O_{m,d}(C)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$; since the nilpotency class of G is at most d , it also means that we may apply Lemma 2.11 to conclude that $\exp\langle \frac{1}{k_1}e_1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_d}e_d \rangle$ is a group. It then follows from Corollary 3.11 that this group is equal to $\langle u_1^{1/k_1}, \dots, u_d^{1/k_d} \rangle = P(u^{1/k}; \infty)$, and from Proposition 3.10 that $(\hat{u}^{1/k}, L)$ is in $O_{C,d,m}(1)$ -upper-triangular form. $\square$

Finally, following result will allow us, once we have applied Proposition 3.24 to a progression coming from Proposition 3.23, to absorb the error set X into a power of the resulting progression.

Lemma 3.26. *Suppose $P = P(u; L)$ is an infinitely proper progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form, and that $X \subseteq \langle P \rangle$ is such for all $x \in X$ we have $x^2 \in XP^r$. Then $X \subseteq P(u; O_{C,d,r}(L))$.*

Proof. Since P is infinitely proper, every element x of X has a unique decomposition as $u_1^{n_1} \dots u_d^{n_d}$. It is enough to show that $n_j = O_{C,d,r}(L_j)$ for each j . We proceed by induction on d . We do not technically need to separate out the case $d = 1$, but it is instructive to do so. In that case, let $x \in X$ be such that $|n_1|$ is maximal. Then x^2 has coordinate $2n_1$, but belongs to XP^r , so that $2|n_1| \leq rL_1 + |n_1|$, and hence $|n_1| \leq rL_1$, as required. In general, by projecting modulo $\langle u_d \rangle$ and applying the induction hypothesis we may assume that for each $j < d$ the j th coordinate of every element of X is in $O_{C,r,d}(L_j)$. This means that if $x \in X$ is such that $|n_d|$ is maximal, then $x \in P(u; O_{C,d,r}(L))u_d^{n_d}$. By Lemma 3.1 and the centrality of u_d , this in turn implies that $x^2 \in P(u; O_{C,d,r}(L))u_d^{2n_d}$. In particular, the d th coordinate m_d of x^2 satisfies $m_d = 2n_d + O_{C,d,r}(L_d)$. However, since $x^2 \in XP^r$, Lemma 3.1 and the centrality of u_d imply that $m_d = n'_d + O_{C,d,r}(L_d)$ for some $n'_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|n'_d| \leq |n_d|$, so that $n_d = O_{C,d,r}(L_d)$ as required. $\square$

We close this section by proving Proposition 3.23.

Proof of Proposition 3.23. First, note that (Qe, L) is in upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$, so that by [50, Lemma 4.3] there exists $Q' = Q'(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\exp\langle QQ'e_1, \dots, QQ'e_d \rangle$ is a subgroup of N . Set $M = QQ'$, noting that $M \leq O_d(Q)$ and $(Me; L)$ is in CM -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ as required. Proposition 3.10 then implies that $(u^M; L)$ is in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, and Corollary 3.11 implies that $\exp\langle Me_1, \dots, Me_d \rangle = \langle u_1^M, \dots, u_d^M \rangle = P(u^M; \infty)$. Set

$$S = P \cup P^{-1} \cup P(u; M)P(u^M; L) \cup (P(u; M)P(u^M; L))^{-1},$$

so that S is symmetric and contains both P and $P(u; M)P(u^M; L)$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 and [50, Lemma 4.5] that

$$S^2 \subseteq P^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)} \subseteq P(u; O_{C,d,Q}(L)) \subseteq P(u; M)P(u^M; O_{C,d,Q}(L)) \subseteq P(u; M)P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}.$$

Applying Lemma 2.5 with $X = P(u; M)$ therefore implies that

$$P^r \subseteq P(u; M)P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \tag{3.11}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now set $Y = P(u; M) \cap P(u^M; \infty)$, noting that $Y^2 \subseteq P(u; M)P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$ by (3.11), and hence that $Y^2 \subseteq YP(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. Lemma 3.26 then implies that $Y \subseteq P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. Setting $X = (P(u; M) \setminus Y) \cup \{1\}$, it then follows from (3.11) that

$$P^r \subseteq XY P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \subseteq P(u^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, giving (3.8).

Finally, (4.6) is trivial, even with X replaced by its superset $P(u; M)$. $\square$

3.4 Powers of Lie progressions

In this section we show that an arbitrary power of a Lie progression can be approximated by another Lie progression projected from the same lattice.

Proposition 3.27. *Suppose $P_0 = P(u^{(0)}, L^{(0)})$ is a Q -rational raw Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists an $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -rational raw Lie progression $P = P(u, L)$ in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form in the same Lie group as P_0 such that*

$$P_0^m \subseteq P \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(m)}. \quad (3.12)$$

It is convenient to prove Proposition 3.27 for integral Lie progressions first and then generalise to arbitrary Lie progressions using the material of the previous section.

Proposition 3.28. *Suppose $P(u; L)$ is an integral raw Lie progression with dimension d in C -upper-triangular form. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists an integral raw Lie progression $P(u', L')$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P(u; L)^m \subseteq P(u', L') \subseteq P(u; L)^{O_{C,d}(m)}$.*

In proving Proposition 3.28 we use the following slight generalisation of a result from our first paper. We say a convex body B in a real vector space is *strictly thick* with respect to a lattice Λ if there exists some $\lambda < 1$ such that $\lambda B \cap \Lambda$ generates Λ .

Proposition 3.29. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\mathfrak{n}$ is a nilpotent Lie algebra of dimension d and Λ is a lattice in $\mathfrak{n}$ satisfying $[\Lambda, \Lambda] \subseteq \Lambda$. Suppose further that B is a symmetric convex body in $\mathfrak{n}$ such that $[B, B] \subseteq \alpha B$ and $\alpha^{-1}B$ is strictly thick with respect to Λ . Then there exists a basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$ of Λ and $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ such that*

$$B \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e; L) \subseteq O_d(1)B,$$

and such that $(e; L)$ is in α -upper-triangular form. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ then we may also insist that $L_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for each i .

Proof. The case $\alpha = 1$ is [50, Proposition 5.1] from our first paper, and the general statement follows from applying this to the strictly thick convex body $\alpha^{-1}B$. Indeed, the fact that $[B, B] \subseteq \alpha B$ implies that $[\alpha^{-1}B, \alpha^{-1}B] = \alpha^{-2}[B, B] \subseteq \alpha^{-1}B$, so [50, Proposition 5.1] implies that there exists a basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$ of Λ and integers $L_1, \dots, L_d$ such that $\alpha^{-1}B \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e; L) \subseteq O_d(\alpha^{-1})B$ and such that $(e; L)$ is in 1-upper-triangular form. This easily implies that $B \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e; \alpha L) \subseteq O_d(1)B$ and that $(e; \alpha L)$ is in α -upper-triangular form. $\square$

Remark 3.30. By adapting the proof of [50, Proposition 5.1] it is not hard to obtain $L_i \in \mathbb{N}$ in Proposition 3.29 even without the assumption that $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof of Proposition 3.28. Write $e_i = \log u_i$ for each i , and extend e to a list $\bar{e}$ of basic Lie brackets as in Section 2.4. It follows from Lemma 3.19 and Lemma 3.20 (iv) that the strictly thick convex body $B = B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (mL)^x)$ satisfies

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^m \approx_d \exp(B)$$

and $[B, B] \subseteq \alpha B$ for some $\alpha = \alpha_d \in \mathbb{N}$. If $m \leq \alpha$ then Lemma 3.1 implies that the proposition is satisfied by taking $u'_i = u_i$ and each L'_i some bounded multiple of L_i , so we may assume that $m > \alpha$. This implies that $\alpha^{-1}B$ is strictly thick, so by Proposition 3.29 there exists a basis $e'_1, \dots, e'_d$ of the lattice $\langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$ and integers $L''_1, \dots, L''_d$ such that $(e'; L'')$ is in α -upper-triangular form and such that

$$B \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'; L'') \subseteq kB \quad (3.13)$$

for some integer $k = k_d$. Since B is a convex body, we have $kB = \{kb : b \in B\}$, and hence $\exp(kB) = \exp\{kb : b \in B\} \subseteq (\exp B)^k$, and so (3.13) implies that $\exp(B) \approx_d \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'; L''))$. On the other hand, Lemma 3.20 (v) implies that writing $u'_i = \exp e'_i$ for each i we have $\exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e'; L'')) \approx_d P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', L'')$, and hence

$$P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^m \approx_d P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', L''), \quad (3.14)$$

whilst Proposition 3.10 implies that $(u'; L'')$ is in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form.

Note that $\langle u_1, \dots, u_d \rangle = \langle u'_1, \dots, u'_d \rangle$ by Corollary 3.11. Writing Γ for this group, Proposition 3.21 implies that

$$P(u; L)^m \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^m \cap \Gamma \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', L'')^{O_d(1)} \cap \Gamma \subseteq P(u', L'')^{O_d(1)}.$$

Lemma 3.1 then implies that there exist $L'_i \ll_d L''_i$ for each i such that

$$P(u; L)^m \subseteq P(u', L').$$

On the other hand, Proposition 3.21 and (3.14) imply that

$$P(u', L') \subseteq P(u', L'')^{O_d(1)} \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u', L'')^{O_d(1)} \cap \Gamma \subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; L)^{O_d(m)} \cap \Gamma \subseteq P(u; L)^{O_{C,d}(m)}.$$

Finally, both (e', L') and (u', L') are in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form because (e', L'') and (u', L'') are. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.27. Write $e_i^{(0)} = \log u_i^{(0)}$ for each i . Let $M \ll_d Q$ and $X \subseteq P(u^{(0)}; M)$ be as given by Proposition 3.23, so that $(Me^{(0)}; L^{(0)})$ is in CM -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$, so that $((u^{(0)})^M; L)$ is in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, so that $\exp\langle Me_1^{(0)}, \dots, Me_d^{(0)} \rangle = \langle (u_1^{(0)})^M, \dots, (u_d^{(0)})^M \rangle = P((u^{(0)})^M; \infty)$, and so that

$$P_0^r \subseteq XP((u^{(0)})^M; L^{(0)})^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$XP((u^{(0)})^M; L^{(0)})^r \subseteq P_0^{O_{d,Q}(r)} \quad (3.16)$$

for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $n = n(C, d, Q) \in \mathbb{N}$ be an integer to be specified shortly. By Proposition 3.28, there exist a basis $e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_d^{(1)}$ for $\langle Me_1^{(0)}, \dots, Me_d^{(0)} \rangle$ and $L_1^{(1)}, \dots, L_d^{(1)} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(e^{(1)}, L^{(1)})$ is in $O_d(1)$ -upper triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$ and such that, writing $u_i^{(1)} = \exp e_i^{(1)}$ for each i , we have

$$P((u^{(0)})^M; L^{(0)})^{nm} \subseteq P(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)}) \subseteq P((u^{(0)})^M; L^{(0)})^{O_d(nm)}. \quad (3.17)$$

By Lemma 3.25, there exist natural numbers $a_1, \dots, a_d \ll_{d,Q} 1$, each one an integer multiple of M , such that $(\frac{1}{a_1}e_1^{(1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{a_d}e_d^{(1)}; L^{(1)})$ is in $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{Z}$, such that $((u^{(1)})^{1/a}, L^{(1)})$ is in $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, and such that $\exp\left\langle \frac{1}{a_1}e_1^{(1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{a_d}e_d^{(1)} \right\rangle = P((u^{(1)})^{1/a}, \infty)$. We may therefore apply Proposition 3.24 to conclude that there exists an $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -rational raw Lie progression $P(u, L^{(2)})$ in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P(u; \infty) = \langle P_0 \rangle$, and such that

$$P(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)}) \subseteq P(u, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(2)})), \quad (3.18)$$

and

$$P(u, L^{(2)}) \subseteq P((u^{(1)})^{1/a}, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)})). \quad (3.19)$$

By (3.15) and (3.16) we have $X^2 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)} \subseteq XP((u^{(0)})^M, L^{(0)})^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. By choosing n large enough in terms of C , d and Q , we may therefore ensure that $X^2 \subseteq XP(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)}) \subseteq XP(u, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(2)})) \subseteq XP(u, L^{(2)})^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. Lemma 3.26 then implies that $X \subseteq P(u, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(2)}))$, which combines with (3.18) and Lemma 3.1 to show that

$$XP(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)}) \subseteq P(u; L) \quad (3.20)$$

for some $L \leq O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(2)})$.

Provided n is chosen large enough in terms of C , d and Q , (3.15), (3.17) and (3.20) imply that $P_0^m \subseteq P(u; L)$, giving the first required inclusion. Moreover (3.17) implies in particular that $(u_i^{(0)})^M \in P(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)})$ for each i , so that for a given i there exist $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|\ell_j| \leq L_j^{(1)}$ such that $(u_i^{(0)})^M = (u_1^{(1)})^{\ell_1} \dots (u_d^{(1)})^{\ell_d}$. Lemma 2.12 therefore implies that $u_i^{(0)} = (u_{j_1}^{(1)})^{\ell_{j_1} p_1(1/M)} \dots (u_{j_t}^{(1)})^{\ell_{j_t} p_t(1/M)}$ for some indices $j_1, \dots, j_t$ and rational polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_t$ depending only on d . In particular, this implies that $u_i^{(0)} \in P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u^{(1)}; L^{(1)})^{O_d(1)}$, and then Lemma 3.17 implies that $X \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u^{(1)}; O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)}))$. Moreover, (3.19) and Lemma 3.17 imply that $P(u; L) \subseteq P((u^{(1)})^{1/a}; O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)})) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u^{(1)}; O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)}))$. Since $P(u; L) \subseteq \Gamma = XP(u^{(1)}; \infty)$, and since $e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_d^{(1)}$ is a strong Mal'cev basis, by Lemma 3.17 it follows that $P(u, L) \subseteq XP(u^{(1)}; O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)}))$. By (3.17) and (3.16), this in turn implies that

$$P(u; L) \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(nm)}.$$

Since n depends only on C, d, Q , this gives the second required inclusion. $\square$

3.5 Lower bounds on growth in Lie progressions

As we mentioned right near the beginning of the introduction to this paper, the upper bound on the growth degree of G in Gromov's theorem as we stated it in Theorem 1.1 follows trivially from the polynomial-growth hypothesis (1.1) and the existence of the growth lower bound $|S^n| \gg n^{\deg G}$ given by (1.2). We prove the upper bounds on the dimension and homogeneous dimension of the progressions arising in Theorem 1.11 in a similar way, but with the asymptotic growth lower bound of (1.2) replaced by the following quantitative volume lower bounds.

Proposition 3.31. *Given $d, k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\gamma = \gamma(d, k, t) > 0$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, $X \subseteq S^t$ contains the identity and satisfies $|X| \leq k$, and P is a Lie progression of dimension at most d such that $XP^r \subseteq S^{rn} \subseteq XP^{\eta r}$ for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$ for some $n, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$|S^m| \gg_{\eta, d, k, t} m^{\text{hdim } P} \quad \text{and} \quad |S^m| \gg_{\eta, d, k, t} m^{\text{dim } P} |S|$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\gamma\eta \leq m/n \leq \text{inj } P$.

We start by proving universal lower bounds on the growth of a generating set for the lattice of P .

Proposition 3.32. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that Γ is a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group with Mal'cev completion of dimension d , and that S is a finite symmetric generating subset of Γ containing the identity. Then*

$$|S^n| \gg_d n^d |S|$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We use the following standard result from additive combinatorics.

Lemma 3.33. *Let A and B be finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$. Then $|A + B| \geq |A| + |B| - 1$. In particular, by induction on n we have $|nA| \geq n(|A| - 1)$.*

Proof. Label the elements of A as $a_1 < \dots < a_p$ and the elements of B as $b_1 < \dots < b_q$, and note that $a_1 + b_1 < a_2 + b_1 < \dots < a_p + b_1 < a_p + b_2 < \dots < a_p + b_q$, so that all of the elements in this last list are distinct. $\square$

We also use the following combinatorial lemma.

Lemma 3.34 ([53, Lemmas 2.6.2 & 2.6.3]). *Suppose G is a group, $H \leq G$ is a subgroup, and $A \subseteq G$ is a finite symmetric subset. Then $|A| \leq |AH/H||A^2 \cap H|$ and $|A^{m+n}| \geq |A^m H/H||A^n \cap H|$ for every $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.32. We proceed by induction on d , the base case $d = 1$ following from Lemma 3.33. Let c be the class of Γ , and let N be the Mal'cev completion of Γ . Let $x_1, \dots, x_c \in S$ be such that $[x_1, \dots, x_c] \neq 1$, and let H be the central one-parameter subgroup of N generated by $[x_1, \dots, x_c]$. Let $r \ll_d 1$ be the word length of $[x_1, \dots, x_c]$. Since $|S^n| \geq |S|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it suffices to consider only $n \geq 2r$. Given $n \geq 2r$, we claim that $|S^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \cap H| \gg_d n |S^2 \cap H|$. To see this, first note that $S^r \cap H$ contains both the identity and $[x_1, \dots, x_c]^{\pm 1}$, and hence that $|S^r \cap H| \geq 3$. Lemma 3.33 and the fact that $n \geq 2r$ therefore imply that $|S^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \cap H| \geq |(S^r \cap H)^{\lfloor n/2r \rfloor}| \gg \lfloor n/2r \rfloor |S^r \cap H| \gg_d n |S^2 \cap H|$ as claimed. Since $\dim(N/H) = d - 1$, by induction on d we have that $|S^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} H/H| \gg_d n^{d-1} |SH/H|$, and the proposition then follows from Lemma 3.34. $\square$

We now reduce Proposition 3.31 to the case $X = \{1\}$ via the following lemma.

Lemma 3.35. *Let $\eta, t, n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a group with a finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity. Suppose $X \subseteq S^t$ and $Q \subseteq G$ both contain the identity and satisfy*

$$XQ^r \subseteq S^{rn} \subseteq XQ^{nr}$$

for $r = 1$ and $r = 2t + 1$. Then writing $\widehat{Q} = Q \cup Q^{-1}$ and $T = S^{2t+1} \cap \widehat{Q}^{2n}$ we have $S \subseteq XT$;

$$S^j \cap \widehat{Q}^\eta \subseteq T^j, \quad j = 1, \dots, n; \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$\widehat{Q} \subseteq T^n \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{4^{|X|}(2t+1)\eta}.$$

Proof. First, the fact that $S \subseteq XQ^\eta$ and $X \subseteq S^t$ implies that $S \subseteq X(S^{t+1} \cap Q^\eta) \subseteq XT$, as required.

Next, let $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and let $g \in S^j \cap \widehat{Q}^\eta$. By definition there exist elements $s_1, \dots, s_j \in S$ such that $g = s_j \cdots s_1$. Set $g_0 = 1$ and $g_i = s_i s_{i-1} \cdots s_1$ for $i = 1, \dots, j$, noting that $g = g_j$. Since $S^j \subseteq S^n \subseteq XQ^\eta$, it follows that for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, j$ there exist $x_i \in X$ and $q_i \in \widehat{Q}^\eta$ such that $g_i = x_i q_i$. Moreover, since $1, g_j \in \widehat{Q}^\eta$ we may assume that $q_0 = x_0 = x_j = 1$, and hence $g = q_j$. We then have $q_i q_{i-1}^{-1} = x_i s_i x_{i-1}^{-1} \in S^{2t+1} \cap \widehat{Q}^{2\eta} = T$ for each i , and hence $g = q_j \in T^j$, giving (3.21) as required.

Since $\widehat{Q} \subseteq S^n$, the case $j = n$ of (3.21) implies in particular that $\widehat{Q} \subseteq T^n$. It therefore remains only to show that $T^n \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{4^{|X|}(2t+1)\eta}$. To prove this, we first claim that there exist $X' \subseteq X$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $(2t+1)\eta \leq m \leq 4^{|X|}(2t+1)\eta$ such that

$$X\widehat{Q}^{(2t+1)\eta} \subseteq X'\widehat{Q}^m \quad (3.22)$$

and

$$x\widehat{Q}^m \cap \widehat{Q}^{2m} = \emptyset \quad (3.23)$$

for every $x \in X' \setminus \{1\}$. To prove this claim, we first check whether it holds with $X' = X$ and $m = (2t+1)\eta$. These choices certainly satisfy (3.22). If they also satisfy (3.23) then the claim holds. If not, there exists $x \in X' \setminus \{1\}$ such that $x\widehat{Q}^m \cap \widehat{Q}^{2m} \neq \emptyset$, and hence $x \in \widehat{Q}^{3m}$ and so

$$x\widehat{Q}^m \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{4m}.$$

If we replace X' by $X' \setminus \{x\}$ and m by $4m$ then (3.22) is therefore still satisfied, and so we check again whether (3.23) is satisfied, and repeat if necessary. This process terminates after at most $|X|$ steps, and so the claim is proved.

We now claim that $T^j \subseteq \widehat{Q}^m$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, which of course implies in particular that $T^n \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{4^{|X|}(2t+1)\eta}$ as required. The case $j = 1$ follows from the definition of T and the fact that $m \geq 2\eta$, so by induction we may assume that $T^{j-1} \subseteq \widehat{Q}^m$, and hence that $T^j \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{m+2\eta}$. Since $T^n \subseteq S^{(2t+1)n}$ we also have $T^n \subseteq XQ^{(2t+1)\eta}$ by hypothesis, and hence $T^j \subseteq X'\widehat{Q}^m$. It follows that $T^j \subseteq \widehat{Q}^{m+2\eta} \cap X'\widehat{Q}^m$, and hence, by definition of X' and m , that $T^j \subseteq \widehat{Q}^m$, as claimed. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.31. Applying Lemma 3.35 and (3.1) we obtain a positive integer $\rho = \rho(d, k, t)$ and a symmetric subset $T \subseteq G$ containing the identity such that $P \subseteq T^n \subseteq P^{\rho n}$ and $S \subseteq XT$. Note that this last containment implies that $|T| \geq |S|/k$.

Set $\omega = 1/(8\rho\eta)$ and $\gamma = 8\rho$, and suppose that $m \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $m/n \geq \gamma\eta$, so that $m/8 \geq \omega m \geq n$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil [\omega m]/n \rceil \rho\eta &\leq 4\omega\rho\eta m/n && (\text{since } \omega m \geq n) \\ &= m/2n \\ &\leq \lfloor m/n \rfloor - 1 && (\text{since } m \geq 8n), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$T^{\lceil \omega m \rceil} \subseteq T^{\lceil [\omega m]/n \rceil n} \subseteq P^{\lfloor m/n \rfloor - 1}. \quad (3.24)$$

The hypothesis on P implies that $P^{\lfloor m/n \rfloor} \subseteq S^m$. Writing H for the symmetry group of P , we may therefore conclude from (3.24) that $T^{\lceil \omega m \rceil} H \subseteq S^m$. Provided $\text{inj } P \geq m/n$, we may also conclude

from (3.24) that, writing π for the projector of P , there exists a unique symmetric subset $\tilde{T} \subseteq \tilde{P}^{\lfloor m/n \rfloor}$ containing the identity such that $\pi(\tilde{T}) = TH/H$, and that this set satisfies $|TH| = |\tilde{T}||H|$ and $|T^{\lceil \omega m \rceil}H| = |\tilde{T}^{\lceil \omega m \rceil}||H|$. This implies in particular that $|S^m| \geq |\tilde{T}^{\lceil \omega m \rceil}||H|$.

Proposition 3.32 implies that $|\tilde{T}^{\lceil \omega m \rceil}| \gg_d (\omega m)^{\dim P} |\tilde{T}| \gg_{\eta,d,k,t} m^{\dim P} |\tilde{T}|$, whilst [32, Proposition 3.1] implies that $|\tilde{T}^{\lceil \omega m \rceil}| \gg_d (\omega m)^{\text{hdim } P} \gg_{\eta,d,k,t} m^{\text{hdim } P}$, and so we conclude that

$$|S^m| \gg_{\eta,d,k,t} m^{\text{hdim } P}$$

and

$$|S^m| \gg_{\eta,d,k,t} m^{\dim P} |\tilde{T}||H| = m^{\dim P} |T| \geq m^{\dim P} |S|/k,$$

as required. $\square$

3.6 Growth of Lie progressions

In his proof of Theorem 1.9, Tao [44, §4] implicitly proved a partial analogue of Theorem 1.11 valid in a certain ultralimit. In his argument, objects called *ultra coset nilprogressions* played a role analogous to that of the Lie progressions P_i appearing in our Theorem 1.11, and a key part of his proof consisted of estimating the growth of these ultra coset progressions.

In order to prove Corollary 1.16, we adapt Tao's argument to our finitary setting, the more refined nature of which allows us to make the quantitative aspects of his computation much more precise, to an extent that allows us to obtain the improvements of Corollary 1.16 compared to Theorem 1.9. The most important improvements are to the bounds on the degrees, which are sharp in our result and in particular lead to Corollary 1.17.

The main technical content of this section lies in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.36 (fine-scale growth of Lie progressions). *Suppose P is a Q -rational Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form. Then there exists a continuous, increasing, piecewise-monomial function f , with degree increasing, bounded below by d , and bounded above by $\text{hdim } P$, such that $|P^n| \ll_{C,d,Q} f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|P^n| \asymp_{C,d,Q} f(n)$ for all $n \leq \text{inj } P$.*

We start by noting that it is sufficient to prove Proposition 3.36 with a polynomial function in place of a piecewise-monomial function, as follows.

Lemma 3.37. *Let $k, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq k \leq r$, let $\alpha_k, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_r \geq 0$, and define a polynomial f by $f(x) = \alpha_k x^k + \alpha_{k+1} x^{k+1} + \dots + \alpha_r x^r$. Then there exist $x_k = 1 \leq x_{k+1} \leq \dots \leq x_r < x_{r+1} = \infty$ such that the piecewise-monomial function $h : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by $h(x) = \alpha_i x^i$ for $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1})$ is continuous and satisfies $f(x) \asymp_r h(x)$ for $x \geq 1$.*

Proof. We claim that setting $h(x) = \max_i \alpha_i x^i$ satisfies the lemma. This function h is certainly continuous. Moreover, if $0 < x < y$ and if i and j are such that $h(x) = \alpha_i x^i$ and $h(y) = \alpha_j y^j$ then we have $\alpha_i x^i \geq \alpha_j x^j$ and $\alpha_i y^i \leq \alpha_j y^j$. This in turn implies that $(y/x)^i \leq (y/x)^j$, and hence that $i \leq j$, so that the i for which $\alpha_i x^i$ is maximal is non-decreasing in x . This easily implies the existence of $x_k = 1 \leq x_{k+1} \leq \dots \leq x_r < x_{r+1} = \infty$ such that $h(x) = \alpha_i x^i$ for $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1})$. Finally, following Tao [44, §4], note that for every $a, b > 0$ we have $a + b \asymp \max\{a, b\}$, so that $f(x) \asymp_r h(x)$ as required. $\square$

The next step in the proof of Proposition 3.36 is the following estimate. Recall that we defined basic Lie brackets in Section 2.4.

Proposition 3.38. *Suppose that G is a connected, simply connected nilpotent Lie group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of dimension d , and $P(x; L) \subseteq G$ is an integral raw Lie progression with basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$ in C -upper-triangular form. Then extending $e = (e_1, \dots, e_d)$ to a list $\bar{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_r)$ of basic Lie brackets, and writing vol for Lebesgue measure on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G , normalised so that the lattice $\Lambda = \langle e_1, \dots, e_d \rangle$ has determinant 1, we have*

$$\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) \ll_{C,d} |P(x; L)^n| \ll_d \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi}))$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3.39. *Let $v_1, \dots, v_r \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $L_1, \dots, L_r > 0$, and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \geq 1$. Then*

$$\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(v, \alpha L)) \leq \lceil \alpha_1 \rceil \cdots \lceil \alpha_r \rceil \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(v, L)).$$

Proof. It suffices to consider the case in which the α_i are integers, and in that case $B_{\mathbb{R}}(v, \alpha L)$ can be covered by $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_r$ translates of $B_{\mathbb{R}}(v, L)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.38. To prove the upper bound, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $Q = \{\ell_1 e_1 + \cdots + \ell_d e_d : \ell_i \in [0, 1]\}$, and note that

$$\begin{aligned} P^n &\subseteq \exp \Lambda \cap P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^n \\ &\subseteq \exp \Lambda \cap \exp (B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi}))^{O_d(1)} && \text{(by Lemma 3.20 (iv))} \\ &\subseteq \exp (\Lambda \cap B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (O_d(nL))^{\chi})) && \text{(by Lemma 3.20 (iii))}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} |P^n| &\leq |\Lambda \cap B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (O_d(nL))^{\chi})| \\ &= \text{vol}((\Lambda \cap B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (O_d(nL))^{\chi})) + Q) \\ &\leq \text{vol} B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (O_d(nL))^{\chi}) \\ &\ll_d \text{vol} B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi}) && \text{(by Lemma 3.39),} \end{aligned}$$

as required.

We now come to the lower bound. A result of van der Corput [57] states that for any convex body $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we have $|\mathbb{Z}^d \cap K| \geq \frac{1}{2^d} \text{vol}(K)$, which in this case implies that

$$\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) \leq 2^d |\Lambda \cap B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})|$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \exp (\Lambda \cap B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) &\subset \langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle \cap P_{\mathbb{R}}(x; L)^{O_d(n)} && \text{(by Lemma 3.20 (iv))} \\ &\subset P(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(n)} && \text{(by Proposition 3.21),} \end{aligned}$$

this implies that for some constant $k = k_d > 0$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) \ll_d |P(x, L)^{kn}|. \quad (3.25)$$

Given $n \geq k$ we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) &\ll_d \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (\lfloor n/k \rfloor L)^{\chi})) && \text{(by Lemma 3.39)} \\ &\ll_d |P(x, L)^n| && \text{(by (3.25)),} \end{aligned}$$

as required. For $n \leq k$, note that by Corollary 3.2 we have $|P(x, L)^{k^2}| \ll_{C,d} |P(x, L)|$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) &\leq \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (kL)^{\chi})) \\ &\ll_d |P(x, L)^{k^2}| && \text{(by (3.25))} \\ &\ll_{C,d} |P(x, L)^n|, \end{aligned}$$

as required. $\square$

To estimate the expression $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi}))$ appearing in Proposition 3.38 we use the following linear-algebraic lemma, which was implicit in [44, §4].

Lemma 3.40. *Let $d, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq d$, and let $M_1, \dots, M_r > 0$. Suppose $\mathbb{R}^d$ is spanned by elements $v_1, \dots, v_r$. Then there exist $i_1 < \dots < i_d$ such that*

$$B_{\mathbb{R}}(v; M) \subset r \cdot B_{\mathbb{R}}(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_d}; M_{i_1}, \dots, M_{i_d}).$$

Proof. Pick the $i_1 < \dots < i_d$ that maximise $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_d}; M_{i_1}, \dots, M_{i_d}))$. On reordering the v_i , we can assume that $i_j = j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d$. It suffices to show that for a given v_k we have

$$M_k v_k \in B_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1, \dots, v_d; M_1, \dots, M_d). \quad (3.26)$$

View each v_i as a column vector, and write A for the $d \times d$ matrix with columns $M_1 v_1, \dots, M_d v_d$. Cramer's rule implies that the solution $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ to the equation $Ay = M_k v_k$ satisfies

$$|y_j| = \frac{\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1, \dots, v_{j-1}, v_k, v_{j+1}, \dots, v_d; M_1, \dots, M_{j-1}, M_k, M_{j+1}, \dots, M_d))}{\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(v_1, \dots, v_d; M_1, \dots, M_d))}$$

(i.e. with v_j replaced by v_k in the numerator). By maximality, this implies in particular that $|y_j| < 1$, which gives (3.26), as required. $\square$

Lemma 3.41. *In the setting of Proposition 3.38 there exists a polynomial f in which every non-trivial term has a positive coefficient and degree between d and $\text{hdim } N$ such that $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^{\chi})) \asymp_d f(n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Following Tao [44, §4], define the polynomial f by

$$f(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_d \leq r} \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}; L^{\chi})) x^{\sum_{j=1}^d |\chi(i_j)|}.$$

This polynomial certainly has no negative coefficients, and each non-zero term in the sum defining f has degree at least d . To see that the degree of f is at most $\text{hdim } N$, note that the coefficient $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}; L^\chi))$ is non-zero only when the vectors $e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}$ are linearly independent. This means that in every such coefficient, and for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number of vectors e_{i_j} with $|\chi(i_j)| \geq k$ must be at most $\dim \mathfrak{n}_k$. In particular, for every set $e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}$ of vectors satisfying $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}; L^\chi)) \neq 0$ we have $\sum_{j=1}^d |\chi(i_j)| \leq \sum_{k=1}^d \dim \mathfrak{n}_k = \text{hdim } N$, as required.

It remains to prove that $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^\chi)) \asymp_d f(n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. First, note that

$$f(n) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_d \leq r} \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}; (nL)^\chi))$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It then follows from Lemma 3.40 that $\text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^\chi)) \leq r^d f(n)$. On the other hand, the fact that $B_{\mathbb{R}}(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_d}; (nL)^\chi) \subseteq B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^\chi)$ for every $i_1, \dots, i_d$ implies that $f(n) \leq \binom{r}{d} \text{vol}(B_{\mathbb{R}}(\bar{e}; (nL)^\chi))$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.36. Write $x_1, \dots, x_d$ for the generators of P and $L_1, \dots, L_d$ for its lengths. It follows from Proposition 3.23 that there exists a natural number $M \ll_d Q$ and a subset $X \subseteq G$ of size at most $O_{d,Q}(1)$ such that $P(x^M; L)$ is an integral raw Lie progression in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form, and such that

$$\tilde{P}^n \subseteq XP(x^M; L)^{O_{C,d,Q}(n)} \quad (3.27)$$

and

$$P(x^M; L)^n \subseteq \tilde{P}^{kn} \quad (3.28)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $k = k(d, Q)$. It then follows from Proposition 3.38 and Lemma 3.41 that there exists a continuous, increasing, piecewise-monomial function f with degree increasing, bounded below by d , and bounded above by $\text{hdim } P$, such that $|P(x^M; L)^n| \asymp_{C,d,Q} f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We claim that $|\tilde{P}^n| \asymp_{C,d,Q} f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We certainly have $|\tilde{P}^n| \ll_{C,d,Q} f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, thanks to (3.27) and the upper bound on the degree of f . For $n \geq k$, (3.28) and the upper bound on the degree of f imply that $f(n) \ll_d f(\lfloor n/k \rfloor) \ll_{C,d,Q} |\tilde{P}^n|$. This implies in particular that for $n < k$ we have $f(n) \leq f(k) \ll_{C,d,Q} |\tilde{P}^k| \ll_{C,d} |\tilde{P}^n|$, the last bound coming from Corollary 3.2, and so the claim is proved. Since $|P^n| \leq |\tilde{P}^n| |H|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|P^n| = |\tilde{P}^n| |H|$ for all $n \leq \text{inj } P$, where H is the symmetry group of P , the proposition follows. $\square$

3.7 Injectivity modulo the centre

It is a standard fact that a discrete normal subgroup of a connected group is central; to see why, note that if Γ is a discrete normal subgroup of a connected topological group G then the map $G \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ defined by $(g, \gamma) \mapsto [g, \gamma]$ is continuous, and hence constant with respect to g . The following general property of Lie progressions can be seen as a finitary analogue of this fact.

Proposition 3.42. *Given $C \geq 1$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $R = R(C, d)$ such that if P is a Lie progression of class c and dimension d in C -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , the lengths of which are all at least $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\text{inj}^Z P \geq m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}$.*

Conclusion (xvi) of Theorem 1.11 follows (though not trivially) from Proposition 3.42. Note that Proposition 3.42 holds by definition in the case $c = 1$ under the convention that $m^{1/0} = \infty$.

The proof of Proposition 3.42 rests on a series of lemmas.

Lemma 3.43. *Let $C, \varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose G is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of class $c \geq 2$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\Omega \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a symmetric convex body satisfying $[\Omega, \Omega] \subseteq C\Omega$. Then*

$$\log[g, h] \in O_{c,C}(n^{c-1}\varepsilon)\Omega$$

for every $g \in \exp(\Omega)^n$ and $h \in \exp(\varepsilon\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $g \in \exp(\Omega)^n$ and $h \in \exp(\varepsilon\Omega)$. It follows from the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula that

$$\log g \in O_c(n)\Omega + O_c(n^2)[\Omega, \Omega] + \cdots + O_c(n^c)[\Omega, \dots, \Omega]_c, \quad (3.29)$$

and hence that there exists $z \in \gamma_c(G)$ such that gz satisfies

$$\log(gz) \in O_c(n)\Omega + O_c(n^2)[\Omega, \Omega] + \cdots + O_c(n^{c-1})[\Omega, \dots, \Omega]_{c-1}.$$

Note that since z is central in G we have $[gz, h] = [g, h]$. We showed in [50, Lemma 4.6] that there are bracket forms $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{k_c}$ of weight at least 3 and at most c and rationals $q_1, \dots, q_{k_c}$, all of which depend only on c , such that

$$\log[(gz), h] = [\log(gz), \log h] + q_1\beta_1(\log(gz), \log h) + \cdots + q_{k_c}\beta_{k_c}(\log(gz), \log h).$$

The result then follows from the bilinearity of the Lie bracket. $\square$

Lemma 3.44. *Let $C > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose G is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of class $c \geq 2$ and dimension d with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$, and write $x_i = \exp e_i$ for each i . Suppose $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$[g, h] \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(1)}$$

for every $g \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L)^{m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}}$ and $h \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L/m)$.

Proof. Let $g \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L)^{m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}}$ and $h \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L/m)$. Lemma 3.20 (v) implies that

$$g \in \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, L))^{O_d(m^{\frac{1}{c-1}})}, \quad h \in \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, L/m))^{O_d(1)},$$

and then the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula implies that

$$h \in \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, O_{C,d}(L/m)))$$

(cf. (3.29)). We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} [g, h] &\in \exp(B_{\mathbb{R}}(e, O_{C,d}(L))) && \text{(by Lemma 3.43)} \\ &\subseteq P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(1)} && \text{(by Lemma 3.20 (v))}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. $\square$

Lemma 3.45. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C > 0$. Suppose G is a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of class $c \geq 2$ and dimension d with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with basis $e_1, \dots, e_d$, and write $x_i = \exp e_i$ for each i . Suppose $L_1, \dots, L_d \geq 1$ are such that $(x; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form and $(e; L)$ is in C -upper-triangular form over $\mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$[g, h] \in P(x; L)^{O_{C,d}(1)}$$

for every $g \in P(x, L)^{m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}}$ and $h \in P(x, L/m)$.

Proof. Given $g \in P(x, L)^{m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}}$ and $h \in P(x, L/m)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} [g, h] &\in P_{\mathbb{R}}(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(1)} \cap \langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle && \text{(by Lemma 3.44)} \\ &\subseteq P(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(1)} && \text{(by Proposition 3.21),} \end{aligned}$$

as required. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.42. Write H for the symmetry group of P , π for its projector, and $x_1, \dots, x_d$ for its generators. If the injectivity radius of P modulo the centre is less than $m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}$ then there exists a non-central $g \in P(x, L)^{m^{\frac{1}{c-1}}} \cap \ker \pi$. The fact that g is not central implies that there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $[g, x_i] \neq 1$, and since $L_i \geq m$ we have $x_i \in P(x, L/m)$, so Lemma 3.45 implies that $[g, x_i] \in P(x, L)^{O_{C,d}(1)} \cap \ker \pi$. We may therefore take R to be the constant implied by the $O_{C,d}(1)$ notation in this expression. $\square$

The following result shows that Proposition 3.42 can be applied to any progression containing a large power of a generating set (recall the definition of the weights $\zeta(i)$ from just before Lemma 3.1).

Lemma 3.46. *Let G be a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, let $C > 0$ and $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $x_1, \dots, x_d \in G$ and $L_1, \dots, L_d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $P(x; L)$ is infinitely proper and in C -upper-triangular form and contains S^m . Then $L_i \geq C^{1-\zeta(i)} m^{\zeta(i)}$ for each i .*

Proof. This is similar to part of the proof of [50, Theorem 1.11]. Enumerate $\{i : \zeta(i) = 1\}$ as $i_1, \dots, i_r$. It is shown in [50, Lemma 9.1] that the map $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ defined by $x_1^{\ell_1} \cdots x_d^{\ell_d} \mapsto (\ell_{i_1}, \dots, \ell_{i_r})$ is a homomorphism. Since S generates G , this implies that for each $j = 1, \dots, r$ there exists $s_j \in S$ with positive x_{i_j} -coordinate, and then that s_j^m has x_{i_j} -coordinate at least m . Since $s_j^m \in P(x; L)$, this forces $L_{i_j} \geq m$, which proves the lemma for all i with $\zeta(i) = 1$. The bound for general i then follows by induction, using the upper-triangular form. $\square$

Finally, we have the following analogue of Lemma 3.5 for $\text{inj}^Z P$, which shows that finite subgroups of Lie progressions in some sense behave on scales within the injectivity radius modulo the centre like compact subgroups of connected nilpotent Lie groups, in that they are central (see Proposition 2.13).

Lemma 3.47. *Suppose P is a Lie progression with symmetry group H , and that $K \subseteq P^{[\text{inj}^Z P/2]}$ is a finite subgroup. Then $KH/H \leq Z(\langle P \rangle/H)$.*

Note that with the convention $A^\infty = \langle A \rangle$ the statement of Lemma 3.47 still makes sense for $\text{inj}^Z P = \infty$, and indeed it still holds in this case by the same proof.

Proof. Let N be the nilpotent Lie group from which P is projected, and write $\Gamma < N$ for its lattice and $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle P \rangle / H$ for its projector. Abbreviate $R = \text{inj}^Z P$, and define $Z_R = \langle \ker \pi \cap (\tilde{P}^R \tilde{P}^{-R}) \rangle$, noting that Z_R is central in Γ by definition, and hence central in N as $\log \Gamma$ generates the Lie algebra of N . Moreover, π factors through the homomorphism $\pi_R : \Gamma / Z_R \rightarrow \langle P \rangle / H$ defined by $\pi_R(gZ_R) = \pi(g)$.

We claim that π_R is injective on $\tilde{P}^R Z_R / Z_R$. Indeed, if $\pi_R(pZ_R) = \pi_R(qZ_R)$ for some $p, q \in \tilde{P}^R$ then by definition of π_R we have $\pi(p) = \pi(q)$, and then by definition of R we have $pq^{-1} \in Z_R$. Lemma 3.7 therefore implies that $\pi_R^{-1}(K/H)$ is a subgroup of Γ / Z_R isomorphic to K/H . In particular, $\pi_R^{-1}(K/H)$ is a compact subgroup of N / Z_R . Proposition 2.13 therefore implies that $\pi_R^{-1}(K/H)$ is central in Γ / Z_R , which implies the desired result. $\square$

4 A preliminary fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem

In this chapter we prove a preliminary version of Theorem 1.11, with bounds depending on those we have in Theorem 1.5. In fact, we will gradually improve the bounds of Theorem 1.5 as we proceed through our argument, and we will apply our preliminary version of Theorem 1.11 for various different instances of these bounds. As such, it will be useful to record exactly how the bounds of the result we are about to prove depend on the bounds we have in Theorem 1.5.

In order to make these dependencies as transparent as possible, we define the following ‘statement’.

Statement 4.1. *If G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon_0(d) n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_0(d)$, then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \triangleleft G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent with class at most $O_d(1)$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k(d)$.

We will then often write sentences such as ‘Let $\varepsilon_0(d)$, $n_0(d)$ and $k(d)$ be such that Statement 4.1 holds’. Note, for example, that Theorem 1.5 shows that Statement 4.1 holds with $k(d) = k^*(d+1)$, $\varepsilon_0(d) = 1$ and $n_0(d) = n_0^*(d+1)$, whilst Theorem 1.6 will show that it holds with $k(d) = g(d)$ and some potentially much smaller value of ε_0 .

The main result of this chapter is as follows.

Theorem 4.2 (preliminary fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem). *Let $d, R \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(2d+1) > 0$, $n_0 = n_0(2d+1) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = k(2d+1) \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that Statement 4.1 holds. Then there exist $n_1 = n_1(d, R, n_0, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_1$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$, then there exist a set $X \subseteq S^k$ of cardinality at most k containing the identity, non-negative integers $d' \ll_d 1$ and $r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_{d'}$ such that $n^{1/2} \leq r_0 \leq n < r_1$ and $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ of dimension at most $O_d(1)$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same normal subgroup of G , such that writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) for each i and every integer $m \geq r_i$ we have $XP_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{O_d(m/r_i)}$;
- (ii) distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$;
- (iii) $\dim P_0 > \dim P_1 > \cdots > \dim P_{d'}$;
- (iv) $\text{hdim } P_0 > \text{hdim } P_1 > \cdots > \text{hdim } P_{d'}$;
- (v) $H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \cdots \leq H_{d'}$;
- (vi) for each $i = 1, \dots, d'$ there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) = \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

- (vii) each H_i is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker(\beta_i \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1))$;
- (viii) $\text{inj } P_i \ll_d \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \ll_{d,R} \text{inj } P_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, d' - 1$, and $\text{inj } P_{d'} = \infty$;
- (ix) for each i we have $m^{\dim P_i} \ll_{d,k,R} |S^m|/|S|$ for every $m \geq n$ with $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$;
- (x) for each i we have $m^{\text{hdim } P_i} \ll_{d,k,R} |S^m|$ for every $m \geq n$ with $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$.

Moreover, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is allowed to depend in addition on d, k and R then we may conclude further that

- (xi) $\dim P_0 \leq d$, and hence $d' \leq d$;
- (xii) $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$.

It is worth remarking at this point that although n_1 depends effectively on d, n_0, k , and as such is not adorned with an asterisk, Statement 4.1 is not currently known to hold for any effective value of n_0 , so Theorem 4.2 cannot currently give an effective bound on n_1 .

4.1 Construction of Lie progressions with large injectivity radius

In our first paper [50] we adapted an argument from Bilu [5] from the abelian case to show that an integral Lie progression with small injectivity radius can be approximated by an integral Lie progression of lower dimension. In this section we extend that result to rational Lie progressions, as follows.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose P_0 is a Q -rational Lie progression in C -upper-triangular form with dimension d , injectivity radius less than R and symmetry group H_0 , projected from the nilpotent Lie group N_0 with lattice Γ_0 by $\pi_0 : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0$. Then there exists a normal subgroup $H_1 \trianglelefteq \langle P_0 \rangle$ containing H_0 and satisfying*

$$H_1 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}, \quad (4.1)$$

and an $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_1 in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension strictly less than d , injectivity radius at least R and symmetry group H_1 such that, writing N_1 for the nilpotent Lie group from which P_1 is projected, $\Gamma_1 \leq N_1$ for its lattice, and $\pi_1 : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \langle P_1 \rangle / H_1$ for its projector, there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$ such that $\beta(\Gamma_0) = \Gamma_1$, such that

$$\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{P}_0)^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}, \quad (4.2)$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_1 \end{array} \quad (4.3)$$

commutes, and such that H_1 is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta)$.

Note that (4.1), (4.2) and the commutativity of (4.3) imply that $P_0 \subseteq P_1 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}$.

Our earlier result for integral progressions was similar to the following (we modify various details here to reflect what we need in the present paper).

Proposition 4.4. *Let $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose P_0 is an integral Lie progression in C -upper-triangular form with dimension d , injectivity radius less than R and symmetry group H_0 , projected from the nilpotent Lie group N_0 with lattice Γ_0 by $\pi_0 : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0$. Then there exists a normal subgroup $H_1 \trianglelefteq \langle P_0 \rangle$ containing H_0 and satisfying*

$$H_1 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,R}(1)},$$

and an integral Lie progression P_1 in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension strictly less than d , injectivity radius at least R and symmetry group H_1 such that, writing N_1 for the nilpotent Lie group from which P_1 is projected, writing $\Gamma_1 \leq N_1$ for its lattice, and writing $\pi_1 : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \langle P_1 \rangle / H_1$ for its projector, there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$ such that $\beta(\Gamma_0) = \Gamma_1$, such that

$$\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{P}_0)^{O_{C,d,R}(1)},$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_1 \end{array} \quad (4.4)$$

commutes, and such that H_1 is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta)$. There also exist elements $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \ker \beta \cap \tilde{P}_0$ such that $[z_i, z_j] \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(z_{j+1}, \dots, z_m)$ whenever $i < j$, and such that $\ker \beta = P_{\mathbb{R}}(z, \infty)$.

Proof. This is very close to the statement of [50, Proposition 7.3] (to which we refer hereafter in this proof as ‘the reference’), but it differs in several details. The first of these is just terminological: in the reference, the Lie progressions are not stated to be integral, but that is just because Lie progressions in that paper are all integral by definition. We now describe and address the remaining differences.

- Instead of injectivity radius, the reference uses a closely related notion called *properness*: a Lie progression P with generators $u_1, \dots, u_d$, lengths $L_1, \dots, L_d$ and projector π is called *m-proper* for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ if the elements $\pi(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d})$ are all distinct as the ℓ_i range over those integers with $|\ell_i| \leq mL_i$. However, it easily follows from (3.2) and Lemma 3.1 that the truth of the result is unaffected by interchanging these two notions.
- In the reference the symmetry group H_0 is assumed to be trivial. This is easily addressed by applying the result there in the quotient $\langle P_0 \rangle / H_0$.
- In the reference there is no mention of the homomorphism β . In particular, it is not there stated that $\beta(\Gamma_0) = \Gamma_1$, that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{P}_0)^{O_{C,d,R}(1)}$, or that the diagram (4.4) commutes. The homomorphism β is in fact the homomorphism Φ appearing in the proof of [50, Proposition 7.6], and (4.4) is part of the commutative diagram [50, (7.5)]. The fact that $\beta(\Gamma_0) = \Gamma_1$ follows from the fact that $\Phi_j(\Gamma_j) = \Gamma_{j+1}$ in the proof of [50, Proposition 7.6] (or from $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{P}_0)^{O_{C,d,R}(1)}$, which we are about to prove). The fact that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{P}_0)^{O_{C,d,R}(1)}$ follows from the proof of [50, (7.1)] but with [50, (7.7)] replaced by the expression $\Phi(\exp B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; k_{C,d}rL)) \subseteq \exp B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e'; rL') \subseteq \Phi(\exp B_{\mathbb{Z}}(e; O_{C,d,m}(rL)))$; this in turn follows from the penultimate displayed equation in the proof of [50, Proposition 7.6] and the commutativity of [50, (7.5)].
- In the reference, H_1 is not stated to be the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta)$, but this follows from the definition of H_{j+1} in the proof of [50, Proposition 7.6] and the commutativity of [50, (7.5)].
- In the reference, there is no explicit mention of the elements z_i in the statement of the proposition. However, they do appear explicitly in its proof, specifically in the proof of [50, Proposition 7.6]. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Write $u_1, \dots, u_d \in \Gamma_0$ for the generators, $e_1, \dots, e_d$ for the basis, and $L_1, \dots, L_d > 0$ for the lengths of P_0 , so that $\tilde{P}_0 = P(u; L)$ and $e_i = \log u_i$. Let $M \ll_d Q$ be as given by Proposition 3.23, let $X_0 \subseteq P(u; M)$ be the subset given by the same lemma, and write $\Gamma'_0 = \langle u_1^M, \dots, u_d^M \rangle$. Thus, $\tilde{Q}_0 = P(u^M; L)$ is an integral raw Lie progression in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form and $\langle \tilde{Q}_0 \rangle = \Gamma'_0 = \exp \langle M e_1, \dots, M e_d \rangle = P(u^M, \infty)$. Furthermore, $X_0 \cap \Gamma'_0 = \{1\}$, and

$$\tilde{P}_0^r \subseteq X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^r \subseteq \tilde{P}_0^{O_{d,Q}(r)} \quad (4.6)$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\Gamma_0 = X_0 \Gamma'_0$ by (4.5).

Let Q_0 be the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\tilde{Q}_0)$, so that Q_0 is an integral Lie progression in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with symmetry group H_0 . We claim that $\text{inj } Q_0 \ll_{C,d,Q} R$. Indeed, since $\text{inj } P_0 < R$, there exist $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that $u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d} \in \ker \pi \cap \tilde{P}_0^R$. Lemma 2.12 implies that there exist rational polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_t$ (with $t \ll_d 1$), the denominators of whose coefficients are all at most $O_d(1)$, such that for all $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d})^\eta = u_{i_1}^{p_1(\eta)\ell_{i_1}} \cdots u_{i_t}^{p_t(\eta)\ell_{i_t}}$. In particular, there exists a positive integer $\eta \ll_d M$ such that $(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d})^\eta \in \Gamma'_0$. However, $(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d})^\eta$ also belongs to $\ker \pi \cap \tilde{P}_0^{O_d(RM)}$, and hence, by (4.5), to $\ker \pi \cap X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(R)}$. Since $X_0 \cap \Gamma'_0 = \{1\}$, we deduce that $(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d})^\eta \in \ker \pi \cap \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(R)}$, so that $\text{inj } Q_0 \ll_{C,d,Q} R$ as claimed.

Letting $\alpha = \alpha(C, d, Q) > 0$ be a quantity to be determined later but depending on C , d and Q only, Proposition 4.4 therefore implies that there exists an integral Lie progression Q_1 in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension $d' < d$, injectivity radius at least αR , and symmetry group $H'_1 \subseteq Q_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}$ containing H_0 such that, writing N_1 for the nilpotent Lie group from which Q_1 is projected, Γ'_1 for its lattice, and $\pi'_1 : \Gamma'_1 \rightarrow \langle Q_0 \rangle / H'_1$ for its projector, there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$ such that $\beta(\Gamma'_0) = \Gamma'_1$, such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma'_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle Q_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma'_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi'_1} & \langle Q_0 \rangle / H'_1 \end{array}$$

commutes, such that H'_1 is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma'_0 \cap \ker \beta)$, and such that

$$\beta(\tilde{Q}_0) \subseteq \tilde{Q}_1 \subseteq \beta(\tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}).$$

Proposition 4.4 also implies that there exist elements $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \ker \beta \cap \tilde{Q}_0$ such that

$$[z_i, z_j] \in \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(z_{j+1}, \dots, z_m) \quad (4.7)$$

whenever $i < j$, and such that $\ker \beta = P_{\mathbb{R}}(z, \infty)$.

Set $\Gamma_1 = \beta(\Gamma_0)$, and let H_1 be the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta)$, noting that $H'_1 \leq H_1 \trianglelefteq \langle P_0 \rangle$. Write $\varphi : \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_1$ for the quotient homomorphism, and define a homomorphism $\pi_1 : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_1$ via $\pi_1 \circ \beta = \varphi \circ \pi_0$, so that the diagram (4.3) becomes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\ \Gamma_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_1 \end{array}$$

and commutes as required. Note that $H_1 \cap \langle Q_0 \rangle = H'_1$, and hence $\ker \pi_1 \cap \Gamma' = \ker \pi'_1 \cap \Gamma'$.

To prove (4.1), let $g \in \Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta$, and note that $g = xp$ for some elements $x \in X_0$ and $p \in \Gamma'_0$. If there is some other element $q \in \Gamma'_0$ such that $xq \in \ker \beta$, then $q^{-1}p \in \Gamma'_0 \cap \ker \beta$, so that $\pi_0(q^{-1}p) \in H'_1/H_0 \subseteq Q_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}/H_0 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}/H_0$. It therefore suffices to show that there exists $q \in \Gamma'_0$ such that $xq \in \ker \beta$ and $\pi_0(xq) \in P_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}/H_0$. In fact, we will prove a more

precise statement, namely that there exists $q \in \Gamma'_0$ such that $xq \in \ker \beta \cap \tilde{P}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. First, note that by definition of the z_i we have $xp = z_1^{r_1} \cdots z_m^{r_m}$ for some $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Applying (4.7) repeatedly, we can therefore choose integers $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_m$ in turn such that $xpz_1^{\ell_1} \cdots z_m^{\ell_m} = z_1^{c_1} \cdots z_m^{c_m}$ for some $c_i \in [0, 1)$. Set $q = pz_1^{\ell_1} \cdots z_m^{\ell_m}$, noting that $q \in \Gamma'_0$ and $xq \in \ker \beta$ as required. Since each $z_i \in P(u; ML)$, Lemma 2.12 implies that $xq \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(u, O_d(ML))^{O_d(1)}$, and so Lemma 3.17 implies that $xq \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(u; O_{C,d,Q}(L))$. Since e is a strong Mal'cev basis and $xq \in \Gamma_0 = P(u; \infty)$, this in turn implies that $xq \in P(u; O_{C,d,Q}(L)) \subseteq \tilde{P}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$ as required, giving (4.1) as claimed.

Write $\hat{u}_1, \dots, \hat{u}_{d'}$ for the generators of Q_1 , write $\hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_{d'}$ for its basis (so that $\hat{e}_i = \log \hat{u}_i$), and write $\hat{L}_1, \dots, \hat{L}_{d'}$ for its lengths. Since Γ'_1 has index at most $|X_0| = O_{d,Q}(1)$ in Γ_1 , there exists

$$m \ll_{d,Q} 1 \quad (4.8)$$

such that $g^m \in \Gamma'_1$ for all $g \in \Gamma_1$. In particular, this implies that $m \log g \in \langle \hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_{d'} \rangle$ for all $g \in \Gamma_1$, and hence that $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \exp \langle \frac{1}{m} \hat{e}_1, \dots, \frac{1}{m} \hat{e}_{d'} \rangle$. By Lemma 3.25, there exist natural numbers $k_1, \dots, k_{d'} \ll_{d,Q} 1$, each a multiple of m , such that $\exp \langle \frac{1}{k_1} \hat{e}_1, \dots, \frac{1}{k_{d'}} \hat{e}_{d'} \rangle = \langle \hat{u}_1^{1/k_1}, \dots, \hat{u}_{d'}^{1/k_{d'}} \rangle = P(\hat{u}^{1/k}, \infty)$, and such that $(\hat{u}^{1/k}, \hat{L})$ is in $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form. We may therefore apply Proposition 3.24 to conclude that there exists an $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -rational raw Lie progression $\tilde{P}_1 = P(u^{(1)}, L^{(1)})$ in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P(u^{(1)}, \infty) = \Gamma_1$, and such that

$$\tilde{Q}_1 \subseteq P(u^{(1)}, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)})) \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\tilde{P}_1 \subseteq P(\hat{u}^{1/k}, O_{C,d,Q}(\hat{L})). \quad (4.10)$$

Set $X_1 = \beta(X_0)$, and let P_1 be the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_1(\tilde{P}_1)$. It follows from (4.5) that $X_0^2 \subseteq X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$, so that $X_1^2 \subseteq X_1 \tilde{Q}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$, and hence $X_1^2 \subseteq X_1 \tilde{P}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$ by (4.9). Since $X_1 \subseteq \Gamma_1 = \langle \tilde{P}_1 \rangle$ by definition, Lemma 3.26 therefore implies that

$$X_1 \subseteq \tilde{P}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}. \quad (4.11)$$

Combined with (4.5), this implies that

$$\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \beta(X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}) \subseteq X_1 \tilde{Q}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)} \subseteq \tilde{P}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)} \tilde{Q}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)},$$

and then another application of (4.9) implies that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$. Lemma 3.17 then implies that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u^{(1)}, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)}))$, and since $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \Gamma_1 = \langle \tilde{P}_1 \rangle$ and $e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_{d'}^{(1)}$ is a strong Mal'cev basis this in fact implies that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq P(u^{(1)}, O_{C,d,Q}(L^{(1)}))$. Upon increasing the lengths $L_i^{(1)}$ by factors depending only on C, d, Q , we may therefore conclude that $\beta(\tilde{P}_0) \subseteq \tilde{P}_1$, which is the first inclusion of (4.2) (note that by Lemma 3.1 this does not affect the truth of (4.10)).

To prove the second inclusion of (4.2), first note that

$$\tilde{P}_1 \subseteq X_1 \Gamma'_1 = X_1 P(\hat{u}; \infty). \quad (4.12)$$

Next, note that $\tilde{P}_1 \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(\hat{u}; O_{C,d,Q}(\hat{L}))$ by (4.10), and that $X_1 \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(\hat{u}; O_{C,d,Q}(\hat{L}))$ by (4.11), (4.10) and Lemma 3.1. Since $e_1^{(1)}, \dots, e_{d'}^{(1)}$ is a strong Mal'cev basis, (4.12) and Lemma 3.17 therefore combine to imply that

$$\tilde{P}_1 \subseteq X_1 P(\hat{u}; O_{C,d,Q}(\hat{L})) \subseteq X_1 \tilde{Q}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)} \subseteq \beta(X_0 \tilde{Q}_0^{O_{C,d,Q,R}(1)}),$$

which by (4.6) completes the proof of (4.2).

It remains to show that $\text{inj } P_1 \geq R$. To see this, note that if $p \in \tilde{P}_1^r \cap \ker \pi_1 \setminus \{1\}$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ then by (4.8) and definition of m we have $p^m \in \tilde{P}_1^{O_{d,Q}(r)} \cap \Gamma'_1 \cap \ker \pi_1 = \tilde{P}_1^{O_{d,Q}(r)} \cap \Gamma'_1 \cap \ker \pi'_1$. By (4.10) and Lemma 3.1, this implies that $p^m \in P(\hat{u}^{1/k}, \hat{L})^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \cap \Gamma'_1 \cap \ker \pi'_1$, and hence by Proposition 3.21 that

$$p^m \in P_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{u}, \hat{L})^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \cap \Gamma'_1 \cap \ker \pi'_1 \subseteq P(\hat{u}, \hat{L})^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \cap \ker \pi'_1 = \tilde{Q}_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(r)} \cap \ker \pi'_1.$$

Setting α to be the implied constant in the final term of this last expression, we deduce that $r > R$, which proves that $\text{inj } P_1 \geq R$ as required. $\square$

4.2 A chain of Lie progressions

The first progression P_0 required by Theorem 4.2 comes from the following result, precursors to which were originally proved implicitly by Breuillard and the second author [9] and, independently, by Tao [44, (1.4)].

Proposition 4.5. *Let $d, R \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $n_0, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that Statement 4.1 holds for this value of d . Then there exist $n_1 = n_1(d, R, n_0, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d, \varepsilon_0) > 0$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^m| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_1$ then there exist a set $X \subseteq S^k$ of cardinality at most k containing the identity, and an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression P of dimension at most $O_d(1)$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form and with injectivity radius at least R generating a normal subgroup of G such that

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq XP^{O_{d,R}(m)}$$

for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P \rangle$.

Proof. We may certainly insist that $n_1 \geq 2$, so that $|S^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}| \leq 3^{d+1} \varepsilon \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor^{d+1} |S|$. Provided n_1 is large enough and ε is small enough, Statement 4.1 therefore implies that there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent of class at most $O_d(1)$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k$.

Let $\beta = \beta_{d,R} > 0$ be a quantity to be determined shortly but depending only on d and R . Provided n_1 is large enough in terms of d and R , it then follows from Lemma 2.6 that there exists $j \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $n^{1/2} < j < \beta n$ such that $|S^{3j}| \ll_d |S^j|$, then from Lemma 2.7 that S^{2j} is an $O_d(1)$ -approximate group, and then finally from Lemma 2.10 that $S^{4j} \cap \Gamma$ is an $O_d(1)$ -approximate group. Theorem 3.3 then implies that there is a nilpotent progression Q_0 of rank and step at most

$O_d(1)$ in the quotient Γ/H , and a subgroup $H_0 \leq \Gamma/H$ normalised by Q_0 , such that $(S^{4j} \cap \Gamma)H/H \subseteq Q_0 H_0 \subseteq S^{O_d(j)}H/H$. By Proposition 3.4, there therefore exists an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression $P_0 \subseteq \Gamma$ of dimension $O_d(1)$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form, the symmetry group of which is the pullback to Γ of H_0 , such that $(S^{4j} \cap \Gamma)H \subseteq P_0 \subseteq S^{O_d(j)}H$. This shows P_0 generates Γ , which is normal.

By Lemma 2.4, we may pick a complete set $X \subseteq S^k$ of coset representatives for Γ in G , including the identity. In particular, $|X| \leq k$ as required, and $S^{2j} \subseteq X\Gamma$. By setting $n_1 \geq k^2$ we may ensure that $j \geq k$, so that in fact $S^{2j} \subseteq X(S^{3j} \cap \Gamma) \subseteq XP_0$, and hence $S^{mj} \subseteq XP_0^m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by Lemma 2.5. Since $X \subseteq S^j$, we may therefore fix $A = A_d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$S^{mj} \subseteq XP_0^m \subseteq S^{Amj}H$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $B = B_{d,R} \in \mathbb{N}$ be a quantity to be determined shortly but depending only on d and R , set $\beta = 1/2AB$, and set $r = \lfloor n/2ABj \rfloor$, noting that $r \geq 1$ and $r \geq n/4ABj$ by the choice of β . Proposition 3.27 then implies that there exists an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_1 of dimension $O_d(1)$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $P_0^r \subseteq P_1 \subseteq P_0^{O_d(r)}$. If $\text{inj } P_1 \geq R$ then set $P = P_1$; if not, then by Proposition 4.3 there exists an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression P in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension at most $O_d(1)$ and injectivity radius at least R such that $P_1 \subseteq P \subseteq P_1^{O_{d,R}(1)}$. In either case, there exists a choice of B such that $P_0^r \subseteq P \subseteq P_0^{Br}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} XP^m &\subseteq XP_0^{Brm} \subseteq S^{ABrmj}H \subseteq S^{\lfloor mn/2 \rfloor}H \\ &\subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq S^{\lceil mn/j \rceil j} \subseteq XP_0^{\lceil mn/j \rceil} \subseteq XP_0^{4ABmr+1} \subseteq XP^{O_{d,R}(m)}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, as required. $\square$

We obtain the subsequent progressions required by Theorem 4.2 via the following result.

Proposition 4.6. *Suppose that P_0 is a Q -rational Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form, and let $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist non-negative integers $d' \leq d$ and $r_0 = 1 < r_1 < \dots < r_{d'}$ such that $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same group as P_0 , such that $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius and such that, writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied for $i = 1, \dots, d'$:*

- (i) $\dim P_i < \dim P_{i-1}$;
- (ii) $H_i \geq H_{i-1}$;
- (iii) *there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) = \Gamma_i$ and the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

(iv) H_i is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker(\beta_i \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1))$;

(v) $\text{inj } P_{i-1} \ll_{C,d,Q} \frac{r_i}{r_{i-1}} \ll_{C,d,Q,R} \text{inj } P_{i-1}$; and

(vi) for every integer $m \geq r_i$ we have $\tilde{P}_i^{[m/r_i]} \subseteq \beta_i \circ \cdots \circ \beta_1(\tilde{P}_0)^m \subseteq \tilde{P}_i^{O_{C,d,Q}(m/r_i)}$, hence $P_i^{[m/r_i]} \subseteq P_0^m \subseteq P_i^{O_{C,d,Q}(m/r_i)}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the proposition in the special case $R = 1$. Indeed, suppose we have a sequence $P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ of Lie progressions satisfying all the required properties except $\text{inj } P_i \geq R$, with $\text{inj } P_i \asymp_{C,d,Q} r_{i+1}/r_i$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, d' - 1$. Let $P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_\ell}$ be the subsequence of those progressions with injectivity radius at least R , noting that this subsequence is not empty because $\text{inj } P_{d'} = \infty$. If P_{i_n} and $P_{i_{n+1}}$ are two consecutive such progressions, we have

$$\frac{r_{i_{n+1}}}{r_{i_n}} \ll_{C,d,Q} R^{i_{n+1}-i_n} \ll_{C,d,Q} R^{d'} \ll_{C,d,Q,R} 1,$$

and hence

$$\frac{r_{i_{n+1}}}{r_{i_n}} \asymp_{C,d,Q,R} \frac{r_{i_{n+1}}}{r_{i_n}} \asymp_{C,d,Q} \text{inj } P_{i_n}.$$

The proposition is then satisfied by taking these progressions together with the surjective Lie group homomorphisms $\beta_{i_{n+1}} \circ \cdots \circ \beta_{i_n+1}$.

We now begin the proof of the case $R = 1$. If $\text{inj } P_0 = \infty$, which is in particular the case when $d = 0$, the proposition is satisfied by taking $d' = 0$. We may therefore assume that P_0 has finite injectivity radius j , that $d \geq 1$, and, by induction, that the proposition has been proven for all smaller values of d . By Proposition 3.27 there exists an $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P' in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form projected from N_0 and satisfying $\tilde{P}_0^j \subseteq \tilde{P}' \subseteq \tilde{P}_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(j)}$. This implies in particular that the injectivity radius of P' is at most 1, and so Proposition 4.3 implies that there exists a normal subgroup $H_1 \triangleleft \langle P_0 \rangle$ containing H_0 and satisfying $H_1 \subseteq P_0^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$, and an $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_1 in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension strictly less than d , injectivity radius at least 1 and symmetry group H_1 such that, writing N_1 for the nilpotent Lie group from which P_1 is projected, $\Gamma_1 \leq N_1$ for its lattice, and $\pi_1 : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \langle P_1 \rangle / H_1$ for its projector, there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_1 : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$ such that $\beta_1(\Gamma_0) = \Gamma_1$, such that $\beta_1(\tilde{P}') \subseteq \tilde{P}_1 \subseteq \beta_1(\tilde{P}')^{O_{C,d,Q}(1)}$, such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \langle P_1 \rangle / H_1 \end{array}$$

commutes, and such that H_1 is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker \beta_1)$. Fixing $r_1 \asymp_{C,d,Q} j$ such that $\tilde{P}_1^2 \subseteq \beta_1(\tilde{P}_0)^{r_1}$, the required conditions all hold for $i = 1$. The proposition then follows from applying the induction hypothesis to P_1 . $\square$

4.3 Proof of the preliminary fine-scale volume theorem

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Note that $|S^{\lceil n^{1/2} \rceil}| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S| \leq \varepsilon \lceil n^{1/2} \rceil^{2(d+1)} |S|$. Setting $r_0 = \lceil n^{1/2} \rceil$, and provided $n_1 \geq n_0$, Proposition 4.5 then gives a set $X \subseteq S^k$ of cardinality at most k containing the identity, and an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_0 of dimension at most $O_d(1)$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form and with injectivity radius at least 1 generating a normal subgroup of G such that

$$XP_0^{\lfloor m/r_0 \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{O_d(m/r_0)}$$

for every $m \geq r_0$, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P \rangle$. Proposition 4.6 then gives non-negative integers $d' \ll_d 1$ and $q_0 = 1 < q_1 < \dots < q_{d'}$ such that $q_i \mid q_{i+1}$ for each i , and $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same group as P_0 , such that $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius and such that, writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, we have $\dim P_i < \dim P_{i-1}$ and $H_i \geq H_{i-1}$ for each i , there exists for each i a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) = \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes, each H_i is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker(\beta_i \circ \dots \circ \beta_1))$, $\text{inj } P_{i-1} \ll_d \frac{q_i}{q_{i-1}} \ll_{d,R} \text{inj } P_{i-1}$ for each i , and for each i and every integer $m \geq q_i$ we have $\tilde{P}_i^{\lceil m/q_i \rceil} \subseteq \beta_i \circ \dots \circ \beta_1(\tilde{P}_0)^m \subseteq \tilde{P}_i^{O_d(m/q_i)}$, hence in particular $XP_i^{\lceil m/q_i \rceil} \subseteq S^{mr_0} \subseteq XP_i^{O_d(m/q_i)}$. Setting $r_i = q_i r_0$ for each i , this implies in particular that

$$XP_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{O_d(m/r_i)} \quad (4.13)$$

for all $m \geq r_i$ and for each i . Note also that since N_i is a quotient of N_{i-1} of lower dimension for each i , it also has lower homogeneous dimension, so that $\text{hdim } P_i < \text{hdim } P_{i-1}$ for each i .

In light of (4.13), Proposition 3.31 implies that there exists a constant $\gamma = \gamma(d, k) \geq 1$ such that for each i and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq \gamma r_i$, if the injectivity radius of P_i is at least m/r_i then we have $|S^m| \gg_{d,k} m^{\text{hdim } P_i}$ and $|S^m| \gg_{d,k} m^{\dim P_i} |S|$. We claim that there exist $\sigma = \sigma(d, k, R) \in (0, 1)$ and a choice of n_1 such that for every $m \geq n$ there exists $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d'\}$ such that

$$\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor \geq \gamma r_j \quad (4.14)$$

and $\text{inj } P_j \geq \sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$. Indeed, for any choice of σ , if we choose n_1 large enough to ensure that $r_0 < \sigma^{d'} n / \gamma$, this certainly implies that (4.14) holds for $j = 0$ and every $m \geq n$. Moreover, if (4.14) holds for a given j and m and the injectivity radius of P_j is less than $\sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$ then by definition of the P_i we must have $j < d'$ and $r_{j+1}/r_j = q_{j+1}/q_j \ll_{d,R} \sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$, and hence $\sigma^{d'-(j+1)} m \gg_{d,R} \sigma^{-1} r_{j+1}$. Provided σ is chosen sufficiently small in terms of d, k and R only, this in turn implies that (4.14) holds for $j+1$ and m . Since $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius, if for a given $m \geq n$ the claim is satisfied for no $j < d'$ then it must therefore be satisfied for that m by $j = d'$.

Now fix some $i \in \{0, \dots, d'\}$, let $m \geq n$ be such that $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$, and let $j \in \{0, \dots, d'\}$ be the integer satisfying the above claim. The fact that j satisfies the claim implies by Proposition 3.31 that

$$|S^m| \geq |S^{\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor}| \gg_{d,k} (\sigma^{d'-j} m / 2)^{\text{hdim } P_j} \gg_{d,k,R} m^{\text{hdim } P_j}$$

and

$$|S^m| \geq |S^{\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor}| \gg_{d,k} (\sigma^{d'-j} m / 2)^{\dim P_j} |S| \gg_{d,k,R} m^{\dim P_j} |S|,$$

where in the final bound of each line we used the fact that $\dim P_j \ll_d 1$ and hence $\text{hdim } P_j \ll_d 1$. Moreover, the fact that j satisfies (4.14) implies in particular that $m \geq r_j$, and hence that $i \geq j$. Since $\dim P_i$ and $\text{hdim } P_i$ are both decreasing in i , this implies that $|S^m| \gg_{d,k,R} m^{\text{hdim } P_i}$ and $|S^m| \gg_{d,k,R} m^{\dim P_i} |S|$.

Define i_0 so that $r_{i_0} \leq n < r_{i_0+1}$, and relabel each P_i as P_{i-i_0} and r_i as r_{i-i_0} , so that $n^{1/2} \leq r_0 \leq n < r_1$. Provided n_1 is large enough in terms of d and R , property (viii) implies that $\text{inj } P_0 \geq R$.

Finally, property (ix) implies that $n^{\dim P_0} \ll_{d,k,R} |S^n|/|S| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$. Since $\dim P_0$ is an integer, provided ε is chosen small enough in terms of d , k and R , this forces $\dim P_0 \leq d$ as required. The fact that $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$ then follows from the fact that this is the largest possible homogeneous dimension of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of dimension d . $\square$

4.4 A fine-scale volume-doubling theorem

In this section we adapt the arguments from the previous sections to prove a variant of Theorem 4.2, with a volume-doubling hypothesis in place of the polynomial-volume hypothesis. Just as the bounds in Theorem 4.2 depend on those in Theorem 1.5, the bounds on our volume-doubling version will depend on the bounds we have in Theorem 1.18, and so just as we defined Statement 4.1 to describe these dependencies in Theorem 4.2, we define the following ‘statement’ to record the dependencies of the bounds in the volume-doubling version.

Statement 4.7. *Let G be a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity. If*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

for some $n \geq n_0(K)$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{O_K^(n)}$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent of class at most $6 \log_2 K$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k_2(K)$. If*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

for some $n \geq n_0(K)$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{O_K^(n)}$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent of class at most $6 \log_2 K$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k_3(K)$.*

Theorem 4.8 (fine-scale doubling theorem). *Let $K \geq 1$ and $R \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $n_0, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_3 \leq k_2$ be such that Statement 4.7 holds for this value of K . Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity satisfying*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

for some integer $n \geq \max\{n_0, k_2, 2K^2\}$. Then there exist a set $X \subseteq S^{k_2}$ of cardinality at most k_2 containing the identity – or, if

$$|S^{3n}| \leq K|S^n|, \tag{4.15}$$

a set $X \subseteq S^{k_3}$ of cardinality at most k_3 containing the identity – non-negative integers d and $r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_d$ satisfying $n \leq r_0 \ll_{K,R}^* n$ and $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_d$ of dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ – or, if (4.15) holds, dimension at most $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ – and class at most $6 \log_2 K$ in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same normal subgroup of G , such that writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (i) for each i and every integer $m \geq r_i$ we have $XP_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{O_K^*(m/r_i)}$;
- (ii) distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$;
- (iii) $\dim P_0 > \dim P_1 > \dots > \dim P_d$;
- (iv) $\text{hdim } P_0 > \text{hdim } P_1 > \dots > \text{hdim } P_d$;
- (v) $H_0 \leq H_1 \leq \dots \leq H_d$;
- (vi) for each $i = 1, \dots, d$ there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) = \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

- (vii) each H_i is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker(\beta_i \circ \dots \circ \beta_1))$;
- (viii) $\text{inj } P_i \ll_K \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \ll_{K,R} \text{inj } P_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, d-1$, and $\text{inj } P_d = \infty$.

The proof of Theorem 4.8 is essentially the same as that of Theorem 4.2, except that we start with the following result in place of Proposition 4.5.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $K \geq 1$ and $R \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and let $n_0, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_3 \leq k_2$ be such that Statement 4.7 holds for this value of K . Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity satisfying*

$$|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$$

for some integer $n \geq \max\{n_0, k_2, 2K^2\}$. Then there exist a set $X \subseteq S^{k_2}$ of cardinality at most k_2 containing the identity, and an $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progression P of dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ and class at most $6 \log_2 K$ in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form and with injectivity radius at least R generating a normal subgroup of G such that

$$S^{mn} \subseteq XP^m \subseteq S^{O_{K,R}(mn) + O_{K,R}^*(n)}$$

for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P \rangle$. If

$$|S^{3n}| \leq K|S^n|, \tag{4.16}$$

then we may in fact obtain the quasipolynomial bound $\dim P \leq \exp(O(\log^3 K))$ on the dimension of P , and also that $X \subseteq S^{k_3}$ and $|X| \leq k_3$, whilst leaving all the other conclusions unchanged.

Proof. Set $k = k_3$ if (4.16) holds, and $k = k_2$ otherwise. Statement 4.7 implies that there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^{O_K^*(n)}$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent of class at most $6 \log_2 K$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k$. It follows from Theorem 1.21 that S^{2n} is an $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ -approximate group, and then from Lemma 2.10 that $S^{4n} \cap \Gamma$ is an $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ -approximate group. Under the stronger tripling bound (4.16), it follows from Lemma 2.7 that S^{2n} is a K^3 -approximate group, and then from Lemma 2.10 that $S^{4n} \cap \Gamma$ is a K^9 -approximate group. Theorem 3.3 then implies that there is a nilpotent progression Q_0 in the quotient Γ/H with step at most $6 \log_2 K$ and rank at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$, or at most $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ if (4.16) holds, and a subgroup $H_0 \leq \Gamma/H$ normalised by Q_0 such that $(S^{4n} \cap \Gamma)H/H \subseteq Q_0 H_0 \subseteq S^{O_K(n)} H/H$. By Proposition 3.4, there therefore exists an $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progression $P_0 \subseteq \Gamma$ of dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$, or at most $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ if (4.16) holds, and class at most $6 \log_2 K$ in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form, the symmetry group of which is the pullback to Γ of H_0 , such that $(S^{4n} \cap \Gamma)H \subseteq P_0 \subseteq S^{O_K(n)} H$. This shows P_0 generates Γ , which is normal.

By Lemma 2.4, we may pick a complete set $X \subseteq S^k$ of coset representatives for Γ in G , including the identity. In particular, $|X| \leq k$ as required, and $S^{2n} \subseteq X\Gamma$. Since $n \geq k$, we in fact have $S^{2n} \subseteq X(S^{3n} \cap \Gamma) \subseteq XP_0$, and hence $S^{mn} \subseteq XP_0^m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by Lemma 2.5. Since $X, H \subseteq S^n$, we therefore have

$$S^{mn} \subseteq XP_0^m \subseteq S^{O_K(mn) + O_K^*(n)}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\text{inj } P_0 \geq R$ then set $P = P_0$; if not, then by Proposition 4.3 there exists an $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progression P in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$, or at most $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ if (4.16) holds, class at most $6 \log_2 K$ and injectivity radius at least R such that $P_0 \subseteq P \subseteq P_0^{O_{K,R}(1)}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.8. Set $k = k_3$ if (4.15) holds, and $k = k_2$ otherwise. Proposition 4.9 gives a set $X \subseteq S^k$ of cardinality at most k containing the identity, and an $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_0 of dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ under the doubling assumption, or $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ under the tripling assumption, and class at most $6 \log_2 K$ in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form and with injectivity radius at least 1 generating a normal subgroup of G such that

$$S^{mn} \subseteq XP_0^m \subseteq S^{O_K^*(mn)}$$

for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$. Proposition 4.6 then gives non-negative integers $d \ll_K 1$ and $q_0 = 1 < q_1 < \dots < q_d$ such that $q_i \mid q_{i+1}$ for each i , and $O_K(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_d$ in $O_K(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same group as P_0 , such that P_d has infinite injectivity radius and such that, writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, we have $\dim P_i < \dim P_{i-1}$ and $H_i \geq H_{i-1}$ for each i , there exists for each i a surjective Lie group

homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) = \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes, each H_i is the pullback to $\langle P_0 \rangle$ of $\pi_0(\Gamma_0 \cap \ker(\beta_i \circ \dots \circ \beta_1))$, $\text{inj } P_{i-1} \ll_K \frac{q_i}{q_{i-1}} \ll_{K,R} \text{inj } P_{i-1}$ for each i , and for each i and every integer $m \geq q_i$ we have $\tilde{P}_i^{[m/q_i]} \subseteq \beta_i \circ \dots \circ \beta_1(\tilde{P}_0)^m \subseteq \tilde{P}_i^{O_K(m/q_i)}$, hence in particular $XP_i^m \subseteq S^{\lambda^* m q_i n} \subseteq XP_i^{O_K(\lambda^* m)}$ for all m and some integer $\lambda^* = \lambda^*(K)$. Setting $r_i = \lambda^* q_i n$ for each i , this implies in particular that

$$XP_i^{[m/r_i]} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{O_K^*(m/r_i)}$$

for all $m \geq r_i$ and for each i , as required. Note also that since N_i is a quotient of N_{i-1} of lower dimension for each i , it also has lower homogeneous dimension, so that $\text{hdim } P_i < \text{hdim } P_{i-1}$ for each i .

If $\text{inj } P_0 \geq R$ then the theorem is satisfied. If not, then by (viii) we have $r_1 \ll_{K,R}^* n$, so the theorem is satisfied by deleting P_0 and replacing each r_i and P_i respectively by r_{i-1} and P_{i-1} . $\square$

5 Effective index bounds

The primary purpose of this chapter is to prove that Statement 4.1 holds with an effective value of k , as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *For every non-negative integer d there exist $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$, and $k = k(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity and*

$$|S^n| \leq n^{d+1} |S|$$

for some integer $n \geq n_0$ then there exist normal subgroups $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $H \leq \Gamma$ such that $H \subseteq S^n$, such that Γ/H is nilpotent with class at most $O_d(1)$, and such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq k$.

Similar arguments will also allow us to prove Theorem 1.19.

Once we have Theorem 5.1, this will then permit us to allow ε to depend on k in Theorem 4.2 without making ε ineffective, and hence bound $\dim P_0$ and $\text{hdim } P_0$ in that result without making ε ineffective. These bounds are in turn crucial in obtaining the optimal bounds on the nilpotence, growth degree and index in our main results, and ultimately for proving that Statement 4.1 in fact holds with $k = g(d)$.

The main technical proposition we need in order to prove Theorem 5.1 is the following proposition, which will also be essential to get the bounds on the size of the sets X_i in Theorem 1.11 (see Proposition 6.1 and its proof).

Proposition 5.2. *Given $C, d, k, t, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$, there positive integers $r = r(d, k, t, \eta)$, $j = j(C, d, k, t, \eta)$ and $M = M(C, d)$ such that, provided $\eta \geq M$, the following holds. Let G be a group with finite*

symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and suppose P is a Lie progression of class c and dimension d with injectivity radius at least r in C -upper-triangular form, and that $X \subseteq S^t$ is a set of size at most k containing the identity such that for some $n \geq 1$ we have

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq XP^{\eta m}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that $xP^j \cap yP^j = \emptyset$ for all distinct $x, y \in X$. Then there exists a normal subgroup $K \trianglelefteq G$ such that $[G : K] \leq g(d)$ and $\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^{n+O_{c,k}(1)}$. Moreover, if $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$ for every $x \in X$ then we may conclude in addition that $K \supseteq P$.

The condition $xP^j \cap yP^j = \emptyset$ in the hypothesis of Proposition 5.2 can be thought of as saying that the translates of P (or rather, the subgroup generated by P) by elements of X are ‘locally disjoint’, and is a finitary analogue of the fact that distinct cosets of a subgroup are genuinely disjoint. The condition $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$ in the final sentence of the statement of Proposition 5.2 can be thought of as a local version of normality of $\langle P \rangle$; in the case where $X \cap \langle P \rangle = \{1\}$, it is in fact exactly equivalent to normality of $\langle P \rangle$ in G , as follows.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and $X, Q \subseteq G$ are subsets of G containing the identity such that $XQ \subseteq S$ and $S^2 \subseteq XQ^\eta$, such that $\langle Q \rangle \trianglelefteq G$, and such that $X \cap \langle Q \rangle = \{1\}$. Then $xQx^{-1} \subseteq Q^\eta$ for every $x \in X$.*

Proof. Given $x \in X$, we have $xQx^{-1} \subseteq S^2 \cap \langle Q \rangle \subseteq XQ^\eta \cap \langle Q \rangle$. Since $X \cap \langle Q \rangle = \{1\}$, this implies that $xQx^{-1} \subseteq Q^\eta$, as required. $\square$

Our approach to Proposition 5.2 is inspired by Mann’s proof of Theorem 1.2, the principal content of which is the following result (although the quantitative aspects of this statement are not mentioned explicitly in Mann’s book, they follow directly from the proof, which we provide for the reader’s convenience).

Proposition 5.4 ([34, Theorem 9.8]). *Suppose G is a group containing a normal torsion-free nilpotent subgroup N of class c , Hirsch length d and index k . Then there exists a normal subgroup $K \trianglelefteq G$ containing N such that G/K is isomorphic to a finite group of automorphisms of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, such that $[K : Z_c(K)] \leq k$, and such that $|\gamma_{c+1}(K)| \ll_{c,k} 1$.*

Proof. Consider the series of generalised commutator subgroups $N = \bar{\gamma}_1(N) \geq \dots \geq \bar{\gamma}_{c+1}(N)$ of N as defined in (2.1), noting that $\bar{\gamma}_{c+1}(N) = \{1\}$ since N is torsion-free. Set

$$K = \bigcap_{i=1}^c C_G(\bar{\gamma}_i(N)/\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(N)),$$

noting that $N \leq K \trianglelefteq G$ as required. Note that G/K is the group of automorphisms that conjugation by G induces on $\bigoplus_{i=1}^c \bar{\gamma}_i(N)/\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}(N) \cong \mathbb{Z}^d$. It is easy to check using (2.2) and induction on i that $\bar{\gamma}_i(N) \leq Z_{c-i+1}(K)$ for each i , and hence in particular that $N \leq Z_c(K)$, and hence $[K : Z_c(K)] \leq k$, as required. Finally, it is known that if $[K : Z_c(K)] \leq k$ then $|\gamma_{c+1}(K)| \ll_{c,k} 1$ [42, Theorem 1.3] (see [42] for a detailed history of this result). $\square$

Proposition 5.2 requires not just a bound on the *size* of $\gamma_{c+1}(K)$, but on its *diameter*. We obtain this using the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $m, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \geq 2$, let G be a group with symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and suppose $|\gamma_j(G)| \leq m$. Then $\gamma_j(G) \subseteq S^{3 \cdot 2^{j-2}m + m^2}$.*

Proof. We will define a sequence $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$ of symmetric subsets of G recursively as follows. First, set $S_1 = \{[s_1, \dots, s_j] : s_i \in S\} \cup \{1\}$. Then, having defined $S_1, \dots, S_k$, set $H_i = \langle S_i \rangle$ for each i . If $H_k \trianglelefteq G$ then stop. If $H_k \not\trianglelefteq G$, on the other hand, then there exist $x \in S_k$ and $s \in S$ such that $sxs^{-1} \notin H_k$. Fix one such pair of elements x, s , and let $S_{k+1} = S_k \cup \{(sxs^{-1})^{\pm 1}\}$. Since all elements of each S_i are simple commutators of weight j , we have $S_i \subseteq \gamma_j(G)$ for each i , so this process must therefore terminate at some S_k with $k \leq m$. By definition, this means that $H_k \trianglelefteq G$, and so since $\gamma_j(G)$ is generated by S_1 as a normal subgroup of G , it must in fact be that $H_k = \gamma_j(G)$. Since $S_i \subseteq S^{\lambda(j)+2(i-1)} \subseteq S^{3 \cdot 2^{j-1} + 2m}$ by construction and $\gamma_j(G) = S_k^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$ by Lemma 2.1, the result follows. $\square$

A more serious issue with applying Proposition 5.4 to prove Proposition 5.2 is that the group G appearing in Proposition 5.2 does not obviously satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 5.4. We spend most of the rest of this chapter refining the structure of G in order to overcome this.

5.1 Large-scale simple connectedness and rough covering maps

Given a graph X , and some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a 2-dimensional CW-complex $P_k(X)$ whose 1-skeleton is X , and whose 2-cells are m -gons for $0 \leq m \leq k$, defined by simple loops $(x_0, \dots, x_m = x_0)$ of length m in X , up to cyclic permutations. As a topological object, every 2-cell is a disc attached along its boundary to a simple loop, so that the intersection of 2 different 2-cells belongs to the 1-skeleton.

Definition 5.6 ([12]). We say that a graph X is *simply connected at scale k* , or *k -simply connected*, if $P_k(X)$ is simply connected. If there exists such a k , then we shall say that X is *large-scale simply connected*.

A Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G, S)$ is k -simply connected if and only if G has a presentation $\langle S \mid R \rangle$ with R a set of relations of length at most k (see for instance the proof of [13, Lemma 7.91]).

It is shown in [12, Theorem 2.2] that if X is k -simply connected and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a (C, K) -quasi-isometry then Y is $O_{C,K,k}(1)$ -simply connected. One can think of this as being analogous to the fact that topological simple connectedness is preserved under homeomorphisms. In this section we prove the following analogue of the fact that a topological covering map with simply connected range is always a homeomorphism.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $C, C', K, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist $R_0 = R_0(C, C', k) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R' = R'(C, K, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Let X and Y be non-empty, connected graphs, and write d_X and d_Y for their respective graph metrics. Suppose that Y is k -simply connected and that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ satisfies the following conditions for some integer $R \geq R_0$:*

- (i) *for every pair of vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ with $d_Y(f(x), y) \leq R'$, there exists $x' \in X$ such that $d_X(x, x') \leq R/2$ and $d_Y(f(x'), y) \leq K$;*
- (ii) *every pair of neighbours x, x' in X satisfies $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq C$;*

(iii) for every $x, x' \in X$ with $d_X(x, x') \leq R$, if $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq C + 2K$ then $d_X(x, x') \leq C'$.

Then f is a $(C \vee (C'/C), C' \vee K)$ -quasi-isometry and X is $O_{C, C', k}(1)$ -simply connected.

To see how the map f appearing in Theorem 5.7 can be thought of as a rough covering map, note that conditions (i)–(iii) say that the R' -neighbourhood of any point $f(x)$ in the image of f is quasi-isometric via f to the $R/2$ -neighbourhood of x . One can think of as being analogous to the fact that for a topological covering map $\varphi : U \rightarrow V$, every point $\varphi(u)$ in the image of φ has a neighbourhood that is homeomorphic via φ to a neighbourhood of u .

In proving that large-scale simple connectedness is stable under quasi-isometries, de la Salle and the first author obtained a characterisation of large-scale simple connectedness in terms of a certain large-scale analogue of homotopy. First, given a constant $C \geq 1$, define a C -path between vertices x, x' in a graph $\mathcal{G}$ to be a sequence $x = v_0, \dots, v_n = x'$ of vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $d(v_i, v_{i+1}) \leq C$ for all i ; we call n the *length* of this C -path. Given another constant $L > 0$, we then define a relation $\approx_{C, L, x, x'}$ on the set of C -paths between x and x' by saying $p \approx_{C, L, x, x'} q$ if, writing $p = (u_0, \dots, u_m)$ and $q = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, there exist non-negative integers j_1, j_2, j'_2, j_3 such that

- $m = j_1 + j_2 + j_3$ and $n = j_1 + j'_2 + j_3$;
- $u_i = v_i$ for all $i \leq j_1$;
- $u_{j_1+j_2+i} = v_{j_1+j'_2+i}$ for all $i \leq j_3$;
- $j_2 + j'_2 \leq L$.

Finally, we define the equivalence relation $\sim_{C, L, x, x'}$ on the set of C -paths between x and x' to be the equivalence relation generated by $\approx_{C, L, x, x'}$. One can think of $p \sim_{C, L, x, x'} q$ as meaning that p and q are ‘large-scale homotopic’.

De la Salle and the first author observe in the proof of [12, Theorem 2.2] that if $\mathcal{G}$ is k -simply connected then for every $C \geq 1$ there exists $L = L(C, k)$ such that for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}$ the equivalence relation $\sim_{C, L, x, x'}$ has a unique equivalence class, and moreover that if there exists some $C \geq 1$ and L for which the equivalence relation $\sim_{C, L, x, x'}$ has a unique equivalence class for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}$ then $\mathcal{G}$ is $O_{C, L}(1)$ -simply connected. This is analogous to the definition of topological simple connectedness as meaning that any two paths with the same endpoints are homotopic.

Recall that if $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a covering map between CW-complexes, x and x' are two points of X , p is a path joining x to x' , and q is a path joining $f(x)$ to $f(x')$, homotopic to $f(p)$, then there exists a unique lift of q joining x to x' . Our next result is a large-scale analogue of this. Here, and throughout the rest of this section, if $p = (p_0, \dots, p_n)$ is a C -path in a graph X , and f is a map from X to some other graph Y , then we define $f(p) = (f(p_0), \dots, f(p_n))$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $C, C', K, L, R \in \mathbb{N}$ with $R \geq \max\{2C' + 1, 2LC'\}$. Let X and Y be graphs, and write d_X and d_Y for their respective graph metrics. Suppose that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is such that*

- (i) *for every pair of vertices $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ with $d_Y(f(x), y) \leq CL + K$, there exists $x' \in X$ such that $d_X(x, x') \leq R/2$ and $d_Y(f(x'), y) \leq K$;*
- (ii) *every pair of neighbours x, x' in X satisfies $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq C$;*

(iii) for every $x, x' \in X$ with $d_X(x, x') \leq R$, if $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq C + 2K$ then $d_X(x, x') \leq C'$.

Suppose further that $x, x' \in X$, that p is a path from x to x' , that q is a C -path from $f(x)$ to $f(x')$, and that the C -path $f(p)$ satisfies $f(p) \sim_{C,L,f(x),f(x')} q$. Then there exists a C' -path p' from x to x' of the same length as q such that $p \sim_{C',L,x,x'} p'$, and such that $d_Y(f(p'_i), q_i) \leq K$ for each i . Moreover, if $q = f(r)$ for some other path r from x to x' then $d_X(p'_i, r_i) \leq C'$ for each i and $p' \sim_{C',L \vee 4C',x,x'} r$.

We isolate the following easy lemma.

Lemma 5.9. Let $C > 0$. Let X be a graph with graph metric d_X . Let $x, x' \in X$, and suppose p, p' are C -paths of length n from x to x' such that $d_X(p_i, p'_i) \leq C$ for each i . Then $p \sim_{C,4C,x,x'} p'$.

Proof. For each $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, let $p^{(j)}$ agree with path p for the first j steps, then move to p'_j , and then continue along the path p' until x' . Then $p \approx_{C,4C,x,x'} p^{(2)} \approx_{C,4C,x,x'} p^{(3)} \approx_{C,4C,x,x'} \dots \approx_{C,4C,x,x'} p^{(n-1)} \approx_{C,4C,x,x'} p'$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.8. Since $f(p) \sim_{C,L,f(x),f(x')} q$, there exist C -paths $q^{(1)}, q^{(2)}, \dots, q^{(t)}$, say of lengths $n_1, \dots, n_t$, respectively, with $q^{(1)} = f(p)$, $q^{(t)} = q$, and $q^{(j)} \approx_{C,L,f(x),f(x')} q^{(j+1)}$ for each j . We will construct C' -paths $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \dots, p^{(t)}$ between x and x' of lengths $n_1, \dots, n_t$, respectively, such that $d_Y(f(p_i^{(j)}), q_i^{(j)}) \leq K$ for each i and j , such that $p^{(j)} \approx_{C',L,f(x),f(x')} p^{(j+1)}$ for each j , and such that $p^{(1)} = p$. Setting $p' = p^{(t)}$ then satisfies the first requirement of the proposition.

We may simply define $p^{(1)} = p$, noting that then $f(p^{(1)}) = q^{(1)}$ by definition. By induction, we may then assume that we have C' -paths $p^{(1)}, p^{(2)}, \dots, p^{(j-1)}$ between x and x' satisfying the required properties, including in particular the property that $d_Y(f(p_i^{(j-1)}), q_i^{(j-1)}) \leq K$ for each i . Since $q^{(j-1)} \approx_{C,L,f(x),f(x')} q^{(j)}$, there exist non-negative integers i_1, i_2, i'_2, i_3 such that $n_{j-1} = i_1 + i_2 + i_3$ and $n_j = i_1 + i'_2 + i_3$, such that $q_i^{(j-1)} = q_i^{(j)}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, i_1$, such that $q_{i_1+i_2+i}^{(j-1)} = q_{i_1+i'_2+i}^{(j)}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, i_3$, and such that $i_2 + i'_2 \leq L$. Define $p_i^{(j)} = p_i^{(j-1)}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, i_1$ and $p_{i_1+i_2+i}^{(j)} = p_{i_1+i'_2+i}^{(j-1)}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, i_3$. For each $i = 1, \dots, i'_2 - 1$, since $d_Y(q_{i_1}^{(j)}, q_{i_1+i}^{(j)}) \leq CL$ and $d_Y(f(p_{i_1}^{(j)}), q_{i_1}^{(j)}) \leq K$, we have $d_Y(f(p_{i_1}^{(j)}), q_{i_1+i}^{(j)}) \leq CL + K$. Invoking property (i) of f , for each such i we may then find a point $p_{i_1+i}^{(j)} \in X$ such that $d_X(p_{i_1+i}^{(j)}, p_{i_1}^{(j)}) \leq R/2$ and $d_Y(f(p_{i_1+i}^{(j)}), q_{i_1+i}^{(j)}) \leq K$. Note also that $d_X(p_{i_1+i'_2}^{(j)}, p_{i_1}^{(j)}) \leq LC' \leq R/2$. By the triangle inequality, we therefore have $d_X(p_{i_1+i-1}^{(j)}, p_{i_1+i}^{(j)}) \leq R$ and $d_Y(f(p_{i_1+i-1}^{(j)}), f(p_{i_1+i}^{(j)})) \leq C + 2K$ for each $i = 1, \dots, i'_2$, so that $d_X(p_{i_1+i-1}^{(j)}, p_{i_1+i}^{(j)}) \leq C'$ for each such i by property (iii) of f and hence $p^{(j)}$ is a C' -path satisfying $p^{(j-1)} \approx_{C',L,f(x),f(x')} p^{(j)}$, as required.

In the event that $q = f(r)$ for some other path r from x to x' , we first show that $d_X(p_i^{(t)}, r_i) \leq C'$ for each i . We have $p_0^{(t)} = x = r_0$ by definition, so by induction it suffices to prove that $d_X(p_i^{(t)}, r_i) \leq C'$ for an arbitrary $i \geq 1$ assuming $d_X(p_{i-1}^{(t)}, r_{i-1}) \leq C'$. Since $d_Y(f(p_i^{(t)}), f(r_i)) = d_Y(f(p_i^{(t)}), q_i^{(t)}) \leq K$, and $d_X(p_i^{(t)}, r_i) \leq 2C' + 1$ by the induction hypothesis and the triangle inequality, property (iii) of f implies that $d_X(p_i^{(t)}, r_i) \leq C'$, as required. Finally, we then have $p^{(t)} \sim_{C',4C',x,x'} r$ by Lemma 5.9. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 5.7. Since Y is k -simply connected, there exists $L = L(C, k)$ such that $\sim_{C, L, y, y'}$ has a single equivalence class for all $y, y' \in Y$. Defining $R_0 = \max\{2C' + 1, 2LC'\}$ and $R' = CL + K$, Proposition 5.8 therefore immediately implies that $\sim_{C', L \vee 4C', x, x'}$ has a single equivalence class for all $x, x' \in X$, and hence that X is $O_{C, C', k}(1)$ -simply connected.

We now prove that f is a $(C \vee (C'/C), C' \vee K)$ -quasi-isometry. Property (ii) of f implies that $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq Cd_X(x, x')$ for all $x \in X$. On the other hand, given $x, x' \in X$, let p be a path from x to x' , and let q be a C -path of minimum length from $f(x)$ to $f(x')$. Write n for the length of q , and note that $n \leq \lceil d_Y(f(x), f(x'))/C \rceil$. Since $f(p)$ is also a C -path from $f(x)$ to $f(x')$, we have $f(p) \sim_{C, L, f(x), f(x')} q$, and so Proposition 5.8 implies that there exists a C' -path p' from x to x' of length n . In particular, $d(x, x') \leq C'd_Y(f(x), f(x'))/C + C'$.

Finally, we claim that, given $y \in Y$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $d_Y(f(x), y) \leq K$. Since X is not empty, we may fix $x_0 \in X$. The claim holds trivially for $y = f(x_0)$, so we may assume that $y \neq f(x_0)$ and, by induction on $d_Y(f(x_0), y)$ (using that Y is connected), that $y' \in Y$ is a neighbour of y and that there exists $x' \in X$ with $d_Y(f(x'), y') \leq K < R'$. The claim then follows from property (i) of f . $\square$

5.2 Reduction to infinite injectivity radius

In this section we reduce Proposition 5.2 to the setting in which the nilpotent quotient $\langle P \rangle/H$ is torsion-free. The basic idea is to lift P and H to a certain large-scale simply connected ‘covering group’ $\widehat{G}$ for G , and then use Theorem 5.7 to show that $\langle P \rangle/H$ is torsion-free in this lift. We can then prove Proposition 5.2 in the lift, and project the resulting group K back down to G .

We define $\widehat{G}$ by means of a truncated presentation of G . More precisely, given a group G with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, fix some integer $r \geq 2$, and write $R_S(r)$ for the set of relations of length at most r in the elements of S that are satisfied in G , which is to say the set of words of length at most r in the elements of S that evaluate to the identity in G . Define the group $\widehat{G}$ to be the group with presentation $\langle S \mid R_S(r) \rangle$. Write $\widehat{S}$ to mean the natural copy of S in $\widehat{G}$, and note that there is a unique homomorphism $\psi : \widehat{G} \rightarrow G$ that takes each element of $\widehat{S}$ to the corresponding element of S , which we will call the *projection* from $\widehat{G}$ to G . Moreover, ψ is injective on $\widehat{S}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$, so there exists a unique inverse $\varphi : S^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \rightarrow \widehat{S}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$ to ψ on $S^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$. Given an element $x \in S^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$ or subset $A \subseteq S^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$, abbreviate $\varphi(x)$ by $\widehat{x}$ or $\varphi(A)$ by $\widehat{A}$, noting that this is consistent with the $\widehat{S}$ notation. Note that φ is a local homomorphism on $S^{\lfloor r/4 \rfloor}$ by Lemma 3.6, and hence moreover that if $H \subseteq S^{\lfloor r/4 \rfloor}$ is a subgroup of G then $\widehat{H} \subseteq \widehat{S}^{\lfloor r/4 \rfloor}$ is a subgroup of $\widehat{G}$ by Lemma 3.7.

Proposition 5.10. *Given $C, d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an integer $M = M(C, d) \geq 2$ such that the following holds for every integer $\eta \geq M$. Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, and $P \subseteq S^r$ is a Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form with symmetry group H , lattice Γ , generators u_i and projector π . Let $g_1, \dots, g_d \in G$ be such that $\pi(u_i) = g_i H$, and set $\widehat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(\eta r) \rangle$. Then $\widehat{H}$ is a subgroup of $\widehat{G}$ normalised by each $\widehat{g}_i$, and there exists a homomorphism $\widehat{\pi} : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle \widehat{g}_1, \dots, \widehat{g}_d, \widehat{H} \rangle / \widehat{H}$ such that $\widehat{\pi}(u_i) = \widehat{g}_i \widehat{H}$ for each i , and such that $\widehat{P}$ is the pullback of $\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{P})$ to $\langle \widehat{g}_1, \dots, \widehat{g}_d, \widehat{H} \rangle$. In particular, $\widehat{P}$ is a Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form with symmetry group $\widehat{H}$, lattice Γ , generators u_i and projector $\widehat{\pi}$.*

When Proposition 5.10 holds, we will call $\widehat{P}$ the *lift* of P to $\widehat{G}$.

Proof. Write $\psi : \widehat{G} \rightarrow G$ for the projection. By definition, for each $h \in H$ and each i there exists $h' \in H$ such that $g_i h = h' g_i$. As discussed above, there is a unique inverse to ψ on $S^{\lfloor Mr/2 \rfloor}$ that is a local homomorphism on $S^{\lfloor \eta r/4 \rfloor}$. Provided $\eta \geq 4$, it follows that $\widehat{H}$ is a subgroup and that $\widehat{g}_i \widehat{h} = \widehat{h}' \widehat{g}_i$ for each $\widehat{h} \in \widehat{H}$ and each i , so that $\widehat{H}$ is normalised by each $\widehat{g}_i$ as required.

Since every element of Γ can be written uniquely in the form $u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}$ with $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we may define a map $\widehat{\pi} : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle \widehat{g}_1, \dots, \widehat{g}_d, \widehat{H} \rangle / \widehat{H}$ by setting $\widehat{\pi}(u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}) = \widehat{g}_1^{\ell_1} \cdots \widehat{g}_d^{\ell_d} \widehat{H}$. We need to show that this map is a homomorphism. To see this, first note that given $m_1, \dots, m_d, n_1, \dots, n_d \in \mathbb{Z}$, in order to write

$$u_1^{m_1} \cdots u_d^{m_d} u_1^{n_1} \cdots u_d^{n_d} = u_1^{\ell_1} \cdots u_d^{\ell_d}$$

with $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ it suffices to use the upper-triangular-form relations

$$[u_i^{\pm 1}, u_j^{\pm 1}] = u_{j+1}^{k_{j+1}} \cdots u_d^{k_d},$$

which for each $i < j$ hold with some $|k_n| \leq CL_n/L_i L_j$, where L_n are the lengths of P . Provided η is large enough in terms of C and d only, for every such relation there is a corresponding relation

$$[\widehat{g}_i^{\pm 1}, \widehat{g}_j^{\pm 1}] \in \widehat{g}_{j+1}^{k_{j+1}} \cdots \widehat{g}_d^{k_d} \widehat{H}$$

in $\langle \widehat{g}_1, \dots, \widehat{g}_d, \widehat{H} \rangle / \widehat{H}$, so that

$$\widehat{g}_1^{m_1} \cdots \widehat{g}_d^{m_d} \widehat{g}_1^{n_1} \cdots \widehat{g}_d^{n_d} \widehat{H} = \widehat{g}_1^{\ell_1} \cdots \widehat{g}_d^{\ell_d} \widehat{H}.$$

It follows that $\widehat{\pi}$ is a homomorphism as required. $\square$

Proposition 5.11. *Given $d, k, t, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $C \geq 1$, there exist $r = r(k, t, d, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j = j(C, k, t, d, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, provided η is at least the quantity $M(C, d)$ appearing in Proposition 5.10, the following holds. Suppose that G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, that P is a Lie progression of class c and dimension at most d in C -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least r , and that $X \subseteq S^t$ is a set of size at most k containing the identity such that for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq XP^{\eta m}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and such that

$$xP^j \cap yP^j = \emptyset$$

for all distinct $x, y \in X$. Write H for the symmetry group of P , and let $\widehat{P}$ be the lift of P to $\widehat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(4\eta n) \rangle$. Then $\widehat{P}$ has infinite injectivity radius, distinct elements of $\widehat{X}$ belong to distinct cosets of $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle$, we have

$$\widehat{X} \widehat{P}^m \subseteq \widehat{S}^{mn} \subseteq \widehat{X} \widehat{P}^{2\eta m} \tag{5.1}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\widehat{H} = \overline{\gamma}_{c+1}(\langle \widehat{P} \rangle)$, which is in particular characteristic in $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle$. Moreover, if $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$ for every $x \in X$ then $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle \trianglelefteq \widehat{G}$.

Proof. Since $S^{2n} \subseteq XP^{2\eta} \subseteq S^{2\eta n}$, we have $\widehat{S}^{2n} \subseteq \widehat{X}\widehat{P}^{2\eta}$, which in turn gives (5.1) by Lemma 2.5.

We will now show that $\widehat{P}$ has infinite injectivity radius. By Lemma 3.35 and (5.1), the set $T = \widehat{S}^{2t+1} \cap (\widehat{P} \cap \widehat{P}^{-1})^{4\eta}$ satisfies

$$\widehat{P} \subseteq T^n \subseteq (\widehat{P} \cap \widehat{P}^{-1})^{4^k(4t+2)\eta} \subseteq \widehat{P}^{4^k(4t+2)d\eta}. \quad (5.2)$$

In particular, T generates $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle$. Now suppose $R, R' \in \mathbb{N}$ are such that R is even and $R \geq 4\eta R'$. We claim that

- (i) for every pair of elements $h \in \langle \widehat{P} \rangle$ and $g \in G$ with $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(h, g) \leq R'$, there exists $h' \in \langle \widehat{P} \rangle$ such that $d_{T^n}(h, h') \leq R/2$ and $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(h', g) \leq 1$; and
- (ii) every pair of elements $h, h' \in \langle \widehat{P} \rangle$ with $h \in h'T^n$ satisfies $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(h, h') \leq 2t + 1$.

We also claim that, provided $j \geq 4^k(4t+2)dR\eta$,

- (iii) for every $h, h' \in X$ with $d_{T^n}(h, h') \leq R$, if $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(h, h') \leq 2t + 3$ then $d_{T^n}(h, h') \leq 2\eta(2t + 3)$.

To prove that condition (i) holds, we note first that $\widehat{P} \subseteq T^n$ by Lemma 3.35, and hence that $\widehat{S}^{mn} \subseteq \widehat{X}\widehat{T}^{2\eta mn} \subseteq \widehat{S}^n T^{2\eta mn}$ for all m . Since $\widehat{S}$ and T are symmetric, this implies that $\widehat{S}^{mn} \subseteq T^{2\eta mn} \widehat{S}^n$ for all m . In particular, if $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(h, g) \leq R'$ then $h^{-1}g \in T^{2\eta R'n} \widehat{S}^n$. This means that there exists $h_0 \in T^{2\eta R'n} \subseteq T^{Rn/2}$ such that $d_{\widehat{S}^n}(hh_0, g) \leq 1$, so that we may take $h' = hh_0$. Condition (ii) holds because $T^n \subseteq (\widehat{S}^n)^{2t+1}$ by definition. Finally, to prove that condition (iii) holds provided $j \geq 4^k(4t+2)dR\eta$, note first that $T^{Rn} \cap \widehat{S}^{(2t+3)n} \subseteq T^{Rn} \cap \widehat{X}\widehat{P}^{2\eta(2t+3)}$. If $j \geq 4^k(4t+2)dR\eta$ then, since $T^{Rn} \subseteq \widehat{P}^{4^k(4t+2)dR\eta}$ by (5.2), this in fact implies that $T^{Rn} \cap \widehat{S}^{(2t+3)n} \subseteq \widehat{P}^{2\eta(2t+3)}$; by (5.2), this in turn gives $T^{Rn} \cap \widehat{S}^{(2t+3)n} \subseteq T^{2\eta(2t+3)n}$, and hence (iii) as claimed.

Let $R_0 = R_0(2t+1, 2\eta(2t+3), 4\eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R' = R'(2t+1, 1, 4\eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the integers appearing in Theorem 5.7, set R to be the smallest even integer that is at least $\max\{R_0, 4\eta R'\}$, and note that the Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{S}^n)$ is 4η -simply connected. Provided $j \geq 4^k(4t+2)dR\eta$, we may therefore apply Theorem 5.7 to the map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f & : & \mathcal{G}(\langle \widehat{P} \rangle, T^n) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(\widehat{G}, \widehat{S}^n) \\ & & x \quad \mapsto \quad x, \end{array}$$

to conclude that $\mathcal{G}(\langle \widehat{P} \rangle, T^n)$ is $O_{t,\eta}(1)$ -simply connected. In particular, this implies that there exists $\ell \ll_{t,\eta} 1$ such that $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle$ admits a presentation $\langle T^n \mid B \rangle$, with B a set of relations of length at most ℓ . The first containment of (5.2) implies in particular that $\widehat{H} \subseteq T^n$, and so $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle / \widehat{H}$ also admits a presentation $\langle T^n \mid B' \rangle$, with B' a set of relations of length at most ℓ . Provided $r \geq 4^k(4t+2)d\ell\eta$, each element of $T\widehat{H}/\widehat{H}$ has a unique preimage in $\widehat{P}$ under $\widehat{\pi}$, and, by (5.2), these preimages satisfy every relation in B' . In particular, $\widehat{\pi}$ is invertible, and so $\widehat{P}$ has infinite injectivity radius.

We will now prove that distinct elements of $\widehat{X}$ belong to distinct cosets of $\langle \widehat{P} \rangle$. Recall that the projection $\psi : \widehat{G} \rightarrow G$ is injective on $\widehat{S}^{2\eta n}$, so an arbitrary element of $\widehat{S}^{2\eta n}$ is of the form $\widehat{x}$ for some $x \in S$, with $\widehat{x} = \widehat{y}$ if and only if $x = y$. Since $\widehat{X} \subseteq \widehat{S}^n$, we may therefore consider two arbitrary elements $\widehat{x}, \widehat{y} \in \widehat{X}$. By (5.1), we have $(\widehat{x}^{-1}\widehat{y})^i \in S^{2nk} \subseteq \widehat{X}\widehat{P}^{4\eta k}$ for each $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, which implies by the pigeonhole principle that there exist integers $i < i'$ between 0 and k and $\widehat{z} \in \widehat{X}$ such that

$(\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y})^i, (\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y})^{i'} \in \hat{z}\hat{P}^{4\eta k}$, and hence $(\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y})^{i'-i} \in \hat{P}^{4\eta(d+1)k}$. By Lemma 3.1, and writing $u_1, \dots, u_d$ for the basis of $\hat{P}$, writing $L_1, \dots, L_d$ for its lengths, and writing $\hat{\pi}$ for its projector, it follows that there exist $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|\ell_i| \ll_{C,d,k,\eta} L_i$ such that $(\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y})^{i'-i} \in \hat{\pi}(u_1^{\ell_1} \dots u_d^{\ell_d})$.

Now suppose in addition that $\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y} \in \langle \hat{P} \rangle$. This means that $\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y} \in \hat{\pi}(v)$ for some v belonging to the lattice Γ of $\hat{P}$, and hence that $(\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y})^{i'-i} \in \hat{\pi}(v^{i'-i})$. Since $\hat{P}$ has infinite injectivity radius, this implies that $v^{i'-i} = u_1^{\ell_1} \dots u_d^{\ell_d}$. Applying Lemma 2.12 then gives $v = u_{j_1}^{p_1(1/(i'-i))\ell_{j_1}} \dots u_{j_m}^{p_m(1/(i'-i))\ell_{j_m}}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, some indices $j_1, \dots, j_m$, and some rational polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_m$, each depending only on d , and then Lemma 3.17 implies that $v \in P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; O_{C,d,k,\eta}(L))^{O_d(1)} \subseteq P_{\mathbb{Q}}(u; O_{C,d,k,\eta}(L))$. Since $\log u_1, \dots, \log u_d$ is a Mal'cev basis and $v \in \Gamma$, it follows that in fact $v \in P(u; O_{C,d,k,\eta}(L))$, hence $v \in P(u; L)^q$ for some $q = q(C, d, k, \eta)$ by Lemma 3.1, and hence $\hat{x}^{-1}\hat{y} \in \hat{P}^q$. Setting $j \geq q$, this implies that $x^{-1}y \in P^j$, hence $x = y$, and hence $\hat{x} = \hat{y}$, as required.

Since $\langle \hat{P} \rangle / \hat{H}$ is torsion-free nilpotent of class c , we certainly have $\overline{\gamma}_{c+1}(\langle \hat{P} \rangle) \leq \hat{H}$. Moreover, since $\langle \hat{P} \rangle / U$ is torsion-free, every subgroup of $\langle \hat{P} \rangle$ properly containing $\overline{\gamma}_{c+1}(\langle \hat{P} \rangle)$ is infinite; since $\hat{H}$ is finite, it follows that $\hat{H} = \overline{\gamma}_{c+1}(\langle \hat{P} \rangle)$ as required.

Finally, if $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$ for every $x \in X$ then, since $xPx^{-1} \subseteq S^{2n}$ and $P^{2\eta} \subseteq S^{2\eta n}$, we have $\hat{x}\hat{P}\hat{x}^{-1} \subseteq \hat{P}^{2\eta}$ for every $\hat{x} \in \hat{X}$, and hence $\langle \hat{P} \rangle \trianglelefteq \hat{G}$ as required. $\square$

5.3 Reduction to the case of a normal torsion-free nilpotent subgroup

In the previous section we reduced Proposition 5.2 to the case in which P had infinite injectivity radius. In order to apply Proposition 5.4, in this section we further reduce to the case in which H is trivial and $\langle P \rangle$ is normal.

Proposition 5.12. *Suppose that G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, that P is a Lie progression of class c and dimension d with infinite injectivity radius, and that for some $n, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a subset $X \subseteq S^n$ of size at most k containing the identity such that*

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq XP^{\eta m}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let H be the symmetry group of P . Then the subgroups

$$H_0 = \bigcap_{x \in X} xHx^{-1},$$

$$U = \bigcap_{x \in X} x\langle P \rangle x^{-1}$$

are normal in G , and satisfy $[G : U] \leq k^k$ and $U \cap H = H_0$. Moreover, the quotient U/H_0 is torsion-free nilpotent of class at most c and Hirsch length at most d .

We start with a general lemma showing that if a subgroup is contained in a few translates of a Lie progression with large injectivity radius, then it is in fact contained in a few cosets of that Lie progression's symmetry group.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $d, k, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that P is a Lie progression of dimension at most d with symmetry group H and injectivity radius at least $3^k(d+1)\eta$ in a group G , that $K \leq G$, and that $X \subseteq G$ is a set of size at most k such that $K \subseteq XP^\eta$. Then $[K : K \cap H] \leq k$.*

Proof. Recall that $P^{-1} \subseteq P^d$, so that, given $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in X$, if P^j contains some element of xP^η , then $P^{j+(d+1)\eta}$ contains all of xP^η . Combined with the hypothesis that $K \subseteq XP^\eta$, this implies that for each integer $j \geq (d+1)\eta$, either $K \cap P^{2j} = K \cap P^j$, or there exists $x \in X$ such that $K \cap P^{2j}$ contains elements of xP^η but $K \cap P^{j-(d+1)\eta}$ does not. In particular, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, either $K \cap P^{2 \cdot 3^i(d+1)\eta} = K \cap P^{3^i(d+1)\eta}$, or there exists $x \in X$ such that $K \cap P^{2 \cdot 3^i(d+1)\eta}$ contains elements of xP^η but $K \cap P^{2 \cdot 3^{i-1}(d+1)\eta}$ does not. By the pigeonhole principle, it follows that there exists $j \leq 3^{k-1}(d+1)\eta$ such that

$$K \cap P^j = K \cap P^{2j}. \quad (5.3)$$

We claim that

$$K \cap P^j = K \cap H, \quad (5.4)$$

or equivalently that if $g \in K \cap P^j$ then $g \in H$. Indeed, given $g \in K \cap P^j$, pick $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{P}^j$ such that $\pi(\tilde{g}) \in gH$. If $\tilde{g} \neq 1$ then we would be able to define q to be the maximal positive integer such that $\tilde{g}^q \in \tilde{P}^j$. However, by definition of g and q , we would then have $\tilde{g}^{q+1} \in \tilde{P}^{2j} \setminus \tilde{P}^j$; since $\text{inj } P \geq 2j$, this would in turn imply that $g^{q+1} \in P^{2j} \setminus P^j$, and hence in particular that $g^{q+1} \in (K \cap P^{2j}) \setminus (K \cap P^j)$, contradicting (5.3). It must therefore in fact be that case that $\tilde{g} = 1$, and hence that $g \in H$ as claimed. This proves (5.4).

Now note that if $g, g' \in (xP^\eta) \cap K$ for a given $x \in X$ then $g^{-1}g' \in P^{(d+1)\eta} \cap K \subseteq P^j \cap K = K \cap H$, so that the set $(xP^\eta) \cap K$ is contained in a single left coset of $K \cap H$. Since

$$K = \bigcup_{x \in X} ((xP^\eta) \cap K)$$

by hypothesis, we conclude that K is contained in a union of at most k left cosets of $K \cap H$, as required. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.12. Since H is normalised by P and $G = X\langle P \rangle$, we have

$$H_0 = \bigcap_{g \in G} gHg^{-1}, \quad U = \bigcap_{g \in G} g\langle P \rangle g^{-1},$$

and hence $H_0, U \trianglelefteq G$ as claimed. Since $[G : \langle P \rangle] \leq k$, we also trivially have $[G : U] \leq k^k$.

Let $u \in U \cap H$. Enumerate the elements of X as $x_1 = 1, x_2, \dots, x_k$, and set $X_i = x_i X x_i^{-1}$, $H_i = x_i H x_i^{-1}$ and $P_i = x_i P x_i^{-1}$ for each i , noting that for each i we have $x_i^{-1} P x_i \subseteq S^{3n} \subseteq X P^{3\eta}$, and hence $H \subseteq X_i P_i^{3\eta}$. Since P has infinite injectivity radius, Lemma 5.13 therefore implies that $[H : H \cap H_i] \leq k$ for each i . Since u normalises each $H \cap H_i$, for each i there therefore exists an integer $j_i \in [0, k]$ such that $u^{j_i} \in H_i$. By definition of U , for each i there exists $p_i \in \langle P \rangle$ such that $u = x_i p_i x_i^{-1}$, meaning that $p_i^{j_i} \in H$. Since P has infinite injectivity radius, this in turn implies that $p_i \in H$, and hence that $u \in H_i$. Since this holds for all i , we therefore have $u \in H_0$, as required.

Finally, $U/H_0 = U/(U \cap H)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\langle P \rangle/H$, so is torsion-free nilpotent of class at most c and Hirsch length at most d , as required. $\square$

5.4 Effective index bounds

It is a fairly straightforward matter to combine the results of the previous sections into a proof of Proposition 5.2, as follows.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. Take r and j be as given by Proposition 5.11, and M be as given by Proposition 5.10. Let $\hat{P}$ be the lift of P to $\hat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(4\eta n) \rangle$ as in Proposition 5.11, noting in particular that if $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$ for every $x \in X$ then $\langle \hat{P} \rangle \trianglelefteq \hat{G}$. Propositions 5.11 and 5.12 then imply that $\hat{G}$ has normal subgroups $H_0 \subseteq \hat{S}^n$ and U , with $U = \langle \hat{P} \rangle$ if $xPx^{-1} \subseteq P^{2\eta}$, such that U/H_0 is torsion-free nilpotent of class at most c , Hirsch length at most d , and index at most k^k in $\hat{G}/H_0$. Proposition 5.4 therefore implies that there exists a normal subgroup $\hat{K} \trianglelefteq \hat{G}$ containing U such that $[\hat{G} : \hat{K}] \leq g(d)$ and $[\gamma_{c+1}(\hat{K})H_0 : H_0] \ll_{c,k} 1$, and then Lemma 5.5 implies that $\gamma_{c+1}(\hat{K}) \subseteq \gamma_{c+1}(\hat{K})H_0 \subseteq \hat{S}^{O_{c,k}(1)}H_0 \subseteq \hat{S}^{n+O_{c,k}(1)}$. We may therefore take $K = \psi(\hat{K})$, where ψ is the projection $\hat{G} \rightarrow G$. $\square$

Finally, we combine Proposition 5.2 with our earlier results to prove Theorems 5.1 and 1.19.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $R^* = R^*(d)$ be a quantity to be specified shortly but depending only on d . Let $k_0^* = k_0^*(d)$ be the quantity $k^*(d+2)$ from Theorem 1.5. Provided n_0^* is large enough in terms of d , we have $|S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}| \leq n^{d+1}|S| \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil^{d+2}|S|$. Provided n_0^* is large enough in terms of d and R^* , Theorems 1.5 and 4.2 therefore give a subset $X \subseteq S^{k_0^*}$ of cardinality at most k_0^* containing the identity; a Lie progression P_0 of dimension at most $O_d(1)$, and hence class $c \ll_d 1$, in C -upper-triangular form for some $C \ll_d 1$ and with injectivity radius at least R^* ; and a positive integer $r_0 \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ such that $XP_0^m \subseteq S^{mr_0} \subseteq XP_0^{\eta^m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\eta = \eta(d)$ at least the quantity $M(C, d)$ coming from Proposition 5.2, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$. Let R^* be the maximum possible value of $r(\dim P_0, k_0^*, k_0^*, \eta)$ in Proposition 5.2, noting that this is indeed bounded in terms of d because $\dim P_0 \ll_d 1$. Then Proposition 5.2 gives a natural number $q^* = q^*(d)$ (coming from the $O_{c,k}(1)$ notation in the conclusion of that proposition, the ineffectiveness arising via the ineffectiveness of k_0^*) and a normal subgroup $K \trianglelefteq G$ such that $[G : K] \leq g(\dim P_0) \ll_d 1$ and $\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^{r_0+q^*} \subseteq S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil+q^*}$. Provided $n_0^* > 2q^*$, this in turn implies that $\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^n$, so that if we take $\Gamma = K$ and $H = \gamma_{c+1}(K)$ then we have $H, \Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ and $H \subseteq S^n \cap \Gamma$, with $[G : \Gamma] \ll_d 1$ and Γ/H nilpotent of class $O_d(1)$ as required. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.19. We first claim that Statement 4.7 holds with $k_2 = g(\exp(\exp(O(K^2))))$ and $k_3 = g(\exp(O(\log^3 K)))$ (and some ineffective value of $n_0(K)$). Let $R^* = R^*(K) > 0$ be a quantity to be specified shortly but depending only on K . Let $k^* = k^*(K)$ be the quantity from Theorem 1.18. Provided n is large enough in terms of K , Theorems 1.18 and 4.8 therefore give a subset $X \subseteq S^{k^*}$ of cardinality at most k^* containing the identity; a Lie progression P_0 of class $c \leq 6 \log_2 K$ and dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ under the doubling assumption or $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ under the tripling assumption, in C -upper-triangular form for some $C \ll_K 1$ and with injectivity radius at least R^* ; and a positive integer $r_0 \ll_{K,R^*}^* n$ such that $XP_0^m \subseteq S^{mr_0} \subseteq XP_0^{\eta^m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\eta^* = \eta^*(K)$ at least the quantity $M(C, \exp(\exp(O(K^2))))$ coming from Proposition 5.2, and such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$. Let R^* be the maximum possible value of $r(\dim P_0, k^*, k^*, \eta^*)$ in Proposition 5.2. Then Proposition 5.2 gives a normal subgroup $\Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ such that $[G : \Gamma] \leq g(\dim P_0)$ and $\gamma_{c+1}(\Gamma) \subseteq S^{r_0+O_{c,k^*}(1)} \subseteq S^{O_K^*(n)}$. The claim is therefore satisfied by taking $H = \gamma_{c+1}(K)$.

Let $i = 2$ under the doubling assumption and $i = 3$ under the tripling assumption. Now that we know Statement 4.7 holds with the desired value of k_i , provided n is large enough in terms of K , Theorem 4.8 gives a subset $Y \subseteq S^{k_i}$ of cardinality at most k_i containing the identity a Lie

progression Q_0 of class at most $6 \log_2 K$ and dimension at most $\exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ under the doubling assumption or $\exp(O(\log^3 K))$ under the tripling assumption, with injectivity radius at least $4\eta^*$, and a positive integer $r'_0 \ll_{K,\eta^*}^* n$ such that $YQ_0^m \subseteq S^{mr'_0} \subseteq YQ_0^{\eta^{*m}}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $YQ_0 \subseteq S^{r'_0}$ and $S^{2r'_0} \subseteq YQ_0^{2\eta^*}$, so Lemma 3.8 implies that the symmetry group of Q_0 is normal in G . We may therefore take $\Gamma = \langle Q_0 \rangle$, and H the symmetry group of Q_0 . $\square$

6 The fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem

The main aim of this chapter is to prove Theorem 1.11. We also show (in Proposition 1.12) that the r_i and P_i appearing in Theorem 1.11 are essentially unique, and prove Corollary 1.14.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 1.11

The main difference between the preliminary Theorem 4.2 and the more refined Theorem 1.11 is in the bounds on the sets X_i , and hence the indices $[G : \langle P_i \rangle]$. The main tool for obtaining this greater precision is the following result.

Proposition 6.1. *Given $C, d, k, Q, R, t, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\rho = \rho(C, d, k, Q, R, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n_0 = n_0(d, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, $X_0 \subseteq S^t$ is a subset of size at most k , and $P_0 \subseteq G$ is a Q -rational Lie progression of dimension d and injectivity radius at least ρ in C -upper-triangular form projected from the simply connected nilpotent Lie group N , with symmetry group H_0 , lattice Γ_0 and projector $\pi_0 : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0$, such that $\langle P_0 \rangle \trianglelefteq G$, such that distinct elements of X_0 belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$, and such that for some integer $n \geq n_0$ we have*

$$X_0 P_0^m \subseteq S^{mn} \subseteq X_0 P_0^{\eta m}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists a normal $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P in $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R projected from N satisfying the following properties, where we write H for the symmetry group of P , $\Gamma < N$ for its lattice and $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle P \rangle / H$ for its projector:

- (i) $[G : \langle P \rangle] \leq g(d)$;
- (ii) $P_0 \subseteq P$;
- (iii) $H_0 = P_0 \cap H = \langle P_0 \rangle \cap H$;
- (iv) $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma$;
- (v) writing $\psi : \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \rightarrow \langle P \rangle / H$ for the canonical isomorphism $gH_0 \mapsto gH$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \Gamma_0 & \\ \pi_0 \swarrow & & \searrow \pi \\ \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \langle P \rangle / H \end{array}$$

commutes;

(vi) there exists a positive integer $q \ll_{C,d,Q,R,t,\eta} 1$ such that, given an arbitrary set $X \subseteq S^n$ of coset representatives for $\langle P \rangle$ in G containing the identity, we have

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mqn} \subseteq XP^{O_{C,d,\eta}(m)}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Morally, conclusion (v) says that π_0 is the ‘restriction’ of π to Γ_0 .

Proof. All bounds depending on η in this proposition also depend on C and d , so on increasing η if necessary we may assume without loss of generality that η is at least the quantity $M(C, d)$ appearing in Propositions 5.2 and 5.11.

Lemma 5.3 implies that $xP_0x^{-1} \subseteq P_0^{2\eta}$ for every $x \in X_0$. Provided ρ is bigger than the quantity $r(d, k, t, \eta)$ appearing in Proposition 5.2, that proposition therefore implies that there exists a normal subgroup $K \trianglelefteq G$ containing P_0 such that $[G : K] \leq g(d)$ and $\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^{n+O_{c,k}(1)}$, where c is the class of P_0 . On setting n_0 large enough, we may assume that $\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^{2n}$.

Set $A = K \cap S^{4n}$, noting that $P_0 \subseteq A$. We may require that $n \geq k$, so that Lemma 2.3 implies that $K = \langle A \rangle$. Moreover, the hypothesis implies that $|S^{3n}|/|S^n| \leq |P_0^{3\eta}|/|P_0|$, so that $|S^{3n}| \ll_{C,d,\eta} |S^n|$ by Corollary 3.2. It therefore follows from Lemma 2.7 that S^{2n} is an $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -approximate group, and then from Lemma 2.10 that A is an $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -approximate group. Applying Theorem 3.3 in the quotient $K/\gamma_{c+1}(K)$ and Proposition 3.4 therefore implies that there exists an $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -rational Lie progression Q_0 of dimension at most $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ in $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -upper-triangular form such that $A \subseteq Q_0 \subseteq A^{O_{C,d,\eta}(1)}\gamma_{c+1}(K) \subseteq S^{\ell n}$ for some natural number $\ell \ll_{C,d,\eta} 1$. This implies in particular that Q_0 generates K .

Let $R' = R'(C, d, Q, t, \eta) \geq R$ be a positive integer to be chosen later but depending only on C, d, Q, R, t, η . From now on, whenever any other parameters depend on the choice of R' we state this explicitly, even if they otherwise depend only on some subset of C, d, Q, t, η ; this is to make it clear that there is no circularity in the definition of our parameters. Proposition 4.6 implies that there exist a positive integer $r_1 \ll_{C,d,R',\eta} 1$, and an $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P in $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R' , dimension at most $O_{C,d,\eta}(1)$ such that $K = \langle P \rangle$ – so that (i) holds – and such that $P \subseteq Q_0^{r_1} \subseteq P^{O_{C,d,\eta}(1)}$. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that on increasing the lengths of P and r_1 by multiples bounded in terms of C, d and η only we may assume in addition that $Q_0 \subseteq P$, so that (ii) holds.

Write H for the symmetry group of P , M for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma < M$ for its lattice and $\pi : \Gamma \rightarrow \langle P \rangle/H$ for its projector. Set $q = r_1\ell + 1$.

Let $X \subseteq S^n$ be a set of coset representatives for $\langle P \rangle = K$ in G . Note that $S^{2n} \subseteq XK$, and hence $S^{2n} \subseteq XA$. Lemma 2.5 therefore implies that $S^{mn} \subseteq XA^{m-1} \subseteq XQ_0^{m-1}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence

$$XP^m \subseteq S^{mqn} \subseteq XP^{O_{C,d,\eta}(m)} \tag{6.1}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, giving conclusion (vi). Provided R' is set large enough in terms of C, d and η , Lemma 3.8 then implies that $H \trianglelefteq G$, so that P is a normal Lie progression as required.

To prove (iii) it suffices to prove that $H_0 \leq H$ and $\langle P_0 \rangle \cap H \subseteq H_0$. Note that $H_0 \subseteq P_0 \subseteq P$, so provided $R' \geq 2$ we have $H_0 \leq H$ by Lemma 3.5. On the other hand, by (6.1) we have $H \subseteq S^{qn} \subseteq X_0P_0^{\eta q}$, which since $X_0 \cap \langle P_0 \rangle = \{1\}$ implies that $\langle P_0 \rangle \cap H \subseteq P_0^{\eta q}$. Provided we set

$\rho \geq 2\eta q$ (and noting therefore that the choice of ρ depends on the choice of R'), Lemma 3.5 implies that $\langle P_0 \rangle \cap H \subseteq H_0$, as required.

Proposition 3.27 implies that there exists an $O_{d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression Q_1 in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with symmetry group H_0 , lattice Γ_0 and projector π_0 such that $\tilde{P}_0 \subseteq \tilde{P}_0^{\Omega_{C,d,Q}(q)} \subseteq \tilde{Q}_1 \subseteq \tilde{P}_0^q$. This implies that $\text{inj } Q_1 \gg_{C,d,Q} \rho$, and that

$$X_0 Q_1^m \subseteq S^{mqn} \subseteq X_0 Q_1^{O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(m)}. \quad (6.2)$$

Let $\alpha = \alpha(C, d, Q, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the smallest integer large enough to replace the implied constants in both (6.1) and (6.2). Choose ρ large enough that $\text{inj } Q_1$ is at least the quantity $r(k, t, d, \alpha)$ appearing in Proposition 5.11, and R' large enough that $\text{inj } P$ is at least the quantity $r([G : K], t, \dim P, \alpha)$ from the same proposition. Proposition 5.11 then implies that if we write $\hat{Q}_1, \hat{P}, \hat{H}_0, \hat{H}$ for the lifts to $\hat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(4\alpha qn) \rangle$ of Q_1, P, H_0, H respectively then $\text{inj } \hat{P} = \text{inj } \hat{Q}_1 = \infty$, and hence $\Gamma \cong \langle \hat{P} \rangle / \hat{H}$ and $\Gamma_0 \cong \langle \hat{Q}_1 \rangle / \hat{H}_0$, and also $[\hat{G} : \langle \hat{Q}_1 \rangle] = [G : \langle P_0 \rangle] < \infty$. Moreover, the same argument we used to prove (iii) implies that $\hat{H}_0 = \hat{P}_0 \cap \hat{H} = \langle \hat{P}_0 \rangle \cap \hat{H}$, so that $\langle \hat{Q}_1 \rangle / \hat{H}_0$ is isomorphic to the finite-index subgroup $\langle \hat{Q}_1 \rangle H / H$ of $\langle \hat{P} \rangle / \hat{H}$ via $\hat{\psi} : g\hat{H}_0 \mapsto g\hat{H}$. The corresponding embedding $\iota : \Gamma_0 \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ induces an isomorphism $\varphi : N \rightarrow M$ of Mal'cev completions such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & M \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \Gamma \\ \hat{\pi}_0 \downarrow & & \hat{\pi} \downarrow \\ \langle \hat{Q}_1 \rangle / \hat{H}_0 & \xrightarrow{\hat{\psi}} & \langle \hat{P} \rangle / \hat{H} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \langle Q_1 \rangle / H_0 & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \langle P \rangle / H \end{array}$$

commutes. Identifying M with N via φ , we may therefore assume that P is projected from N as required, and that (iv) and (v) hold. $\square$

We now use the above result to give a refined version of Proposition 4.6.

Proposition 6.2. *Given a non-negative integer d and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $n_0 = n_0(d, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose that G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S containing the identity, that P_0 is a Q -rational Lie progression of dimension d in C -upper-triangular form, and that $X_0 \subseteq S^t$ is a subset of size at most k such that for some $r_0, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r_0 \geq n_0$ we have $X_0 P_0^m \subseteq S^{mr_0} \subseteq X_0 P_0^{\eta m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $R \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist non-negative integers $d' \leq d$ and $r_1 < \dots < r_{d'}$ such that $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and normal $O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in $O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R such that $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius and such that, writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied for $i = 1, \dots, d'$:*

- (i) $\dim P_i < \dim P_{i-1}$;
- (ii) $[G : \langle P_i \rangle] \leq g(\dim P_i)$;
- (iii) for any set $X_i \subseteq S^{r_{i-1}}$ of coset representatives for $\langle P_i \rangle$ in G we have $X_i P_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq X_i P_i^{O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(m/r_i)}$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (iv) $\langle P_{i-1} \rangle \leq \langle P_i \rangle$;
- (v) $H_i \geq H_{i-1}$;
- (vi) there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) \subseteq \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_{i-1} \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_i \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

- (vii) $\text{inj } P_{i-1} \ll_{C,d,Q} \frac{r_i}{r_{i-1}} \ll_{C,d,k,Q,R,t,\eta} \text{inj } P_{i-1}$.

Proof. The result is trivial if P_0 has infinite injectivity radius, which is in particular the case if $d = 0$, so we may assume that $\text{inj } P_0 < \infty$ and $d \geq 1$ and, by induction, that the result is known for all smaller values of d . Let $R_1 = R_1(C, d, k, Q, R, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number to be determined shortly, but depending only on C, d, k, Q, R, t, η . Applying Proposition 4.6, we obtain a natural number p_1 satisfying $\text{inj } P_0 \ll_{C,d,Q} p_1 \ll_{C,d,Q,R_1} \text{inj } P_0$ and an $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression Q_1 in $O_{C,d,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension strictly less than d and injectivity radius at least R_1 such that $\langle Q_1 \rangle = \langle P_0 \rangle$ and such that, writing U_1 for the symmetry group of Q_1 , N_1 for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Lambda_1 < N_1$ for its lattice and $\varphi_1 : \Lambda_1 \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / U_1$ for its projector, we have $U_1 \geq H_0$ and $Q_1^{\lfloor m/p_1 \rfloor} \subseteq P_0^m \subseteq Q_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(m/p_1)}$ for every integer $m \geq p_1$, and there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_1 : N_0 \rightarrow N_1$ such that $\beta_1(\Gamma_0) = \Lambda_1$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \langle P_0 \rangle / H_0 \\ \beta_1 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Lambda_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & \langle Q_1 \rangle / U_1 \end{array}$$

commutes. The fact that $Q_1^{\lfloor m/p_1 \rfloor} \subseteq P_0^m \subseteq Q_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(m/p_1)}$ implies also that $X_0 Q_1^m \subseteq S^{mp_1 r_0} \subseteq X_0 Q_1^{O_{C,d,Q}(\eta m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Provided R_1 and n_0 are set sufficiently large, we may now apply Proposition 6.1 to obtain a positive integer $q \ll_{C,d,Q,R,t,\eta} 1$ and a normal $O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_1 in $O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R projected from N_1 with symmetry group H_1 satisfying $U_1 = \langle Q_1 \rangle \cap H_1$ and a lattice $\Gamma_1 \geq \Lambda_1$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & \langle Q_1 \rangle / U_1 \\ \text{inclusion} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & \langle P_1 \rangle / H_1 \end{array}$$

commutes, such that $[G : \langle P_1 \rangle] \leq g(\dim P_1)$, such that $\langle P_1 \rangle \geq \langle Q_1 \rangle$, and such that for any set $X_1 \subseteq S^{r_0}$ of coset representatives for $\langle P_1 \rangle$ in G we have $X_1 P_1^m \subseteq S^{mqp_1 r_0} \subseteq X_1 P_1^{O_{C,d,Q,\eta}(m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Setting $r_1 = qp_1 r_0$, the required properties are all satisfied for $i = 1$. Moreover, since $\langle P_1 \rangle \geq \langle P_0 \rangle$, the set X_0 contains a set of coset representatives for $\langle P_1 \rangle$ in G , which is in particular contained in both S^t and S^{r_0} , and of size at most k . Taking this set for X_1 in (iii), we see that the induction hypothesis applies, and hence we obtain the remaining progressions. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Let $\alpha = \alpha(d, R) \in (0, 1)$ and $R_0 = R_0(d, R) \in \mathbb{N}$ be quantities to be specified shortly. Set n_0^* large enough that $\lceil \alpha n \rceil \leq n$, noting that this introduces some dependence of n_0^* on α , so that $|S^{\lceil \alpha n \rceil}| \leq |S^n| \leq \varepsilon \alpha^{-(d+1)} \lceil \alpha n \rceil^{d+1} |S|$. Provided ε is small enough in terms of d, R_0 and α , Theorems 4.2 and 5.1 then imply that there exist a set $Z_0 \subseteq S^{O_d(1)}$ of cardinality at most $O_d(1)$ containing the identity, an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progressions Q_0 of dimension at most d in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R_0 , and a natural number p_0 satisfying $(\alpha n)^{1/2} \leq p_0 \leq \alpha n$ such that $Z_0 Q_0^{\lfloor m/p_0 \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq Z_0 Q_0^{O_d(m/p_0)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Provided n_0^* and R_0 are set large enough, Proposition 6.1 then implies that there exists a normal $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression P_0 in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with dimension at most d and injectivity radius at least R satisfying $[G : \langle P_0 \rangle] \leq g(\dim P_0)$, and a positive integer $q \ll_{d,R} 1$ such that for any set $X_0 \subseteq S^{p_0}$ of coset representatives for $\langle P \rangle$ in G containing the identity we have $X_0 P_0^m \subseteq S^{mqp_0} \subseteq X_0 P_0^{O_d(m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $r_0 = qp_0$, noting that $r_0 \leq n$ as long as α is set small enough.

Provided n_0^* is large enough, Proposition 6.2 now yields non-negative integers $d' \leq d$ and $r_1 < \dots < r_{d'}$ such that $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and normal $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progressions $P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R such that $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius and such that, writing H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , N_i for the nilpotent Lie group from which it is projected, $\Gamma_i < N_i$ for its lattice and $\pi_i : \Gamma_i \rightarrow \langle P_0 \rangle / H_i$ for its projector, the following conditions are satisfied for $i = 1, \dots, d'$:

- (a) $\dim P_i < \dim P_{i-1}$;
- (b) $[G : \langle P_i \rangle] \leq g(\dim P_i)$;
- (c) for any set $X_i \subseteq S^{r_{i-1}}$ of coset representatives for $\langle P_i \rangle$ in G we have $X_i P_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq X_i P_i^{O_d(m/r_i)}$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (d) $\langle P_{i-1} \rangle \leq \langle P_i \rangle$;
- (e) $H_i \geq H_{i-1}$;
- (f) there exists a surjective Lie group homomorphism $\beta_i : N_{i-1} \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\beta_i(\Gamma_{i-1}) \subseteq \Gamma_i$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma_{i-1} & \xrightarrow{\pi_{i-1}} & \langle P_{i-1} \rangle / H_{i-1} \\ \beta_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \Gamma_i & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & \langle P_i \rangle / H_i \end{array}$$

commutes;

$$(g) \text{ inj } P_{i-1} \ll_d \frac{r_i}{r_{i-1}} \ll_{d,R} \text{ inj } P_{i-1}.$$

Since each N_i is a quotient of N_{i-1} of lower dimension, it also has lower homogeneous dimension, and we certainly have $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$, since this is the largest possible homogeneous dimension of a simply connected nilpotent Lie group of dimension at most d .

We now claim that for each i there exists a set X_i of coset representatives for $\langle P_i \rangle$ in G containing the identity such that $X_i \subseteq S^{([G:\langle P_i \rangle]^{-1}) \wedge r_{i-1}}$, such that $X_0 \supseteq X_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq X_{d'}$; combined with (b) and (c) above, this will give conclusions (i)–(v). Provided we set n_0^* large enough, we may ensure that $r_0 \geq g(\dim P_i)$ for each i , so that in fact it is enough to obtain $X_i \subseteq S^{[G:\langle P_i \rangle]^{-1}}$. For $i = d'$, the existence of the necessary $X_{d'}$ follows from (b) above and Lemma 2.4. More generally, suppose we have already found X_{i+1} with the desired properties. Since $\langle P_i \rangle \leq \langle P_{i+1} \rangle$, Lemma 2.4 implies that we may find a set $Y_i \subseteq S^{[\langle P_{i+1} \rangle : \langle P_i \rangle]^{-1}}$ of coset representatives for $\langle P_i \rangle$ in $\langle P_{i+1} \rangle$ containing the identity, and it then follows that $X_{i+1}Y_i \subseteq S^{[G:\langle P_{i+1} \rangle] + [\langle P_{i+1} \rangle : \langle P_i \rangle]^{-2}}$ is a set of coset representatives for $\langle P_i \rangle$ in G . Since $[G : \langle P_{i+1} \rangle] + [\langle P_{i+1} \rangle : \langle P_i \rangle] - 2 < [G : \langle P_{i+1} \rangle][\langle P_{i+1} \rangle : \langle P_i \rangle] = [G : \langle P_i \rangle]$, we may therefore take $X_i = X_{i+1}Y_i$.

We prove (xii) and (xiii) by essentially the same argument we used in the proof of Theorem 4.2. In light of conclusions (i)–(iii) of the theorem we are proving, Proposition 3.31 implies that there exists a constant $\gamma = \gamma(d) \geq 1$ such that for each i and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq \gamma r_i$, if the injectivity radius of P_i is at least m/r_i then we have $|S^m| \gg_d m^{\text{hdim } P_i}$ and $|S^m| \gg_d m^{\dim P_i} |S|$. We claim that there exist $\sigma = \sigma(d, R) \in (0, 1)$ and a choice of α such that for every $m \geq n$ there exists $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, d'\}$ such that

$$\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor \geq \gamma r_j \quad (6.3)$$

and $\text{inj } P_j \geq \sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$. Indeed, for any choice of σ , if we choose α small enough to ensure that $r_0 < \sigma^{d'} n / \gamma$, this certainly implies that (6.3) holds for $j = 0$ and every $m \geq n$. Moreover, if (6.3) holds for a given j and m and the injectivity radius of P_j is less than $\sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$ then by definition of the P_i we must have $j < d'$ and $r_{j+1}/r_j = p_{j+1}/p_j \ll_{d,R} \sigma^{d'-j} m / r_j$, and hence $\sigma^{d'-(j+1)} m \gg_{d,R} \sigma^{-1} r_{j+1}$. Provided σ is chosen sufficiently small in terms of d and R only, this in turn implies that (6.3) holds for $j+1$ and m . Since $P_{d'}$ has infinite injectivity radius, if for a given $m \geq n$ the claim is satisfied for no $j < d'$ then it must therefore be satisfied for that m by $j = d'$.

Now fix some $i \in \{0, \dots, d'\}$, let $m \geq n$ be such that $r_i \leq m < r_{i+1}$, and let $j \in \{0, \dots, d'\}$ be the integer satisfying the above claim. The fact that j satisfies the claim implies by Proposition 3.31 that

$$|S^m| \geq |S^{\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor}| \gg_d (\sigma^{d'-j} m / 2)^{\text{hdim } P_j} \gg_{d,R} m^{\text{hdim } P_j}$$

and

$$|S^m| \geq |S^{\lfloor \sigma^{d'-j} m \rfloor}| \gg_d (\sigma^{d'-j} m / 2)^{\dim P_j} |S| \gg_{d,R} m^{\dim P_j} |S|,$$

where in the final bound of each line we used the fact that $\dim P_j \leq d$ and $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$. Moreover, the fact that j satisfies (6.3) implies in particular that $m \geq r_j$, and hence that $i \geq j$. Since $\dim P_i$ and $\text{hdim } P_i$ are both decreasing in i , this implies that $|S^m| \gg_{d,R} m^{\text{hdim } P_i}$ and $|S^m| \gg_{d,R} m^{\dim P_i} |S|$, as required.

Conclusion (xiv) follows from (i), (ix), Proposition 3.36 and the fact that if $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ is a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function with finitely many pieces, each of which has degree at most d , then $f(cx) \leq c^d f(x)$ for every $x, c \geq 1$.

To prove (xvi), let $A = A(d, R) > 1$ be a parameter to be specified shortly, and fix some $i < d'$. We may assume that $r_{i+1}/A > r_i$, and may therefore let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be maximal such that $kr_i \leq r_{i+1}/A$. We may also assume that $c_i \geq 2$. It follows from Proposition 3.27 that there exists an $O_d(1)$ -rational Lie progression Q_i in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form with the same lattice, symmetry group and projector as P_i such that $P_i^k \subseteq Q_i \subseteq P_i^{O_d(k)}$. It follows that $\text{inj } Q_i \asymp_{d,R} r_{i+1}/kr_i \geq A$, and also that there exist positive integers $q_i \geq kr_i \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}$ and $\eta \ll_d 1$ such that $X_i Q_i^m \subseteq S^{mq_i} \subseteq X_i Q_i^{\eta m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Letting $T = S^{2g(\dim P_i)-1} \cap (Q_i \cup Q_i^{-1})^{2\eta}$, Lemma 3.35 therefore implies that $Q_i \subseteq T^{q_i} \subseteq Q_i^{O_d(1)}$. Setting A large enough in terms of d and R only, it follows that we may lift T to a unique subset $\tilde{T}$ in the lattice of Q_i such that $\tilde{Q}_i \subseteq \tilde{T}^{q_i} \subseteq \tilde{Q}_i^{O_d(1)}$. Writing $\tilde{Q}_i = P(u; L)$, it then follows from Lemma 3.1 that $\tilde{T}^{q_i} \subseteq P(u; O_d(L))$; since $P(u; O_d(L))$ is in $O_d(1)$ -upper-triangular form, Lemma 3.46 therefore implies that $L_j \gg_d q_i \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}$ for each length L_j of Q_i . Finally, provided A is large enough, it follows from Proposition 3.42 that $\text{inj}^Z Q_i \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}^{1/(c_i-1)}$, and hence by definition of Q_i that $\text{inj}^Z P_i \gg_{d,R} kr_{i+1}^{1/(c_i-1)} \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}^{c_i/(c_i-1)}/r_i$, as claimed.

It remains to prove (xv). Abbreviate $\gamma = \text{diam}_S(G)$, and let $M = M(d, R)$ be a natural number to be chosen shortly but depending only on d and R . The fact that $|G| < \infty$ implies that $\dim P_{d'} = 0$, and in particular that $P_{d'}$ is abelian. It therefore suffices to show that if $i+1$ is such that $r_{i+1} > M\gamma^{1/2}$ and P_{i+1} is abelian then P_i is also abelian. Given such an i , it follows from (xvi) that

$$\text{inj}^Z P_i \gg_{d,R} r_{i+1}^{c_i/(c_i-1)}/r_i \geq (M\gamma^{1/2})^{1/(c_i-1)}(r_{i+1}/r_i). \quad (6.4)$$

We claim first that P_i has class at most 2. To see this, first note that since $H_{i+1} \subseteq S^{r_{i+1}} \subseteq X_i P_i^{O_d(r_{i+1}/r_i)}$, and since distinct elements of X_i belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_i \rangle$, we have that $H_{i+1} \cap \langle P_i \rangle \subseteq P_i^{O_d(r_{i+1}/r_i)}$. Provided M is large enough, this implies by (6.4) that $H_{i+1} \cap \langle P_i \rangle \subseteq P_i^{\lfloor \text{inj}^Z P_i/2 \rfloor}$, and hence by Lemma 3.47 that $(H_{i+1} \cap \langle P_i \rangle)/H_i \leq Z(\langle P_i \rangle/H_i)$. In particular, $\langle P_i \rangle/(H_{i+1} \cap \langle P_i \rangle)$ is a central quotient of $\langle P_i \rangle/H_i$. However, $\langle P_i \rangle/(H_{i+1} \cap \langle P_i \rangle)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of the abelian group $\langle P_{i+1} \rangle/H_{i+1}$, and hence abelian, so that $\langle P_i \rangle/H_i$ is nilpotent of class at most 2. Assuming as we may that $R \geq 10$, this implies that whenever u, v, w are generators of $\tilde{P}_i$ we have $[[u, v], w] = 1$, and hence that P_i has class at most 2 as required.

We may now use the bound $c_i \geq 2$ to bootstrap the estimate (6.4) and obtain

$$\text{inj}^Z P_i \gg_{d,R} M\gamma^{1/2} \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from (i) that

$$G = S^\gamma = S^{\lceil \gamma^{1/2}/M \rceil r_{i+1}} \subseteq X_i P_i^{O_d(\lceil \gamma^{1/2}/M \rceil r_{i+1}/r_i)}.$$

Provided M is large enough, it follows that $G \subseteq X_i P_i^{\lfloor \text{inj}^Z P_i/2 \rfloor}$, and hence that $\langle P_i \rangle \subseteq P_i^{\lfloor \text{inj}^Z P_i/2 \rfloor}$. Lemma 3.47 then implies that $\langle P_i \rangle/H_i$ is abelian, and hence that P_i is abelian. $\square$

6.2 Uniqueness in the fine-scale polynomial-volume theorem

In this section we prove Proposition 1.12. The main content lies in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *Given $C, D, k, Q, t, \eta \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $R = R(C, D, k, Q, t, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose G is a group with finite symmetric generating set S , and there are natural numbers $r \geq r'$, subsets $X, X' \subseteq S^t$ of size at most k , and Q -rational Lie progressions $P, P' \subseteq G$ of dimension at most D in C -upper-triangular form such that $XP^m \subseteq S^{mr} \subseteq XP^{\eta m}$ and $X'(P')^m \subseteq S^{mr'} \subseteq X'(P')^{\eta m}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P \rangle$ and distinct elements of X' belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P' \rangle$, and such that $\text{inj } P \geq R$ and $\text{inj } P' \geq Rr/r'$. Then writing N and N' for the respective nilpotent Lie groups from which P and P' are projected, Γ and Γ' for their respective lattices, H and H' for their respective symmetry groups, and π and π' for their respective projectors, the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$(i) \quad [H : H \cap H'] \leq |X'| \text{ and } [H' : H' \cap H] \leq |X|;$$

$$(ii) \quad H \cap \langle P \rangle = H \cap H' = \langle P \rangle \cap H';$$

(iii) *there exist a sublattice Λ of index at most $|X'|$ in Γ such that*

$$\pi(\Lambda) = \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H}{H},$$

a sublattice Λ' of index at most $|X|$ in Γ' such that

$$\pi'(\Lambda') = \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H'}{H'},$$

and an isomorphism $\psi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda'$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \Lambda' & & \\ \pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi' & & \\ \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H}{H} & \cong & \frac{\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle}{H \cap H'} & \cong & \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H'}{H'} \end{array}$$

commutes;

$$(iv) \quad N \cong N'.$$

Proof. Proposition 3.27 implies that there exists an $O_{D,Q}(1)$ -rational Lie progression P'' in $O_{C,D,Q}(1)$ -upper-triangular form with symmetry group H' , lattice Γ' and projector π' such that

$$\tilde{P}' \subseteq (\tilde{P}')^{\Omega_{C,D,Q}(r/r')} \subseteq \tilde{P}'' \subseteq (\tilde{P}')^{\lfloor r/r' \rfloor},$$

and hence $\text{inj } P'' \geq R$ and

$$X'(P'')^m \subseteq S^{mr} \subseteq X'(P'')^{\alpha m}.$$

for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\eta \leq \alpha \ll_{C,D,Q} \eta$ and at least the quantity $M(C, d)$ appearing in Proposition 5.11.

Note that $H \subseteq S^r \subseteq X'(P'')^\alpha$ and $H' \subseteq S^r \subseteq XP^\eta$. By Lemma 5.13, and choosing $R \geq 3^k(D+1)\alpha$, this implies that

$$[H : H \cap H'] \leq |X'| \quad \text{and} \quad [H' : H' \cap H] \leq |X|.$$

It also implies that $H \cap \langle P' \rangle \subseteq S^r \cap \langle P'' \rangle \subseteq (P'')^\alpha$ and $\langle P \rangle \cap H' \subseteq S^r \cap \langle P \rangle \subseteq P^\eta$, and hence by Lemma 3.5 that

$$H \cap \langle P' \rangle = H \cap H' = \langle P \rangle \cap H',$$

and hence in particular that

$$\frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H}{H} \cong \frac{\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle}{H \cap H'} \cong \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H'}{H'}.$$

Choosing R to be at least the quantity $r(k, t, D, \alpha)$ appearing in Proposition 5.11, that proposition implies that the lifts $\hat{P}, \hat{P}', \hat{P}'', \hat{H}, \hat{H}'$ to $\hat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(4\alpha r) \rangle$ of P, P', P'', H, H' , respectively, satisfy $\text{inj } \hat{P}'' = \text{inj } \hat{P} = \infty$, hence $\Gamma' \cong \langle \hat{P}'' \rangle / H' = \langle \hat{P}' \rangle / H'$ and $\Gamma \cong \langle \hat{P} \rangle / H$, and also $[\langle \hat{P} \rangle : \langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle] \leq |X'|$ and $[\langle \hat{P}' \rangle : \langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle] \leq |X|$. Lemma 3.5 implies that $\hat{H}' \cap \langle \hat{P} \rangle \leq \hat{H}$ and $\hat{H} \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle \leq \hat{H}'$, hence

$$\frac{(\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}}{\hat{H}} \cong \frac{\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle}{\hat{H} \cap \hat{H}'} \cong \frac{(\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}'}{\hat{H}'}$$

Setting $\Lambda = \hat{\pi}^{-1}((\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}/\hat{H})$ and $\Lambda' = (\hat{\pi}')^{-1}((\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}'/\hat{H}')$, where $\hat{\pi}$ and $\hat{\pi}'$ are the projectors of $\hat{P}$ and $\hat{P}'$. We therefore have $[\Gamma : \Lambda] \leq |X'|$ and $[\Gamma' : \Lambda'] \leq |X|$. Since $\text{inj } \hat{P}' = \text{inj } \hat{P} = \infty$, $\hat{\pi}$ and $\hat{\pi}'$ are injective, hence we have an isomorphism $\psi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda'$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \Lambda' & & \\ \hat{\pi} \downarrow & & \downarrow \hat{\pi}' & & \\ \frac{(\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}}{\hat{H}} & \cong & \frac{\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle}{\hat{H} \cap \hat{H}'} & \cong & \frac{(\langle \hat{P} \rangle \cap \langle \hat{P}' \rangle)\hat{H}'}{\hat{H}'} \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H}{H} & \cong & \frac{\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle}{H \cap H'} & \cong & \frac{(\langle P \rangle \cap \langle P' \rangle)H'}{H'} \end{array}$$

commutes. This also implies that Γ and Γ' are commensurable, and hence that $N \cong N'$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.12. Take R as in Lemma 6.3. We first claim that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, d'\}$ such that $r_i/r'_j \in [1/AR, AR]$. Let j be maximal such that $r'_j \leq r_i$, noting that there exists such a j because $r'_1 < r_i$. If $r_i \geq r'_{j+1}/AR$ then the claim is satisfied by $j+1$. If not then either $r_i \leq r'_{j+1}/AR$ or $j = d'$, in which case $\text{inj } P'_j \geq Rr_i/r'_j$ and Lemma 6.3 implies that $\dim P_i = \dim P'_j$. If $r_{i-1} \geq r'_j$ then the same argument would imply that $\dim P_{i-1} = \dim P'_j$, contrary to our hypotheses, so we must have $r_{i-1} < r'_j \leq r_i$. If $r'_j \leq r_i/AR$ then the same argument again implies that $\dim P'_j = \dim P_{i-1}$, so it must be that $r'_j \geq r_i/AR$, and the claim is satisfied.

Now let ℓ be maximal such that $r_\ell \leq ARr_1$. The previous claim implies that $r'_\ell/r_1 \in [1/AR, AR]$, and if $\ell \neq d'$ then by definition it satisfies $r_1 < r'_{\ell+1}$. The same argument as in the previous claim then implies that for all $j \in \{\ell+1, \dots, d'\}$ there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $r_i/r'_j \in [1/AR, AR]$, proving (1).

Now suppose that $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ is such that either $i = d$ or $r_{i+1} \geq (AR)^2 r_i$, and let j be maximal such that $r'_j \leq ARr_i$. If $r_i \geq r'_j$ then (1) implies that either $r'_{j+1} \geq r_{i+1}/AR \geq ARr_i$ or $j = d'$, whilst if $r_i < r'_j$ then we have by definition of i and j that either $i = d$ or $r_{i+1} \geq (AR)^2 r_i \geq ARr'_j$. In either case, (2) follows from Lemma 6.3. $\square$

7 Applications

In this chapter we provide details of some of the applications described in Section 1.4.

7.1 Finite groups

Proof of Corollary 1.14. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d)$, $n_0^* = n_0^*(d, 1)$ and $M = M(d, 1)$ be as in Theorem 1.11. Abbreviate $\gamma = \text{diam}_S(G)$. Given $r \leq \gamma$ we have $\text{diam}_{S^r}(G) = \lceil \gamma/r \rceil$, and hence $|G| \geq \lceil \gamma/r \rceil |S^r|/3$ by Lemma 2.2. Taking $r = \lceil \gamma^{1/2} \rceil$, this implies that

$$|G| \geq \frac{1}{6} \gamma^{1/2} |S^{\lceil \gamma^{1/2} \rceil}|,$$

and hence by (1.6) that

$$|S^{\lceil \gamma^{1/2} \rceil}| \leq 6A^{-\frac{d+2}{2}} (\gamma^{1/2})^{d+1} |S|.$$

Set A so that $6A^{-(d+2)/2} = \varepsilon$ and D^* so that $\gamma^{1/2} > n_0^*$. Apply Theorem 1.11 with $n = \lceil \gamma^{1/2} \rceil$, and let i be maximal such that the resulting r_i is at most $M\gamma^{1/2}$. It follows from conclusion (xv) of that theorem that P_i is abelian, from conclusion (x) that $\dim P_i \leq d$, from conclusion (ii) that $[G : \langle P_i \rangle] \leq g(d)$, and from conclusion (i) that $H_i \subseteq S^{r_i} \subseteq S^{M\gamma^{1/2}}$. Since $H_i \trianglelefteq G$ and $\langle P_i \rangle/H_i$ is abelian of rank at most $\dim P_i$, this proves the result. $\square$

7.2 Vertex-transitive graphs

As we mentioned in the introduction, in a recent paper [51] we proved a finitary version of Trofimov's result that a vertex-transitive graph of polynomial growth is quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph. More precisely, one of the main results of that paper showed that if we have a polynomial upper bound on the volume of a ball of sufficiently large radius in a vertex-transitive graph then there is a virtually nilpotent group that admits a certain 'algebraic' quasi-isometry to that graph [51, Corollary 2.4].

In the first result of this section, we refine this result by obtaining the optimal bounds on the index and complexity of a nilpotent subgroup of the group, and more generally showing that it satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 1.11.

Before we state this result, let us recall some notation from our previous paper [51]. Given a vertex-transitive graph $\mathcal{G}$ and a group $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$, we write G_x for the stabiliser of a vertex $x \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a vertex-transitive graph and $H \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ is a subgroup then we define $\mathcal{G}/H$ to be the quotient graph with vertices $\{H(x) : x \in \mathcal{G}\}$, and $H(x) \sim H(y)$ in $\mathcal{G}/H$ if and only if there exists $x_0 \in H(x)$ and $y_0 \in H(y)$ such that $x_0 \sim y_0$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Note that $\mathcal{G}/H$ is trivial if and only if H is transitive. We call the sets $H(x) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ with $x \in \mathcal{G}$ the *fibres* of the projection $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$. If G is another subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$, we say that the quotient graph $\mathcal{G}/H$ is *invariant under the action of G on $\mathcal{G}$* if for every $g \in G$ and $x \in \mathcal{G}$ there exists $y \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $gH(x) = H(y)$. If H

is normalised by G then $\mathcal{G}/H$ is invariant under the action of G [51, Lemma 3.1], and the action of G on $\mathcal{G}$ descends to an action of G on $\mathcal{G}/H$ [51, Lemma 3.2]. We write $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ for the image of G in $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G}/H)$ induced by this action; thus $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ is the quotient of G by the normal subgroup $\{g \in G : gH(x) = H(x) \text{ for every } x \in \mathcal{G}\}$.

Corollary 7.1. *For every integer $d \geq 0$, every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and every $R \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$, $n_0^* = n_0^*(d, R, \lambda) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M = M(d, R) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, locally finite vertex-transitive graph such that*

$$\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1) \quad (7.1)$$

for some $n \geq n_0^$. Let $o \in \mathcal{G}$, and let $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ be a transitive subgroup. Then there is a normal subgroup $H \trianglelefteq G$ such that*

- (i) *every fibre of the projection $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$ has diameter at most n^λ ;*
- (ii) *$G_{\mathcal{G}/H} = G/H$;*
- (iii) *the group $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ has a normal d -nilpotent subgroup with index at most $g(d)$;*
- (iv) *the set $S = \{g \in G_{\mathcal{G}/H} : d_{\mathcal{G}/H}(g(H(o)), H(o)) \leq 1\}$ is a finite symmetric generating set for $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$;*
- (v) *every vertex stabiliser of the action of $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ on $\mathcal{G}/H$ has cardinality $O_{d,\lambda}(1)$; and*
- (vi) *the quotient map $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$ is a $(1, n^\lambda)$ -quasi-isometry, and the map $\text{Cay}(G_{\mathcal{G}/H}, S) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$, $gH \mapsto gH(o)$ is a $(1, 1)$ -quasi-isometry.*

Remark 7.2. In the proof of Corollary 7.1, in order to obtain conclusion (iii) we apply Theorem 1.11 to the ball $S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. Note, therefore, that one can also deduce that the group $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ and the generating set S satisfy the other conclusions of Theorem 1.11. Moreover, using Lemma 7.4, below, one can essentially replace $|S^m|$ in any of those conclusions with $\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m)$. We omit the (routine) details for brevity, but see e.g. the proof of Corollary 1.16, below. In any case, we plan to investigate the structure of balls with polynomial volume in vertex-transitive graphs in greater detail in forthcoming work [49].

The second result of this section is the following more detailed version of Corollary 1.15.

Corollary 7.3. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there exist $A = A(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a connected, finite vertex-transitive graph such that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) \geq n_0$ and*

$$\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}) \geq A \left(\frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)} \right)^{\frac{2}{d+2}}. \quad (7.2)$$

Let $o \in \mathcal{G}$, and let $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ be a transitive subgroup. Then there is a normal subgroup $H \trianglelefteq G$ such that

- (i) *every fibre of the projection $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$ has diameter at most $O_d(\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})^{\frac{1}{2}})$;*

- (ii) $G_{\mathcal{G}/H} = G/H$;
- (iii) $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ has an abelian subgroup of rank at most d and index at most $g(d)$;
- (iv) the set $S = \{g \in G_{\mathcal{G}/H} : d_{\mathcal{G}/H}(g(H(o)), H(o)) \leq 1\}$ is a symmetric generating set for $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$;
- (v) every vertex stabiliser of the action of $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ on $\mathcal{G}/H$ has cardinality $O_d(1)$; and
- (vi) the quotient map $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$ is a $(1, O_d(\text{diam}(\mathcal{G})^{\frac{1}{2}}))$ -quasi-isometry, and the map $\text{Cay}(G_{\mathcal{G}/H}, S) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H$, $gH \mapsto gH(o)$ is a $(1, 1)$ -quasi-isometry.

The fact that the quasi-isometries defined in (vi) combine to show that $\mathcal{G}$ is quasi-isometric to $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$ as required for Corollary 1.15 is a straightforward exercise; see e.g. [51, Lemma 5.1].

A straightforward but technically very useful fact that we use often in the proofs of Corollaries 7.1 and 7.3 is that if $\mathcal{G}$ is a vertex-transitive graph, $o \in \mathcal{G}$ is a vertex and $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ is a transitive subgroup then the set $S = \{g \in G : g(o) \in B_{\mathcal{G}}(o, 1)\}$ is a symmetric generating set for G , and in fact $S^n = \{g \in G : g(o) \in B_{\mathcal{G}}(o, n)\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [51, Lemma 3.4]. In particular, this implies that if we write $\text{rad}_o(A) = \inf\{n \in \mathbb{N}_0 : A \subseteq B_{\mathcal{G}}(o, n)\}$ for a subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ then we have

$$\text{rad}_o(H(o)) = \inf\{k \in \mathbb{N} : H \subseteq S^k\} \quad (7.3)$$

for an arbitrary subgroup $H \leq G$, a fact that we will often use without explicit mention.

We obtain the improved conclusions in Corollaries 7.1 and 7.3 by using the following lemma to compare the balls in the graphs $\mathcal{G}$ to those in the groups $G_{\mathcal{G}/H}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose $\mathcal{G}$ is a vertex-transitive graph, $o \in \mathcal{G}$ is a vertex, $G \leq \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ is a transitive subgroup, and $H \trianglelefteq G$ is a normal finite subgroup, and set $S = \{g \in G_{\mathcal{G}/H} : d_{\mathcal{G}/H}(g(H(o)), H(o)) \leq 1\}$. Then*

$$\frac{|(G_{\mathcal{G}/H})_{H(o)}|}{|H(o)|} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m) \leq |S^m| \leq \frac{|(G_{\mathcal{G}/H})_{H(o)}|}{|H(o)|} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(m + \text{rad}_o(H(o)))$$

for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. This is essentially given by the proof of [51, Proposition 9.1]; the only required modification is to replace the $O_K(n)$ appearing in (9.3) of that proof with $\text{rad}_o(H(o))$ (indeed, that argument takes place in the setting of specific $\mathcal{G}$, o , G and H , and the $O_K(n)$ arises precisely because that is the bound we have on $\text{rad}_o(H(o))$ in that setting). $\square$

Proof of Corollary 7.1. Provided n_0^* is large enough, [51, Corollary 2.4] implies the existence of $H \trianglelefteq G$ satisfying conclusions (i), (ii), (iv) and (v). Conclusion (vi) follows from [51, Lemmas 5.2 & 5.3]. Finally, to obtain conclusion (iii), note that provided n_0^* is sufficiently large to force $n/2 > n^\lambda$ we have by Lemma 7.4 that

$$\frac{|S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}|}{|S|} \leq \frac{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)} \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}.$$

Provided ε is small enough in terms of d , we may therefore apply Theorem 1.11 to the ball $S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 7.3. Writing $\gamma = \text{diam}(\mathcal{G})$, the hypothesis (7.2) translates as

$$\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) \leq A^{-(d+2)/2} \gamma^{(d+2)/2} \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1).$$

Provided A is small enough and γ is large enough in terms of d only, Corollary 7.1 therefore gives a normal subgroup $H_0 \trianglelefteq G$ such that

- (a) every fibre of the projection $\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H_0$ has diameter at most $\gamma^{1/2}$;
- (b) $G_{\mathcal{G}/H_0} = G/H_0$;
- (c) the set $S_1 = \{g \in G_{\mathcal{G}/H_0} : d_{\mathcal{G}/H_0}(g(H_0(o)), H_0(o)) \leq 1\}$ is a symmetric generating set for $G_{\mathcal{G}/H_0}$; and
- (d) every vertex stabiliser of the action of $G_{\mathcal{G}/H_0}$ on $\mathcal{G}/H_0$ has cardinality $O_d(1)$.

We will use property (b) implicitly throughout this proof in order to interchange $G_{\mathcal{G}/H_0}$ and G/H_0 . Setting $S_0 = \{g \in G : d(g(e), e) \leq 1\}$, property (a) implies that

$$H_0 \subseteq S_0^{\lfloor \gamma^{1/2} \rfloor}. \quad (7.4)$$

Write $\pi : G \rightarrow G/H_0$ and $\psi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}/H_0$ for the quotient maps, and note that [51, Lemma 3.7] combines with (7.4) to imply that $\psi^{-1}(B_{\mathcal{G}/H_0}(H_0(o), \gamma - \lfloor \gamma^{1/2} \rfloor - 1)) \subseteq B_{\mathcal{G}}(o, \gamma - 1) \subsetneq \mathcal{G}$, and hence that $\text{diam}(\mathcal{G}/H_0) \geq \gamma - \gamma^{1/2}$. It follows from (7.3) that $\text{diam}_{S_1}(G/H_0) = \text{diam}(\mathcal{G}/H_0)$, and so as long as $\gamma \geq 4$ we conclude that

$$\gamma \geq \text{diam}_{S_1}(G/H_0) \geq \gamma - \gamma^{1/2} \geq \frac{\gamma}{2}. \quad (7.5)$$

On the other hand, [51, Lemma 4.8] implies that

$$\frac{|G|}{|S_0|} = \frac{|\mathcal{G}|}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)},$$

whilst [51, Lemma 3.5] implies that $|S_1| \geq |S_0|/|H_0|$, so (7.2) and (7.5) combine to imply that

$$\text{diam}_{S_1}(G/H_0) \geq \frac{A}{2} \left(\frac{|G/H_0|}{|S_1|} \right)^{\frac{2}{d+2}}.$$

Provided A is small enough and γ is large enough in terms of d , it therefore follows from Corollary 1.14, (7.5) and [51, Lemma 3.5] that there exists $H \trianglelefteq G$ satisfying $H_0 \subseteq H \subseteq S_0^{O_d(\gamma^{1/2})} H_0 \subseteq S_0^{O_d(\gamma^{1/2})}$ such that G/H has an abelian subgroup of rank at most d and index at most $g(d)$, giving conclusions (i) and (iii) of the corollary. We may also assume that conclusion (ii) holds by [51, Lemma 3.6], whilst conclusion (iv) follows from [51, Lemma 3.4], and conclusion (v) follows from (d) and [51, Lemma 3.5]. Finally, conclusion (vi) follows from [51, Lemmas 5.2 & 5.3]. $\square$

7.3 Growth of balls with polynomial volume

Proof of Corollary 1.16. We start by proving that the corollary holds in the special case of a Cayley graph. More precisely, we show that there exist $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(d) > 0$ and $n_0^* = n_0^*(d) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if S is a finite symmetric generating set of a group containing the identity such that $|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S|$ for some $n \geq n_0$ then there exists a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ satisfying conditions (i)–(iii), and condition (i') if $|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$, such that

$$|S^m| \asymp_d f(m/n) |S^n| \quad \text{for all } m \geq n. \quad (7.6)$$

For suitable choices of n_0^* and ε we can apply Theorem 1.11 with $R = 1$. Let $r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{d'}$ and $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ be the resulting integers and progressions, noting in particular that $d' \leq d$. Note also that if we choose ε small enough then conclusion (xiii) of Theorem 1.11 implies that if $|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$ then $\text{hdim } P_0 \leq d$. Proposition 3.36 implies that for each i there exists a continuous, increasing, piecewise-monomial function f_i , with degree increasing, bounded below by $\dim P_i$, and bounded above by $\text{hdim } P_i$, such that $|P_i^m| \ll_d f_i(m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|P_i^m| \asymp_d f_i(m)$ for all $m \leq \text{inj } P_i$. Since $f_i(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\deg f_i} f_i(x)$ for all $\lambda > 1$ and $x \geq 1$, and since $r_{i+1}/r_i \ll_d \text{inj } P_i$, we in fact have $|P_i^m| \asymp_d f_i(m)$ for all $m \leq r_{i+1}/r_i$. Conclusion (i) of Theorem 1.11 and Proposition 3.36 then imply that $|S^m| \asymp_d |P_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor}| \asymp_d f_i(m/r_i)$ for all integers m satisfying $r_i \leq m \leq r_{i+1}$.

We now define f inductively on each interval $[r_i/n, r_{i+1}/n]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, d'$, with the convention that $r_{d'+1}/n = \infty$. First, define $f(1) = 1$, and define. Next, assuming f has been defined up to r_i/n , for $x \in [r_i/n, r_{i+1}/n]$ define

$$f(x) = \frac{f_i\left(\frac{xn}{r_i}\right)}{f_i(1)} f\left(\frac{r_i}{n}\right).$$

This f is then a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function with $f(1) = 1$ satisfying (7.6). The pieces of f have degree at most $\text{hdim } P_0$, which is at most $\frac{1}{2}d(d-1) + 1$ as required, and at most d if $|S^n| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$. The only places where the degree of f can decrease are at r_i/n with $i = 1, \dots, d'$, and there are at most d of these. Finally, since the degree of f_i is increasing from something at least $\dim P_i$ to something at most $\text{hdim } P_i$, the number of boundaries of f across which the degree increases is at most $\sum_{i=0}^{d'} (\text{hdim } P_i - \dim P_i)$. This in turn is at most $\sum_{i=1}^d (\frac{1}{2}i(i-1) + 1 - i) = \sum_{i=1}^d (\frac{1}{2}i(i-3) + 1)$, and it is easy to verify by induction that this last sum is equal to $\frac{1}{6}d^3 - \frac{1}{2}d^2 + \frac{1}{3}d$. This completes the proof in the Cayley case.

We now prove the general case. First, apply Corollary 7.1 with $G = \text{Aut}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\lambda = 1/2$, say, and $n_0^* > 4$ so that $n/2 > n^{1/2}$. Let H be the resulting subgroup and S the resulting set. Lemma 7.4 then implies that

$$\frac{|S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}|}{|S|} \leq \frac{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n)}{\beta_{\mathcal{G}}(1)} \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1};$$

by conclusion (v) of Corollary 7.1, it also implies that

$$|S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}| \ll_d \beta_{\mathcal{G}}(n).$$

Provided ε is small enough in terms of d , we may therefore apply the Cayley case of the corollary to the ball $S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ and obtain a non-decreasing continuous piecewise-monomial function $f : [1, \infty) \rightarrow$

$[1, \infty)$ with $f(1) = 1$ satisfying conditions (i)–(iii), and condition (i') if $\beta_G(n) \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1}$, such that

$$|S^m| \asymp_d f(2m/n) |S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}|$$

for all $m \geq n/2$. Since Lemma 7.4 implies that

$$\frac{|S^{m-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}|}{|S^n|} \leq \frac{\beta_G(m)}{\beta_G(n)} \leq \frac{|S^m|}{|S^{\lceil n/2 \rceil}|}$$

for all $m \geq n$, the corollary follows. $\square$

Corollary 1.22 results from using [51, Theorem 2.3] in place of Corollary 7.1 and using Theorem 4.8 in place of Theorem 1.11 in the above argument, combined with an application of [48, Corollary 1.4] to show that [51, Theorem 2.3] holds under the hypothesis $\beta_G(2n) \leq K\beta_G(n)$.

7.4 Uniform finite presentation for groups of polynomial growth

In this section we prove Corollary 1.24. We also recover Theorem 1.23 with bounds that do not depend on the size of the generating set, as follows.

Corollary 7.5. *For each $K > 0$ there exists $n_0^* = n_0^*(K) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a group and S is a finite symmetric generating set for G containing the identity and satisfying $|S^{2n}| \leq K|S^n|$ for some integer $n \geq n_0^*$ then*

$$\#\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m \geq \log_2 n \text{ and } (G, S) \text{ has a new relation on scale } m\} \ll_K^* 1.$$

There is considerable overlap between the proofs of Corollaries 1.24 and 7.5, so we prove them simultaneously.

Proof of Corollaries 1.24 and 7.5. In the case of Corollary 7.5, let $d = \exp(\exp(O(K^2)))$ be the bound on the dimension of the progressions given by Theorem 4.8, and let k be the number k_2 appearing in Theorem 1.18. In the case of Corollary 1.24, leave d as defined in the statement of the corollary, and let $k = g(2d + 1)$. Let R be a quantity to be determined shortly, but depending only on K in the case of Corollary 7.5 and on d in the case of Corollary 1.24.

We start by applying Theorems 4.8 and 1.18 in the case of Corollary 7.5, or Theorems 4.2 and 1.6 in the case of Corollary 1.24. In the case of Corollary 1.24, we actually apply Theorem 4.2 to the set $S^{n'}$ for some $n' \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $n \ll_d n' \leq n$; we can do this as long as ε is chosen small enough, since it means that $|S^{n'}| \leq \varepsilon n^{d+1} |S| \ll_d \varepsilon (n')^{d+1} |S|$. In either case, we obtain non-negative integers C , d' and η depending only on K or d , with η at least the quantity $M(C, d)$ appearing in Proposition 5.10; a set $X \subseteq S^k$ of size at most k containing the identity; natural numbers $r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_{d'}$ such that $r_i \mid r_{i+1}$ for each i , and such that $n \leq r_0 \ll_{K,R}^* n$ in the case of Corollary 7.5 and $(n')^{1/2} \leq r_0 \leq n' < r_1$ in the case of Corollary 1.24; and Lie progressions $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_{d'}$ in C -upper-triangular form with injectivity radius at least R , each generating the same normal subgroup of G , such that for each i and every integer $m \geq r_i$ we have $XP_i^{\lfloor m/r_i \rfloor} \subseteq S^m \subseteq XP_i^{\eta m/r_i}$, such that distinct elements of X belong to distinct cosets of $\langle P_0 \rangle$, and such that $\text{inj } P_i \ll_K^* \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \ll_{K,R} \text{inj } P_i$ in the case of Corollary 7.5, $\text{inj } P_i \ll_d \frac{r_{i+1}}{r_i} \ll_{d,R} \text{inj } P_i$ in the case of Corollary 1.24, and $\text{inj } P_{d'} = \infty$. Provided

we take ε small enough in terms of d , k and η in the case of Corollary 1.24 (and unconditionally in the case of Corollary 7.5), we may also conclude that $\dim P_i \leq d$ for each i and $d' \leq d$. Let $R = \max\{4\eta, r(k, k, d, \eta)\}$, where $r(k, k, d, \eta)$ is given by Proposition 5.11. We should point out that although η is ineffective in the case of Corollary 7.5, it is effective in the case of Corollary 1.24, and hence so is R . Moreover, this means that in the case of Corollary 1.24 we may choose $n' = \lfloor n/4\eta \rfloor - 1$, so that $4\eta r_0 < n$.

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, d'\}$, lift P_i to the Lie progression $\hat{P}_i$ in the group $\hat{G} = \langle S \mid R_S(4\eta r_i) \rangle$, and write $\psi_i : \hat{G} \rightarrow G$ for the projection. Write H_i for the symmetry group of P_i , and note that ψ_i is injective on $\hat{H}_i$. Proposition 5.11 implies that $\hat{X}\hat{P}^m \subseteq \hat{S}^{mr_i} \subseteq \hat{X}\hat{P}^{2\eta m}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, that distinct elements of $\hat{X}$ belong to distinct cosets of $\langle \hat{P}_i \rangle$, and that $\hat{P}_i$ has infinite injectivity radius.

We claim that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ depending only on K or d such that $\ker \psi_i \cap \hat{S}^{\lfloor \alpha r_{i+1} \rfloor} = \{1\}$, where we interpret $\alpha r_{d'+1}$ to mean ∞ . To see this, suppose $a \in \hat{S}^{\lfloor \alpha r_{i+1} \rfloor} \subseteq \hat{S}^{\lfloor \alpha(r_{i+1}/r_i) \rfloor r_i}$ with $a \neq 1$. This implies in particular that $a = \hat{x}p$ for some $x \in X$ and $p \in \hat{P}_i^{2\eta \lfloor \alpha(r_{i+1}/r_i) \rfloor}$. Setting α small enough we may therefore ensure that $p \in \hat{P}_i^{\text{inj } P_i}$. Since $a \neq 1$, we may consider the following three cases: $x \neq 1$ (case 1); $a = p$ and $a \in \hat{H}_i$ (case 2); $a = p$ and $a \notin \hat{H}_i$ (case 3). In case 1 we have $\psi_i(a) \in x\langle P_i \rangle$, and hence $\psi_i(a) \neq 1$ as claimed. In case 2 we have $\psi_i(a) \neq 1$ as claimed because ψ_i is injective on $\hat{H}_i$. Finally, in case 3, writing π_i for the projector of P_i , we have $p \in \hat{\pi}_i(q)$ for some $q \in \hat{P}_i^{\text{inj } P_i} \setminus \{1\}$, hence $\psi_i(a) \in \pi_i(q)$ by Proposition 5.10, and hence $\psi_i(a) \neq 1$ as claimed.

This claim implies that if a word of length at most αr_{i+1} in the elements of S evaluates to the identity in G then it also evaluates to the identity in $\langle S \mid R_S(4\eta r_i) \rangle$. This implies that (G, S) has no new relations on scales between $\log_2(4\eta r_i)$ and $\log_2(\alpha r_{i+1})$. In particular, any new relations on scales greater than $\log_2(4\eta r_0)$ must lie in one of the intervals $\log_2 r_i + [\log_2 \alpha, \log_2(4\eta)]$ with $i = 1, \dots, d'$. This confirms Corollary 1.24, since $4\eta r_0 < n$ in that case. It also confirms Corollary 7.5, since $r_0 \ll_K^* n$ in that case. $\square$

References

- [1] H. Bass. The degree of polynomial growth of finitely generated nilpotent groups. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), 25:603–614, 1972.
- [2] I. Benjamini, H. Finucane, and R. Tessera. On the scaling limit of finite vertex transitive graphs with large diameter. *Combinatorica*, 37(3):333–374, 2017.
- [3] I. Benjamini and G. Kozma. A resistance bound via an isoperimetric inequality. *Combinatorica*, 25(6):645–650, 2005.
- [4] N. Berestycki, J. Hermon, and L. Teyssier. On the universality of fluctuations for the cover time, 2023. arXiv:2202.02255.
- [5] Y. Bilu. Structure of sets with small sumset. In *Structure theory of set addition*, volume 258 of *Astérisque*, pages 77–108. 1999.
- [6] E. Breuillard and B. Green. Approximate groups. I: The torsion-free nilpotent case. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 10(1):37–57, 2011.
- [7] E. Breuillard, B. Green, and T. Tao. The structure of approximate groups. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 116:115–221, 2012.
- [8] E. Breuillard, B. Green, and T. Tao. Small doubling in groups. In *Erdős centennial*, volume 25 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 129–151. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013.
- [9] E. Breuillard and M. C. H. Tointon. Nilprogressions and groups with moderate growth. *Adv. Math.*, 289:1008–1055, 2016.

- [10] M. J. Collins. On Jordan’s theorem for complex linear groups. *J. Group Theory*, 10(4):411–423, 2007.
- [11] L. J. Corwin and F. P. Greenleaf. *Representations of nilpotent Lie groups and their applications. Part I: Basic theory and examples*, volume 18 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [12] M. de la Salle and R. Tessera. Characterizing a vertex-transitive graph by a large ball. *J. Topol.*, 12(3):705–743, 2019.
- [13] C. Druţu and M. Kapovich. *Geometric group theory*, volume 63 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. With an appendix by Bogdan Nica.
- [14] H. Duminił-Copin, S. Goswami, A. Raoufi, F. Severo, and A. Yadin. Existence of phase transition for percolation using the Gaussian free field. *Duke Math. J.*, 169(18):3539–3563, 2020.
- [15] P. Easo and T. Hutchcroft. The critical percolation probability is local, 2023. arXiv:2310.10983.
- [16] P. Easo and T. Hutchcroft. Uniform finite presentation for groups of polynomial growth, 2023. arXiv:2308.12428.
- [17] W. Feit. The orders of finite linear groups. Unpublished, 1995.
- [18] S. Friedland. The maximal orders of finite subgroups in $GL_n(\mathbf{Q})$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 125(12):3519–3526, 1997.
- [19] B. Green. Approximate groups and their applications: work of Bourgain, Gamburd, Helfgott and Sarnak. In *Current Events Bulletin of the AMS*, 2010. arXiv:0911.3354.
- [20] B. Green. Approximate algebraic structure. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. 1*, pages 341–367. Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [21] A. Grigor’yan. *Introduction to analysis on graphs*, volume 71 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
- [22] M. Gromov. Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 53:53–73, 1981.
- [23] M. Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*, volume 152 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1999. Based on the 1981 French original [MR0682063 (85e:53051)], with appendices by M. Katz, P. Pansu and S. Semmes, translated from the French by Sean Michael Bates.
- [24] Y. Guivarc’h. Groupes de Lie à croissance polynomiale. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 271:A237–A239, 1970.
- [25] Y. Guivarc’h. Croissance polynomiale et périodes des fonctions harmoniques. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 101:333–379, 1973.
- [26] M. Hall, Jr. *The theory of groups*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1959.
- [27] H. A. Helfgott. Growth in groups: ideas and perspectives. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 52(3):357–413, 2015.
- [28] J. Hermon and R. Pymar. A direct comparison between the mixing time of the interchange process with “few” particles and independent random walks, 2021. arXiv:2105.13486.
- [29] E. Hrushovski. Stable group theory and approximate subgroups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 25(1):189–243, 2012.
- [30] T. Hutchcroft and M. Tointon. Non-triviality of the phase transition for percolation on finite transitive graphs, 2024. To appear in *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*. arXiv:2104.05607.
- [31] B. Kleiner. A new proof of Gromov’s theorem on groups of polynomial growth. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23(3):815–829, 2010.
- [32] R. Lyons, A. Mann, R. Tessera, and M. Tointon. Explicit universal minimal constants for polynomial growth of groups. *J. Group Theory*, 26(1):29–53, 2023.
- [33] A. I. Mal’cev. On a class of homogeneous spaces. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 13:9–32, 1949.
- [34] A. Mann. *How groups grow*, volume 395 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [35] T. Meyerovitch, I. Perl, M. Tointon, and A. Yadin. Polynomials and harmonic functions on discrete groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 369(3):2205–2229, 2017.

- [36] H. Minkowski. Zur Theorie der positiven quadratischen Formen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 101:196–202, 1887.
- [37] M. Newman. *Integral matrices*, volume Vol. 45 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.
- [38] N. Ozawa. A functional analysis proof of Gromov’s polynomial growth theorem. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(3):549–556, 2018.
- [39] M. S. Raghunathan. *Discrete subgroups of Lie groups*, volume 68 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972.
- [40] T. Sanders. The structure theory of set addition revisited. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 50(1):93–127, 2013.
- [41] Y. Shalom and T. Tao. A finitary version of Gromov’s polynomial growth theorem. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 20(6):1502–1547, 2010.
- [42] Y. Taghavi, S. Kayvanfar, and M. Parvizi. On Baer’s theorem and its generalizations. *Mediterr. J. Math.*, 18:254, 20 pages, 2021.
- [43] T. Tao. Product set estimates for non-commutative groups. *Combinatorica*, 28(5):547–594, 2008.
- [44] T. Tao. Inverse theorems for sets and measures of polynomial growth. *Q. J. Math.*, 68(1):13–57, 2017.
- [45] T. Tao and V. H. Vu. *Additive Combinatorics*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [46] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. Scaling limits of cayley graphs with polynomially growing balls, 2018. arXiv:1711.08295.
- [47] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. Sharp relations between volume growth, isoperimetry and resistance in vertex-transitive graphs, 2020. arXiv:2001.01467.
- [48] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. Small doubling implies small tripling at large scales, 2023. arXiv:2310.20500.
- [49] R. Tessera and M. Tointon. Lie-group approximations of balls with polynomial volume in vertex-transitive graphs. In preparation, 2024+.
- [50] R. Tessera and M. C. H. Tointon. Properness of nilprogressions and the persistence of polynomial growth of given degree. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 17, 38, 2018.
- [51] R. Tessera and M. C. H. Tointon. A finitary structure theorem for vertex-transitive graphs of polynomial growth. *Combinatorica*, 41(2):263–298, 2021.
- [52] M. C. H. Tointon. Freiman’s theorem in an arbitrary nilpotent group. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 109(2):318–352, 2014.
- [53] M. C. H. Tointon. *Introduction to approximate groups*, volume 94 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [54] M. C. H. Tointon. Polylogarithmic bounds in the nilpotent Freiman theorem. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 170(1):111–127, 2021.
- [55] V. I. Trofimov. Graphs with polynomial growth. *Math. USSR-Sb.*, 51(2):405–417, Feb 1985.
- [56] V. I. Trofimov. The local structure of graphs and the polynomiality of growth. In *The subgroup structure of groups (Russian)*, pages 149–152, 174. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ural. Otdel., Sverdlovsk, 1988.
- [57] J. van der Corput. Verallgemeinerung einer Mordellschen Beweismethode in der Geometrie der Zahlen, zweite Mitteilung. *Acta Arith.*, 2(1):145–146, 1936.
- [58] N. T. Varopoulos. Random walks on soluble groups. *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)*, 107(4):337–344, 1983.
- [59] N. T. Varopoulos, L. Saloff-Coste, and T. Coulhon. *Analysis and geometry on groups*, volume 100 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [60] B. Weisfeiler. On the size and structure of finite linear groups, c. 1984. arXiv:1203.1960.
- [61] W. Woess. Topological groups and infinite graphs. In *Directions in infinite graph theory and combinatorics (Cambridge, 1989)*, volume 95 of *Discrete Math.*, pages 373–384. 1991.