## MALNORMAL SUBGROUPS OF FINITELY PRESENTED GROUPS

Francis Wagner

#### Abstract

The following refinement of the Higman embedding theorem is proved: Given a finitely generated recursively presented group R, there exists a quasi-isometric malnormal embedding of R into a finitely presented group H such that the image of the embedding enjoys the Congruence Extension Property. Moreover, it is shown that the group H can be constructed to have decidable Word problem if and only if the Word problem of R is decidable, yielding a refinement of a theorem of Clapham. Finally, it is proved that for any countable group G and any computable function  $\ell : G \to \mathbb{N}$  satisfying some necessary requirements, there exists a malnormal embedding enjoying the Congruence Extension Property of G into a finitely presented group H such that the restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to G is equivalent to  $\ell$ , producing a refinement of a result of Ol'shanskii.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Formulation of the main theorems.

A finitely generated group is said to be *recursively presented* if it admits a presentation  $\langle X \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ with  $|X| < \infty$  such that there exists an 'effective algorithm' to list the elements of  $\mathcal{R}$ , i.e such that  $\mathcal{R}$  is a recursively enumerable subset of the set of words  $(X \cup X^{-1})^*$ . It is clear from this definition that finitely presented groups are recursively presented. Indeed, it is not difficult to see that a finitely generated subgroup of such a finitely presented group is also recursively presented.

In his celebrated theorem, G. Higman [9] showed that this condition is both necessary and sufficient, exhibiting an embedding of an arbitrary finitely generated recursively presented group into a finitely presented group.

Higman's embedding theorem has inspired many works investigating what properties of the group may be preserved under such an embedding. For just a few examples, chosen specifically for their relevance to this manuscript's purposes:

- Clapham demonstrated [7] a refinement of the embedding which preserves the decidability of the Word problem.
- Ol'shanskii demonstrated [15] a refinement of the embedding which is bi-Lipschitz (and so quasi-isometric).
- Birget, Rips, Ol'shanskii, and Sapir demonstrated [4] a refinement of the embedding where the (non-deterministic) complexity of the Word problem of the embedded group is polynomially equivalent to the Dehn function of the finitely presented group.
- Sapir demonstrated [27] a refinement of the embedding that preserves the asphericity of the group.
- Ol'shanskii and Sapir demonstrated [21] a refinement of the embedding which preserves the decidability of the Conjugacy problem.

Some other notable refinements can be found in [2], [3], [5], [18], and [30].

In this manuscript, we investigate a refinement along similar lines to those above, adding the condition of 'malnormality'.

A subgroup  $G \leq H$  is called *malnormal*, denoted  $G \leq_{mal} H$ , if for all  $h \in H$  with  $h \notin G$ ,  $(h^{-1}Gh) \cap G = \{1\}$ . Naturally, an embedding  $\iota : G \hookrightarrow H$  is called *malnormal* if  $\iota(G)$  is a malnormal subgroup of H.

The question of whether there is a malnormal refinement of the Higman embedding theorem was posed by Sapir in [27] (see Remark 5.23) and attributed to D. Osin. While it is suggested therein that it is 'quite possible' that the methods employed in that setting may produce a positive answer to the question, the problem is left open. Further details on the problem are discussed in [10].

Our first statement resolves this question:

**Theorem 1.1.** For any finitely generated recursively presented group R, there exists a malnormal embedding  $\iota : R \hookrightarrow H$  into a finitely presented group H.

Next, we study particular characteristics of this embedding, combining the statement of Theorem 1.1 with several of the properties mentioned above.

Given a group G with a finite generating set X, the *length* of an element  $g \in G$  with respect to X, denoted  $|g|_X$ , is the length of a shortest word W over  $X \cup X^{-1}$  that represents g. This defines a function  $|\cdot|_X : G \to \mathbb{N}$  given by  $g \mapsto |g|_X$ .

In general, for a countable group G, two functions  $\ell_1, \ell_2 : G \to \mathbb{N}$  are said to be *equivalent*, denoted  $\ell_1 \simeq \ell_2$ , if there exist positive constants  $c_1, c_2$  such that for all  $g \in G$ ,

$$c_1\ell_1(g) \le \ell_2(g) \le c_2\ell_1(g)$$

It is easy to see that the relation  $\simeq$  is indeed an equivalence relation on functions  $G \to \mathbb{N}$ . What's more, for any finitely generated group G, one can see that  $|\cdot|_X \simeq |\cdot|_Y$  for any finite generating sets X and Y. As a result, if G is finitely generated, then the notation  $|\cdot|_G$  may be used to denote any function in the equivalence class of  $|\cdot|_X$  for some fixed finite generating set X.

With this terminology at hand, the following powerful condition is established for the malnormal embedding of Theorem 1.1, demonstrating that the embedding is bi-Lipschitz and so a refinement of the aforementioned embedding of Ol'shanskii in [15]:

**Theorem 1.2.** For any finitely generated recursively presented group R, there exists a malnormal embedding  $\iota : R \hookrightarrow H$  into a finitely presented group H such that the restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to the embedded subgroup R is equivalent to  $|\cdot|_R$ .

However, more care is needed when considering countable groups which are not finitely generated. To this end, for any countable group G, a function  $\ell: G \to \mathbb{N}$  is said to satisfy the *D*-condition if the following conditions hold:

(D1)  $\ell(g) = 0$  if and only if g = 1;

(D2)  $\ell(g) = \ell(g^{-1})$  for all  $g \in G$ ;

(D3)  $\ell(gh) \leq \ell(g) + \ell(h)$  for all  $g, h \in G$ ;

(D4) There exists a > 0 such that  $\#\{g \in G \mid \ell(g) \le r\} \le a^r$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Note that if G embeds in a finitely generated group H, then the restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to G is a function satisfying the D-condition.

Conversely, for any countable group G and any function  $\ell$  satisfying the D-condition, Ol'shanskii exhibited [14] an embedding  $\rho_{G,\ell}$  of G into a finitely generated group S such that the restriction of

 $|\cdot|_S$  to G is equivalent to  $\ell$ . Moreover, if  $\ell$  is a computable function, then the group S constructed to satisfy this embedding is shown to be recursively presented.

Hence, combining  $\rho_{G,\ell}$  with the embedding of Theorem 1.2 immediately implies the following statement:

**Corollary 1.3.** For any countable group G and any computable function  $\ell : G \to \mathbb{N}$  satisfying the *D*-condition, there exists a malnormal embedding of G into a finitely presented group H such that the restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to G is equivalent to  $\ell$ .

In particular, Corollary 1.3 says that for any finitely generated group G, any 'reasonable' function can be realized as the distortion of G as a malnormal subgroup of a finitely presented group.

A condition that we add to these results is that of the congruence extension property, a property first introduced by Ol'shanskii in [13].

A subgroup G of a group H satisfies the congruence extension property (CEP) if for any epimorphism  $\varepsilon : G \to G_1$ , there exists an epimorphism  $\overline{\varepsilon} : H \to H_1$  for some group  $H_1$  containing  $G_1$  as a subgroup and such that the restriction of  $\overline{\varepsilon}$  to G is  $\varepsilon$ . In this case, we write  $G \leq_{CEP} H$  and say that G is a CEP-subgroup of H or that G is CEP-embedded in H.

The following statement establishes this property for the embedding of Theorem 1.1, and so gives a first such refinement of the Higman embedding theorem:

**Theorem 1.4.** For any finitely generated recursively presented group R, there exists a malnormal CEP-embedding  $\iota : R \hookrightarrow H$  into a finitely presented group H.

There are two convenient reformulations of the definition of the congruence extension property:

- (1) G is a CEP-subgroup of H if and only if for any normal subgroup  $N \triangleleft G$ , there exists a normal subgroup  $M \triangleleft H$  such that  $M \cap G = N$
- (2) G is a CEP-subgroup of H if and only if for any subset  $S \subseteq G$ ,  $G \cap \langle \langle S \rangle \rangle^H = \langle \langle S \rangle \rangle^G$  (where  $\langle \langle T \rangle \rangle^K$  denotes the normal closure of a subset T of a group K).

It is clear from (1) that any retract of a group is a CEP-subgroup and that  $\leq_{CEP}$  is a transitive relation. Hence, since the the embedding  $\rho_{G,\ell}$  of [14] is itself a CEP-embedding (see Section 2.5 of [19] for further discussion), the next statement is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.4:

**Corollary 1.5.** For any countable group G and any computable function  $\ell : G \to \mathbb{N}$  satisfying the *D*-condition, there exists a malnormal CEP-embedding of G into a finitely presented group H such that the restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to G is equivalent to  $\ell$ .

Finally, the following statement serves as a malnormal refinement of Clapham's theorem [7]:

**Theorem 1.6.** For any finitely generated group R with decidable Word Problem, there exists a malnormal CEP-embedding  $\iota : R \hookrightarrow H$  into a finitely presented group H such that:

- The restriction of  $|\cdot|_H$  to R is equivalent to  $|\cdot|_R$
- *H* has decidable Word problem

#### 1.2. Approach.

As in [32], the construction of the finitely presented groups of interest is through S-machines (see Section 4.1 for a full definition of S-machine).

The S-machine was first defined by Sapir, Birget, and Rips in [29] as a computational model carefully tailored to produce finitely presented groups with desired algebraic and geometric properties. These groups arise from their associated S-machine in a canonical way, with defining relations that yield a group structure that 'simulates' the computational structure of the machine (see Section 7.1 or [32] for further discussion).

Using a computational model to construct a group satisfying desired properties is a fundamental technique for many seminal results in algorithmic group theory. Indeed, this is the general approach to classical solutions to the Higman embedding theorem (see for example the construction of Aanderaa in [1]).

In a very rough sense (see [19] for a detailed discussion), S-machines are novel in their ability to produce groups whose geometric and algorithmic properties are informed by the machine, while also crucially providing a robust computational structure (see [29] for full details or Section 5.2 for a cursory discussion).

For a concrete example of this point, the groups associated to non-deterministic Turing machines given in [1] are defined by 'Baumslag-Solitar-type' relations, necessitating the groups to have at least exponential Dehn function (see Section 16); on the other hand, the commutator relations inherent to the presentations associated to an S-machine allow for these groups to have Dehn functions as low as quadratic, a point exploited in [32], [17], [23], [24], and others.

However, these commutator relations seem to naturally preclude the use of S-machines for the constructions of the main theorems of this manuscript, as they necessitate group elements that provide a counterexample to the malnormality of any embedded subgroup.

Indeed, this obstacle necessitates a generalization of the computational structure, defined here in Section 4.2. This adaptation, simply termed *generalized S-machines*, essentially combines the theory of *S*-machines with the 'Baumslag-Solitar-type' relations found in sources like [1]. The result is an associated group whose structure is not very different from that of [27], but that is fully defined in terms of a computational model, allowing more effective study through the associated machine.

This generalization is employed in one particular 'step' of the main machine (see Section 5.1), particularly the only one that involves the letters which correspond to the image of the embedding. Introducing this 'noise' into the relational structure is enough to ensure the malnormality of the given embeddings (see Section 11).

As indicated above, the introduction of these 'Baumslag-Solitar-type' relations means a 'loss of control' on the Dehn function of the associated groups. As such, much less care is taken in this manuscript in finding upper bounds on the area of circular diagrams over these presentations when compared to the detailed arguments made in previous sources (e.g in [32], [17], and [23]); some computable upper bound is necessary, thoguh, for the proof of Theorem 1.6.

With that said, the resemblance to the setting of S-machines allows for a similar treatment here. For example, we again use the notion of *a*-cells, first introduced by the author in [32], to study the embedding. Hence, despite the loss of control on the Dehn function, other algebraic geometric properties can be proved (e.g an analogue of [19] to prove Theorem 1.2) through similar means to those of previous settings, in particular [32]. Of course, the new types of relations in this generalization also introduce several new obstacles to just about every argument; for example, compare Section 10.4 and Section 12 to their analogues in [32].

### 1.3. Outline of the contents.

What follows is a brief outline of the contents of this manuscript.

Section 2 functions mainly to recall the definition of a diagram over the presentation of a group, the fundamental tool for the arguments of Section 3 and Sections 7-12.

In Section 3, we construct an initial embedding of a finitely generated recursively presented group into another such group which satisfies some convenient combinatorial properties (see for example Lemma 3.3). This embedding is also shown to satisfy several key properties which reduce the main theorem to demonstrating the embeddings of finitely generated recursively presented groups satisfying these desirable properties.

Sections 4-6 serve to study the main computational structures of this construction. Section 4 recalls the definition of S-machines and introduces the notion of generalized S-machines. Several auxiliary generalized S-machines are then constructed and studied in Section 5, culminating with the construction and study of the main machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in Section 6.

Several group presentations associated to a generalized S-machine are introduced in Section 7, with these relational structures arising in an analogous manner to that employed in [32]. The section culminates with an investigation of diagrams over these presentations, demonstrating properties shared by the presentations associated to any generalized S-machine.

In Sections 8-12, we study the group presentations associated to the main machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , using the properties established in Section 6 to verify sufficient conditions to ensure that the corresponding groups are suitable for the proofs of the main theorems.

The final sections provide the proofs of the main theorems, pulling together the group properties verified in Sections 7-12 and the initial embedding of Section 3 to demonstrate the embeddings.

Acknowledgements. The author expresses his deep gratitude to Alexander Ol'shanskii for his suggestions on this work. The author is also thankful for the comments and advice of Mark Sapir. Finally, the author would like to thank and Jingying Huang, Arman Darbinyan, and Bogdan Chornomaz for their helpful discussions.

### 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Diagrams over presentations.

A vital tool for many of the arguments to come is the concept of *van Kampen diagrams* over group presentations, a notion introduced by its namesake in 1933 [31]. It is assumed that the reader is intimately acquainted with this concept, but some of the most important definitions are summarized below; for further reference, see [16], [11], and [28].

Let G be a group with presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ . Suppose  $\Delta$  is an oriented 2-complex homeomorphic to a disk equipped with a *labelling function*, i.e a function Lab :  $E(\Delta) \to \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1} \cup \{1\}$  which satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}^{-1}) = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e})^{-1}$  for any edge  $\mathbf{e} \in E(\Delta)$  (with, of course,  $1^{-1} \equiv 1$ ). The label of a path in  $\Delta$  is defined in the obvious way, i.e  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_1 \dots \mathbf{e}_n) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_1) \dots \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_n)$  (where ' $\equiv$ ' denotes 'visual' letter-for-letter equality). For any edge  $\mathbf{e}$  in  $\Delta$ ,  $\mathbf{e}$  is called a 0-edge if  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}) = 1$ ; otherwise,  $\mathbf{e}$  is called a *positive edge*.

Suppose that for each cell  $\Pi$  of  $\Delta$ , one of the following is true:

- (1) omitting the label of any zero edges,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Pi)$  is visually equal to a cyclic permutation of  $R^{\pm 1}$  for some  $R \in \mathcal{R}$
- (2)  $\partial \Pi$  consists of 0-edges and exactly two positive edges **e** and **f**, with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{f})^{-1}$
- (3)  $\partial \Pi$  consists only of 0-edges.



(a) Positive cell corresponding to (b) 0-cell of type (2),  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . (c) 0-cell of type (3). the relator  $R = aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ .

FIGURE 2.1. Cells in van Kampen diagrams

Then  $\Delta$  is called a *van Kampen diagram* (or simply a *circular diagram*) over the presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} | \mathcal{R} \rangle$ . The cells satisfying condition (1) above are called *positive cells*, while the others are called *0-cells*.

For any 0-cell of type (2), the positive edges **e** and **f** are called *immediately adjacent*. In any diagram, two positive edges **e** and **f** are said to be *adjacent* if there exists a sequence of edges  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{k+1} = \mathbf{f}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_i$  and  $\mathbf{e}_{i+1}$  are immediately adjacent for  $i = 1, \ldots, k$ .

It is easy to see that the contour,  $\partial \Delta$ , of a circular diagram  $\Delta$  has label equal to the identity in *G*. Conversely, van Kampen's Lemma (Lemma 11.1 of [16]) ensures that a word *W* over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ represents the identity of *G* if and only if there exists a circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .

The area of a diagram  $\Delta$ , denoted Area( $\Delta$ ), is the number of positive cells it contains. Further, the area of a word W satisfying W = 1 in G is the minimal area of a circular diagram  $\Delta$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .

A 0-refinement of a diagram  $\Delta$  is a diagram  $\Delta'$  with homeomorphic underlying map obtained from  $\Delta$  by the insertion/deletion of 0-edges and/or 0-cells. Note that a 0-refinement has the same area as the diagram from which it arises.

Let  $\Delta$  be a circular diagram over  $\langle \mathcal{A} | \mathcal{R} \rangle$  and  $\Pi_1$ ,  $\Pi_2$  be two positive cells in  $\Delta$ . Suppose there exists a simple path **t** in  $\Delta$  between the vertices  $O_1, O_2$  of  $\partial \Pi_1, \partial \Pi_2$ , respectively, such that:

- Lab(t) = 1 in  $F(\mathcal{A})$  (that is, the free group with basis  $\mathcal{A}$ ), and
- Lab $(\partial \Pi_1)$  read starting at  $O_1$  and Lab $(\partial \Pi_2)$  read starting at  $O_2$  are mutually inverse

Then  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are called *cancellable* in  $\Delta$ .



FIGURE 2.2. Cancellable cells

This terminology is justified by the ability to 'remove'  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  from  $\Delta$  through 0-refinement, yielding a circular diagram  $\Delta'$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  and  $\text{Area}(\Delta') < \text{Area}(\Delta)$ .

Naturally, a circular diagram is called *reduced* if it has no pair of cancellable cells. By simply removing pairs of cancellable cells, any circular diagram over a presentation can be made reduced without affecting its contour label. This immediately implies a strengthened version of van Kampen's lemma: A word W over  $\mathcal{A}$  represents the identity in G if and only if there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the presentation with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .

A Schupp diagram (or simply annular diagram) over the presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$  is defined in the analogous way, changing only that the underlying map is homeomorphic to an annulus rather than a disk. Pairs of *cancellable cells* in an annular diagram are defined in exactly the same way as for circular diagrams, again justified by the ability to use 0-refinement to remove them without affecting the contour labels.

It is then an immediate consequence of van Kampen's lemma that two words W and V are conjugate in G if and only if there exists a reduced annular diagram  $\Delta$  with contour components  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv V^{-1}$ .

A subdiagram of a diagram over a presentation is defined in the natural way, inheriting the labelling function from that of the diagram. However, it is convenient to restrict the terminology by assuming that subdiagrams are always circular, even if the original diagram is annular.



FIGURE 2.3. Annular diagram

### 2.2. Parameters.

The arguments spanning the rest of this paper are reliant on the *highest parameter principle*, the dual to the *lowest parameter principle* introduced in [16]. For this, we introduce the relation << on parameters defined as follows.

If  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n$  are parameters with  $\alpha_1 \ll \alpha_2 \ll \cdots \ll \alpha_n$ , then for all  $2 \leq i \leq n$ , it is understood that  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}$  are assigned prior to the assignment of  $\alpha_i$  and that the assignment of  $\alpha_i$  is dependent on the assignment of its predecessors. The resulting inequalities are then understood as ' $\alpha_i \geq$  (any expression involving  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{i-1}$ )'

Specifically, the assignment of parameters we use here is:

$$N << C << c_0 << L << c_1 << \delta^{-1} << K$$

#### 3. INITIAL EMBEDDING

The first step toward addressing the statements of the introduction is to 'expand' a general recursive presentation with finite generating set, producing another such presentation into which the original presentation embeds. Crucially, this new presentation will be shown (using diagrammatic arguments that resemble those of [13]) to satisfy key properties that are vital to later combinatorial calculations.

Let Q be a finitely generated recursively presented group. Let  $\langle Y | S \rangle$  be a presentation of Q with  $|Y| < \infty$  and assume that S satisfies the following three conditions:

- (R1)  $S \subseteq Y^*$ , i.e S is a set of *positive* words in Y in that each word is comprised entirely of letters from Y (and not  $Y^{-1}$ )
- (R2)  $\mathcal{S}$  is a recursive subset of  $Y^*$
- (R3) The trivial word is not an element of  $\mathcal{S}$

As will be discussed further in Sections 13 and 16, these three conditions are not restrictive.

Setting  $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_m\}$ , for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$  let  $Y_{C,i} = \{a_{1,i}, \ldots, a_{C,i}\}$ , where C is the parameter listed in Section 2.3, and let  $Y_C = \bigcup Y_{C,i}$ .

Further, for all *i* let  $A_i = a_{1,i} \dots a_{C,i} \in F(Y_{C,i})$ . Then, for all  $r = r(y_1, \dots, y_m) \in S$ , define the word  $r_C = r(A_1, \dots, A_m) \in F(Y_C)$ . For example, if  $r = y_1 y_m$ , then  $r_C = a_{1,1} \dots a_{C,1} a_{1,m} \dots a_{C,m}$ .

Letting  $S_C = \{r_C : r \in S\}$ , it follows that  $S_C$  is a set of positive words over  $Y_C$  which is evidently recursive. Hence,  $\langle Y_C | S_C \rangle$  is a recursive presentation of a group  $Q_C$  with  $|Y_C| < \infty$ .

Let F be the subgroup of  $F(Y_C)$  generated by  $\mathcal{D} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ . Since every letter of  $Y_C$  appears once and only once in an element of  $\mathcal{D}$ , no cancellation occurs when forming products over  $\mathcal{D}^{\pm 1}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a basis for the free subgroup F of  $F(Y_C)$ .

For any normal subgroup  $N \triangleleft F$ , let  $T_N$  be the set of non-trivial cyclically reduced words over  $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^{-1}$  which are elements of N. Note that since these words are cyclically reduced as words over  $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^{-1}$ , they are cyclically reduced as words over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$ . Further, note that  $T_N$  is closed under taking inverses. A diagram  $\Delta$  over the presentation  $\langle Y_C \mid T_N \rangle$  is then called a  $T_N$ -diagram. Let  $L_N = \langle \langle N \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)}$ , i.e the normal closure of N in  $F(Y_C)$ . Then for words W and V over  $Y_C^{\pm 1}$ ,

van Kampen's lemma implies the following statements:

- $W \in L_N$  if and only if there exists a circular  $T_N$ -diagram satisfying  $Lab(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .
- W and V are conjugate in  $F(Y_C)/L_N$  if and only if there exists an annular  $T_N$ -diagram with contour components **p** and **q** satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv V^{-1}$ .

For any positive cell  $\Pi$  in a  $T_N$ -diagram  $\Delta$ , there exists a decomposition  $\partial \Pi = \mathbf{p}_1 \dots \mathbf{p}_s$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_i$  is labelled by  $A_{j(i)}^{\varepsilon_i}$  for some  $j(i) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{p}_i$  is called an *F*-subpath of  $\partial \Pi$  and the vertices  $(\mathbf{p}_i)_-$  and  $(\mathbf{p}_i)_+$  are called *entire vertices* of  $\partial \Pi$ .

If a subpath  $\mathbf{q}$  of a boundary component of  $\Delta$  is labelled by an element of F, then the *F*-subpaths and the *entire vertices* of  $\mathbf{q}$  are defined analogously.

Suppose there exist positive cells  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  (perhaps  $\Pi_1 = \Pi_2$ ) in a  $T_N$ -diagram  $\Delta$  and a path **t** such that  $\mathbf{t}_-$  is an entire vertex of  $\partial \Pi_1$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_+$  is an entire vertex of  $\partial \Pi_2$ , and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t})$  is trivial in  $F(Y_C)$ . Then  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are said to be *compatible*.

In this case, viewing  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi_1)$  as starting at  $\mathbf{t}_-$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi_2)$  as starting at  $\mathbf{t}_+$ , the label of the loop  $\mathbf{t}(\partial \Pi_2)^{-1}\mathbf{t}^{-1}(\partial \Pi_1)^{-1}$  is freely conjugate to an element of  $T_N$ . So, if  $\Pi_1 \neq \Pi_2$ , then after 0-refinement one may excise from  $\Delta$  a (circular) subdiagram containing the cells  $\Pi_1$  and

 $\Pi_2$  and paste in its place a circular  $T_N$ -diagram consisting of exactly one positive cell, yielding a  $T_N$ -diagram with the same contour labels and area less by one.

If a subpath  $\mathbf{q}$  of a component of  $\partial \Delta$  is labelled by an element of F, then the compatibility of  $\mathbf{q}$  and a positive cell  $\Pi$  is defined analogously. In this case, one may use 0-refinement to remove  $\Pi$  from  $\Delta$ , obtaining a  $T_N$ -diagram  $\Delta'$  with area less by one. However, for  $\mathbf{q}'$  the subpath of the component of  $\partial \Delta'$  arising from  $\mathbf{q}$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}')$  are not equal in F. As  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \in T_N$ , though,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}')$  do represent the same element of F/N.

A  $T_N$ -diagram  $\Delta$  containing no pair of compatible cells is called  $T_N$ -reduced. Note that any  $T_N$ diagram can be made  $T_N$ -reduced by simply iterating the process of replacing pairs of compatible cells with single positive cells. Hence, the statements above can be refined in the following ways:

- $W \in L_N$  if and only if there exists a circular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .
- W and V are conjugate in  $F(Y_C)/L_N$  if and only if there exists an annular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram with contour components **p** and **q** satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv V^{-1}$ .

Suppose there exist positive cells  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  in a  $T_N$ -diagram  $\Delta$  and edges  $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \partial \Pi_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2 \in \partial \Pi_2$ such that the labels of  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  are mutually inverse. Further, suppose there exists a path  $\mathbf{s}$ in  $\Delta$  with  $\mathbf{s}_- = (\mathbf{e}_1)_-$  and  $\mathbf{s}_+ = (\mathbf{e}_2)_+$  and so that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s})$  is freely trivial. Then since any letter of  $Y_C$  appears once and only once in any element of  $\mathcal{D}$ , the *F*-subpaths  $\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_2$  of  $\partial \Pi_1, \partial \Pi_2$ containing  $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2$ , respectively, must have inverse labels. Letting  $\mathbf{p}'_1$  be the initial subpath of  $\mathbf{p}_1$ with  $(\mathbf{p}'_1)_+ = (\mathbf{e}_1)_-$  and  $\mathbf{p}'_2$  be the terminal subpath of  $\mathbf{p}_2$  with  $(\mathbf{p}'_2)_- = (\mathbf{e}_2)_+$ , it follows that  $\mathbf{p}'_1 \mathbf{s} \mathbf{p}'_2$  is a path between entire vertices of these cells with freely trivial label. Hence,  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$ are compatible.

Thus, a  $T_N$ -reduced diagram is necessarily reduced. Moreover, for any  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$  and any pair of distinct positive cells  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  in  $\Delta$ , if  $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \partial \Pi_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2 \in \partial \Pi_2$ , then  $\mathbf{e}_1$  cannot be adjacent  $\mathbf{e}_2^{-1}$ .

Similarly, adjacency implies the compatibility between a positive cell  $\Pi$  and an appropriate subpath **q** of a contour component of a  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 3.1** (Compare to Theorem 2 of [13]). For any normal subgroup  $N \triangleleft F$ ,  $L_N \triangleleft F(Y_C)$  and satisfies  $L_N \cap F = N$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $L_N \triangleleft F(Y_C)$  and contains N.

Supposing  $L_N \cap F \neq N$ , there exists a circular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$  of minimal area satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \in (L_N \cap F) \setminus N$ .

As the label of the contour of any circular diagram with zero area is freely trivial,  $\Delta$  must contain at least one positive cell.

Suppose there exists a positive cell  $\Pi$  in  $\Delta$  that is self-compatible. Then the entire vertices o, o' of  $\partial \Pi$  defining this compatibility partition  $\partial \Pi = \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{q}_2$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_i) \in F$ . Letting  $\mathbf{t}$  be a path from o to o' such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}) = 1$  in  $F(Y_C)$ , after 0-refinement the loop  $\mathbf{tq}_1$  can be assumed to bound a (circular) subdiagram  $\Delta_1$  not containing  $\Pi$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta_1) = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1)$  in  $F(Y_C)$ . As  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1)$  cannot be trivial in  $F(Y_C)$ ,  $\Delta_1$  must contain at least one positive cell; further,  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta_1) \in L_N$  by van Kampen's Lemma, so that the inductive hypothesis implies  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1) \in N$ . Since  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \in N$ , this also means that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2) \in N$ . Letting  $\Delta_2$  be the subdiagram bounded by the loop  $\mathbf{tq}_2^{-1}$ , it follows that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta_2) =_{F(Y_C)} \text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2)^{-1} \in N$ . As a result,  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta_2)$  is freely conjugate to an element of  $T_N$ , so that one may excise  $\Delta_2$  from  $\Delta$  and paste in its place a diagram containing exactly one positive cell. But this produces a circular  $T_N$ -diagram with the same contour label as  $\Delta$  and strictly lesser area, contradicting the minimality of  $\Delta$ .

Hence, for any positive cell  $\Pi$  of  $\Delta$ , every edge of  $\partial \Pi$  is adjacent a boundary edge of  $\Delta$ . As a result, any positive cell is compatible with  $\partial \Delta$ , so that we may remove such a cell to produce a diagram  $\Delta'$  with area less by one and such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) = \text{Lab}(\partial \Delta')$  in F/N. But then  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \in (L_N \cap F) \setminus N$ , so that the minimality of  $\Delta$  is again contradicted.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $N \triangleleft F$ . If  $W \in L_N$  is a non-trivial cyclically reduced word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$ , then there exists a subword of a cyclic permutation of W which is a cyclic permutation of an element of  $T_N$ . In particular,  $|W|_{Y_C} \ge C$ .

*Proof.* As noted above,  $W \in L_N$  if and only if there exists a circular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ . Choose such a diagram  $\Delta$  with minimal area.

As  $W \neq 1$  in  $F(Y_C)$ , the area of  $\Delta$  must be at least 1. Further, as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, no positive cell of  $\Delta$  can be self-compatible. Hence, for any positive cell  $\Pi$  of  $\Delta$ , every edge of  $\partial \Pi$  is adjacent to a boundary edge of  $\Delta$ .

Thus, the diagram  $\Delta$  as a map satisfies the small-cancellation condition C'(0) (see Chapter 5 of [11]), so that Grindlinger's Lemma implies  $\Delta$  contains a cell  $\Pi$  such that the edges adjacent to  $\partial \Pi$  form a subpath **q** of  $\partial \Delta$ .

Let W' be the cyclic permutation of W obtained from reading  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  starting at  $\mathbf{q}_-$ . Further, let  $V \in T_N$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv V$ . Then, the subword  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  of W' is a cyclic permutation of V. In particular,  $|W|_{Y_C} \geq |\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q})|_{Y_C} = C|V|_{\mathcal{D}} \geq C$ .

 $\square$ 

Note that if  $N = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ , then  $L_N = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)}$ . Hence, Lemma 3.1 implies:

$$\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)} \cap F = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$$

Letting  $K = F\langle\langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle\rangle^{F(Y_C)} \leq F(Y_C)$ , it then follows that

$$K/\langle\langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle\rangle^{F(Y_C)} \cong F/\langle\langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle\rangle^F \cong \langle \mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$$

By the theorem of von Dyck (Theorem 4.5 of [16]), the map  $Y \to \langle \mathcal{D} | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  defined by  $y_i \mapsto A_i$ extends to an isomorphism  $Q \to \langle \mathcal{D} | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$ . Hence, for  $\tilde{Q} = K/\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)} \leq Q_C$ , there exists an isomorphism  $\varphi : Q \to \tilde{Q}$  given by  $\varphi(y_i) = A_i$  for all *i*.

The following is then an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.2:

**Lemma 3.3.** Let W be a non-trivial cyclically reduced word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  which represents the identity in  $Q_C$ . Then there exists a non-trivial subword of a cyclic permutation of W which is a cyclic permutation of an element of  $\langle \langle S_C \rangle \rangle^F$ . In particular,  $|W|_{Y_C} \geq C$ .

*Proof.* Set  $N = \langle \langle S_C \rangle \rangle^F$ . Then, since  $L_N = \langle \langle S_C \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)}$ , W represents the identity in  $Q_C$  if and only if  $W \in L_N$ . Hence, the statement follows from Lemma 3.2.

**Lemma 3.4.** For all  $w \in Q$ ,  $|\varphi(w)|_{Y_C} = C|w|_Y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $k = |w|_Y$  and set  $N = \langle \langle \mathcal{R}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ .

Then, there exist  $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_k \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w = y_{i_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots y_{i_k}^{\varepsilon_k}$  in Q. So,  $A_{i_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots A_{i_k}^{\varepsilon_k} = \varphi(w)$  in  $Q_C$ . Hence,  $|\varphi(w)|_{Y_C} \leq Ck$ .

Conversely, for any  $f \in F$  such that  $\varphi(w) = f$  in  $\tilde{Q} \leq Q_C$ , then for  $j_1, \ldots, j_\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$  and  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\ell \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $f \equiv A_{j_1}^{\delta_1} \ldots A_{j_\ell}^{\delta_\ell}$ , then  $y_{j_1}^{\delta_1} \ldots y_{j_\ell}^{\delta_\ell} = w$ . As a result,  $\ell \geq k$  and so  $|f|_{Y_C} \geq Ck$ .

Now let v be an arbitrary reduced word over  $Y_C^{\pm 1}$  such that  $v = \varphi(w)$  in  $Q_C$ . Then for  $f \in F$ ,  $f = \varphi(w)$  in  $Q_C$  if and only if  $v^{-1}f \in L_N$ , i.e if and only if there exists a circular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv v^{-1}f$ . Choose such an  $f \in F$  and corresponding diagram  $\Delta$  such that  $\Delta$  has minimal area. Then, partition  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{pq}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}) \equiv v^{-1}$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv f$ .

If any positive cell of  $\Delta$  is compatible with  $\mathbf{q}$ , then 0-refinement allows us to remove this cell to yield a circular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta'$  satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv v^{-1}f'$  with  $f' \in F$ . But then  $\operatorname{Area}(\Delta') = \operatorname{Area}(\Delta) - 1$ , contradicting the minimality of  $\Delta$ .

As a result, every edge of **q** must be adjacent another boundary edge of  $\Delta$ .

Suppose there exists a subpath  $\mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{q}' \mathbf{e}_2$  of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2^{-1}$  are adjacent edges. Then, let  $\mathbf{t}$  be a path consisting entirely of 0-edges such that  $\mathbf{t}_- = (\mathbf{e}_1)_-$  and  $\mathbf{t}_+ = (\mathbf{e}_2)_+$ . Using 0-refinement, we may then assume that  $\mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{q}' \mathbf{e}_2$  and  $\mathbf{t}$  bound a subdiagram  $\Gamma$ . As no edge on the boundary of a positive cell can be adjacent an edge of  $\partial \Gamma$ ,  $\Gamma$  must be a circular diagram over the free group  $F(Y_C)$ , and so  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Gamma)$  is freely trivial. But then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{q}' \mathbf{e}_2)$  is freely trivial, contradicting the assumption that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  is reduced.

Hence, every edge of **q** is adjacent an edge of  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$ . In particular,  $|v|_{Y_C} \ge |f|_{Y_C} \ge Ck$ .

Lemma 3.5.  $\tilde{Q} \leq_{mal} Q_C$ .

*Proof.* Let  $N = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ .

Supposing the statement is false, there exists an annular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta$  with contour components  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}), \text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}) \in F \setminus N$  and there exists a path  $\mathbf{t}$  in  $\Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{t}_-$  is an entire vertex of  $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t}_+$  is an entire vertex of  $\mathbf{q}$ , and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t})L_N \notin \tilde{Q}$ . Choose such a diagram  $\Delta$  with minimal area.

If any positive cell  $\Pi$  of  $\Delta$  is compatible with  $\mathbf{p}$ , then  $\Pi$  may be removed to yield an annular  $T_N$ -reduced diagram  $\Delta'$  with contour components  $\mathbf{p}'$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}') = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  in  $\tilde{Q}$ . Further, using 0-refinement, the path  $\mathbf{t}$  can be assumed to be undisturbed by this procedure, so that there exists a path  $\mathbf{t}'$  in  $\Delta'$  between entire vertices of  $\mathbf{p}'$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}') \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{t})$ . But then the existence of  $\Delta'$  contradicts the minimality of  $\Delta$ .

Similarly, no positive cell of  $\Delta$  can be compatible with **q**.

In particular, since  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  are reduced words, then as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 every edge of  $\mathbf{p}$  must be adjacent an edge of  $\mathbf{q}^{-1}$  and vice versa. As a result, there exists a path  $\mathbf{s}_1$  in  $\Delta$  such that  $(\mathbf{s}_1)_- = \mathbf{t}_-$ ,  $(\mathbf{s}_1)_+$  is an entire vertex of  $\mathbf{q}$ , and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1)$  is freely trivial.

Let  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $(\mathbf{s}_2)_- = (\mathbf{s}_1)_+$  and  $(\mathbf{s}_2)_+ = \mathbf{t}_+$ . Then since the initial and terminal vertices of  $\mathbf{s}_2$  are entire,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2) \in F$ .

So, setting  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}) \in F$  with  $\mathbf{s}_- = \mathbf{t}_-$  and  $\mathbf{s}_+ = \mathbf{t}_+$ . Hence, there exists an integer  $\ell$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}) = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p})^{\ell} \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s})$  in  $Q_C$  (see Lemma 11.4 of [16]).

But  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p})^{\ell}\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}) \in F \leq K$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t})L_N \notin \tilde{Q}$ .

#### 4. Rewriting Systems

#### 4.1. S-Machines.

There are many equivalent interpretations of S-machines (for example, see [26] and [6]). Following the conventions of [4], [17], [19], [21], [22], [23], [29], [32], and others, we describe them here as rewriting systems for words over group alphabets.

Let (Y, Q) be a pair of finite sets with  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{N} Q_i$  and  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{N} Y_i$  for some positive integer N. For convenience of notation, set  $Y_0 = Y_{N+1} = \emptyset$  in this setting.

The elements of  $Q \cup Q^{-1}$  are called *state letters* or *q*-letters, while those of  $Y \cup Y^{-1}$  are *tape letters* or *a*-letters. The sets  $Q_i$  and  $Y_i$  are called the *parts* of Q and Y, respectively. Note that the parts of the state letters are typically represented by capital letters, while their elements are represented by lowercase.

For any reduced word  $W \in F(Y \cup Q)$ , define its *a*-length  $|W|_a$  as the number of *a*-letters that comprise it. The *q*-length of W is defined similarly and is denoted  $|W|_q$ .

The language of admissible words of (Y, Q) is the collection of reduced words which are of the form  $W \equiv q_0^{\varepsilon_0} u_1 q_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots u_k q_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  where  $q_i \in Q$ ,  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and each subword  $q_{i-1}^{\varepsilon_{i-1}} u_i q_i^{\varepsilon_i}$  either:

- (1) belongs to  $(Q_{j(i)-1}F(Y_{j(i)})Q_{j(i)})^{\pm 1}$ ;
- (2) has the form  $quq^{-1}$  for  $q \in Q_{j(i)}$  and  $u \in F(Y_{j(i)+1})$ ; or
- (3) has the form  $q^{-1}uq$  for  $q \in Q_{j(i)}$  and  $u \in F(Y_{j(i)})$

In this case, the *base* of W is  $base(W) \equiv Q_{j(0)}^{\varepsilon_0} Q_{j(1)}^{\varepsilon_1} \dots Q_{j(k)}^{\varepsilon_k}$ , where these letters are merely representatives of their corresponding parts, and  $u_i$  is called the  $Q_{j(i)}^{\varepsilon_i} Q_{j(i+1)}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$ -sector of W. Note that the base of an admissible word W need not be a reduced word over the corresponding symbols and that W is permitted to have many sectors of the same name (for example, W may contain many  $Q_0Q_1$ -sectors).

The base  $Q_0Q_1 \ldots Q_N$  is called the *standard base* of (Y, Q). An admissible word with the standard base is called a *configuration*.

Now, let  $Q(\theta)$  be a subset of Q such that  $Q(\theta) \cap Q_i$  is a singleton for each i. If  $Q(\theta) \cap Q_i = \{q_i\}$ , then to  $q_i$  there is an associated word  $u_i q'_i v_{i+1}$  where  $q'_i \in Q_i$ ,  $u_i \in F(Y_i)$ , and  $v_{i+1} \in F(Y_{i+1})$ .

Further, let  $Y(\theta) = \sqcup Y_j(\theta)$  be some subset of Y such that  $Y_j(\theta) \subseteq Y_j$ . For each  $j, Y_j(\theta)$  is called the *domain* of  $\theta$  in the corresponding sector of the standard base.

In this case,  $\theta$  is called an *S*-rule of (Y, Q) and is denoted

$$\theta = [q_0 \to u_0 q'_0 v_1, \ q_1 \to u_1 q'_1 v_2, \dots, q_N \to u_N q'_N v_{N+1}]$$

Note that this notation does not fully specify the rule, as the domain  $Y(\theta)$  is not included.

Suppose W is an admissible word with all its state letters contained in  $Q(\theta) \cup Q(\theta)^{-1}$  and all its tape letters contained in  $Y(\theta) \cup Y(\theta)^{-1}$ . Then, W is said to be  $\theta$ -admissible and  $W \cdot \theta$  is defined to be the admissible word resulting from the simultaneously:

- for all  $q_i \in Q(\theta)$ , replacing every occurrence of  $q_i^{\pm 1}$  in W with  $(u_i q'_i v_{i+1})^{\pm 1}$ , and
- reducing/trimming the resulting word so that it is again admissible.

An important note to stress is that the application of an S-rule results in a reduced word, i.e reduction is not a separate step in the process.

If the *i*-th part of  $\theta$  is  $U_i \to V_i$  and  $Y_{i+1}(\theta) = \emptyset$ , then this part of the rule is denoted  $U_i \xrightarrow{\ell} V_i$  and  $\theta$  is said to *lock* the  $Q_i Q_{i+1}$ -sector of the standard base.

Note that every S-rule  $\theta$  has a natural inverse, namely the S-rule  $\theta^{-1}$  with  $Y(\theta^{-1}) = Y(\theta)$  and  $\theta^{-1} = [q'_0 \to u_0^{-1} q_0 v_1^{-1}, \dots, q'_N \to u_N^{-1} q_N v_{N+1}^{-1}]$ . Note that if W is  $\theta$ -admissible, then  $W \cdot \theta$  is  $\theta^{-1}$ -admissible with  $(W \cdot \theta) \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv W$ .

An *S*-machine **S** with hardware (Y, Q) is defined to be a rewriting system whose software is a finite symmetric set of *S*-rules  $\Theta(\mathbf{S}) = \Theta$ , i.e so that  $\theta \in \Theta$  if and only if  $\theta^{-1} \in \Theta$ .

It is convenient to partition  $\Theta$  into two disjoint sets,  $\Theta^+$  and  $\Theta^-$ , such that  $\theta \in \Theta^+$  if and only if  $\theta^{-1} \in \Theta^-$ . The elements of  $\Theta^+$  are called the *positive rules* and those of  $\Theta^-$  the *negative rules*.

For  $t \geq 0$ , suppose  $W_0, \ldots, W_t$  are admissible words with the same base such that there exist  $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_t \in \Theta$  satisfying  $W_{i-1} \cdot \theta_i \equiv W_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq t$ . Then the sequence of applications of rules  $\mathcal{C} : W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  is called a *computation* of *length* or *time* t of **S**. The word  $H = \theta_1 \ldots \theta_t$  is called the *history* of  $\mathcal{C}$  and the notation  $W_t \equiv W_0 \cdot H$  is used to represent the computation.

A computation is called *reduced* if its history is a reduced word over  $\Theta$ . Note that every computation can be made reduced without changing the initial and final admissible words of the computation by simply removing consecutive mutually inverse rules.

Typically, it is assumed that each part of the state letters contains two (perhaps the same) fixed elements, called the *start* and *end* state letters. A configuration is called a *start* (or *end*) configuration if all its state letters are start (or end) letters.

A recognizing S-machine is one with specified sectors called the *input sectors*. If a start configuration has all sectors empty except for the input sectors, then it is called an *input configuration* and its projection onto  $Y \cup Y^{-1}$  (i.e its image under the map that sends each state letter to 1 and each tape letter to itself) is called its *input*. The end configuration with every sector empty is called the *accept configuration*.

A configuration W is accepted by a recognizing S-machine if there is an accepting computation, i.e. a computation with initial configuration W and final configuration the accept configuration. If W is an accepted input configuration with input u, then u is also said to be accepted.

If the configuration W is accepted by the S-machine **S**, then T(W) is the minimal time of its accepting computations. For a recognizing S-machine **S**, its *time function* is

 $T_{\mathbf{S}}(n) = \max\{T(W) : W \text{ is an accepted input configuration of } \mathbf{S}, |W|_a \le n\}$ 

If two recognizing S-machines have the same language of accepted words and  $\Theta$ -equivalent time functions, then they are said to be *equivalent*.

The following simplifies how one approaches the rules of a recognizing S-machine.

**Lemma 4.1.** (Lemma 2.1 of [17]) Every recognizing S-machine **S** is equivalent to a recognizing S-machine such that for every part  $q_i \to u_i q'_i v_{i+1}$  of every rule,  $||u_i|| + ||v_{i+1}|| \le 1$ .

Through the rest of our discussion of computational models, we will often use copies of words over disjoint alphabets. To be precise, let A and B be disjoint alphabets,  $W \equiv a_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots a_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  with  $a_i \in A$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $\varphi : \{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \to B$  be an injection. Then the *copy* of W over the alphabet B formed by  $\varphi$  is the word  $W' \equiv \varphi(a_1)^{\varepsilon_1} \dots \varphi(a_k)^{\varepsilon_k}$ . Typically, the injection defining the copy will be contextually clear.

Alternatively, a copy of an alphabet A is a disjoint alphabet A' which is in one-to-one correspondence with A. For a word over A, its copy over A' is defined by the correspondence between the alphabets.

#### 4.2. Generalized S-machines.

We now introduce a modification to the definition of S-machines, permitting the rewriting to also take place within a particular sector. The motivation of this alteration will be made clear by the definitions of the associated groups.

Let (Y, Q) be a pair of finite sets with  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{N} Y_i$  and  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{N} Q_i$ .

As in the definition of S-rule, let  $Q(\theta)$  be a subset of Q with  $Q(\theta) \cap Q_i = \{q_i\}$  for each i. In this environment, however, for each i, in place of a domain  $Y_i(\theta)$  we assign two finite subsets  $X_i(\theta), Z_i(\theta) \subseteq F(Y_i)$  which form bases of free subgroups of  $F(Y_i)$  and such that there exists a bijection  $f_{\theta,i} : X_i(\theta) \to Z_i(\theta)$  extending to an isomorphism  $\tilde{f}_{\theta,i} : \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle \to \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$ . Finally, let  $u_i, v_i \in \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$  for all i.

Then the generalized S-rule  $\theta$  is defined as the rewriting rule denoted

$$\theta = [q_0 \to q'_0 v_1, \ q_1 \to u_1 q'_1 v_2, \ \dots, \ q_N \to u_N q'_N]$$

Note that, similar to how the notation for S-rules does not specify the domain of a rule, this notation does not capture the subsets  $X_i(\theta)$  and  $Z_i(\theta)$  or the bijection  $f_{\theta,i}$ .

Let  $w \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$  for some  $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ . Since  $X_i(\theta)$  forms a basis for the corresponding subgroup of  $F(Y_i)$ , there must exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_l \in X_i(\theta)$  and  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_l \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w =_{F(Y_i)} x_1^{\delta_1} \ldots x_k^{\delta_l}$ . In this case, we define the  $\theta$ -length of w,  $l_{\theta}(w)$ , to be the value l, i.e  $l_{\theta}(w) = |w|_{X_i(\theta)}$ . Note that if  $X_i(\theta) \subseteq Y_i$ , then  $l_{\theta}(w) = ||w||$ .

Now suppose  $W \equiv p_0 w_1 p_1 \dots p_{k-1} w_k p_k$  is an admissible word where for each  $i, p_i \in Q(\theta) \cup Q(\theta)^{-1}$ and  $w_i \in \langle X_{j(i)}(\theta) \rangle$  for some  $j(i) \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Then W is said to be  $\theta$ -admissible, with the application  $W \cdot \theta$  taken as the admissible word resulting from simultaneously doing the following:

- for all *i*, replace  $w_i$  with  $\tilde{f}_{\theta,j(i)}(w_i)$ ,
- for all *i*, replace  $p_i$  with  $(u_j q'_i v_{j+1})^{\pm 1}$  where  $p_i = q_i^{\pm 1}$ , and
- reduce/trim the resulting word so that it is again admissible.

The  $\theta$ -length of W is then defined to be  $l_{\theta}(W) = (k+1) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} l_{\theta}(w_i)$ . As above, note that if  $X_{j(i)}(\theta) \subseteq Y_{j(i)}$  for all i, then  $l_{\theta}(W)$  is simply ||W||.

As with S-rules, it is important to stress that the application of a generalized S-rule immediately results in an admissible word.

Also, note that if  $X_i(\theta) = Z_i(\theta)$  and  $f_{\theta,i}$  is the identity map for each *i*, then  $\theta$  can be regarded as an S-rule with  $Y_i(\theta) = X_i(\theta)$ . As such, every S-rule can be viewed as a generalized S-rule.

We then extend the definition of locked sector to say that the generalized S-rule  $\theta$  locks the  $Q_i Q_{i+1}$ -sector of the standard base if  $X_i(\theta) = Z_i(\theta) = \emptyset$  (and so  $\tilde{f}_{\theta,i}$  is the identity map on the trivial group). As with S-rules, this is denoted by  $q_i \stackrel{\ell}{\to} q'_i$  in the definition of  $\theta$ .

Next, we define the inverse  $\theta^{-1}$  of the generalized *S*-rule  $\theta$ . For this, let  $Q(\theta^{-1})$  be the subset of Q with  $Q(\theta^{-1}) \cap Q_i = \{q'_i\}$  for all i, let  $X_i(\theta^{-1}) = Z_i(\theta)$  and  $Z_i(\theta^{-1}) = X_i(\theta)$  for all i, and let  $f_{\theta^{-1},i} = f_{\theta,i}^{-1}$  for all i. Then, we set

$$\theta^{-1} = [q'_0 \to q_0 \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},1}(v_1^{-1}), \ q'_1 \to \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},1}(u_1^{-1})q_1 \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},2}(v_2^{-1}), \dots, \ q'_N \to \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},N}(u_N^{-1})q_N]$$

Note that inversion is indeed an involutional operation on generalized S-rules, i.e  $(\theta^{-1})^{-1} = \theta$ . Then, following the definition of S-machine, a generalized S-machine is a triple  $(Y, Q, \Theta)$  where

 $\Theta = \Theta^+ \sqcup \Theta^-$  is a symmetric set of generalized S-rules.

The following statement is critical to our study of computations of generalized S-machines.

**Lemma 4.2.** Suppose  $\theta = [q_0 \to q'_0 v_1, q_1 \to u_1 q'_1 v_2, \ldots, q_N \to u_N q'_N]$  is a generalized S-rule and W is  $\theta$ -admissible. Then  $W \cdot \theta$  is  $\theta^{-1}$ -admissible with  $(W \cdot \theta) \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv W$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to prove this for admissible words with two-letter base.

Say the base of W is  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ , so that  $W \equiv q_{i-1}w_iq_i$  for some  $w_i \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$ . Then it follows that  $W \cdot \theta = q'_{i-1}v_i \tilde{f}_{\theta,i}(w_i)u_iq'_i$ .

Since  $v_i \tilde{f}_{\theta,i}(w_i) u_i \in \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle = \langle X_i(\theta^{-1}) \rangle$ ,  $W \cdot \theta$  is  $\theta^{-1}$ -admissible with

$$(W \cdot \theta) \cdot \theta^{-1} = (q_{i-1}\widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(v_i^{-1})) \cdot \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(v_i\widetilde{f}_{\theta,i}(w_i)u_i) \cdot (\widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(u_i^{-1})q_i)$$
$$= q_{i-1}\widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(v_i)^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(v_i)w\widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(u_i) \cdot \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(u_i)^{-1}q_i$$
$$= q_{i-1}wq_i \equiv W$$

The other cases, i.e where the base of W is unreduced, are proved in a similar manner.

It will prove useful in the sequel to consider a weakened version of computation in regards to generalized *S*-machines, called *semi-computations*.

Given a reduced word  $w \in F(Y_i)$ , w is said to be  $\theta$ -applicable for  $\theta \in \Theta$  if  $w \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$ . Then, the application of  $\theta$  to w is taken to be  $w \cdot \theta = \tilde{f}_{\theta,i}(w)$ .

Note that an analogue of Lemma 4.2 in this setting is immediate by construction, i.e  $w \cdot \theta$  is  $\theta^{-1}$ -applicable with  $(w \cdot \theta) \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv w$ . As  $\tilde{f}_{\theta,i}$  is an isomorphism,  $l_{\theta^{-1}}(w \cdot \theta) = l_{\theta}(w)$ .

As with the definition of computation, this generalizes naturally to the concept of semi-computation: If  $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_t \in F(Y_i)$  and  $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_t \in \Theta$  such that  $w_{i-1} \cdot \theta_i = w_i$  for  $i = 1, \ldots, t$ , then there is a corresponding *semi-computation in the*  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector, denoted  $S: w_0 \to w_1 \to \cdots \to w_t$ . The history of S is defined to be the word  $H \equiv \theta_1 \ldots \theta_t$  and S is called reduced if H is a reduced word.

Note that semi-computations can be defined in the same way for S-machines; however, in that setting, semi-computations are merely constant sequences.

Moreover, for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $1 \cdot \theta = 1$  where 1 represents the trivial word in  $F(Y_i)$ . So, for any semicomputation  $\mathcal{S}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector,  $w_j = 1$  for some j if and only if  $w_j = 1$  for all j, in which case  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a *trivial semi-computation*.

Hence, the next statement is an immediate consequence of the definition of a locked sector:

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $S: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a semi-computation in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector with history  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$ . If there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$  such that  $\theta_j$  locks the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector, then S is a trivial semi-computation.

# 5. Auxiliary Machines

In this section, several machines are constructed with respect to some fixed finite non-empty alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  and recursive set  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$  of positive words over  $\mathcal{A}$ . These sets are treated generally until Sections 13-16, as the proofs therein require different setups.

However, it is critical to note that the relevant contexts call for  $\mathcal{A}$  to be taken to be an alphabet whose cardinality is bounded above by a linear function of C, justifying the parameter assignments in the sections that follow.

### 5.1. The machine $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

The first machine in this construction is the generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  that will assure the malnormality of the embedding of Theorem 1.1. Note the naming of the machine indicates that its makeup only depends on the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  and not the specific language  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be copies of the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  given by the bijections  $\varphi_i : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}_i$ . For simplicity, denote  $\varphi_i(a) = a_i$  for each  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\widetilde{\varphi}_i : F(\mathcal{A}) \to F(\mathcal{A}_i)$  be the isomorphism induced by  $\varphi_i$ .

Further, let  $\mathcal{B} = \{b_1, b_2\}$  be a set of auxiliary letters.

Then, the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $(Y_1^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup Y_2^{\mathcal{A}}, Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup Q_1^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup Q_2^{\mathcal{A}})$ , where:

- $Q_i^{\mathcal{A}} = \{q_i\}$  for i = 0, 1, 2•  $Y_1^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $Y_2^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_2$ .

Let  $D_{\mathcal{A}} = 4|(\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{A}| = 4|\mathcal{A}|(|\mathcal{A}|+2)$  and fix a bijection  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}} : (\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{A} \to \{1, \ldots, D_{\mathcal{A}}/4\}$ . Then, for  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , define  $v(y, a) = b_1^k (b_2 b_1)^{D_{\mathcal{A}} - 2k} b_2^k \in F(\mathcal{B})$  for  $k = \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(y, a)$ . Note that for all  $(y, a) \in (\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{A}, ||v(y, a)|| = D_{\mathcal{A}}.$ 

Let  $S_{\mathcal{A}} = \{ v(y, a) : (y, a) \in (\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{A} \}.$ 

**Lemma 5.1.** For  $(y_1, a_1), (y_2, a_2) \in (\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}) \times \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{\pm 1\}$ , either  $(y_1, a_1) = (y_2, a_2)$  and  $\varepsilon_1 = -\varepsilon_2$  or less than  $\frac{1}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}$  letters of  $v(y_j, a_j)$  are cancelled in the product  $v(y_1, a_1)^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot v(y_2, a_2)^{\varepsilon_2}$ . In particular,  $S_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a basis for a (free) subgroup of  $F(\mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* If  $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2$ , then no letters are cancelled in the product  $v(y_1, a_1)^{\varepsilon_1} \cdot v(y_2, a_2)^{\varepsilon_2}$ . So, it suffices to assume that  $\varepsilon_1 = -\varepsilon_2$  and  $(y_1, a_1) \neq (y_2, a_2)$ .

But then exactly  $\min\{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(y_1, a_1), \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(y_2, a_2)\} < \frac{1}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}$  cancellations take place in this product.

For fixed  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_{1,y} = \{v(y,a) \cdot a_1 : a \in \mathcal{A}\} \subseteq F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}).$ 

**Lemma 5.2.** For all  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  is a basis for  $F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ .

*Proof.* For all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $v(y, a)^{-1} \in \langle \mathcal{B} \rangle \leq \langle \mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B} \rangle$ . So,  $a_1 = v(y, a)^{-1} \cdot (v(y, a) \cdot a_1) \in \langle \mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B} \rangle$ , meaning  $\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B} \subseteq \langle \mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B} \rangle$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  generates  $F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ .

Now, let  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_k \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w \equiv x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  is a non-empty reduced word over  $(\mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ . Suppose that w represents 1 in  $F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  when viewed as a word over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ .

If  $x_i \in \mathcal{B}$  for each i, then no cancellations occur in the factorization defining w, and so w cannot be trivial in  $F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ . Hence, w must contain a letter from  $\mathcal{A}_1$ .

As w is freely trivial over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ , there exists a sequence of cancellations taking the product  $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  to the empty word. Considering the first cancellation in this sequence which cancels mutually elements of  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , there exists a subword of w (as a word over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ ) of the form  $a_1^{\pm 1} v a_1^{\pm 1}$  for some  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  such that v is a freely trivial word over  $\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}$ .

As each letter of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  appears exactly once in the words defining  $\mathcal{A}_{1,y}$ , it follows that there exists  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$  such that  $x_i = x_j = v(y, a) \cdot a_1$ ,  $\varepsilon_i = -\varepsilon_j$ , and  $x_\ell \in \mathcal{B}$  for each  $i+1 \leq \ell \leq j-1$ . Then,  $w' = x_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}} \dots x_{j-1}^{\varepsilon_{j-1}}$  is a reduced word conjugate to v in  $F(\mathcal{B})$ , and so is freely trivial. As above, this implies that w' is freely trivial, and so empty. But then j = i + 1, contradicting the assumption that w is reduced over  $(\mathcal{A}_{1,y} \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ .

In light of Lemma 5.2, the set of positive generalized S-rules of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  is defined as follows:

- For  $i = 1, 2, \ \theta_{b_i} = [q_0 \to q_0, \ q_1 \to b_i^{-1} q_1, \ q_2 \to q_2],$  $X_1(\theta_{b_i}) = \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}, \ Z_1(\theta_{b_i}) = \mathcal{A}_{1,b_i} \sqcup \mathcal{B}, \ X_2(\theta_{b_i}) = Z_2(\theta_{b_i}) = \mathcal{A}_2,$  $f_{\theta_{b_i},1}(a_1) = v(b_i, a) \cdot a_1$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}, f_{\theta_{b_i},1}(b_j) = b_j$  for j = 1, 2, and  $f_{\theta_{b_1},2} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$ .
- For all  $y \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\theta_y = [q_0 \rightarrow q_0, q_1 \rightarrow y_1^{-1}q_1y_2, q_2 \rightarrow q_2],$  $X_1(\theta_u) = \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}, \ Z_1(\theta_u) = \mathcal{A}_{1,u} \sqcup \mathcal{B}, \ X_2(\theta_u) = Z_2(\theta_u) = \mathcal{A}_2,$  $f_{\theta_{y,1}}(a_1) = v(y,a) \cdot a_1$  for all  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $f_{\theta_{y,1}}(b_j) = b_j$  for j = 1, 2, and  $f_{\theta_{y,2}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}_2}$ .

By Lemma 5.2,  $\langle X_1(\theta_y) \rangle = \langle Z_1(\theta_y) \rangle = F(Y_1^{\mathcal{A}})$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ . Hence, any admissible word of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $\theta_{y}^{\pm 1}$ -admissible, while any word  $w \in F(Y_{j}^{\mathcal{A}})$  is  $\theta_{y}^{\pm 1}$ -applicable.

Further, note that for  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\tilde{f}_{\theta_a,1}(v(a,a)^{-1} \cdot a_1) = a_1$ . As a result,

$$\theta_a^{-1} = [q_0 \to q_0, \ q_1 \to v(a, a)^{-1} a_1 q_1 a_2^{-1}, \ q_2 \to q_2]$$

For any word  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -projection of  $w, \delta(w)$ , is defined to be the (unreduced) word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  obtained from w by removing any occurrence of  $b_i^{\pm 1}$  and applying  $\varphi_1^{-1}$  to each letter in the remaining word. The  $\mathcal{A}$ -length of w is then taken to be  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} = ||\delta(w)||$ . Similarly, the *b*-length is defined as  $|w|_b = ||w|| - |w|_A$ .

For any configuration  $W \equiv q_0 w_1 q_1 w_2 q_2$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -projection of W is defined to be the (reduced) word  $\varepsilon(W) = w'_1 w'_2 \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , where  $w'_1 = \delta(w_1)$  and  $w'_2 = \widetilde{\varphi}_2^{-1}(w_2)$ .

The following statement is an immediate consequence of the construction of the software of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ :

**Lemma 5.3.** For any  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and any configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\varepsilon(W) \equiv \varepsilon(W \cdot \theta_y^{\pm 1})$ .

**Lemma 5.4.** For  $u, v \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , suppose there exists a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  such that  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \widetilde{\varphi}_1(u) q_1 q_2$  and  $W_t \equiv q_0 q_1 \widetilde{\varphi}_2(v) q_2$ . Then  $u \equiv v$ .

*Proof.* Noting that  $\varepsilon(W_0) \equiv u$  and  $\varepsilon(W_t) \equiv v$ , the statement follows from Lemma 5.3.

Similarly, the next statement is a corollary to Lemma 5.3:

**Lemma 5.5.** For  $u, v \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , suppose there exists a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  such that  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \widetilde{\varphi}_1(u) q_1 q_2$  and  $W_t \equiv q_0 \widetilde{\varphi}_1(v) q_1 q_2$ . Then  $u \equiv v$ .

Similarly, the following statement is an immediate consequence of the definition of the rules:

**Lemma 5.6.** Let W be an admissible word of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ . For any  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}, |W \cdot \theta_u^{\varepsilon}|_a \le c_0(|W|_a + 1).$ 

*Proof.* Let  $W \equiv q_0 w q_1$  with  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$  for  $u_i \in F(\mathcal{B}), x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$ , and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Then,  $W \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon} \equiv q_0 w' v q_1$  where:

- $w' = u_0(v(y, \tilde{x}_1)x_1)^{\delta_1}u_1(v(y, \tilde{x}_2)x_k)^{\delta_2}\dots u_{k-1}(v(y, \tilde{x}_k)x_k)^{\delta_k}u_k$ , where  $\tilde{x}_i = \varphi_1^{-1}(x_i)$

- $v = y^{-\varepsilon}$  if  $y \in \mathcal{B}$   $v = y_1^{-1}$  if  $y \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon = 1$   $v = v(y, y)y_1$  if  $y \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon = -1$

As a result,

$$|W \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon}|_a = ||w'v|| \le ||w'|| + ||v|| \le ||w|| + D_{\mathcal{A}}k + (D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)$$
  
= (||w|| + 1) + D\_{\mathcal{A}}(|w|\_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)  
\$\le (D\_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)(|W|\_a + 1)\$

As  $|\mathcal{A}|$  is bounded above by a linear function of C,  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  is bounded above by a quadratic function of C. As a result, the parameter assignment  $c_0 >> C$  given in Section 2.2 can be interpreted as  $c_0 >> D_{\mathcal{A}}$ , implying the statement.

**Lemma 5.7.** For any  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  and  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\delta(w \cdot \theta_y^{\pm 1}) \equiv \delta(w)$ .

*Proof.* If  $w \in F(\mathcal{B})$ , then  $w \cdot \theta_y^{\pm 1} \equiv w$ . Hence, it suffices to assume that there exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_k \in F(\mathcal{B})$ , such that  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \ldots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$ .

Suppose there exists  $i \in \{1, ..., k-1\}$  such that  $x_i = x_{i+1}$  and  $\delta_i = -\delta_{i+1}$ . Then, since w is reduced,  $u_i$  must be non-trivial.

Then, letting  $\widetilde{x}_j = \varphi_1^{-1}(x_j)$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ , it follows that  $w \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon}$  is freely equal to:  $u_0(v(y,\widetilde{x}_1)^{\varepsilon}x_1)^{\delta_1}u_1(v(y,\widetilde{x}_2)^{\varepsilon}x_2)^{\delta_2}\dots u_{k-1}(v(y,\widetilde{x}_k)^{\varepsilon}x_k)^{\delta_k}u_k$ 

Note that for each *i*, this word contains a subword  $x_i^{\delta_i} v_i x_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}$  where  $v_i$  is freely conjugate to  $u_i$ . As a result,  $x_i^{\delta_i}$  and  $x_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}$  cannot cancel in this product. Hence, no letter from  $\mathcal{A}_1$  cancels, and thus  $\delta(w \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon}) \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} \equiv \delta(w)$ .

**Lemma 5.8.** Let  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ ,  $W \equiv q_0 w q_1$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ , and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Set  $w' \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  such that  $W \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon} \equiv q_0 w' q_1$ .

- (a) If  $y \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $\delta(w') \equiv \delta(w)$ .
- (b) If  $y \in \mathcal{A}$ , then either  $\delta(w') \equiv \delta(w)y^{-\varepsilon}$  or  $\delta(w')y^{\varepsilon} \equiv \delta(w)$ .

*Proof.* If  $y \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $w' = (w \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon})y^{-\varepsilon}$ , so that  $\delta(w') \equiv \delta(w \cdot \theta_y^{\varepsilon})$ . So, the statement follows from Lemma 5.7.

If  $y \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon = 1$ , then  $w' = (w \cdot \theta_y)\varphi_1(y)^{-1}$ . If  $\varphi_1(y)^{-1}$  does not cancel in reducing, then  $\delta(w') \equiv \delta(w \cdot \theta_y)y^{-1}$ ; if it does cancel, then  $\delta(w \cdot \theta_y) \equiv \delta(w')y$ . Hence, the statement follows from Lemma 5.7.

If  $y \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon = -1$ , then  $w' = (w \cdot \theta_y)v(y, y)^{-1}\varphi_1(y)$ . Thus, the statement follows by the same argument as above.

**Lemma 5.9.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Set  $W_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  for all *i*. If  $|w_0|_{\mathcal{A}} < |w_1|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $|w_{i-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} \le |w_i|_{\mathcal{A}}$  for all  $1 \le i \le t$ .

*Proof.* Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Assuming to the contrary, let  $m \in \{2, \ldots, t\}$  be the minimal index such that  $|w_{m-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} > |w_m|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then, let  $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$  be the maximal index such that  $|w_{\ell-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} < |w_{\ell}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

By Lemma 5.8, there exists  $a, a' \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_{\ell} = \theta_a^{\varepsilon}$  and  $\theta_m = \theta_{a'}^{\varepsilon'}$  so that  $\delta(w_{\ell}) \equiv \delta(w_{\ell-1})a^{-\varepsilon}$  and  $\delta(w_m)(a')^{\varepsilon'} \equiv \delta(w_{m-1})$ .

Further, the minimality of m and the maximality of  $\ell$  imply that  $|w_{\ell}|_{\mathcal{A}} = \cdots = |w_{m-1}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , so that Lemma 5.8 implies that  $\theta_i \in \{\theta_{b_1}^{\pm 1}, \theta_{b_2}^{\pm 1}\}$  for all  $\ell + 1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . So,  $\delta(w_{\ell}) \equiv \cdots \equiv \delta(w_{m-1})$ .

As a result, a = a' and  $\varepsilon = -\varepsilon'$ . Hence, as H is reduced,  $m > \ell + 1$ .

Let  $y_{\ell+1}, \ldots, y_{m-1} \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\delta_{\ell+1}, \ldots, \delta_{m-1} \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_i = \theta_{y_i}^{\delta_i}$  for all  $\ell + 1 \leq i \leq m-1$ . Letting  $v \equiv y_{\ell+1}^{-\delta_{\ell+1}} \ldots y_{m-1}^{-\delta_{m-1}}$ , it follows that v must be reduced.

Suppose  $\varepsilon = -1$ . Then,  $w_{\ell} \equiv u_{\ell}a_1$  for some  $u_{\ell} \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ . So,  $w_{m-1} \equiv u_{m-1}a_1v$  for some  $u_{m-1} \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ . But then  $w_m = (u_{m-1}a_1 \cdot \theta_a)va_1^{-1}$ , so that  $\delta(w_m) \equiv \delta(w_{m-1})a^{-1}$  since v is non-trivial, contradicting the hypothesis for m.

Conversely, suppose  $\varepsilon = 1$ . As above, this implies that  $w_{\ell} \equiv u'_{\ell}a_1^{-1}$  for some  $u'_{\ell} \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ . So, letting  $z = \prod_{i=\ell+1}^{m-1} v(y_i, a)$ , it follows that  $w_{m-1} = u'_{m-1}a_1^{-1}z^{-1}v$  for some  $u'_{m-1} \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ .

Since the product defining z is reduced as an element of  $\langle S_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ , it follows from Lemma 5.1 that  $||z|| \geq \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}||v||$ . So, since  $D_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 4$ ,  $||z^{-1}v|| \geq ||z|| - ||v|| \geq ||v|| \geq 1$ . In particular  $z^{-1}v$  is a non-trivial element of  $F(\mathcal{B})$ .

Hence,  $w_m = (u'_{m-1} \cdot \theta_a^{-1})a_1^{-1}v(a,a)(z^{-1}v)v(a,a)^{-1}a_1$ , so that  $\delta(w_m) \equiv \delta(w_{m-1})a$ , again yielding a contradiction.

Suppose there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  such that for  $W_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  for all i,

$$|w_0|_{\mathcal{A}} = \dots = |w_{t-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} = |w_t|_{\mathcal{A}} + 1$$

Then,  $w_0$  is called *rear shiftable* and C is called a *rear shift of* w.

Note that  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 1$  for any rear shiftable word  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ , and so there exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_k \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that

$$w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$$

**Lemma 5.10.** Let  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  and suppose  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$  with  $\delta_k = 1$ . Then w is rear shiftable. Moreover, there exists a unique rear shift  $\mathcal{C} : W_0 \to \dots \to W_t$  of w which satisfies:

- (a)  $t = ||u_k|| + 1$
- (b) For all i = 1, ..., t 1,  $W_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  where  $w_i \equiv u_0^{(i)} x_1^{\delta_1} u_1^{(i)} x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1}^{(i)} x_k u_k^{(i)}$  such that  $\|u_i^{(i)}\| \le \|u_j\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}i$  for  $0 \le j \le k 1$  and  $\|u_k^{(i)}\| = \|u_k\| i$
- (c)  $W_t \equiv q_0 w' q_1$  where  $w' \equiv u'_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u'_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u'_{k-1}$  such that  $||u'_j|| \le ||u_j|| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  for all  $0 \le j \le k-1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $x_k = a_1$ .

If  $u_k = 1$ , then  $W_0 \cdot \theta_a \equiv q_0 w' q_1$  where

$$w' = u_0(v_{k,1}x_1)^{\delta_1} u_1(v_{k,2}x_2)^{\delta_2} \dots (v_{k,k-1}x_{k-1})^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1}v_{k,k}$$

such that  $v_{k,j} = v(a, \varphi_1^{-1}(x_j))$  for all  $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ . Since  $||v_{k,j}|| = D_{\mathcal{A}}$  for all j, the one-rule computation  $W_0 \to W_0 \cdot \theta_{x_k}$  is a rear shift of w satisfying the statement.

Otherwise, setting  $m = ||u_k||$ , let  $y_1, \ldots, y_m \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_m \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $u_k \equiv y_m^{\varepsilon_m} \ldots y_1^{\varepsilon_1}$ . Then, for  $i = 1, \ldots, m$ , let  $H_i = \theta_{y_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots \theta_{y_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ . Further, for  $j = 1, \ldots, k$  and  $i = 1, \ldots, m$ , define  $v_j^{(i)} = \prod_{\ell=1}^i v(y_\ell, \varphi_1^{-1}(x_j))^{\varepsilon_\ell}$ .

Then, for all  $i = 1, ..., m, W_0 \cdot H_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  where

$$w_i = u_0 (v_1^{(i)} x_1)^{\delta_1} u_1 (v_2^{(i)} x_2)^{\delta_2} \dots (v_{k-1}^{(i)} x_{k-1})^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1} v_k^{(i)} a_1 u_k^{(i)}$$

such that  $u_k^{(i)} = y_m^{\varepsilon_m} \dots y_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$  (with  $u_k^{(m)} = 1$ ). Hence, since  $||v_j^{(m)}|| \leq D_{\mathcal{A}}m$ , the computation with history  $H_m \theta_a$  is a rear shift of w satisfying the given bounds.

Now, suppose  $\mathcal{C}': W_0 \equiv W'_0 \to \cdots \to W'_{s+1}$  is another rear shift of w. By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, there exists  $z_1, \ldots, z_s \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_s \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that the history H' of  $\mathcal{C}'$  satisfies  $H' \equiv \theta_{z_1}^{\nu_1} \ldots \theta_{z_s}^{\nu_s} \theta_a$ . Letting  $H'_0$  be the prefix  $\theta_{z_1}^{\nu_1} \ldots \theta_{z_s}^{\nu_s}$  of  $H', w_0 \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \ldots u_{k-1}$  the prefix of  $w, \bar{v} = \prod_{i=1}^s v(y'_i, a)$ , and  $z \equiv z_1^{-\nu_1} \ldots z_s^{-\nu_s}$ , it follows that  $W'_s \equiv W'_0 \cdot H'_0 = q_0(w_0 \cdot H'_0) \bar{v} a_1 u_k z q_1$ . Then,  $W'_{s+1} = q_0(w_0 \cdot H') \bar{v} v(a, a) a_1 u_k z a_1^{-1} q_1$ , so that  $u_k z$  must be freely trivial since  $a_1$  and  $a_1^{-1}$  cancel by hypothesis. Since H' is reduced, z is also reduced, and so  $u_k \equiv z^{-1}$ . But then  $H' \equiv H$ , i.e  $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** Let  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$  be a rear shiftable word. Then for any rear shift  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \dots \to W_t$  of w:

- (a)  $t \le ||u_k|| + 1$
- (b) For all i = 1, ..., t 1,  $W_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  where  $w_i \equiv u_0^{(i)} x_1^{\delta_1} u_1^{(i)} x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1}^{(i)} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k^{(i)}$  such that  $\|u_i^{(i)}\| \le \|u_i\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}i$  for  $0 \le j \le k$
- (c)  $W_t \equiv q_0 w' q_1$  where  $w' \equiv u'_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u'_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u'_{k-1}$  such that  $||u'_j|| \le ||u_j|| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  for all  $0 \le j \le k-1$

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.10, it may be assumed that  $\delta_k = -1$ . Let  $w_0$  be the prefix of w given by  $w_0 \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1}$ . Further, let  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $x_k = a_1$ . So,  $w \equiv w_0 a_1^{-1} u_k$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a rear shift of w with history  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$ . By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9,  $\theta_t = \theta_a^{-1}$  and, for all  $1 \le i \le t - 1$ , there exists  $y_i \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_i = \theta_{y_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ .

Then, letting  $\bar{v} = \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} v(y_i, a)^{\varepsilon_i}$  and  $z = y_1^{-\varepsilon_1} \dots y_{t-1}^{-\varepsilon_{t-1}}$ , it follows that  $W_t = q_0(w_0 \cdot H)a_1^{-1}v(a, a)\bar{v}^{-1}u_k zv(a, a)^{-1}a_1q_1$ 

So, since  $a_1^{-1}$  and  $a_1$  cancel by hypothesis, the word  $v(a, a)\bar{v}^{-1}u_kzv(a, a)^{-1}$  must be freely trivial. In particular, this implies that  $u_kz$  must be freely equal to  $\bar{v}$ . Since the product defining  $\bar{v}$  is reduced as an element of  $\langle S_A \rangle$ , Lemma 5.1 implies  $||u_kz|| = ||\bar{v}|| \ge \frac{1}{2}D_A t$ . Hence, since  $D_A \ge 4$ ,  $||u_k|| \ge ||u_kz|| - ||z|| \ge (\frac{1}{2}D_A - 1)t \ge t$ .

The bound on  $||u_j^{(i)}||$  and  $||u_j'||$  follow from this bound on t in much the same way as in the proof of Lemma 5.10.

Similar to the previous definition, a word  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  is called *shiftable* if there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  such that  $W_0 \equiv q_0 w q_1$  and  $W_t \equiv q_0 q_1$ . Accordingly, the computation  $\mathcal{C}$  in this case is called a *shift of* w. **Lemma 5.12.** Any word  $w \in F(\mathcal{B})$  is shiftable. Moreover, in this case there exists a unique shift  $\mathcal{C}_w: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of w, which satisfies t = ||w||.

*Proof.* By hypothesis, there exists  $y_1, \ldots, y_t \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_t \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w \equiv y_t^{\varepsilon_t} \ldots y_1^{\varepsilon_1}$ . Then, letting  $W_0 \equiv q_0 w q_1$ , the computation  $\mathcal{C}_w : W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  with history  $\theta_{y_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots \theta_{y_t}^{\varepsilon_t}$  is a shift of w with  $W_i \equiv q_0 y_t^{\varepsilon_t} \ldots y_{i+1}^{\varepsilon_{i+1}} q_1$  for all i.

Now, suppose  $\mathcal{C}': W_0 \equiv W'_0 \to \cdots \to W'_s \equiv W_t$  is a shift of w. Let H' be the history of  $\mathcal{C}'$ . By Lemmas 5.8 and 5.9, there exist  $z_1, \ldots, z_s \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_s \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $H' \equiv \theta_{z_1}^{\nu_1} \ldots \theta_{z_s}^{\nu_s}$ .

Then, letting  $z \equiv z_1^{-\nu_1} \dots z_s^{-\nu_s}$ , it follows that  $W'_s \equiv W_0 \cdot H' = q_0 w z q_1$ . Since H' is reduced, z must also be reduced. So,  $w \equiv z^{-1}$ .

But then H' = H, and so  $\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C}_w$ .

The following is an immediate consequence of Lemmas 5.10 and 5.12:

**Lemma 5.13.** For any  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  such that  $\delta(w) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ , w is shiftable. Moreover, there exists a unique shift of w.

**Lemma 5.14.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ . If  $W_0 \equiv q_0 q_1 \equiv W_t$ , then t = 0.

*Proof.* By definition, C is a shift of the trivial word 1. But an empty computation also constitutes a shift of the empty word, so that the statement follows from Lemma 5.13.

**Lemma 5.15.** For any  $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ , there exists a (unique) reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$ of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base such that  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1(w) q_1 q_2$  and  $W_t \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(w) q_2$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.13, there exists a (unique) shift  $\mathcal{D}: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  of  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(w)$ . Let H be the history of  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Since every configuration is  $\theta$ -admissible for any rule  $\theta$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ , there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  in the standard base with history H such that  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1(w) q_1 q_2$ . Hence, the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ . But then  $\mathcal{C}$  must satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4, so that  $W_t \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(w) q_2$ .

The uniqueness of C is given by applying Lemma 5.13 to the restriction of any such computation to the base  $Q_0^A Q_1^A$ .

**Lemma 5.16.** Suppose  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  is shiftable. Then there exists a unique shift of w $\mathcal{C}_w: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{C}_w$  satisfies  $t \leq ||w|| + ||w|| c_0^{||w||}$ .

Proof. First, let  $C_1 : W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  and  $C_2 : V_0 \to \cdots \to V_s$  be two shifts of w. Then, letting  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  be the histories of these computations, respectively, there exists a (possibly unreduced) computation  $\mathcal{D} : V_s \to \cdots \to V_0 \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  with history  $H_2^{-1}H_1$ . Since  $V_s \equiv q_0q_1 \equiv W_t$ , Lemma 5.14 implies the reduced version of  $\mathcal{D}$  must be empty. Thus,  $H_1 = H_2$ , i.e the shift of w is unique.

Now, let  $C_w : W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be the shift of w. By Lemma 5.12, it suffices to assume that  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 1$ . So,  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$  for some  $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathcal{A}_1, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k \in F(\mathcal{B})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a shift of w and set  $W_i \equiv q_0 w_i q_1$  for all i. By Lemma 5.9, there exist  $1 \leq t_1 < \cdots < t_k \leq t$  such that  $|w_{t_j}|_{\mathcal{A}} = k - j$  while  $|w_{t_j-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} = k - j + 1$ . For completeness, set  $t_0 = 0$  and  $t_{k+1} = t$ .

Then, for  $j = 1, \ldots, k+1$ , let  $C_j : W_{t_{j-1}} \to \cdots \to W_{t_j}$  be the corresponding subcomputation of C. For each  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , Lemma 5.8 implies  $w_{t_j} \equiv u_0^{(j)} x_1^{\delta_1} u_1^{(j)} x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-j-1} x_{k-j}^{\delta_{k-j}} u_{k-j}^{(j)}$  for some words  $u_i^{(j)} \in F(\mathcal{B})$ . As above, set  $u_i^{(0)} \equiv u_i$ . By construction,  $w_{t_k} \equiv u_0^{(k)} \in F(\mathcal{B})$ , so that Lemma 5.12 yields the inequalities  $t_{k+1} - t_k = ||u_0^{(k)}||$  and  $|W_i|_a \leq ||u_0^{(k)}||$  for all  $t_k \leq i \leq t$ .

Further, for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $C_j$  is a rear shift of  $w_{t_{j-1}}$ . Lemma 5.11 then implies  $t_j - t_{j-1} \leq ||u_{k-j+1}^{(j-1)}|| + 1$ and  $||u_i^{(j)}|| \leq ||u_i^{(j-1)}|| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}(t_j - t_{j-1}) \leq ||u_i^{(j-1)}|| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}(||u_{k-j+1}^{(j-1)}|| + 1)$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq k-j$ . Iterating, this second inequality yields:

$$\|u_i^{(j)}\| \le \|u_i^{(0)}\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}j$$
(5.1)

for any  $0 \le i \le k - j$ . In particular,  $\|u_{k-1}^{(1)}\| \le \|u_{k-1}^{(0)}\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}\|u_{k}^{(0)}\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}$ , so that:

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{1} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| \le \sum_{\ell=0}^{1} (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{1-\ell} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(0)}\| + (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)$$
(5.2)

Now suppose  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| \le \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} (2D_{\mathcal{A}}+1)^{j-1-\ell} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(0)}\| + (j-1)(2D_{\mathcal{A}}+1)^{j-1}$  for some  $2 \le j \le k$ . Then, using (5.1) and (5.2) and noting that  $(2D_{\mathcal{A}}+1)^j \ge 2D_{\mathcal{A}}j$  for  $D_{\mathcal{A}} \ge 4$  and  $j \ge 2$ :

$$\begin{split} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| &\leq \|u_{k-j}^{(j)}\| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| \leq \|u_{k-j}^{(0)}\| + (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)\sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\| + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}j \\ &\leq \|u_{k-j}^{(0)}\| + \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{j-\ell} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(0)}\| + (j-1)(2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{j} + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}j \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{j} (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{j-\ell} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(0)}\| + j(2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{j} \end{split}$$

As a result,

$$t = t_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} (t_j - t_{j-1}) \le \sum_{j=1}^k (\|u_{k-j+1}^{(j-1)}\| + 1) + \|u_0^{(k)}\| \le k + \sum_{\ell=0}^k \|u_{k-\ell}^{(\ell)}\|$$
$$\le k + \sum_{\ell=0}^k (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{k-\ell} \|u_{k-\ell}^{(0)}\| + k(2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^k$$
$$\le k + (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^k \left(\sum_{i=0}^k \|u_i^{(0)}\| + k\right)$$
$$\le \|w\|_{\mathcal{A}} + (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{|w|_{\mathcal{A}}} (\|w\|_b + \|w\|_{\mathcal{A}}) \le \|w\| + \|w\| (2D_{\mathcal{A}} + 1)^{|w||}$$

Thus, the bound follows by the parameter choice  $c_0 >> D_A$  arising from  $c_0 >> C$ .

Note that the upper bound on the length of the reduced computation given in Lemma 5.16 is not sharp. For example, in the setting of Lemma 5.13, the factor of ||w|| in the product  $\|w\|(2D_{\mathcal{A}}+1)^{\|w\|}$  may be removed. However, such improvements will prove most for the purposes of this manuscript.

Now, we study semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector. The next statement is a vital first step in this and will be crucial to proving the malnormality of the embedding of Theorem 1.1:

**Lemma 5.17.** Let  $S: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a reduced semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2} x_3^{\delta_3}$  for some  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Then, there exist  $u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3 \in F(\mathcal{B})$ such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2 x_3^{\delta_3} u_3$
- (2)  $||u_0||, ||u_3|| \leq \bar{D}_{\mathcal{A}}t$
- (3)  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \leq ||u_1|| + ||u_2|| \leq 3D_{\mathcal{A}}t$
- (4)  $(u_1, u_2)$  uniquely determines the history of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  be the history of  $\mathcal{S}$ . For all  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , fix  $y_i \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_i = \theta_{u_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ .

Let  $\tilde{x}_i = \varphi_1^{-1}(x_i)$  and set  $v_i = \prod_{i=1}^t v(y_i, \tilde{x}_i)^{\varepsilon_i}$ . Then,  $w_t \equiv w_0 \cdot H = (v_1 x_1)^{\delta_1} (v_2 x_2)^{\delta_2} (v_3 x_3)^{\delta_3}$ .

As H is reduced, the product defining each  $v_j$  is reduced as an element of  $\langle S_A \rangle$ . So, Lemma 5.1 implies that each  $v_j$  uniquely determines the history of H and  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \leq ||v_j|| \leq D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ .

In particular,  $||u_1|| + ||u_2|| \le |w_t|_b \le ||v_1|| + ||v_2|| + ||v_3|| = 3D_{\mathcal{A}}t, ||u_0|| \le ||v_1|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ , and  $\|u_3\| \le \|v_3\| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}t.$ 

Suppose 
$$\delta_2 = 1$$
.

If  $\delta_1 = 1$ , then  $u_1 = v_2$ , so that Lemma 5.1 implies  $||u_1|| \ge \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  and  $u_1$  uniquely determines H. Conversely, if  $\delta_1 = -1$ , then  $u_1 = v_1^{-1}v_2$ . Since w is reduced,  $x_1 \neq x_2$ , so that the product  $\left(\prod_{i=1}^{t} v(y_i, \tilde{x}_1)^{\varepsilon_i}\right)^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t} v(y_i, \tilde{x}_2)^{\varepsilon_i}\right)$  defining  $v_1^{-1}v_2$  is reduced as an element of  $\langle S_{\mathcal{A}} \rangle$ . Hence, Lemma 5.1 implies that  $||u_1|| \ge D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  and  $u_1$  uniquely determines H.

If  $\delta_2 = -1$ , then the same arguments imply that  $||u_2|| \ge \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  and  $u_2$  uniquely determines H.

The next statement is similar in nature to Lemma 5.17 and is proved in an analogous manner:

**Lemma 5.18.** Let  $\mathcal{S}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a reduced semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2}$  for some  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\delta_1 \neq 1$  or  $\delta_2 \neq -1$ . Then, there exist  $u_0, u_1, u_2 \in \tilde{F}(\tilde{\mathcal{B}})$  such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2$ (2)  $||u_0||, ||u_2|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}} t$
- (3)  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \leq ||u_1|| \leq 2D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ (4)  $u_1$  uniquely determines the history of  $\mathcal{S}$

*Proof.* Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  and fix  $y_i \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_i = \theta_{y_i}^{\varepsilon_i}$ .

Then, letting  $\tilde{x}_j = \varphi_1^{-1}(x_j)$  and  $v_j = \prod_{i=1}^t v(y_i, \tilde{x}_j)^{\varepsilon_i}$ , we have  $w_t \equiv w \cdot \theta = (v_1 x_1)^{\delta_1} (v_2 x_2)^{\delta_2}$ .

As H is reduced,  $v_i$  is reduced as an element of  $\langle S_A \rangle$ , so that Lemma 5.1 implies each  $v_i$  uniquely determines *H* with  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \leq ||v_j|| \leq D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ . As a result,  $||u_1|| \leq |w_t|_b \leq ||v_1|| + ||v_2|| \leq 2D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ ,  $||u_0|| \le ||v_1|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ , and  $||u_2|| \le ||v_2|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ .

Now, if  $\delta_1 = 1$ , then an identical argument to that presented in Lemma 5.17 implies  $||u_1|| \geq \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t$ and  $u_1$  uniquely determines H.

Conversely, if  $\delta_2 = -1$ , then by hypothesis  $\delta_1 = -1$ . So,  $u_1 = v_1^{-1}$ , i.e the statement again follows. 

A word in  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  whose first and last letter is an element of  $\mathcal{A}_1^{\pm 1}$  is called *compressed*. For any word  $w' \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  with  $|w'|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 1$ , the compression  $\mathscr{C}(w')$  is the maximal compressed subword of w'.

Let  $\theta$  be a rule of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $w \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2 \dots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k}$  be a compressed word, i.e with  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$ ,  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_i \in F(\mathcal{B})$ . Lemma 5.7 then implies that  $w \cdot \theta \equiv u'_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u'_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u'_2 \dots u'_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u'_k$  for some  $u'_i \in F(\mathcal{B})$ . The compressed application of  $\theta$  to w is then taken to be reduced word

$$w * \theta \equiv \mathscr{C}(w \cdot \theta) \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1' x_2^{\delta_2} u_2' \dots u_{k-1}' x_k^{\delta_k}$$

Note the resemblance between a compressed application of a rule to a compressed word and the standard setup of an application of a rule to an admissible word: The 'compression' mimics the 'trimming' that occurs in the latter to make the resulting word again admissible.

Accordingly, a compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{A}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector is defined to be a sequence  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  such that  $w_0$  is compressed and  $w_i \equiv w_{i-1} * \theta_i$  for some rule  $\theta_i$ .

Note that any semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector such that  $|w_0|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 1$  can be associated to the compressed semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}} : \mathscr{C}(w_0) \to \cdots \to \mathscr{C}(w_t)$ whose history is the same as that of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

All terminology relating to semi-computations is carried over to compressed semi-computations. Hence, the history of the compressed semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$  above is the word  $\theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$  is called *reduced* if its history is a reduced word.

The following statement is then an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.17:

**Lemma 5.19.** Let  $S_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2} x_3^{\delta_3}$  for some  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Then, there exist  $u_1, u_2 \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2 x_3^{\delta_3}$ (2)  $\frac{1}{2} D_{\mathcal{A}} t \leq ||u_1|| + ||u_2|| \leq 3 D_{\mathcal{A}} t$ (3) the pair  $(u_1, u_2)$  uniquely determines the history of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$

Similarly, the following statement is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.18:

**Lemma 5.20.** Let  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2}$  for some  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\delta_1 \neq 1$  or  $\delta_2 \neq -1$ . Then, there exist  $u_1 \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2}$ (2)  $\frac{1}{2} D_{\mathcal{A}} t \leq ||u_1|| \leq 2D_{\mathcal{A}}$ (3)  $u_1$  uniquely determines the history of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$

Let  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  be a subset of  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C. Then, define  $\mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$  to be the set of all reduced words w over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$  for which there exists a semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector such that  $w_0 \equiv w$  and  $w_t \in \Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{S}$  is said to  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accept w.

For any  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepting semi-computation, Lemma 5.7 implies  $\delta(w_i) \equiv \delta(w_t) \equiv \tilde{\varphi}_1^{-1}(w_t)$  for all *i*. Hence, the terminal word  $w_t$  of any such  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepting semi-computation is uniquely determined by the word w.

In particular,  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C \geq 1$ , so that there exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \mathcal{A}_1, \ \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_k \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \ldots u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$ .

**Lemma 5.21.** Let  $w \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$  and set  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$  as above. Then there exists a unique reduced semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector  $\mathcal{S}_1(w) : w \equiv w_0 \to \dots \to w_t$  which  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w and satisfies:

- (1)  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \le ||u_{i-1}|| + ||u_i|| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  for any  $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$
- (2)  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \le ||u_k u_0|| + ||u_j|| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  for any  $j \in \{1, k-1\}$
- (3)  $\|u_0\|, \|u_k\| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}t$

Proof. Let  $S: w \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a reduced semi-computation which  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w. By Lemma 5.7,  $w_t \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} \in \Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ , and so the definition of  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  yields  $k \geq C \geq 3$ .

Let H be the history of S and, for  $i \in \{2, \ldots, k-1\}$ , let  $S_{\mathscr{C}}^{(i)} : v_0^{(i)} \to \cdots \to v_t^{(i)}$  be the reduced compressed semi-computation with history  $H^{-1}$  such that  $v_0^{(i)} \equiv x_{i-1}^{\delta_{i-1}} x_i^{\delta_i} x_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}$ .

Similarly, for  $j \in \{1, k\}$ , let  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}^{(j)} : v_0^{(j)} \to \cdots \to v_t^{(j)}$  be the reduced compressed semi-computation with history  $H^{-1}$  such that  $v_0^{(1)} \equiv x_k^{\delta_k} x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2}$  and  $v_0^{(k)} \equiv x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} x_k^{\delta_k} x_1^{\delta_1}$ .

For any *i*, applying Lemma 5.19 to  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}^{(i)}$  implies  $v_t^{(i)} \equiv x_{i-1}^{\delta_{i-1}} y_i x_i^{\delta_i} z_i x_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}$  for some  $y_i, z_i \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \leq ||y_i|| + ||z_i|| \leq 3D_{\mathcal{A}}t$  and the pair  $(y_i, z_i)$  uniquely determines  $H^{-1}$ .

By construction,  $y_i = u_{i-1}$  and  $z_i = u_i$  for  $2 \le i \le k$ . Hence, (1) holds and the semi-computation  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepting  $\mathcal{S}$  is uniquely determined by w.

Further, it follows from construction that:

• 
$$y_1 = u_k u_0$$
 and  $z_1 = u_1$ 

• 
$$y_k = u_{k-1}$$
 and  $z_k = u_k u_0$ 

Hence, (2) is implied by the application of Lemma 5.19 to  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}^{(k)}$ .

Finally, let  $\mathcal{S}': v'_0 \to \cdots \to v'_t$  and  $\mathcal{S}'': v''_0 \to \cdots \to v''_t$  be the reduced semi-computations with history  $H^{-1}$  such that  $v'_0 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2} x_3^{\delta_3}$  and  $v''_0 \equiv x_{k-2}^{\delta_{k-2}} x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} x_k^{\delta_k}$ . Then, by construction there exist  $u'_3, u''_{k-3} \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $v'_t \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2 x_3^{\delta_3} u'_3$  and  $v''_t \equiv u''_{k-3} x_{k-2}^{\delta_{k-2}} u_{k-2} x_{k-1}^{\delta_{k-1}} u_{k-1} x_k^{\delta_k} u_k$ . Thus, (3) follows by applying Lemma 5.17 to  $\mathcal{S}'$  and  $\mathcal{S}''$ .

# 5.2. The machine $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

As it is assumed that  $\mathcal{L}$  is a recursive subset of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ , there exists a non-deterministic Turing machine  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$  with alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  that enumerates  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Let  $\operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}$  be the time function of  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ , i.e  $\operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  is the nondecreasing function satisfying the condition that  $\operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(n)$  is the smallest number such that for all  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  with  $||w|| \leq n$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$ computes w by a finite sequence of  $\leq \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(n)$  basic moves.

Note that since  $\mathcal{L}$  is recursive, it may be assumed without loss of generality that  $TM_{\mathcal{L}}$  is a computable function.

A seminal result of Sapir, Birget, and Rips [29] then produces the following auxiliary machine:

**Lemma 5.22** (Proposition 4.1 of [29]). There exists an S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfying Lemma 4.1 that 'simulates' the Turing machine  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{L}}$  in the following sense:

- (1) The hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is  $(\sqcup_{i=1}^{N} X_{i}^{\mathcal{L}}, \sqcup_{i=0}^{N} P_{i}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , where  $X_{1}^{\mathcal{L}} = \emptyset$ ,  $X_{2}^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{A}$ , and the  $P_{1}^{\mathcal{L}} P_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector is the only input sector
- (2) The language of accepted inputs is  $\mathcal{L}$
- (3) For any accepted configuration W satisfying  $|W|_a \leq n$ , there exists a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  which accepts W and has length  $\leq c_0 \mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + c_0 n + c_0$

Note that condition (3) may be summarized by saying that the 'generalized time function' of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  is asymptotically bounded above by  $\mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}^3$ .

Further, note that the constants  $c_0$  and N are listed amongst the parameters in Section 2.2. In particular, N can be taken to be as large as desired by simply adding sectors with empty tape alphabets to the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

It should be noted that the bounds given in Lemma 5.22 may be improved: The statement of Proposition 4.1 in [29] also gives upper bounds on the 'space' and 'area' functions of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ . In fact, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the main machine of [6] can be used to construct a machine in which the cubic exponent of  $\mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}$  in the statement can be reduced to  $1 + \varepsilon$ . However, such improvements are moot for the purposes of this manuscript.

# 5.3. The machine $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The next auxiliary machine is a *composition* of the machines  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the sense described below (and as in the constructions of [17], [21], [23], [32], etc).

To begin, define the sets  $Y_i^{\mathcal{L}}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq N$  as follows:

•  $Y_1^{\mathcal{L}} = Y_1^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup X_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ 

• 
$$Y_2^{\mathcal{L}} = Y_2^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_2$$

•  $Y_i^{\mathcal{L}} = X_i^{\mathcal{L}}$  for all  $i \ge 3$ .

Further, let  $Q_j^{\mathcal{A}} = \{q_j\}$  for all  $3 \leq j \leq N$  and define  $Q_i^{\mathcal{L}} = Q_i^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup P_i^{\mathcal{L}}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq N$ .

The hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is then taken to be  $(\sqcup_{i=1}^{N} Y_{i}^{\mathcal{L}}, \sqcup_{i=0}^{N} Q_{i}^{\mathcal{L}}).$ 

The positive rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\Theta^{+}(\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , are defined as follows:

- (a) For any positive rule of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ , there is a corresponding positive rule of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  which operates in exactly the same way as  $\theta$  on the subword  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  of the standard base and has the part  $q_i \stackrel{\ell}{\to} q_i$  for all  $3 \leq i \leq N$ .
- (b)  $\sigma = [q_0 \xrightarrow{\ell} p_0, q_1 \rightarrow p_1, q_2 \xrightarrow{\ell} p_2, \ldots, q_{N-1} \xrightarrow{\ell} p_{N-1}, q_N \rightarrow p_N]$  where  $p_i$  is the start letter of the part  $P_i^{\mathcal{L}}$  of the state letters of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Note that  $\sigma$  is defined as an S-rule, with the domain  $Y_2(\sigma)$  taken to be  $\mathcal{A}_2$ .
- (c) For every positive rule of  $\mathbf{M}_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , there exists a corresponding positive rule of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  which operates in the analogous way, identifying the tape alphabet  $\mathcal{A}_{2}$  with the input alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}} Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector is taken to be the only input sector of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Finally, the letters of  $Q_i^{\mathcal{A}}$  are the start letters of their corresponding parts, while the end letters correspond to the end letters of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  in  $P_i^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

By its construction,  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  can be viewed as the *composition* of two 'submachines', which are denoted  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  and given as follows:

- (1) The hardware of M<sup>L</sup><sub>3</sub>(1) is (□<sup>N</sup><sub>i=1</sub>Y<sup>A</sup><sub>i</sub>, □<sup>N</sup><sub>i=0</sub>Q<sup>A</sup><sub>i</sub>) (with Y<sup>A</sup><sub>i</sub> = Ø for i ≥ 3) and its set of positive rules Θ<sup>+</sup>(M<sup>L</sup><sub>3</sub>(1)) consists are of all rules of the form (a) above.
   (2) The hardware of M<sup>L</sup><sub>3</sub>(2) is (□<sup>N</sup><sub>i=1</sub>X<sup>L</sup><sub>i</sub>, □<sup>N</sup><sub>i=0</sub>P<sup>L</sup><sub>i</sub>) (with X<sup>L</sup><sub>2</sub> identified with A<sub>2</sub>) and its set of
- positive rules  $\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2))$  consists of all rules of the form (c) above.

With these definitions,  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  is a generalized S-machine for j = 1, 2, (in fact,  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  is an S-machine), while  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  concatenates these machines with the *transition rule*  $\sigma$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  can be identified with the machines  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , respectively, with the only major distinction being that several locked sectors are added to  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  to make the standard bases the same size.

The next statements are immediate consequences of the definition of the rules and Lemmas 5.4 and 5.15:

**Lemma 5.23.** Let  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1(w) q_1 q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$  for some  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ . Suppose there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  in the standard base such that  $W_t$  is  $\sigma$ -admissible. Then  $W_t \equiv q_0 q_1 \widetilde{\varphi}_2(w) q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$ .

**Lemma 5.24.** For any  $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ , there exists a (unique) reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$ of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  in the standard base such that  $W_{0} \equiv q_{0}\widetilde{\varphi}_{1}(w)q_{1}q_{2}q_{3}\ldots q_{N}$  and  $W_{t}$  is  $\sigma$ -admissible.

**Lemma 5.25.** Suppose  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  is a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  in the standard base. If  $W_0$  and  $W_t$  are both  $\sigma$ -admissible, then t = 0.

*Proof.* The restriction  $\mathcal{C}': W'_0 \to \cdots \to W'_t$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}} Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ . But if  $W_0$  and  $W_t$  are both  $\sigma$ -admissible, then  $W'_0 \equiv q_0 q_1 \equiv W'_t$ , so that  $\mathcal{C}'$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.14.

**Lemma 5.26.** Let H be the history of a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Then, there exist  $H_1, H_1' \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)))$  and  $H_2 \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)))$  such that H is a subword of  $H_1 \sigma H_2 \sigma^{-1} H_1'$ .

*Proof.* Assuming the statement is false, H must contain a subword of the form  $\sigma^{-1}H_1\sigma$  for some  $H_1 \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)))$ . Then, the subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}_1 : W_r \to \cdots \to W_s$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  with history  $H_1$ is a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  where  $W_{r}$  and  $W_{s}$  are  $\sigma$ -admissible. But then Lemma 5.25 implies  $||H_1|| = 0$ , contradicting the assumption that C is reduced.

**Lemma 5.27.** Let  $u, v \in F(\mathcal{A})$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{C} : W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  is a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ such that  $W_0$  and  $W_t$  are the input configurations with inputs  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(u)$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(v)$ , respectively. Then  $u \in \mathcal{L}$  if and only if  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* If C is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  then the restriction of C to the base  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.5, so that  $u \equiv v$ .

Hence, it suffices to assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is not a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ .

Let H be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, since  $W_0$  and  $W_t$  are both configurations of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ , Lemma 5.26 implies that there exists a non-trivial word  $H_2 \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)))$  such that  $H \equiv H_1 \sigma H_2 \sigma^{-1} H_1'$ for some  $H_1, H'_1 \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1))).$ 

Let  $C_1: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_r$  be the subcomputation of C with history  $H_1$ . Then, the restriction of  $C_1$  to the base  $Q_0^L Q_1^L Q_2^L$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^A$  satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4, so that  $W_r \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(u) q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$ .

Similarly, letting  $\mathcal{C}'_1 : W_s \to \cdots \to W_t$  be the subcomputation of  $\mathcal{C}$  with history  $H'_1$ , the same argument (applied to the inverse computation  $W_t \to \cdots \to W_s$ ) implies  $W_s \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(v) q_2 q_3 \ldots q_N$ . Hence, the subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}_2 : W_{r+1} \to \cdots \to W_{s-1}$  with history  $H_2$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  between the input configurations whose inputs are u and v. But then this computation (or its inverse) can be concatenated with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting one of these inputs to produce an accepting computation of the other input, so that the statement follows from Lemma 5.22.

**Lemma 5.28.** For  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , the input  $\widetilde{\varphi}_1(w)$  is accepted by  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  if and only if  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* First, suppose  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  is an accepting computation of the input configuration  $W_0 \equiv q_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1(w) q_1 q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$ . As  $W_0$  is a configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ , Lemma 5.26 implies there exists a factorization  $H \equiv H_1 \sigma H_2$  of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that:

- The subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}_1: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_s$  with history  $H_1$  is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$
- The subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}_2: W_{s+1} \to \cdots \to W_t$  with history  $H_2$  is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$

Lemma 5.23 then implies that  $W_s \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(w) q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$ , so that  $W_{s+1} \equiv W_s \cdot \sigma$  is the configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  corresponding to the input configuration  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  with input w. But then  $\mathcal{C}_2$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting this input, so that Lemma 5.22 implies  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

Conversely, suppose  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

As  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^*$ , there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D}_1 : V_0 \to \cdots \to V_r$  given by Lemma 5.24 such that  $V_0$  is the input configuration with input  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(w)$  and  $V_r \cdot \sigma$  is the configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  corresponding to the input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  with input w.

Since Lemma 5.22 implies that w is an accepted input of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ , identifying such an accepting computation with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  yields a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D}_2$  accepting  $V_r \cdot \sigma$ .

Hence, letting  $H'_j$  be the history of the computation  $\mathcal{D}_j$  for j = 1, 2, then  $H'_1 \sigma H'_2$  is the history of a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting the input  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(w)$ .

**Lemma 5.29.** For any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $|W|_a = n$ , there exists an accepting computation  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  satisfying  $t \leq c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + 2c_0 n + 2c_0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{D}: W \equiv V_0 \to \cdots \to V_s$  be a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  which accepts W.

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$ , then it can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . But then Lemma 5.22 produces a computation  $\mathcal{C}$  accepting W with length  $\leq c_{0} \mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_{0}n)^{3} + c_{0}n + c_{0}$ .

Hence, by Lemma 5.26, it suffices to assume that there exists a factorization  $H \equiv H_1 \sigma H_2$  of the history H of  $\mathcal{D}$  such that:

- The subcomputation  $\mathcal{D}_1: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_r$  with history  $H_1$  is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$
- The subcomputation  $\mathcal{D}_2: V_{r+1} \to \cdots \to V_s$  with history  $H_2$  is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$

As above,  $\mathcal{D}_2$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting  $V_{r+1}$ , so that Lemma 5.22 provides a computation  $\mathcal{C}_2$  of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  accepting  $V_{r+1}$  such that the history  $H'_2$  of  $\mathcal{C}_2$  satisfies:

$$||H'_2|| \le c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 |V_{r+1}|_a)^3 + c_0 |V_{r+1}|_a + c_0$$

As  $V_{r+1}$  is  $\sigma^{-1}$ -admissible, it corresponds to an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_2^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Lemma 5.22 then implies there exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $V_r \equiv q_0 q_1 \tilde{\varphi}_2(w) q_2 q_3 \dots q_N$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}'_1: V'_0 \to \cdots \to V'_r$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{D}_1$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}} Q_1^{\mathcal{L}} Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}$  and fix  $w_1 \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ and  $w_2 \in F(\mathcal{A}_2)$  such that  $V'_0 \equiv q_0 w_1 q_1 w_2 q_2$ . So,  $W \equiv q_0 w_1 q_1 w_2 q_2 \dots q_N$ .

Then,  $\mathcal{D}'_1$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base, so that Lemma 5.3 implies  $|V_{r+1}|_a = ||w|| = ||\varepsilon(V'_t)|| = ||\varepsilon(V'_0)|| \le ||w_1|| + ||w_2|| = |W|_a = n$ .

Moreover, the restriction of  $\mathcal{D}'_1$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  which is a shift of  $w_1$ . Lemma 5.16 then implies that  $r \leq ||w_1|| + ||w_1||c_0^{||w_1||} \leq n + nc_0^n$ . Thus,  $H' \equiv H_1 \sigma H'_2$  is the history of a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting W such that:

$$||H'|| \le c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + c_0 n + c_0 + 1 + n + n c_0^n$$

The statement then follows by taking  $c_0 \ge 1$ .

As the only rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  that do not lock the  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector are those of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ , Lemma 4.3 implies that any non-trivial semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector can be identified with a semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{A}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector.

# 5.4. The machine $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is the composition of the machine  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with a 'reflected copy' of itself, introducing a level of symmetry to the model. This composition is done in a manner similar to the methods employed in [17] and [23], and will be used explicitly in Section 12.

Let  $\mathcal{H}'_3 = (\sqcup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{L}}_i, \sqcup_{i=0}^N R^{\mathcal{L}}_i)$  be a copy of the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ . The standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  is then:

$$Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}\dots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(R_N^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}\dots (R_1^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$$

For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ , the tape alphabet of the  $Q_{i-1}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_i^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector is  $Y_i^{\mathcal{L}}$ , while that of the  $(R_i^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}(R_{i-1}^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$ -sector is  $\mathcal{Y}_i^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Finally, the tape alphabet of the  $Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(R_N^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$ -sector is empty.

By construction, any configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  has an *associated pair* of configurations of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  $(W_1, W_2)$  such that  $W \equiv W_1(W_2')^{-1}$  where  $W_2'$  is the copy of  $W_2$  over the hardware  $\mathcal{H}_3'$ .

The generalized rules of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  correspond to those of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ , operating on admissible words whose base is a subword of either  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}\ldots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}$  or of  $R_0^{\mathcal{L}}R_1^{\mathcal{L}}\ldots R_N^{\mathcal{L}}$  as the corresponding rule operates on an analogous admissible word of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

In particular, suppose the generalized rule  $\theta$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  has the part  $q_{i} \to u_{i-1}q'_{i}v_{i}$ . Then, letting  $r_{i}$  and  $r'_{i}$  be the copies of  $q_{i}$  and  $q'_{i}$  in  $R_{i}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , respectively, then the corresponding rule  $\bar{\theta}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}$  has the parts  $q_{i} \to u_{i-1}q'_{i}v_{i}$  and  $r_{i}^{-1} \to \bar{v}_{i}^{-1}(r'_{i})^{-1}\bar{u}_{i-1}^{-1}$ , where  $\bar{u}_{i-1}$  and  $\bar{v}_{i}$  are the copies of  $u_{i-1}$  and  $v_{i}$  in  $\mathcal{Y}_{i-1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_{i}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , respectively.

Further, for  $\theta$  and  $\overline{\theta}$  as above,  $X_i(\overline{\theta}) = X_i(\theta)$ ,  $Z_i(\overline{\theta}) = Z_i(\theta)$ , and  $f_{\overline{\theta},i} = f_{\theta,i}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ . Similarly,  $X_{2N+2-i}(\overline{\theta})$  and  $Z_{2N+2-i}(\overline{\theta})$  are the natural copies of  $X_i(\theta)$  and  $Z_i(\theta)$  in  $\mathcal{Y}_i^{\mathcal{L}}$ , respectively, while the bijection  $f_{\overline{\theta},2N+2-i}$  is the natural analogue of  $f_{\theta,i}$ . As such, for any configuration W with associated pair  $(W_1, W_2)$ , W is  $\bar{\theta}$ -admissible if and only if both  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are  $\theta$ -admissible, in which case  $W \cdot \bar{\theta}$  is the configuration with associated pair  $(W_1 \cdot \theta, W_2 \cdot \theta)$ . Hence, if  $(W_1, W_2)$  is the associated pair of an accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , then the parallel nature of the rules implies  $W_1 \equiv W_2$ . Consequently, any accepted configuration W is essentially palindromic:  $W^{-1}$  and W are equivalent if  $\mathcal{H}'_3$  is identified with the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

This symmetry can be seen on another level: If W is an admissible word whose base is a subword of  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}} Q_1^{\mathcal{L}} \dots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}$ , then define the *reflection* of W to be the admissible word which is the natural copy of  $W^{-1}$  obtained over  $\mathcal{H}'_3$ . Then, for any rule  $\bar{\theta}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , W is  $\bar{\theta}$ -admissible if and only if its reflection is  $\bar{\theta}$ -admissible.

As the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are in correspondence with the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and operate similarly, the submachines  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  are defined as for  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The input sectors of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  are taken to be the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ - and  $(R_1^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$ -sectors, while the start and end letters correspond to those of the machine  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ . In particular, letting  $A_3$  be the accept configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ , the accept configuration  $A_4$  of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  has associated pair  $(A_3, A_3)$ .

For any word  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , let  $I_3(w)$  be the input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  with input  $\tilde{\varphi}_1(w)$ . Then,  $I_4(w)$  is the input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  whose associated pair is  $(I_3(w), I_3(w))$ .

The following is thus a direct consequence of Lemma 5.28:

**Lemma 5.30.** Suppose W is an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that any tape letter of W is of the form  $a_{1}^{\pm 1}$  such that  $a_{1}$  is a letter of the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_{1}$  in the corresponding input tape alphabet. Then, W is accepted if and only if  $W \equiv I_{4}(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

Similarly, the next statement follows immediately from Lemma 5.29:

**Lemma 5.31.** For any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $|W|_a = n$ , there exists an accepting computation  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W \equiv W_0 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_t \equiv A_4$  satisfying  $t \leq c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + c_0$ .

As all rules of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  operate in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector in the same way as those of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ , semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  in this sector are the same as those in  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Hence, non-trivial semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector can be identified with semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector.

# 5.5. The machine $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  is the 'circular' analogue of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ . It is defined in much the same way as the analogous machine in [32].

Letting  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  be the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  is  $\{t\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , where  $\{t\}$  is a singleton. The tape alphabet of the  $\{t\}Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector is empty, while the tape alphabet of the other sectors are identified with the corresponding tape alphabets of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

However, there is a fundamental difference between  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  and the machines constructed in the previous sections: A tape alphabet is assigned to the space after  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$ , corresponding to the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}\{t\}$ -sector. As such, it is a priori possible for an admissible word of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  to have base

$$(Q_1^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}(Q_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}\{t\}^{-1}R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}\{t\}Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$$

i.e so that it essentially 'wraps around' the standard base. A generalized S-machine with this property is called *cyclic*, as the standard base can be visualized as being written on a circle.

In this machine, the tape alphabet of the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}{t}$ -sector is taken to be empty. The generalized rules of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  correspond to those of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , operating on the copy of the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the

same way and, as is compulsory by the definition of the tape alphabets, locking the new sectors with the part  $t \stackrel{\ell}{\to} t$ .

As with the previous machine, the submachines  $\mathbf{M}_{5}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{5}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  are adopted from the submachines of  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Similarly, any admissible word whose base is a subword of  $Q_{0}^{\mathcal{L}}Q_{1}^{\mathcal{L}}\ldots Q_{N}^{\mathcal{L}}$  has a *reflection*, capturing the symmetry inherent to the machine.

The input sectors, start letters, and end letters of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  are analogous to those of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  (with the start and end letter of the part  $\{t\}$  taken to be the only letter). For any  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , the configuration  $tI_4(w)$  is thus an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$ , hereby denoted  $I_5(w)$ .

So, since the newly introduced sectors have empty tape alphabet, the following statements are direct consequences of Lemmas 5.30 and 5.31:

**Lemma 5.32.** Suppose W is an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that any tape letter of W is of the form  $a_1^{\pm 1}$  such that  $a_1$  is a letter of the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in the corresponding input tape alphabet. Then, W is accepted if and only if  $W \equiv I_5(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

**Lemma 5.33.** For any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $|W|_a = n$ , there exists an accepting computation  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  satisfying  $t \leq c_0 \mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + c_0$ .

Again, the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  are in correspondence with those of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  and operate in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector analogously. Hence, non-trivial semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}$ -sector can be identified with semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector.

# 5.6. The machines $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The cyclic generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  functions as the 'parallel' composition of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  with itself a number of times.

For any any  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$  (where L is the parameter listed in Section 2.2), let  $B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$  be a copy of the standard base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$ , i.e with:

$$B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(i) = Q_0^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)Q_1^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)\dots Q_N^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)(R_N^{\mathcal{L},1}(i))^{-1}\dots (R_1^{\mathcal{L},1}(i))^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L},1}(i))^{-1}$$

Then the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is:

$$\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(1)\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(2)\dots\{t(L)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(L)$$

For any letter of  $\{t(i)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$  (or its inverse), the index *i* is called its *coordinate*.

The tape alphabet of any sector containing a singleton  $\{t(i)\}$  (including the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L},1}(L))^{-1}\{t(1)\}$ -sector) is taken to be empty, while the tape alphabet of any other sector is a copy of the tape alphabet of the corresponding sector of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The generalized rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are in correspondence with those of  $\mathbf{M}_{5}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , with each rule operating on every subword  $\{t(i)\}B_{4}^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$  of the standard base as the corresponding rule. As such, there are corresponding submachines  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$ .

The input sectors of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are taken to be the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)Q_1^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$ - and  $(R_1^{\mathcal{L},1}(i))^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L},1}(i))^{-1}$ -sectors for all  $i = 1, \ldots, L$ , while the start and end letters are taken to be the copies of those of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Clearly, the statements of the previous section pertaining to the machine  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  have natural analogues to the machine  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . For example, for  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , let  $I_6(w)$  be the input configuration such that every admissible subword with base  $\{t(i)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$  is the natural copy of  $I_5(w)$ .

The following statement is then the analogue of Lemma 5.32:

**Lemma 5.34.** Suppose W is an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that any tape letter of W is of the form  $a_1^{\pm 1}$  such that  $a_1$  is a letter of the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in the corresponding input tape alphabet. Then W is accepted if and only if  $W \equiv I_6(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a reduced computation accepting W and let  $\mathcal{C}'$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the base  $\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(2)$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}'$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting an input configuration W' of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that every tape letter of W' is from the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^{-1}$  in the corresponding input tape alphabet. Lemma 5.32 then implies  $W' \equiv I_5(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ . Note that the admissible subwords of the accept configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  whose bases are of the form  $\{t(i)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},1}(i)$  for some  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$  are copies of one another. So, the parallel nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  imply the same for W. Hence,  $W \equiv I_6(w)$ .

Conversely, for any  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ , Lemma 5.32 provides a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting the input configuration  $I_5(w)$ . Letting H be the history of  $\mathcal{D}$ , the computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  whose history is the natural copy of H in the software of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepts the input configuration  $I_6(w)$ .

The cyclic generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is constructed in much the same way as  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ :

Letting  $B_4^{\mathcal{L},2}(i)$  be a distinct copy of  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ , the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is

$$\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},2}(1)\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},2}(2)\dots\{t(L)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L},2}(L)$$

Similarly, the tape alphabets of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are defined in just the same way as those of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

However, there is one fundamental difference between  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and its predecessor: While the positive rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are copies of those of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$ , each locks the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L},2}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L},2}(1)$ -sector. This sector is still called an input sector, though any configuration must have this sector empty for it to be  $\theta$ admissible for any rule  $\theta$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Again, the statements from the previous section have analogues to the machine  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . For example, for any  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , let  $J_6(w)$  be the input configuration analogous to  $I_6(w)$  except with empty  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L},2}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L},2}(1)$ -sector. Then, the following statement is the analogue of Lemma 5.32, proved in much the same way as Lemma 5.34:

**Lemma 5.35.** Suppose W is an input configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that any tape letter of W is of the form  $a_1^{\pm 1}$  such that  $a_1$  is a letter of the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  in the corresponding input tape alphabet. Then W is accepted if and only if  $W \equiv J_6(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

### 6. The Main Machine

# 6.1. The machine $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

The main machine of this construction, the generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , is the concatenation of the machines  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . However, unlike the compositions described in previous sections (but similar to the construction of the main machine of [32]), the concatenation of these machines is done in a way so that they run 'one or the other' instead of 'one after another' or 'in parallel'.

For every  $j \in \{0, \dots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ , define the sets:

- $Q_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i) = Q_j^{\mathcal{L},1}(i) \sqcup Q_j^{\mathcal{L},2}(i) \sqcup \{q_{j,s}(i), q_{j,a}(i)\}$   $R_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i) = R_j^{\mathcal{L},1}(i) \sqcup R_j^{\mathcal{L},2}(i) \sqcup \{r_{j,s}(i), r_{j,a}(i)\}$

Further, for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ , denote  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(i) = Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i) \ldots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(i) (R_N^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1} \ldots (R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ . Then, the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is:

$$\left(\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)\right)\left(\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(2)\right)\ldots\left(\{t(L)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(L)\right)$$

Similar to the setup of the machines  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , the input sectors of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are taken to be the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$ - and  $(R_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ -sectors. For any *i* and *j*, the letters  $q_{j,s}(i)$  and  $r_{j,s}(i)^{-1}$  are taken to be the start letters of  $Q_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$  and  $(R_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ , respectively. Similarly,  $q_{j,a}(i)$  and  $r_{j,a}(i)^{-1}$  are the end letters of  $Q_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$  and  $(R_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ , respectively.

For any non-input sector, the associated tape alphabet is a copy of the corresponding tape alphabet of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  (which is identified with the corresponding tape alphabet of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ ). However, while the tape alphabet of each input sector of the machines  $\mathbf{M}_{6,i}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is a copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ , each such tape alphabet in  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is a copy of  $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ . In particular, the tape alphabet of the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ -sector is identified with the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B}$ .

The set of generalized S-rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\Theta$ , is the disjoint union of two symmetric sets, denoted  $\Theta_1$ and  $\Theta_2$ . Naturally, the positive (and negative) generalized rules are partitioned accordingly, i.e with  $\Theta^+ = \Theta_1^+ \sqcup \Theta_2^+$  with  $\Theta_i^+ = \Theta^+ \cap \Theta_i$  for i = 1, 2.

The rules of  $\Theta_1^+$  are defined as follows:

- The transition rule  $\theta(s)_1$  locks all sectors other than the input sectors and switches the state letters from the start letters of the machine to the copies of the start letters of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . For each *i* corresponding to an input sector,  $X_i(\theta(s)_1)$  is the copy of  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $Z_i(\theta(s)_1)$  is the copy of  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , and  $f_{\theta(s)_1,i}$  operates as  $\varphi_1$ .
- The positive 'working' rules of  $\Theta_1$  correspond to the positive generalized S-rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , with each rule operating on the copy of the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  as its corresponding rule.
- The transition rule  $\theta(a)_1$  locks all sectors and switches the state letters from the copy of the end letters of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  to the end letters of the machine.

The rules of  $\Theta_2^+$  are defined as follows:

- The transition rule  $\theta(s)_2$  operates in a similar manner to the rule  $\theta(s)_1$ , but with two exceptions: (i) The input  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ -sector is locked, and (ii) The state letters are switched from the start letters of the machine to the copies of the start letters of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .
- The positive 'working' rules of  $\Theta_2$  correspond to the positive generalized S-rules of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , with each rule operating on the copy of the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  as its corresponding rule.
- The transition rule  $\theta(a)_2$  locks all sectors and switches the state letters from the copy of the end letters of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  to the end letters of the machine.

The definition of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  make it evident that the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ -sector stands out amongst the input sectors. Thus, it is henceforth fittingly referred to as the 'special' input sector.

Note that for  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , the natural copies of  $I_6(w)$  and  $J_6(w)$  in the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  are configurations which are  $\theta(s)_1^{-1}$ -admissible and  $\theta(s)_2^{-1}$ -admissible, respectively. The configurations I(w) and J(w) are then defined to be the configurations resulting from applying these respective rules. Hence, I(w) is the input configuration with the corresponding copy of w written in each  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$ -sector and the copy of  $w^{-1}$  written in each  $(R_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ -sector, while J(w) is the input configuration obtained from I(w) by erasing the copy of w in the 'special' input sector.

# 6.2. Standard computations of $M^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

As in [32], a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}$  is called a *one-machine computation of the i-th machine* if every letter of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  corresponds to a rule of  $\Theta_i$ , i.e  $H \in F(\Theta_i^+)$  for H the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  is not a one-machine computation, then it is called a *multi-machine computation*.

**Lemma 6.1.** Suppose  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine in the standard base. Then:

- (a) Any occurrence of  $\theta(s)_i$  or of  $\theta(a)_i^{-1}$  in the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  is as the first letter.
- (b) Any occurrence of  $\theta(s)_i^{-1}$  or of  $\theta(a)_i$  in the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  is as the last letter.

*Proof.* Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Suppose there exists  $r \in \{2, ..., t\}$  such that  $\theta_r = \theta(s)_i$ . Then,  $W_{r-1}$  is  $\theta(s)_i$ -admissible, and so must be a start configuration (indeed, an input configuration).

Further, if a start configuration is  $\theta$ -admissible for  $\theta \in \Theta_i$ , then necessarily  $\theta = \theta(s)_i$ . But then  $\theta_{r-1} = \theta(s)_i^{-1}$ , so that H is unreduced.

Similarly:

• Any configuration that is  $\theta(a)_i^{-1}$ -admissible must be an end configuration (indeed, must be the configuration  $W_{ac}$ ).

• If an end configuration is  $\theta$ -admissible for  $\theta \in \Theta_i$ , then necessarily  $\theta = \theta(a)_i^{-1}$ .

Hence, the same argument as above implies that any occurrence of  $\theta(a)_i^{-1}$  in the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  must be as the first letter.

(b) then follows by applying (a) to the inverse computation  $\overline{\mathcal{C}}: W_t \to \cdots \to W_0$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** Let C be a multi-machine computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the standard base. Suppose there exists a factorization  $H \equiv H_1H_2$  of the history H of C such that for i = 1, 2, the subcomputation  $C_i$  with history  $H_i$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine. Then either:

- (a) The last letter of  $H_1$  is either  $\theta(s)_1^{-1}$  and the first letter of  $H_2$  is  $\theta(s)_2$ ; or
- (b) The last letter of  $H_1$  is  $\theta(a)_1$  and the first letter of  $H_2$  is  $\theta(a)_2^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $C: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$ ,  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$ , and  $||H_1|| = r$ . Then, the configuration  $W_r$  must be both  $\theta_r^{-1}$ - and  $\theta_{r+1}$ -admissible. Since  $\theta_r$  is a suffix of  $H_1$  and  $\theta_{r+1}$  is a prefix of  $H_2$ ,  $W_r$  is admissible for rules of both machines. Hence, by the construction of the rules, either:

- $W_r$  is a start configuration, in which case  $\theta_r = \theta(s)_1^{-1}$  and  $\theta_{r+1} = \theta(s)_2$ , or
- $W_r$  is an end configuration, in which case  $\theta_r = \theta(a)_1$  and  $\theta_{r+1} = \theta(a)_2^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** For a start configuration W, there exists a one-machine computation of the first (respectively second) machine accepting W if and only if there exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W \equiv I(w)$  (respectively  $W \equiv J(w)$ ).

*Proof.* First, consider a word  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

By Lemma 5.34, there exists a reduced computation  $C_1$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  which accepts the configuration  $I_6(w)$ . Letting  $H_1$  be the history of  $C_1$  and  $H'_1 \in F(\Theta_1^+)$  be the natural copy of  $H_1$  in the software

of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , it follows that  $\theta(s)_1 H'_1 \theta(a)_1$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the first machine that accepts I(w).

Similarly, Lemma 5.35 implies there exists a reduced computation  $C_2$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,2}^{\mathcal{L}}$  which accepts the configuration  $J_6(w)$ . Letting  $H_2$  be the history of  $C_2$  and  $H'_2 \in F(\Theta_2^+)$  be the natural copy of  $H_2$  in the software of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , it follows that  $\theta(s)_2 H'_2 \theta(a)_2$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the second machine that accepts J(w).

Now, suppose on the other hand that  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t \equiv W_{ac}$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine such that W is a start configuration. Let  $H \in F(\Theta_i^+)$  be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ . By Lemma 6.1, there exists a factorization  $H \equiv \theta(s)_i H'\theta(a)_i$  such that H' consists entirely of working rules of the *i*-th machine.

If i = 1, then the subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}'$  with history H' can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.34. This implies that there exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W_1$  is the natural copy of  $I_6(w)$  in the hardware of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Thus,  $W \equiv W_1 \cdot \theta(s)_1^{-1} \equiv I(w)$ .

If i = 2, then the analogous argument implies that  $W \equiv J(w)$ .

**Lemma 6.4.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a one-machine computation of the first machine in the standard base. Suppose  $W_t$  is a start configuration and  $W_0 \equiv I(u)$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then there exists  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W_t \equiv I(v)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.3, there exists a one-machine computation of the first machine  $\mathcal{D}_1$  accepting I(u). Letting H be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $H_1$  be the history of  $\mathcal{D}_1$ , then  $H^{-1}H_1$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the first machine accepting  $W_t$ . Hence, the statement follows by Lemma 6.3.

The next statement is similarly implied by Lemma 6.3:

**Lemma 6.5.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a one-machine computation of the second machine in the standard base. Suppose  $W_t$  is a start configuration and  $W_0 \equiv J(u)$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then there exists  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W_t \equiv J(v)$ .

**Lemma 6.6.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  be a one-machine computation of the first machine in the standard base. Suppose  $W_t$  is a start configuration and  $W_0 \equiv J(u)$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then t = 0.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that t > 0.

Lemma 6.1 then implies that there exists a factorization  $H \equiv \theta(s)_1 H' \theta(s)_1^{-1}$  of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that H' is a non-empty word consisting entirely of working rules of the first machine. The subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}': W_1 \to \cdots \to W_{t-1}$  with history H' can then be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Suppose this is a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ . Then, the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}'$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ can be identified with a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D}_1: V_1 \to \cdots \to V_{t-1}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard base. Since  $W_{t-1}$  is  $\theta(s)_1^{-1}$ -admissible,  $V_{t-1}$  must be of the form  $q_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1(v) q_1 q_2$  for some  $v \in F(\mathcal{A})$ . As a result,  $\mathcal{D}_1$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.5, so that v = 1. But then the restriction of  $\mathcal{D}_1$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 5.14, yielding the contradiction H' = 1.

Hence, H' has a maximal proper prefix  $H'_1$  such that the subcomputation  $\mathcal{C}'_1 : W_1 \to \cdots \to W_r$ with history  $H'_1$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,1}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ .

For any  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ , the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}'_1$  to the base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i) \ldots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$  can be identified with a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D}_i : U_1^{(i)} \to \cdots \to U_r^{(i)}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_3^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the standard base. Then, as  $H'_1$  is a proper prefix of H',  $U_r^{(i)}$  must be  $\sigma$ -admissible for each i. By construction,  $U_1^{(1)} \equiv q_0 q_1 q_2 \ldots q_N$ and  $U_1^{(j)} \equiv q_0 \widetilde{\varphi}_1(u) q_1 q_2 \ldots q_N$  for each  $j \geq 2$ . So, Lemma 5.23 implies that  $U_r^{(1)} \equiv U_1^{(1)}$  and  $U_r^{(j)} \equiv q_0 q_1 \widetilde{\varphi}_2(u) q_2 \ldots q_N$  for  $j \geq 2$ .

Hence, the configuration  $W_r$  has empty  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ -sector and the corresponding copy of  $\widetilde{\varphi}_2(u)$  written in the  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(j)Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$ -sector for each  $2 \leq j \leq L$ . But all rules operate in parallel on the  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_2^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$ -sectors, so that the condition  $u \neq 1$  necessitated by  $1 \notin \mathcal{L}$  produces a contradiction.

For any non-empty reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , define  $\ell(\mathcal{C})$  to be the number of maximal one-machine subcomputations of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Further, for any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , let A(W) be the set of accepting computations of W.

Then, for  $W \neq W_{ac}$ , define  $\ell(W) = \min\{\ell(\mathcal{C}) \mid \mathcal{C} \in A(W)\}.$ 

For completeness, set  $\ell(W_{ac}) = 0$ .

**Lemma 6.7.** For any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\ell(W) \leq 2$ . Moreover, if  $\ell(W) = 2$ , then W is not a start configuration and for any  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W)$  with  $\ell(\mathcal{C}) = 2$ , there exists a factorization  $H \equiv H_1H_2$  of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that:

- (a)  $H_i$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine.
- (b)  $W \cdot H_1 \equiv J(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* By definition, it suffices to assume  $W \neq W_{ac}$ . So, we can fix a non-empty accepting computation  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W)$  such that  $\ell(\mathcal{C}) = \ell(W)$ .

Then, the history H of C can be factored  $H \equiv H_1 \dots H_\ell$  such that  $\ell = \ell(W)$  and each  $H_j$  is the history of a non-empty maximal one-machine subcomputation of C.

Suppose 
$$\ell \geq 2$$
.

For all  $j \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ , let i(j) be the number such that  $H_j$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the i(j)-th machine. Note that  $i(j) \neq i(j+1)$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$ .

Suppose there exists  $k \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$  such that the last letter of  $H_k$  is  $\theta(a)_{i(k)}$ . Then, the configuration  $W \cdot (H_1 \ldots H_k)$  is  $\theta(a)_{i(k)}^{-1}$ -admissible, and so must be  $W_{ac}$ . But then  $H_1 \ldots H_k$  is the history of a reduced computation  $\mathcal{D} \in A(W)$  such that  $\ell(\mathcal{D}) = k < \ell$ , contradicting the definition of  $\ell(W)$ .

Hence, Lemma 6.2 implies that for any  $k \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$ , the last letter of  $H_k$  is  $\theta(s)_{i(k)}^{-1}$ .

For all  $k \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$ , let  $V_k \equiv W \cdot (H_1 \ldots H_k)$ . Then,  $V_k$  is  $\theta(s)_{i(k)}$ -admissible, and so must be a start configuration. Lemma 6.2 then also implies that the first letter of  $H_{k+1}$  is  $\theta(s)_{i(k+1)}$ , i.e  $V_k$  must also be  $\theta(s)_{i(k+1)}$ -admissible. As a result,  $V_k$  is both  $\theta(s)_1$ - and  $\theta(s)_2$ -admissible, and so must have empty 'special' input sector.

In particular,  $H_{\ell}$  is the history of a one-machine computation accepting the start configuration  $V_{\ell-1}$ , and thus by Lemma 6.3 there exists  $u \in \mathcal{L}$  such that either:

- $i(\ell) = 1$  and  $V_{\ell-1} \equiv I(u)$ ; or
- $i(\ell) = 2$  and  $V_{\ell-1} \equiv J(u)$
But  $V_{\ell-1}$  has empty 'special' input sector, and so the assumption  $1 \notin \mathcal{L}$  implies  $V_{\ell-1} \equiv J(u)$  and  $i(\ell) = 2$ .

Now, consider the computation  $C_{\ell-1}: V_{\ell-1} \to \cdots \to V_{\ell-2}$  with history  $H_{\ell-1}^{-1}$ . Then,  $C_{\ell-1}$  is a one-machine computation of the first machine and  $V_{\ell-1} \equiv J(u)$ .

If  $\ell > 2$ , then also  $V_{\ell-2}$  is a start configuration, so that  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell-1}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.6. But then  $||H_{\ell-1}|| = 0$ , contradicting the assumption that each  $H_j$  is non-empty.

The statement then follows by construction.

The following is thus a corollary of Lemmas 6.3 and 6.7:

**Lemma 6.8.** A start configuration W is accepted by  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  if and only if there exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that either  $W \equiv I(w)$  or  $W \equiv J(w)$ .

For any configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and any  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ , the *i*-th component of W, denoted W(i), is the admissible subword of W with base  $\{t(i)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$ .

Since the tape alphabet of the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}{t(i+1)}$ -sector is empty for each *i* (where we take t(L+1) = t(1) for indexing purposes), any configuration is the concatenation of its components, i.e  $W \equiv W(1) \dots W(L)$ .

**Lemma 6.9.** For any accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfying  $\ell(W) = 1$ ,  $|W(1)|_a \leq |W(j)|_a$  for all  $2 \leq j \leq L$ .

*Proof.* As  $|W_{ac}(i)|_a = 0$  for all *i*, it suffices to assume that  $W \neq W_{ac}$ .

So, there exists a non-empty computation  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t \equiv W_{ac}$  with  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W)$  and  $\ell(\mathcal{C}) = 1$ .

If C is a one-machine computation of the first machine, then every rule of C operates in parallel on the components of the configurations. Hence,  $|W_i(1)|_a = |W_i(j)|_a$  for all  $0 \le i \le t$  and  $2 \le j \le L$ .

Conversely, if C is a one-machine computation of the second machine, then each rule of C operates in parallel on the components of the configurations with the exception that it locks the 'special' input sector.

So, for each  $i \in \{0, \ldots, t\}$  there exists a word  $u_i \in F(\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  such that  $W_i$  has the corresponding copy of  $u_i$  written in each input sector other than the 'special' input sector.

Hence,  $|W_i(1)|_a = |W_i(j)|_a - ||u_i||$  for all  $2 \le j \le L$ .

# 6.3. Extending computations.

For simplicity, for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$  and  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , the notation  $I(w, i) \equiv (I(w))(i)$  and  $J(w, i) \equiv (J(w))(i)$  is adopted.

Given an admissible word V whose base consists entirely of letters with coordinate *i*, a coordinate shift V' of V is an admissible word obtained from V by changing each of the state letters' coordinates to some index  $j \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$  and taking the corresponding copies of the tape words. For example, for any  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \{1\}$ , J(w, i) and J(w, j) are coordinate shifts of one another for  $i, j \geq 2$ , but not of J(w, 1). **Lemma 6.10.** Let  $V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  be a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine with history H and base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Then there exists a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  in the standard base with history H such that  $W_{\ell}(j) \equiv V_{\ell}$  for all  $\ell \in \{0, \ldots, t\}$ . Moreover:

- (a) If  $V_{\ell} \equiv W_{ac}(j)$ , then  $W_{\ell} \equiv W_{ac}$
- (b) If  $V_{\ell} \equiv I(w, j)$  for some  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , then
  - $W_{\ell} \equiv I(w)$  if i = 1, or
  - $W_{\ell} \equiv J(w)$  if i = 2.

*Proof.* For each  $\ell \in \{0, \ldots, t\}$  and each  $k \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ , let  $V_{\ell}^{(k)}$  be the coordinate shift of  $V_{\ell}$  with base  $\{t(k)\}B_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}(k)$ .

If i = 1, then similarly let  $V_{\ell}^{(1)}$  be the coordinate shift of  $V_{\ell}$  with base  $\{t(1)\}B_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ .

If i = 2, then let  $V_{\ell}^{(1)}$  be the admissible word with base  $\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  obtained from the corresponding coordinate shift of  $V_{\ell}$  by emptying the 'special' input sector.

Then, define the configuration  $W_{\ell} \equiv V_{\ell}^{(1)}V_{\ell}^{(2)}\dots V_{\ell}^{(L)}$  for each  $\ell$ .

Clearly,  $W_{\ell}(j) \equiv V_{\ell}$ . Further, (a) and (b) are satisfied by the construction.

Finally, letting  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$ , then in either case the parallel nature of the machines implies that  $W_{\ell-1} \cdot \theta_\ell \equiv W_\ell$ .

**Lemma 6.11.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  be a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine with history H and base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Suppose  $V_0 \equiv V_t \equiv W_{ac}(j)$ . Then  $W_{ac}$  is H-admissible and  $W_{ac} \cdot H \equiv W_{ac}$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.10, there exists a one-machine computation  $W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of the *i*-th machine in the standard base such that  $W_\ell(j) \equiv V_\ell$  for all  $\ell$  and  $W_0 \equiv W_t \equiv W_{ac}$ , so that the statement follows.

**Lemma 6.12.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  be a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine with history H and base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Suppose  $V_0$  is a start configuration and  $V_t \equiv W_{ac}(j)$ . Then there exists  $u \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $V_0 \equiv I(u, j)$ .

Moreover, if i = 1, then I(u) is *H*-admissible with  $I(u) \cdot H \equiv W_{ac}$ ; and if i = 2, then J(u) is *H*-admissible with  $J(u) \cdot H \equiv W_{ac}$ .

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.11, applying Lemma 6.10 yields a one-machine computation  $W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of the *i*-th machine in the standard base such that  $W_\ell(j) \equiv V_\ell$  for all  $\ell$  and  $W_t \equiv W_{ac}$ . By construction,  $W_0$  is a start configuration. Lemma 6.3 then implies that there exists  $u \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W_0 \equiv I(u)$  if i = 1 or  $W_0 \equiv J(u)$  if i = 2. The statement then follows by noting that  $I(u, j) \equiv J(u, j)$  for all  $2 \leq j \leq L$ .

**Lemma 6.13.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  be a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine with history H and base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Suppose  $V_0 \equiv I(u, j)$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{L}$ and  $V_t$  is an admissible subword of a start configuration. Then there exists  $v \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $V_t \equiv I(v, j)$ .

Moreover, if i = 1, then I(u) is *H*-admissible with  $I(u) \cdot H \equiv I(v)$ ; and if i = 2, then J(u) is *H*-admissible with  $J(u) \cdot H \equiv J(v)$ .

*Proof.* If i = 1, then Lemma 6.10 again yields a one-machine computation  $W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of the first machine in the standard base such that  $W_{\ell}(j) \equiv V_{\ell}$  for all  $\ell$  and  $W_0 \equiv I(u)$ . By construction,  $W_t$  is a start configuration. But then applying Lemma 6.4, it follows that  $W_t \equiv I(v)$  for some  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ , so that the statement follows.

The analogous conclusion can be reached if i = 2 by applying Lemma 6.5 in place of 6.4.

The following statement is thus a direct consequence of Lemmas 6.11, 6.12, and 6.13:

**Lemma 6.14.** Let  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$  and suppose  $\mathcal{C} : W_{ac}(j) \to \cdots \to W_{ac}(j)$  is a reduced computation. Let  $H \equiv H_1 \dots H_k$  be the factorization of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, H_i$ is the history of a maximal one-machine subcomputation of the  $z_i$ -th machine  $\mathcal{C}_i: U_i \to \cdots \to V_i$ of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then for all *i*, either:

- (a)  $V_i \equiv W_{ac}(j)$  or
- (b)  $V_i \equiv I(w_i, j)$  for some  $w_i \in \mathcal{L}$ .

In case (a), set  $W_i^{(1)} \equiv W_i^{(2)} \equiv W_{ac}$ ; in case (b), set  $W_i^{(1)} \equiv I(w_i)$  and  $W_i^{(2)} \equiv J(w_i)$ . Further, set  $W_0^{(1)} \equiv W_0^{(2)} \equiv W_{ac}$ .

Then for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ , there exists a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}'_i : W_{i-1}^{(z_i)} \to \cdots \to W_i^{(z_i)}$  in the standard base with history  $H_i$ .

In other words, Lemma 6.14 says that  $\mathcal{C}$  can be 'almost-extended' to a reduced computation  $W_{ac} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow W_{ac}$ , in that such a computation exists if one were to allow the insertion/deletion of elements of  $\mathcal{L}$  in the 'special' input sector between maximal one-machine subcomputations.

#### 6.4. Accepted configurations with $\theta$ -admissible components.

**Lemma 6.15.** Let W and W' be accepted configurations of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $W(j) \equiv W'(j)$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Suppose there exist  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W), \mathcal{C}' \in A(W')$ , and  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that both  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  are one-machine computations of the *i*-th machine. Then  $W \equiv W'$ .

*Proof.* Let  $k \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . By construction, the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  operate in parallel on the subwords  $\{t(k)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(k)$  and  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  of the standard base. So, since  $W_{ac}(k)$  is a coordinate shift of  $W_{ac}(j)$ , W(k) and W'(k) must be coordinate shifts of W(j) and W'(j), respectively. Hence,  $W(j) \equiv W'(j)$  implies  $W(k) \equiv W'(k)$ .

As every rule of  $\Theta_1$  also operates analogously on the subword  $\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  of the standard base, the identical argument implies  $W(1) \equiv W'(1)$  if i = 1.

Hence, it suffices to assume i = 2.

For every  $1 \leq k \leq L$  and  $2 \leq \ell \leq N$ , let  $W_{k,\ell}$  be the admissible subword of W with base  $Q_{\ell-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(k)Q_{\ell}^{\mathcal{L}}(k)$ . Similarly, let  $W'_{k\,\ell}$  be the analogous admissible subword of W'.

Since every rule of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  operates in parallel on the subwords  $Q_{\ell-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(k)Q_{\ell}^{\mathcal{L}}(k)$  of the standard base for  $1 \le k \le L$  and  $2 \le \ell \le N$ , then as above:

- W<sub>k,ℓ</sub> is a coordinate shift of W<sub>j,ℓ</sub>
  W'<sub>k,ℓ</sub> is a coordinate shift of W'<sub>j,ℓ</sub>

Hence, since  $W_{j,\ell} \equiv W'_{j,\ell}$  by hypothesis, we have  $W_{1,\ell} \equiv W'_{1,\ell}$ .

Similarly, for every  $1 \leq k \leq L$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq N$ , let  $V_{k,\ell}$  and  $V'_{k,\ell}$  be the admissible subwords of W and W', respectively, with base  $(R^{\mathcal{L}}_{\ell}(k))^{-1}(R^{\mathcal{L}}_{\ell-1}(k))^{-1}$ . The analogous argument then implies that  $V_{1,\ell} \equiv V'_{1,\ell}$ .

As all other sectors formed by two-letter subwords of  $\{t(1)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  are locked by every rule of  $\Theta_2$ , this implies  $W(1) \equiv W'(1)$  and thus  $W \equiv W'$ .

**Lemma 6.16.** Let W be an accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W) \leq 1$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Suppose W(j) is  $\theta$ -admissible for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ , but W is not  $\theta$ -admissible. Then  $\theta = \theta(s)_2$  and  $W \equiv I(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* First, suppose  $W \equiv W_{ac}$ . Then, since  $W_{ac}(j)$  is  $\theta$ -admissible,  $\theta$  must be of the form  $\theta(a)_i^{-1}$ . But then W is  $\theta$ -admissible, contradicting the hypothesis of the statement.

So, it suffices to assume  $\ell(W) = 1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W)$  such that  $\ell(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  and fix  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine. Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t \in F(\Theta_i^+)$  be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ .

First, suppose  $\theta \in \Theta_i$ .

Then, the computation  $W(j) \to W(j) \cdot \theta$  with history  $\theta$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine with base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$ , so that Lemma 6.10 produces a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $\mathcal{D}: W' \to W' \cdot \theta$  in the standard base such that  $W'(j) \equiv W(j)$ .

Similarly, letting  $C_j$  be the restriction of C to the base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$ , then applying Lemma 6.10 to  $C_j$  gives rise to a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $\mathcal{E}$  in the standard base with history H accepting a configuration W'' satisfying  $W''(j) \equiv W(j)$ .

Since  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  are both formed by extending one-machine computations of the *i*-th machine which begin with the same admissible word, the construction outlined in the proof of Lemma 6.10 will produce the same initial configuration. As a result,  $W' \equiv W''$ .

So, W' is a configuration accepted by a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine which satisfies  $W'(j) \equiv W(j)$ . Hence, Lemma 6.15 implies  $W \equiv W'$ . But then W is  $\theta$ -admissible, again yielding a contradiction.

Thus, it suffices to assume  $\theta \in \Theta_k$  for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  with  $k \neq i$ .

Then, W(j) is both  $\theta_1$ -admissible and  $\theta$ -admissible, i.e it is admissible for rules of both machines. Hence, W must either be a start or an end configuration. As the only accepted end configuration is  $W_{ac}$ , W must be a start configuration. By Lemma 6.8, there then exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W \equiv I(w)$  or  $W \equiv J(w)$ .

In either case,  $W(j) \equiv I(w, j)$ , and so  $\theta = \theta(s)_k$ . But J(w) is both  $\theta(s)_1$ - and  $\theta(s)_2$ -admissible, so that  $W \equiv I(w)$ .

Lemma 6.3 then implies that i = 1, so that  $\theta = \theta(s)_2$ .

**Lemma 6.17.** Let W be an accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W) \leq 1$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Suppose W is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) > 1$ . Then  $\theta = \theta(s)_1$  and  $W \equiv J(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ .

*Proof.* If  $W \equiv W_{ac}$ , then the computation  $W \cdot \theta \to W$  with history  $\theta^{-1}$  is a one-machine computation accepting  $W \cdot \theta$ , contradicting the hypotheses of the statement.

So, it suffices to assume that  $\ell(W) = 1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C} \in A(W)$  such that  $\ell(\mathcal{C}) = 1$  and fix  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine. Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t \in F(\Theta_i^+)$  be the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then, if  $\theta \in \Theta_i$ , the word  $\theta^{-1}H \in F(\Theta_i^+)$  is the history of a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine accepting  $W \cdot \theta$ , again yielding a contradiction.

Thus, it suffices to assume  $\theta \in \Theta_k$  for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$  with  $k \neq i$ .

So, W is both  $\theta_1$ - and  $\theta$ -admissible, and so must either be a start or an end configuration. As the only accepted end configuration is  $W_{ac}$ , W must be a start configuration, and so  $\theta = \theta(s)_k$ . By Lemma 6.8, there then exists  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  such that  $W \equiv I(w)$  or  $W \equiv J(w)$ . If  $W \equiv I(w)$ , then Lemma 6.3 implies i = 1. But I(w) is not  $\theta(s)_2$ -admissible, contradicting the hypotheses.

Hence,  $W \equiv J(w)$ , so that  $\theta = \theta(s)_1$  by Lemma 6.3.

### 6.5. Complexity.

The goal of this section is to study the accepting computations of configurations of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  satisfying  $\ell(W) = 1$ . Specifically, for each such configuration, a particular accepting configuration is constructed which satisfies established bounds on its 'length' and 'width' (or 'time' and 'space', respectively) in terms of its *a*-length.

**Lemma 6.18.** Let W be a configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  that is  $\theta$ -admissible for some  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Then  $|W \cdot \theta|_a \leq c_0(|W|_a + 2LN)$ .

Proof. Let  $W_{i,j}$  be the admissible subword of W with base  $Q_{j-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$  for  $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ . If j = 1, then Lemma 5.6 implies that  $|W_{i,j} \cdot \theta|_a \leq c_0(|W_{i,j}|_a + 1)$ . Otherwise, Lemma 4.1 implies  $|W_{i,j} \cdot \theta|_a \leq |W_{i,j}|_a + 1 \leq c_0(|W_{i,j}|_a + 1)$  for  $c_0 \geq 1$ .

Similarly, let  $V_{i,j}$  be the admissible subword of W with base  $(R_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}(R_{j-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$  for  $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L\}$ . Again, Lemma 5.6 implies  $|V_{i,1} \cdot \theta|_a \leq c_0(|V_{i,1}|_a + 1)$ , while Lemma 4.1 implies  $|V_{i,j} \cdot \theta|_a \leq |V_{i,j}|_a + 1 \leq c_0(|V_{i,j}|_a + 1)$  for  $j \geq 2$ .

As any other sector is locked by every rule,  $|W|_a = \sum_{i,j} |W_{i,j}|_a$  and  $|W \cdot \theta|_a = \sum_{i,j} |W_{i,j} \cdot \theta|_a$ . Hence,  $|W \cdot \theta|_a = \sum_{i,j} |W_{i,j} \cdot \theta|_a \le c_0 \sum_{i,j} (|W_{i,j}|_a + 1) = c_0 (|W|_a + 2LN)$ .

**Lemma 6.19.** Let  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t \equiv W_{ac}$  be a computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting the configuration  $W_0$ . Then  $|W_i|_a \leq 4c_0^t LN$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq t$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 6.18 immediately yields  $|W_{i-1}|_a \le c_0(|W_i|_a + 2LN)$  for all  $1 \le i \le t$ . So, since  $|W_t|_a = |W_{ac}|_a = 0$ ,  $|W_{t-1}|_a \le 2c_0LN$ .

Assuming  $|W_{t-i}|_a \leq \sum_{j=1}^i 2c_0^j LN$ , then:

$$|W_{t-i-1}|_a \le c_0 \left(\sum_{j=1}^i 2c_0^j LN + 2LN\right) = 2c_0 \sum_{j=0}^i c_0^j LN = \sum_{j=1}^{i+1} 2c_0^j LN$$

Hence, by induction  $|W_{t-i}|_a \leq \sum_{j=1}^i 2c_0^j LN$  for all *i*. Taking  $c_0 \geq 2$ , then  $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_0^j \leq c_0^i$ , and thus  $|W_{t-i}|_a \leq 4c_0^i LN \leq 4c_0^t LN$ .

**Lemma 6.20.** Let W be an accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W) = 1$  and  $|W(2)|_a = n$ . Then there exists an accepting computation  $W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t \equiv W_{ac}$  such that

$$t \le c_0 TM_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + 2c_0$$

*Proof.* Let  $C \in A(W)$  such that  $\ell(C) = 1$ . Fix  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  such that C is a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine. Then, Lemma 6.1 implies that there exists a factorization  $H \equiv H_s H_i \theta(a)_i$  of the history of C such that:

- $H_s$  is either empty or  $H_s \equiv \theta(s)_i$ , and
- $H_i$  consists only of working rules in  $\Theta_i$ .

Let  $W' \equiv W \cdot H_s$ . Then,  $|W'(j)|_a = |W(j)|_a$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq L$ , and hence  $|W'(2)|_a = |W(2)|_a = n$ . Now, let  $\mathcal{C}_i$  be the subcomputation of  $\mathcal{C}$  with history  $H_i$ . Then,  $\mathcal{C}_i$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,i}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . What's more, since the configuration  $W' \cdot H_i$  is  $\theta(a)_i$ -admissible, it is the natural copy of the accept configuration of  $\mathbf{M}_{6,i}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

So, the computation  $\mathcal{C}_i$  can be identified with a computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{6i}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting W'.

As a result, the restriction of  $C_i$  to the base  $\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  can be identified with a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}_5^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting the configuration W'(2). By Lemma 5.33, there then exists a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $\mathcal{D}': V_0 \to \cdots \to V_z$  with base  $\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  satisfying:

• 
$$V_0 \equiv W'(2)$$

• 
$$V_z \equiv W_{ac}(2) \cdot \theta(a)_i^{-1}$$

•  $z \le c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + c_0$ 

Let H' be the history of  $\mathcal{D}'$ . Then, there exists a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $\mathcal{D}: V_0 \to \cdots \to V_z \to A(2)$  with base  $\{t(2)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(2)$  and history  $H'\theta(a)_i$ .

By applying Lemma 6.10 to  $\mathcal{D}$ , there then exists a one-machine computation of the *i*-th machine  $\mathcal{E}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_z \to W_{z+1}$  in the standard base with history  $H'\theta(a)_i$  such that  $W_\ell(2) \equiv V_\ell$  for all  $0 \leq \ell \leq z$  and  $W_{z+1} \equiv W_{ac}$ .

Hence,  $W_0$  and W' are both configurations accepted by one-machine computations of the *i*-th machine with  $W_0(2) \equiv V_0 \equiv W'(2)$ , so that Lemma 6.15 implies  $W_0 \equiv W'$ .

Thus,  $H_s H' \theta(a)_i$  is the history of an accepting computation of W with

$$|H_s H'\theta(a)_i|| \le z + 2 \le c_0 \mathrm{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + c_0 + 2$$

so that the statement follows by taking  $c_0 \geq 2$ .

# 6.6. Semi-computations in the 'special' input sector.

As the rules of  $\Theta_2$  lock the 'special' input sector, Lemma 4.3 implies that any non-trivial semicomputation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector must consist entirely of rules from the first machine.

In particular, any rule of such a semi-computation is either  $\theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$  or can be identified with the application (in the sense of semi-computations) of a rule of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  to a tape word of the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector.

The following statement is an immediate consequence of the definition of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ :

**Lemma 6.21.** Let w be a non-trivial word over the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Then w is  $\theta$ -applicable if and only if:

•  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$  if  $\theta \neq \theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$ 

• 
$$w \in F(\mathcal{A})$$
 if  $\theta = \theta(s)_1$ 

• 
$$w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1)$$
 if  $\theta = \theta(s)_1^{-1}$ 

Hence, the next statement is an immediate corollary of Lemma 6.21:

**Lemma 6.22.** Let w be a non-trivial word over the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector and v be a subword of a cyclic permutation of  $w^{\pm 1}$ . If w is  $\theta$ -applicable for some  $\theta \in \Theta$ , then v is also  $\theta$ -applicable.

Recall from Section 5.1 that a reduced word over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$  is defined to be compressed if it both begins and ends with a letter of  $\mathcal{A}_1^{\pm 1}$ . This is now extended to reduced words over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ , which are all taken to be compressed.

Note that, by definition, a non-trivial word w in the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector is  $\theta(s)_1$ -admissible if and only if  $w \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , in which case  $w \cdot \theta(s)_1 \in F(\mathcal{A}_1)$ . So, a non-trivial word w which is  $\theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$ -admissible is necessarily compressed. As such, the definition of the compressed application of a rule is extended to include applications of  $\theta(s)_{1}^{\pm 1}$ .

The following statement is thus a consequence of Lemma 5.19:

**Lemma 6.23.** Let  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a non-empty reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2} y_3^{\delta_3} \in F(\mathcal{A})$ . Then, setting  $x_i = \varphi_1(y_i)$ , there exist  $u_1, u_2 \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} u_2 x_3^{\delta_3}$ (2)  $\frac{1}{2} D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \leq ||u_1|| + ||u_2|| \leq 3D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$ (3) The pair  $(u_1, u_2)$  uniquely determine the history of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$

*Proof.* As  $w_0 \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , there exists a factorization  $H \equiv \theta(s)_1 H'$  of the history H of  $\mathcal{S}$ . In particular,  $w_1 \equiv w_0 \cdot \theta(s)_1 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} x_2^{\delta_2} x_3^{\delta_3}$ .

Suppose H' is non-empty. Since  $w_1 \notin F(\mathcal{A})$ , the first letter of H' cannot be  $\theta(s)_1^{-1}$ . So, since H is reduced, H' has a maximal non-empty prefix H'' consisting entirely of working rules of the first machine.

Hence, the sub-compressed semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}'': w_1 \to \cdots \to w_s$  with history H'' can be identified with a reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}}Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector satisfying the hypotheses of Lemma 5.19. But then  $w_s$  is not  $\theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$ -admissible, so that H' = H''.

The statement then follows from Lemma 5.19.

By an identical argument, the following statement is a consequence of Lemma 5.20:

**Lemma 6.24.** Let  $S_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  be a non-empty reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector. Suppose  $w_0 \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2} \in F(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\delta_1 \neq 1$  or  $\delta_2 \neq -1$ . Then, setting  $x_i = \varphi_1(y_i)$ , there exists  $u_1 \in F(\mathcal{B})$  such that:

- (1)  $w_t \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2}$ (2)  $\frac{1}{2} D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \leq ||u_1|| \leq 2D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$ (3)  $u_1$  uniquely determines the history of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$

For any subset  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  of  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C, let  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  be the set of reduced words w over  $(\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$  for which there exists a semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector of the form  $\mathcal{S}: w \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  such that  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . In this case, the semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}$  is then said to  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accept w.

Let  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}} = \{ \widetilde{\varphi}_1(w) : w \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \} = \{ w \cdot \theta_1(s) : w \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \}$ . Note that  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  is then subset of  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_1^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C.

**Lemma 6.25.** Let  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  be a subset of  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C. Then:

- (1)  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}) = \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}).$
- (2) For any  $w \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ , there is a unique semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(w) : w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w.
- (3) Let  $w \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} u_k \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$  for some  $x_i \in \mathcal{A}_1, \ \delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ , and  $u_i \in F(\mathcal{B})$ . Then the history of  $\mathcal{S}(w)$  has the form  $H\theta(s)_1^{-1}$  where:
  - $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}||H|| \le ||u_{i-1}|| + ||u_i|| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}||H||$  for any  $i \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$
  - $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}||H|| \le ||u_k u_0|| + ||u_j|| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}||H||$  for any  $j \in \{1, k-1\}$   $||u_0||, ||u_k|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}||H||$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{S}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  is a non-empty reduced semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector such that  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then, as  $w_t \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , there exists a factorization  $H_w \equiv H\theta(s)_1^{-1}$  of the history of  $\mathcal{S}$ . In particular,  $w_{t-1} \equiv w_t \cdot \theta(s)_1 \equiv \widetilde{\varphi}_1(w_t) \in \Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Suppose H is non-empty. Since  $w_{t-1} \notin F(\mathcal{A})$ , the last letter of H cannot be  $\theta(s)_1^{-1}$ . So, since  $H_w$  is reduced, there must be a maximal non-empty suffix  $H_0$  of H consisting entirely of working rules of the first machine.

Let  $\mathcal{S}_0: w_r \to \cdots \to w_{t-1}$  be the sub-(semi-computation) of  $\mathcal{S}$  with history  $H_0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{S}_0$  can be identified with a semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector which  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts  $w_r$ .

Since  $H_0$  is non-empty, Lemma 5.21 then implies  $|w_r|_b > 0$ . But then  $w_r$  is not  $\theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$ -applicable, i.e  $H_0 = H$  and r = 0.

Hence, if there exists a non-empty semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}$  which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w, then:

- $w \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$
- The history  $H_w$  of  $\mathcal{S}$  can be factored  $H_w \equiv H\theta(s)_1^{-1}$  where H can be identified with the history of a reduced semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in the  $Q_0^{\mathcal{A}} Q_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -sector which  $\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w.

By Lemma 5.21, though, there is a unique semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$  that  $\Lambda_{1}^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w. Hence, H is uniquely determined by w, and so  $H_w$  is also.

As the existence of an empty semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ accepts a word w implies  $w \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , (1) and (2) immediately follow.

Moreover, for  $w \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$ , the structure of the semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(w)$  combined with the bounds established in Lemma 5.21 imply (3).

**Lemma 6.26.** Let  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  be a subset of  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C. Let  $w' \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  and let  $w \in F(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B})$  be a cyclically reduced word which is freely conjugate to w'. Then for any rule  $\theta \in \Theta$ , w is  $\theta$ -applicable if and only if w' is  $\theta$ -applicable.

*Proof.* If  $w' \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , then by hypothesis w and w' are non-trivial cyclic permutations of one another. Hence, the statement follows from Lemma 6.22.

So, by Lemma 6.25(1), it suffices to assume that  $w' \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$ .

By Lemma 6.25(2), there then exists a unique semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(w'): w' \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w'. Let  $w_t \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} \dots y_k^{\delta_k} \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Then,  $w' \equiv u_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} u_k \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$  where  $u_j \in F(\mathcal{B})$  and  $x_j = \varphi_1(y_j) \in \mathcal{A}_1$  for all j. As a result, Lemma 6.25(3) implies the history H of  $\mathcal{S}(w')$  is of the form  $H \equiv H'\theta(s)_1^{-1}$  with  $||u_1|| + ||u_2|| \geq \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}(||H'|| - 1)$ .

Suppose ||H'|| = 0. Then,  $w' \equiv w_t \cdot \theta(s)_1 \equiv x_1^{\delta_1} \dots x_k^{\delta_k}$ . But then w' is cyclically reduced, so that again Lemma 6.22 implies the statement. Hence,  $|w'|_b \geq ||u_1|| + ||u_2|| > 0$ .

Now, let p be the maximal suffix of  $u_k$  such that  $p^{-1}$  is a prefix of  $u_0$ .

Further, let  $u'_0$  and  $u'_k$  be the (perhaps trivial) words over  $\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}$  such that  $u_0 \equiv p^{-1}u'_0$  and  $u_k \equiv u'_k p$ . Then, the maximality of p and the assumption that  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  is cyclically reduced imply that the word  $pw'p^{-1} = u'_0 x_1^{\delta_1} u_1 x_2^{\delta_2} \dots x_k^{\delta_k} u'_k$  is cyclically reduced.

By hypothesis, w is then a cyclic permutation of this word. As a result,  $w \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B})$  with  $|w|_b \ge ||u_1|| + ||u_2|| > 0$  by a parameter choice  $k \ge C > 3$ .

Hence, the statement follows from Lemma 6.21.

**Lemma 6.27.** Let  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  be a subset of  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  consisting of cyclically reduced words of length at least C. Further, let  $w \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Suppose there exists a  $\theta$ -applicable subword v of w such that  $|v|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 3$ . Then w is also  $\theta$ -applicable.

*Proof.* If  $\theta \neq \theta(s)_1^{\pm 1}$ , then Lemma 6.21 implies that  $v \in F(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})$ . But then Lemma 6.25(1) then implies that  $w \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$ , so that the statement follows from Lemma 6.21.

Similarly, if  $\theta = \theta(s)_1$ , then Lemma 6.21 yields  $v \in F(\mathcal{A})$ , so that Lemma 6.25(1) implies  $w \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  so that the statement follows again by Lemma 6.21.

Finally, suppose  $\theta = \theta(s)_1^{-1}$ . As in the first case, Lemma 6.21 implies  $v \in F(\mathcal{A}_1)$ , so that Lemma 6.25(1) implies  $w \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$ . However, since  $|v|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 3$  and  $|v|_b = 0$ , Lemma 6.25(3) implies  $w \in \Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}}$ , and thus the statement again follows from Lemma 6.21.

# 7. Groups Associated to Generalized S-machines

### 7.1. The groups.

As in previous literature (for example [17], [20], [23], [32]), we now associate finitely presented groups to a cyclic generalized S-machine **S**. In the case  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , the groups 'simulate' the work of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the precise sense described in Section 7.4.

Let **S** be a cyclic recognizing generalized S-machine with hardware (Y, Q), where  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{s} Q_i$ and  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{s+1} Y_i$ , and software the set of rules  $\Theta(\mathbf{S}) = \Theta^+(\mathbf{S}) \sqcup \Theta^-(\mathbf{S})$ . For notational purposes, set  $Q_{s+1} = Q_0$ , set  $Y_0 = Y_{s+1}$ , and denote the accept word of **S** by  $W_{ac}$ .

For  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ , let  $\theta = [q_0 \to u_{s+1}q'_0v_1, q_1 \to u_1q'_1v_2, \ldots, q_{s-1} \to u_{s-1}q'_{s-1}v_s, q_s \to u_sq'_sv_{s+1}]$ where some of the arrows may take the form  $\stackrel{\ell}{\to}$ . Further, for all i, let  $X_i(\theta)$  and  $Z_i(\theta)$  be the finite subsets of  $F(Y_i)$  prescribed by  $\theta$  and let  $f_{\theta,i} : X_i(\theta) \to Z_i(\theta)$  be the associated bijection inducing the isomorphism  $\widetilde{f}_{\theta,i} : \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle \to \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$ .

Define  $T = \{\theta_i : \theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S}), 0 \leq i \leq s\}$ . For notational convenience, set  $\theta_{s+1} = \theta_0$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ .

The group  $M(\mathbf{S})$  is then defined by taking the (finite) generating set  $\mathcal{X} = Q \cup Y \cup T$  and imposing the (finite number of) relations:

- $q_i \theta_{i+1} = \theta_i v_i q'_i u_{i+1}$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$  and  $0 \le i \le s$ ,
- $x\theta_i = \theta_i \cdot f_{\theta,i}(x)$  for all  $0 \le i \le s$  and  $x \in X_i(\theta)$ .

As in the language of computations of generalized S-machines, letters from  $Q \cup Q^{-1}$  are called *q*-letters and those from  $Y \cup Y^{-1}$  are called *a*-letters. Additionally, those from  $T \cup T^{-1}$  are called  $\theta$ -letters.

The relations of the form  $q_i\theta_{i+1} = \theta_i v_i q'_i u_{i+1}$  are called  $(\theta, q)$ -relations, while those of the form  $x\theta_i = \theta_i \cdot f_{\theta,i}(x)$  are called  $(\theta, a)$ -relations; when specificity is required, this  $(\theta, a)$ -relation said to be a  $(\theta, a)$ -relation of the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector.

Note that if  $\theta$  locks the *i*-th sector, then there is no relation between  $\theta$  and the elements of  $F(Y_i)$ .

In the particular setting of  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , let *a* be an *a*-letter from the tape alphabet of an input sector.

- (a) If a is the natural copy of a letter from  $\mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{A}_1$ , then  $a^{\pm 1}$  is called an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter.
- (b) If a is a copy of a letter from  $\mathcal{B}$  then  $a^{\pm 1}$  is called a *b*-letter.

Any other *a*-letter is called *ordinary a-letter*.

Note that for any  $\theta \in \Theta^+$ , every domain  $X_i(\theta)$  consists of letters from the corresponding tape alphabet. Naturally, based on the type of *a*-letter of  $x \in X_i(\theta)$ , the  $(\theta, a)$ -relation  $x\theta_i = \theta_i \cdot f_{\theta,i}(x)$ is called a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -relation, a  $(\theta, b)$ -relation, or an ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -relation.

The coordinate of a  $(\theta, q)$ -relation of  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is the coordinate of either of its q-letters. Accordingly, the coordinate of a  $(\theta, a)$ -relation of  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is taken to be *i* if the tape letters are from  $(Y_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i) \cup \mathcal{Y}_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{\pm 1}$  for some *j*.

However, the group  $M(\mathbf{S})$  evidently lacks any reference to the accept configuration. To amend this, the group  $G(\mathbf{S})$  is constructed by adding one more relation to those defining  $M(\mathbf{S})$ , namely the *hub-relation*  $W_{ac} = 1$ . In other words,  $G(\mathbf{S}) \cong M(\mathbf{S})/\langle \langle W_{ac} \rangle \rangle$ .

Moreover, it is useful for the purposes of this manuscript to consider extra relations, called *a*-relations, within the language of tape letters. If  $\Omega$  is the set of relators defining these *a*-relations, then the groups arising from the addition of *a*-relations are denoted by  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$ . Hence,  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S}) \cong M(\mathbf{S})/\langle\langle\Omega\rangle\rangle$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S}) \cong G(\mathbf{S})/\langle\langle\Omega\rangle\rangle$ .

It is henceforth taken as an assumption that any *a*-relation adjoined to the groups associated to the machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  corresponds to a word over the alphabet  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}$  of the 'special' input sector.

In particular, it is assumed that  $\Omega$  is the set of all cyclically reduced words over  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ which are freely conjugate to an element of  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ , where  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  is a subset of  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  satisfying:

- (L1)  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  consists entirely of cyclically reduced words of length at least C
- (L2)  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  is closed under taking inverses
- (L3)  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  is closed under taking cyclic permutations
- (L4) For any  $w_1, w_2 \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , either  $w_1 \equiv w_2^{-1}$  or  $w_1 w_2$  is freely conjugate to an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ (L5)  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$

The following is then a consequence of these conditions:

**Lemma 7.1.** The set of *a*-relators  $\Omega$  is closed under taking inverses.

*Proof.* Let  $w \in \Omega$ . Then, there exists a word  $v \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  which is freely conjugate to w.

By definition, there then exists a (unique) semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(v) : v \equiv v_0 \to \cdots \to v_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts v. Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$  be the history of  $\mathcal{S}(v)$ .

As the application of each rule of a semi-computation is the application of an isomorphism, it follows that for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ ,  $v_{i-1}^{-1}$  is  $\theta_i$ -applicable with  $v_{i-1}^{-1} \cdot \theta_i = (v_{i-1} \cdot \theta)^{-1} = v_i^{-1}$ . Hence, there exists a semi-computation  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}(v) : v^{-1} \equiv v_0^{-1} \to \cdots \to v_t^{-1}$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H.

But condition (L2) implies that  $v_t^{-1} \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , so that  $\overline{\mathcal{S}(w)} \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts  $v^{-1}$ . Hence,  $w^{-1}$  is a cyclically reduced word which is freely conjugate to  $v^{-1}$ , so that  $w^{-1} \in \Omega$ .

Note that though they remain finitely generated,  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$  may no longer be finitely presented. In fact, in all relevant situations encountered in the sequel, the presentations defining the groups  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  necessarily have infinitely many relations.

### 7.2. Bands and annuli.

The majority of the arguments presented in the forthcoming sections rely on van Kampen and Schupp diagrams (see Section 2.1) over the presentations of the groups introduced in Section 7.1. To present these arguments efficiently, it is convenient to first differentiate between the types of edges and cells that abound in such diagrams, doing so in a way similar to that employed in [17], [23], and [32].

For simplicity, when possible the presence of 0-edges and 0-cells will be disregarded in these diagrams. Hence, adjacent edges are generally identified in these settings. However, even when ignored, the existence of 0-cells should be kept in mind, as 0-refinement ensures that many of the diagrammatic operations performed in the sequel do not alter the desired topological properties of the diagram (for example, so that the process of removing a pair of cancellable cells in a circular diagram results in a circular diagram).

Additionally, it is henceforth taken as an assumption that the contour of any circular diagram, the contour of any subdiagram, the contour of any cell, and the outer contour of any annular diagram is traced in the counterclockwise direction. Conversely, it is assumed that the inner contour of an annular diagram is traced in the clockwise direction.

For any diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$  (or any group associated to a generalized *S*-machine **S**), an edge labelled by a *q*-letter is called a *q*-edge. Similarly, an edge labelled by a  $\theta$ -letter is called a  $\theta$ -edge and one labelled by an *a*-letter is a *a*-edge.

For a path  $\mathbf{p}$  in  $\Delta$ , the (combinatorial) length of  $\mathbf{p}$  is denoted  $\|\mathbf{p}\|$ . Further, the path's *a-length*  $|\mathbf{p}|_a$  is the number of *a*-edges in the path. The path's  $\theta$ -length and *q*-length, denoted  $|\mathbf{p}|_{\theta}$  and  $|\mathbf{p}|_q$ , respectively, are defined similarly.

A cell whose contour label corresponds to a  $(\theta, q)$ -relation is called a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell. Similarly, there are  $(\theta, a)$ -cells, *a*-cells, and *hubs*. More specifically, a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell is called a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell of the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector if its contour label corresponds to such a  $(\theta, a)$ -relation, while the coordinate of a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or  $(\theta, a)$ -cell is defined similarly.

In the particular setting where  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , an *a*-edge is called an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge, a *b*-edge, or an ordinary *a-edge* based on the type of *a*-letter labelling it.

The  $\mathcal{A}$ -length, b-length, and ordinary a-length of the path  $\mathbf{p}$ , denoted  $|\mathbf{p}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $|\mathbf{p}|_{b}$ , and  $|\mathbf{p}|_{o}$ , respectively, are then defined in much the same way as above. Note that  $|\mathbf{p}|_a = |\mathbf{p}|_A + |\mathbf{p}|_b + |\mathbf{p}|_o$  for any path  $\mathbf{p}$ . Moreover, if  $Lab(\mathbf{p})$  is a reduced word over the tape alphabet of an input sector, then  $|\mathbf{p}|_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $|\mathbf{p}|_b$  agree with  $|\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})|_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $|\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})|_b$ , respectively. Conversely, if  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  is a reduced word over the tape alphabet of any other sector, then  $|\mathbf{p}|_o = |\mathbf{p}|_a$ .

A  $(\theta, a)$ -cell is called a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell, a  $(\theta, b)$ -cell, or an ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cell based on the type of  $(\theta, a)$ -relation defining its boundary label. Note that it is a consequence of these definitions that  $(\theta, b)$ -cells and ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cells correspond to relators of the form  $[\theta_i, y]$  for some index i and some a-letter y.

In the general setting of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over any presentation with generating set X, fix a subset  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq X$ . For  $m \geq 1$ , suppose  $\mathcal{S} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m)$  is a sequence of distinct cells in  $\Delta$ ,  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m)$  is a sequence of edges of  $\Delta$ , and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  is a number such that the following conditions hold:

- e<sup>-1</sup><sub>i-1</sub> and e<sub>i</sub> are edges of ∂π<sub>i</sub>
  Lab(e<sub>i</sub>) ∈ Z<sup>ε</sup>
  e<sup>-1</sup><sub>i-1</sub> and e<sub>i</sub> are the only edges of ∂π<sub>i</sub> labelled by a letter of Z ∪ Z<sup>-1</sup>

Then S is called a Z-band of length m with defining edge sequence  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_m)$  comprised of the defining edges  $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m\}$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a *positive* or *negative*  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band depending on the value of  $\varepsilon$ .

Using only edges from the boundaries of  $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m$ , there exists a simple closed path  $\mathbf{e}_0^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{e}_m(\mathbf{q}_2)^{-1}$ such that  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are simple (perhaps closed) paths. What's more, using 0-refinement (or gluing), it may be assumed that  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  both have reduced label. In this case,  $\mathbf{q}_1$  is called the bottom of  $\mathcal{S}$ , denoted **bot**( $\mathcal{S}$ ), while  $\mathbf{q}_2$  is called the *top* of  $\mathcal{S}$  and denoted **top**( $\mathcal{S}$ ). When the top and bottom of the band need not be distinguished, they are called the *sides* of the band.

If  $\mathbf{e}_0 = \mathbf{e}_m$  in a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band  $\mathcal{S}$  of length  $m \geq 1$ , then  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -annulus.

If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a non-annular  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band, then identifying  $\mathcal{S}$  with the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  consisting of its cells,  $\mathbf{e}_0^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{e}_m\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  is called the standard factorization of  $\partial S$ .







(b) Annular  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band of length m

Note that  $\bar{S} = (\pi_m, \dots, \pi_1)$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -band of length m with defining edge sequence  $(\mathbf{e}_m^{-1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_1^{-1}, \mathbf{e}_0^{-1})$ (and so  $\mathcal{I}_{\bar{S}} = \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S}}^{-1}$ ), so that S is a positive  $\mathbb{Z}$ -band if and only if  $\bar{S}$  is a negative  $\mathbb{Z}$ -band. Hence, a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -band of length  $m \ge 1$  can be identified with the collection of cells that comprise it along with a *direction* determined by whether the band is positive or negative.

For completeness, the definition of  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band is extended by saying that any edge **e** labelled by a letter of  $\mathcal{Z}^{\pm 1}$  is a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band of length zero with defining edge sequence (**e**). Naturally, this band is positive or negative depending on whether Lab(**e**) is an element of  $\mathcal{Z}$  or  $\mathcal{Z}^{-1}$ , respectively.

A  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is a *(proper)* subband of a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band  $\mathcal{S}_2$  if the defining edge sequence of  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is a (proper) subsequence of that of  $\mathcal{S}_2$ . A  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band is said to be *maximal* if it is not a proper subband of any other  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band. Note that every edge labelled by a letter of  $\mathcal{Z}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{Z}^{-1}$ ) is a defining edge of a maximal positive (resp. negative)  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band; moreover, if it is non-annular, then this maximal  $\mathcal{Z}$ -band is unique.

If S is a non-annular Z-band, then  $\mathbf{e}_0$  and  $\mathbf{e}_m$  are called the *ends* of S. If  $\mathbf{e}_0$  (or  $\mathbf{e}_m^{-1}$ ) is an edge of  $\partial \pi$  for some cell  $\pi$  which is not a cell comprising S, then S is said to have an end on  $\pi$ . Naturally, S can have two ends on  $\pi$  if both  $\mathbf{e}_0$  and  $\mathbf{e}_m^{-1}$  are edges of  $\partial \pi$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{e}_0^{-1}$  (or  $\mathbf{e}_m$ ) is an edge of a subpath  $\mathbf{t}$  of a boundary component of  $\Delta$ , then S is said to have an end on  $\mathbf{t}$ .

A  $\mathcal{Z}_1$ -band and a  $\mathcal{Z}_2$ -band cross if they have a common cell and  $\mathcal{Z}_1 \cap \mathcal{Z}_2 = \emptyset$ .

In the particular setting of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over a group associated to a generalized *S*-machine, there exist *q*-bands corresponding to bands arising from taking  $\mathcal{Z}$  to be some part of the state letters. Note that the makeup of the relations precludes the inclusion of a hub in a *q*-band, so that every cell of the band is a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell.

The natural projection of the label of the top (or bottom) of a q-band onto  $\Theta^+ \sqcup \Theta^-$  is called the *history* of the band. Note that the structure of the relations implies that any reduction of adjacent  $\theta$ -edges in a side would necessitate a pair of cancellable  $(\theta, q)$ -cells in the band. Hence, if H is the history of a q-band Q, then  $H \in F(\Theta^+)$  and Q has length ||H||.

Similarly, for a positive (generalized) rule  $\theta$  of the machine, there exist  $\theta$ -bands given by taking  $\mathcal{Z}$  to be the set of all letters  $\theta_i$ . The history of a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{S}$  is taken to be  $\theta$  if  $\mathcal{S}$  is a positive  $\theta$ -band and  $\theta^{-1}$  if it is negative. The natural projection (without reduction) of the top (or bottom) of a  $\theta$ -band onto the alphabet given by the letters of the standard base is called the *base* of the band. As above, the length of the base of the band is equal to the number of  $(\theta, q)$ -cells in the band.

As opposed to the groups associated to typical S-machines (see [32]), though, letters from the tape alphabet of an arbitrary generalized S-machine do not obviously define bands in the associated diagrams. However, in the particular setting of diagrams over the groups associated to the generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , these bands can be defined by restricting the types of cells which can be present. Such bands are called *a-bands* and are classified as follows:

- (1) For any  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  and any input tape alphabet, there exist *a*-bands given by  $\mathcal{Z} = \{\tilde{a}, \tilde{a}_1\}$ , where  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{a}_1$  are the corresponding copies of *a* and  $\varphi_1(a)$ , respectively, in this input tape alphabet.
- (2) For any  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  and any input tape alphabet, there exist *a*-bands given by  $\mathcal{Z} = \{\tilde{b}\}$ , where  $\tilde{b}$  is the corresponding copy of *b* in this input tape alphabet.
- (3) For any tape letter a of a non-input tape alphabet, there exist a-bands given by  $\mathcal{Z} = \{a\}$

The *a*-bands of type (1) are called  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands. Similarly, those of type (2) are called *b*-bands and those of type (3) are called *ordinary a*-bands.

In all cases, the inclusion of  $(\theta, q)$ - or *a*-cells in an *a*-band is forbidden, so that any such band must consist only of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells. Moreover, the inclusion of  $(\theta, A)$ -cells is forbidden in *b*-bands.

Hence, each cell of any  $\mathcal{A}$ -band is a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell, each cell of any *b*-band is a  $(\theta, b)$ -cell, and each cell of any ordinary *a*-band is an ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cell.

Given a *b*-band or an ordinary *a*-band S, the makeup of the groups' relations dictates that the defining edges are labelled identically. Similarly, the defining edges of a  $\theta$ -band correspond to the same rule, though the index of these edges may differ.

The history of an *a*-band is defined in much the same way as it is for *q*-bands. As in that setting, if H is the history of an *a*-band  $\mathcal{U}$ , then  $H \in F(\Theta^+)$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  has length ||H||.

Note that distinct maximal q-bands either consist of the same cells with opposite direction or do not intersect at all. In particular, distinct maximal positive q-bands cannot intersect. Analogous observations apply to distinct maximal  $\theta$ -bands and distinct maximal a-bands.

Given the makeup of the relations of the groups defined in Section 7.1, a maximal band in a reduced diagram over the canonical presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  can have ends in the following ways:

- a maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band can have an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, on an *a*-cell, or on the diagram's boundary;
- a maximal b-band can have an end on a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell, on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, on an a-cell, or on the diagram's boundary;
- a maximal ordinary *a*-band can have an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or on the diagram's boundary;
- a maximal q-band can have an end on a hub or on the diagram's boundary; and
- a maximal  $\theta$ -band can have an end only on the diagram's boundary.

Note that if a maximal  $\theta$ -band (respectively  $\mathcal{A}$ -band, *b*-band, ordinary *a*-band, *q*-band) has an end as above in one part of the diagram, then it must also have another end in another part of the diagram as it cannot be a  $\theta$ -annulus (respectively  $\mathcal{A}$ -annulus, *b*-annulus, ordinary *a*-annulus, *q*-annulus).

Suppose the sequence of cells  $(\pi_0, \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_m)$  comprises a  $\theta$ -band and  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_\ell)$  a *q*-band such that  $\pi_0 = \gamma_0$ ,  $\pi_m = \gamma_\ell$ , and no other cells are shared. Suppose further that  $\partial \pi_0$  and  $\partial \pi_m$  both contain edges on the outer countour of the annulus bounded by the two bands. Then the union of these two bands is called a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus and  $\pi_0$  and  $\pi_m$  are called its *corner* cells.

A  $(\theta, a)$ -annulus is defined similarly, with a  $\theta$ -band and an *a*-band intersecting twice. If the *a*-band defining this annulus is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -band, then the  $(\theta, a)$ -annulus is called a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -annulus. A  $(\theta, b)$ -annulus and an ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -annulus are defined similarly.



FIGURE 7.2.  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus with defining  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  and q-band  $\mathcal{Q}$ 

**Lemma 7.2** (Compare to Lemma 6.1 of [15]). For any generalized S-machine **S**, a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{S})$  contains no:

- (1)  $(\theta, q)$ -annuli
- (2) q-annuli

*Proof.* (1) Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus S. Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the defining q-band and let  $\Delta_S$  be the subdiagram bounded by the outer component of the contour of S (see Figure 7.3(a)).

By the definition of the annulus, the history H of Q must be of the form  $\theta w \theta^{-1}$  for some rule  $\theta \in \Theta(\mathbf{S})$  and some word  $w \in F(\Theta^+(\mathbf{S}))$ .

If *H* is unreduced, then a cancellable pair in *H* implies a cancellable pair of  $(\theta, q)$ -cells in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . As a result, *H* must be reduced, and so *w* cannot be trivial. Hence,  $\mathcal{Q}$  must contain a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell  $\pi$  with no boundary *q*-edge shared with  $\partial \Delta_S$ .

Note that each cell of  $\mathcal{Q}$  has exactly one boundary  $\theta$ -edge that is shared with  $\partial \Delta_S$ . Indeed, all  $\theta$ -edges of  $\partial \Delta_S$  arise in this way.

Letting **e** be the  $\theta$ -edge of  $\partial \pi$  shared with  $\partial \Delta_S$ , let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta_S$  such that  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}$  must have another end on  $\partial \Delta_S$ , and so this end is a  $\theta$ -edge of  $(\partial \Delta_S)^{-1}$ .

Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  defines a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus S' with some subband of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Note that the history of the q-band defining S' is a subword of w.

Iterating, there exists a  $\theta$ -band whose two ends are boundary edges of adjacent cells of Q. But then these two  $(\theta, q)$ -cells are cancellable, contradicting the assumption that  $\Delta$  is reduced.

(2) Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a q-annulus S and let  $\Delta_S$  be the subdiagram bounded by the outer component of the contour of S (see Figure 7.3(b)).

As each cell comprising S is a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, each cell of S has exactly one boundary  $\theta$ -edge which is shared with  $\partial \Delta_S$ . For any such edge **e**, let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band with  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{T}$ must have another end which is a  $\theta$ -edge of  $(\partial \Delta_S)^{-1}$ .

But then  $\mathcal{T}$  and a subband of S form a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus, contradicting (1).





(a)  $\Delta_S$  for S a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus



(b)  $\Delta_S$  for S a q-annulus

In diagrams over the generalized S-machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , the existence and makeup of *a*-bands allow for the following statement, proved in exactly the same way as Lemma 7.2:

**Lemma 7.3.** A reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  contains no:

- (1)  $(\theta, a)$ -annuli
- (2) *a*-annuli

As a result, in a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , if a maximal  $\theta$ -band and a maximal q-band (respectively a-band) cross, then their intersection is exactly one  $(\theta, q)$ -cell (respectively one  $(\theta, q)$ -cell).

Similarly, the following statement is proved in exactly the same way as Lemma 8.2 of [32]:

**Lemma 7.4** (Compare with Lemma 8.2 of [32]). If  $\Delta$  is a reduced circular diagram over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\pi$  is an *a*-cell in  $\Delta$ , then no *a*-band of positive length has two ends on  $\pi$ .



FIGURE 7.4. *a*-band with two ends on an *a*-cell

Note that Lemma 7.4 does not rule out the possibility that an *a*-band of length 0 has two ends on the *a*-cell  $\pi$ . This is possible if there exists an edge **e** of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}$  is also an edge of  $\partial \pi$  (again, this is ignoring the existence of 0-cells; for topological purposes, we may employ a 0-refinement so that there exists an edge **f** adjacent to **e** such that  $\mathbf{f}^{-1}$ , not  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}$ , is an edge of  $\partial \pi$ ). In this case,  $\pi$  is called a *pinched a-cell* and  $\mathbf{e}^{\pm 1}$  are called *pinched edges* of  $\pi$ .

Given a pinched *a*-cell  $\pi$ , let **s** be a maximal subpath of  $\partial \pi$  consisting of pinched edges. Then, there exists a decomposition  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{s}^{\pm 1} \mathbf{q} \mathbf{s}^{\mp 1} \mathbf{p}$  such that  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  is the contour of a subdiagram  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$ of  $\Delta$  not containing  $\pi$  (see Figure 7.5). In this case,  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1} \mathbf{q} \mathbf{s}^{\mp 1} \mathbf{p}$  is called the *pinched factorization* of  $\partial \pi$  with respect to the *pinched subpath* **s**.

Note that  $\mathbf{q}$  is the contour of a subdiagram  $\Phi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  of  $\Delta$  consisting of  $\pi$  and  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$ . What's more, since  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Omega$  is cyclically reduced,  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  must be non-trivial subpaths of  $\partial \pi$ .

A reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is called *smooth* if it contains no pinched *a*-cells.



FIGURE 7.5. The subdiagram  $\Phi_{\pi,s}$  corresponding to a pinched *a*-cell  $\pi$ 

**Lemma 7.5.** A reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  contains no  $\theta$ -annuli.

*Proof.* Suppose S is a  $\theta$ -annulus in  $\Delta$  and let  $\Delta_S$  be the subdiagram bounded by the outer component of S.

First, suppose  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  contains a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell  $\pi$  and let  $\mathbf{e}$  be a q-edge of  $\partial \pi$ . By Lemma 7.2(2), there exists a unique maximal q-band  $\mathcal{Q}$  of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  such that  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ . As  $\mathcal{Q}$  is non-annular, it must have two ends on  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ . But then  $\mathcal{Q}$  and a subband of  $\mathcal{S}$  form a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus in  $\Delta$ , contradicting Lemma 7.2(1).

Hence,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  consists entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells.

Next, suppose  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  contains a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell  $\pi'$  and let **f** be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\partial \pi'$ . Then, Lemma 7.3(2) implies there exists a unique maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  such that  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{U}}$ . But then similar to above,  $\mathcal{U}$  must have two ends on  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ , so that  $\mathcal{U}$  and a subband of  $\mathcal{S}$  form a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -annulus that contradicts Lemma 7.3(1).

Hence,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  must consist entirely of  $(\theta, b)$ -cells and ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cells.

But then any edge of  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  must be one end of an *a*-band which has another end on  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ , again producing a  $(\theta, a)$ -annulus that contradicts Lemma 7.3(1).

As a result, in a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , each maximal  $\theta$ -band and each maximal q-band has two ends on  $\partial \Delta$ .

### 7.3. Semi-trapezia.

We now introduce a new classification of reduced diagram over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  that is unique to this setting. Denote the hardware of  $\mathbf{S}$  as (Y, Q) with  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{s+1} Y_i$  and  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{s} Q_i$ .

**Lemma 7.6.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band of positive length in a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector. If the history of  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\theta$ , then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ applicable and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}))$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$ .

First, suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  is a positive  $\theta$ -band, i.e  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ . By the makeup of the relations of  $M(\mathbf{S})$ , for all  $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ , there exist  $x_j \in X_i(\theta)$  and  $\varepsilon_j \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_j) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} x_j^{\varepsilon_j} \theta_i f_{\theta,i}(x_j)^{-\varepsilon_j}$ . As a result,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots x_k^{\varepsilon_k} \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$  and

$$\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T})) = f_{\theta,i}(x_1)^{\varepsilon_1} \dots f_{\theta,i}(x_k)^{\varepsilon_k} = \widetilde{f}_{\theta,i}(x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots x_k^{\varepsilon_k})$$

Hence,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ -applicable  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  is a negative  $\theta$ -band, i.e  $\theta \in \Theta^{-}(\mathbf{S})$ . Then, since  $\theta^{-1} \in \Theta^{+}(\mathbf{S})$ , for all  $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ , there exist  $z_j \in X_i(\theta^{-1})$  and  $\delta_j \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_j) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} f_{\theta^{-1},i}(z_j)^{\delta_j} \theta_i z_j^{-\delta_j}$ . As a result,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv z_1^{\delta_1} \ldots z_k^{\delta_k} \in \langle X_i(\theta^{-1}) \rangle$  and

$$\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) = f_{\theta^{-1},i}(z_1)^{\delta_1} \dots f_{\theta^{-1},i}(z_k)^{\delta_k} = \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(z_1^{\delta_1} \dots z_k^{\delta_k})$$

Since  $Z_i(\theta^{-1}) = X_i(\theta)$ , it follows that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$ , i.e  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ -applicable. But since  $\tilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i} = \tilde{f}_{\theta,i}^{-1}$  by definition, it immediately follows that

$$\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{\mathbf{bot}}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta = f_{\theta,i}(\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{\mathbf{bot}}(\mathcal{T}))) = \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{\mathbf{top}}(\mathcal{T}))$$

**Lemma 7.7.** Let  $u \to v$  be a semi-computation of **S** in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector with history H of length 1, so that  $H = \theta \in \Theta(\mathbf{S})$ . Then there exists a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $l_{\theta}(u)$  history  $\theta$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv u$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv v$ .

*Proof.* First, suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ . Note that  $u \in \langle X_i(\theta) \rangle$ , so that there exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in X_i(\theta)$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_k \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $u = x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \ldots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$ . By the makeup of the relations, for each  $j = 1, \ldots, k$ one can construct a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell  $\pi_j$  satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_j) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} x_j^{\varepsilon_j} \theta_i f_{\theta,i}(x_j)^{-\varepsilon_j}$ . Pasting along the  $\theta$ -edges (and making any necessary cancellations through 0-refinement or gluing) then gives a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}^+ = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k)$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T}^+)) \equiv u$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T}^+)) \equiv \widetilde{f}_{\theta,i}(u) \equiv v$ . Hence, since the length of  $\mathcal{T}^+$  is  $k = |u|_{X_i(\theta)} = l_{\theta}(u)$ , the band  $\mathcal{T}^+$  satisfies the statement.

Conversely, suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^{-}(\mathbf{S})$ . Then,  $v \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv u$  with  $\theta^{-1} \in \Theta^{+}(\mathbf{S})$ . Let  $z_1, \ldots, z_\ell \in X_i(\theta^{-1})$  and  $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_\ell \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $v = z_1^{\delta_1} \ldots z_\ell^{\delta_\ell}$ . As above, the makeup of the relations then allows one to construct  $(\theta, a)$ -cells  $\pi'_1, \ldots, \pi'_\ell$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi'_j) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} f_{\theta^{-1},i}(z_j)^{\delta_j} \theta_i z_j^{-\delta_j}$ . Pasting  $\pi'_1, \ldots, \pi'_\ell$ along their  $\theta$ -edges and making any necessary cancellations then gives a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}^- = (\pi'_1, \ldots, \pi'_{\ell})$ with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T}^{-})) \equiv v$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T}^{-})) \equiv \widetilde{f}_{\theta^{-1},i}(v) \equiv u$ . Thus, the statement follows as above by noting that  $\mathcal{T}^-$  has length  $\ell = |v|_{X_i(\theta^{-1})} = l_{\theta^{-1}}(v) = l_{\theta}(u)$ .

Fix  $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$  and suppose  $\Delta$  is a reduced circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  which can be decomposed into maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  such that:

- top(*T<sub>j</sub>*) = bot(*T<sub>j+1</sub>*) for each *j* ∈ {1,..., *h* − 1} *T<sub>j</sub>* consists entirely of (*θ*, *a*)-cells in the *Q<sub>i-1</sub>Q<sub>i</sub>*-sector

Then  $\Delta$  is called a *semi-trapezium* with height h over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector.

In this case, the maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  are said to be enumerated from bottom to top. Further, the *bottom* and *top* of  $\Delta$  are defined to be  $\mathbf{bot}(\Delta) = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{top}(\Delta) = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ , respectively. Finally, if  $\theta_i$  is the history of  $\mathcal{T}_i$ , then the history of  $\Delta$  is  $\theta_1 \dots \theta_h$ .

As a semi-trapezium consists entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells, for each maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_i$  the defining edges are labelled identically. In particular, there exists a factorization  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  such that:

- q<sub>1</sub> = bot(Δ) and q<sub>2</sub> = top(Δ)
  Lab(p<sub>1</sub>) ≡ Lab(p<sub>2</sub>), with each a copy of the history of Δ

In particular,  $bot(\Delta)$  and  $top(\Delta)$  are conjugate in  $M(\mathbf{S})$ .

An iteration of applications of Lemmas 7.6 and 7.7 then imply the following statements:

**Lemma 7.8.** Let  $\Delta$  be a semi-trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector with maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  enumerated from bottom to top. Let  $H \equiv \theta_1 \ldots \theta_h$  be the history of  $\Delta$ . Then, letting  $w_{j-1} = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_j))$  for  $j = 1, \ldots, h$  and  $w_h = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_h))$ , there exists a semi-computation  $w_0 \to \cdots \to w_h$  of **S** in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector with history *H*.

**Lemma 7.9.** For any reduced semi-computation  $w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of **S** in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector with history  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_t$ , there exists a semi-trapezium  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  in the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector satisfying:

(a)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\Delta)) \equiv w_0$ (b)  $Lab(top(\Delta)) \equiv w_t$ (c) The history of  $\Delta$  is H (d) Area( $\Delta$ ) =  $\sum_{j=1}^{t} l_{\theta_j}(w_{j-1})$ 

#### 7.4. Trapezia.

The goal of this section is to define the reduced diagrams over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  that 'simulate' computations of the generalized machine S. This is achieved much in the same way as the semi-trapezia of the last section 'simulate' semi-computations.

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. The maximal subpath of  $bot(\mathcal{T})$  whose first and last edges are q-edges is called the *trimmed bottom* of the band, denoted  $\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})$ . The trimmed top  $\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T})$  is defined similarly.



FIGURE 7.6.  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  with trimmed top

Lemma 7.10. Let S be a generalized S-machine and  $\mathcal{T}$  be a positive  $\theta$ -band in a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. Suppose the history of  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ . Then:

- (a)  $Lab(tbot(\mathcal{T}))$  and  $Lab(ttop(\mathcal{T}))$  are admissible words
- (b)  $Lab(tbot(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ -admissible
- (c)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}))$

*Proof.* Denote the hardware of **S** as (Y,Q) with  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{s+1} Y_i$  and  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{s} Q_i$ .

Suppose first that  $\mathcal{T}$  consists of one  $(\theta, q)$ -cell  $\pi$ . Then  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  contain just one q-edge, which is a part of  $(\partial \pi)^{\pm 1}$ . So,  $ttop(\mathcal{T})$  and  $tbot(\mathcal{T})$  each consist of this one q-edge. It follows from the definition of  $(\theta, q)$ -relations that  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta \equiv \text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}))$ .

Now suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  contains at least two  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. Let  $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2$  be consecutive q-edges of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  with  $q_1 = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_1)$  and  $q_2 = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_2)$ . So,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  has a subword  $q_1wq_2$  for some  $w \in F(Y)$ . For j = 1, 2, let  $\pi_j$  be the  $(\theta, q)$ -cell in  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_j$  is an edge of  $\partial \pi_j$ .

Further, let  $\mathcal{T}_w$  be the maximal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  (perhaps of length 0) between  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ . By construction,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_w)) \equiv w$ . Further, let  $\mathcal{T}_1$  be the  $\theta$ -band formed by  $\pi_1, \pi_2$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_w$ .

Let  $i \in \{0, \ldots, s\}$  such that  $q_1 \in Q_i^{\pm 1}$ .

**1.** Suppose  $q_1 \in Q_i$ .

Then the *i*-th part of  $\theta$  must be  $q_1 \to v_i q'_1 u_{i+1}$  for some  $q'_1 \in Q_i, v_i \in \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$ , and  $u_{i+1} \in \langle Z_{i+1}(\theta) \rangle$ . As a result,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} q_1 \theta_{i+1} (v_i q'_i u_{i+1})^{-1}$ .

Further, any cell of  $\mathcal{T}_w$  must be a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell with a boundary edge labelled by  $\theta_{i+1}$ , and so is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell of the  $Q_i Q_{i+1}$ -sector. Hence, Lemma 7.6 implies  $w \in F(Y_{i+1})$  is  $\theta$ -applicable with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T}_w)) \equiv w \cdot \theta.$ 

What's more, the label of  $\partial \pi_2$  must have a subword  $\theta_{i+1}^{-1}q_2$ . By the definition of the  $(\theta, q)$ -relations, this means one of two things:

- (i)  $q_2 \in Q_{i+1}$  and the (i+1)-th part of  $\theta$  is  $q_2 \to v_{i+1}q'_2u_{i+2}$  for some  $q'_2 \in Q_{i+1}$ , some  $v_{i+1} \in \langle Z_{i+1}(\theta) \rangle$ , and some  $u_{i+2} \in \langle Z_{i+2}(\theta) \rangle$ ; or (ii)  $q_2 = q_1^{-1}$ , so that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_2) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1)^{-1}$ .

In case (i), the subword  $q_1wq_2$  of  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  satisfies condition (1) in the requirements for subwords of admissible words (see Section 4.1). Moreover,  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv q'_1 u_{i+1}(w \cdot \theta) v_{i+1}q'_2$ . In case (ii), the subword  $q_1wq_1^{-1}$  of  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  satisfies condition (2) as long as w is non-empty; but this is required in the band, as otherwise there would either be a pair of cancellable  $(\theta, a)$ -cells or  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  would be a pair of cancellable cells. Further,  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv q'_1 u_{i+1}(w \cdot \theta) u_{i+1}^{-1}(q'_1)^{-1}$ .

In either case, it follows that  $q_1wq_2$  is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv (q_1wq_2) \cdot \theta$ .

**2.** Suppose  $q_1 \in Q_i^{-1}$ .

Then the *i*-th part of  $\theta$  must be  $q_1^{-1} \to v_i(q_1')^{-1}u_{i+1}$  for some  $q_1' \in Q_i^{-1}$ ,  $v_i \in \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$ , and  $u_{i+1} \in \langle Z_{i+1}(\theta) \rangle$ . So,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1) \equiv \theta_{i+1}^{-1}q_1\theta_i(u_{i+1}^{-1}q_1'v_i^{-1})$ .

Similar to above, any cell of  $\mathcal{T}_w$  must be a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell with a boundary edge labelled by  $\theta_i$ , and so is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell of the  $Q_{i-1}Q_i$ -sector. Hence, as above Lemma 7.6 implies  $w \in F(Y_i)$  is  $\theta$ -applicable with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_w)) \equiv w \cdot \theta$ .

The label of  $\partial \pi_2$  then must have a subword  $\theta_i^{-1}q_2$ , so that either:

(i)  $q_2 \in Q_{i-1}^{-1}$  and the (i-1)-th part of  $\theta$  is  $q_2^{-1} \to v_{i-1}(q_2')^{-1}u_i$  for some  $q_2' \in Q_{i-1}^{-1}$ , some  $v_{i-1} \in \langle Z_{i-1}(\theta) \rangle$ , and some  $u_i \in \langle Z_i(\theta) \rangle$ . (ii)  $q_2 = q_1^{-1}$ , so that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_2) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1)^{-1}$ ; or

In case (i), the subword  $q_1wq_2$  of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  satisfies condition (1) in the requirements for subwords of admissible subwords. Moreover,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv q'_1 v_i^{-1} (w \cdot \theta) u_i^{-1} q'_2$ .

In case (ii), the subword  $q_1wq_1^{-1}$  of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  satisfies condition (3) as long as w is non-empty; as above, this must be the case since  $\mathcal{T}$  is reduced. Further,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv q'_1 v_i^{-1}(w \cdot \theta) v_i(q'_1)^{-1}$ . In either case,  $q_1wq_2$  is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_1)) \equiv (q_1wq_2) \cdot \theta$ .

Thus, applying this argument to all such subwords of  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  implies the statement.

**Lemma 7.11.** Let **S** be a generalized S-machine and  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band in a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. Suppose the history of  $\mathcal{T}$  is  $\theta \in \Theta(\mathbf{S})$ . Then:

- (a)  $Lab(tbot(\mathcal{T}))$  and  $Lab(ttop(\mathcal{T}))$  are admissible words
- (b)  $Lab(tbot(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ -admissible
- (c)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}))$

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 7.10, denote the hardware of **S** as (Y,Q) with  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{s+1} Y_i$  and  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{s} Q_i$ .

By Lemma 7.10, it suffices to assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a negative  $\theta$ -band, i.e  $\theta \in \Theta^{-}(\mathbf{S})$ .

Let  $\pi$  be a cell of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

First, suppose  $\pi$  is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell. Then, there exist  $i \in \{0, \ldots, s\}$ ,  $x_i \in X_i(\theta^{-1})$ , and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv \theta_i^{-1} f_{\theta^{-1},i}(x_i)^{\varepsilon} \theta_i x_i^{-\varepsilon}$ . So, letting  $\bar{\pi}$  be the 'mirror' cell obtained by reversing the orientation of  $\pi$ , then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \bar{\pi}) \equiv \theta_i x_i^{\varepsilon} \theta_i^{-1} f_{\theta^{-1},i}(x_i)^{-\varepsilon}$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\pi$  is a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell. Then, there exists  $i \in \{0, \ldots, s\}$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv \theta_i^{-1}(u_i q'_i v_{i+1})^{\varepsilon} \theta_{i+1} q_i^{-\varepsilon}$ , where  $q_i \to u_i q'_i v_{i+1}$  is the corresponding part of  $\theta^{-1}$ . So, letting  $\bar{\pi}$  be the 'mirror' cell as above, then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \bar{\pi}) \equiv \theta_i q_i^{\varepsilon} \theta_{i+1}^{-1}(u_i q'_i v_{i+1})^{-\varepsilon}$ .

Pasting together the 'mirror' cells constructed above then produces a  $\theta$ -band  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  with history  $\theta^{-1}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{tbot}(\overline{\mathcal{T}})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}))$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\overline{\mathcal{T}})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  (see Figure 7.7).



FIGURE 7.7.

Hence, Lemma 7.10 implies that both  $\text{Lab}(\text{ttop}(\mathcal{T}))$  and  $\text{Lab}(\text{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$  are admissible words with  $\text{Lab}(\text{ttop}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv \text{Lab}(\text{tbot}(\mathcal{T}))$ . But then the statement follows from Lemma 4.2.

**Lemma 7.12.** Let  $U \to V$  be a computation of a generalized S-machine **S** with history H of length 1, so that  $H = \theta \in \Theta(\mathbf{S})$ . Then there exists a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  with history  $\theta$  whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, q)$ -cells and such that  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv U$  and  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv V$ . Moreover, the length of  $\mathcal{T}$  is:

- $l_{\theta}(U)$  if  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$
- $l_{\theta^{-1}}(V)$  if  $\theta \in \Theta^{-}(\mathbf{S})$

*Proof.* Let (Y, Q) be the hardware of **S** with  $Y = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{s+1} Y_i$  and  $Q = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{s} Q_i$ .

Suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^+(\mathbf{S})$ .

Let  $U \equiv q_0^{\varepsilon_0} w_1 q_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots w_\ell q_\ell^{\varepsilon_\ell}$  so that for each  $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$ ,  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  and  $q_i \in Q_{j(i)}$  for some  $j(i) \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ .

Then, as U is  $\theta$ -admissible,  $w_i$  must also be  $\theta$ -applicable for each i.

By Lemma 7.7, we can then construct a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_i$  of length  $l_{\theta}(w_i)$  with history  $\theta$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\text{bot}(\mathcal{T}_i)) \equiv w_i$  and  $\text{Lab}(\text{top}(\mathcal{T}_i)) \equiv w_i \cdot \theta$ .

Further,  $q_i \in Q(\theta)$  for each  $0 \le i \le \ell$ , so that the j(i)-th part of  $\theta$  takes the form  $q_i \to u_{j(i)}q'_i v_{j(i)+1}$  for some  $q'_i \in Q_{j(i)}, u_{j(i)} \in \langle Z_{j(i)}(\theta) \rangle$ , and  $v_{j(i)+1} \in \langle Z_{j(i)+1}(\theta) \rangle$ .

So, there are relations of  $M(\mathbf{S})$  of the form  $R_i = \theta_{j(i)}^{-1} q_i \theta_{j(i)+1} (u_{j(i)} q'_i v_{j(i)+1})^{-1}$  for all *i*.

Let  $\pi_i$  be a cell with boundary labelled by  $R_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ .

By the definition of admissible words, for either possibility of  $\varepsilon_i$  one can glue  $\mathcal{T}_i$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{i+1}$  to the left and right of  $\pi_i$ , respectively.

After 0-refinement (or gluing) to cancel any adjacent edges with mutually inverse labels, this process produces a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $l_{\theta}(U)$  with history  $\theta$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv U$ .

By the makeup of the band, it follows that  $\text{Lab}(\text{ttop}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv V$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^{-}(\mathbf{S})$ .

Then Lemma 4.2 implies  $V \cdot \theta^{-1} \equiv U$ , so that the same construction as above forms a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $l_{\theta^{-1}}(V)$  with history  $\theta^{-1}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv V$  and  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv U$ .

Taking the 'mirror' of this band as in the proof of Lemma 7.11 (see Figure 7.7) then produces a  $\theta$ -band  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  with history  $\theta$  and satisfying the statement.

Now, let  $\Delta$  be a reduced circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{S})$  such that  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$ , where:

- $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are sides of maximal q-bands
- $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are the trimmed sides of maximal  $\theta$ -bands

Then  $\Delta$  is called a *trapezium* over  $M(\mathbf{S})$ .

In this case,  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  is called the *standard factorization* of the contour. The paths  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are called the *trimmed bottom* and *trimmed top* of the trapezium, respectively, denoted  $\mathbf{tbot}(\Delta)$  and  $\mathbf{ttop}(\Delta)$ . Further,  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are the *left* and *right* sides of  $\Delta$ .



FIGURE 7.8. Trapezium with side q-bands  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ 

Let  $\mathbf{e}_1$  be the first and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  the last edge of  $\mathbf{q}_1$ . Then, by the definition of trapezium, there exist maximal *q*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  of  $\Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_j^{-1}$  is a defining edge of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ . As such,  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_1) = \mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_2) = \mathbf{p}_2$ .

The history of the trapezium is the history of  $Q_2$  and the length of this history is the trapezium's height. The base of Lab $(\mathbf{q}_1)$  is called the base of the trapezium.

It is evident from this definition that a non-annular  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, q)$ cells can be viewed as a trapezium of height 1, with the standard factorization of  $\partial \mathcal{T}$  giving the
standard factorization of the trapezium.

**Lemma 7.13.** Let  $\Delta$  be a trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with height h and standard factorization  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$ . Then  $\Delta$  can be decomposed into maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  such that:

- (1) For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, h\}$  and  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , an edge of  $\mathbf{p}_j$  is a defining edge of  $\mathcal{T}_i$
- (2)  $\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_i) = \operatorname{tbot}(\mathcal{T}_{i+1})$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, h-1\}$
- (3)  $\mathbf{tbot}(\Delta) = \mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{ttop}(\Delta) = \mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_h)$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$ . By Lemma 7.5,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have two ends on  $\partial\Delta$ . As  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  do not contain any  $\theta$ -edges, then necessarily the ends of  $\mathcal{T}$  must be on  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}$  or  $\mathbf{p}_2$ .

If  $\mathcal{T}$  has two ends on  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}$  and a subband of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  form a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus, contradicting Lemma 7.2(2). Similarly,  $\mathcal{T}$  cannot have two ends on  $\mathbf{p}_2$ .

Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have ends on both  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$ , and so there exists  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that one end of  $\mathcal{T}$  is an edge of  $\mathbf{p}_1^{\varepsilon}$  and the other is an edge of  $\mathbf{p}_2^{\varepsilon}$ .

By definition, there exists a factorization  $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{u}_0 \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \dots \mathbf{e}_h \mathbf{u}_h$  such that:

- $\mathbf{e}_i$  is a  $\theta$ -edge
- $\mathbf{u}_i$  is a (perhaps empty) subpath containing no  $\theta$ -edges

For all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, h\}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_i$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band such that  $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{T}_i}$ . Then, every cell of  $\Delta$  is part of exactly one such band. Conditions (1)-(3) then follow by construction.

In the setting of Lemma 7.13, the  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  comprising the trapezium  $\Delta$  are said to be enumerated from bottom to top.

Hence, the next two statements follow from Lemmas 7.11 and 7.12 and exemplify how the group  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  'simulates' the computational structure of the machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ :

**Lemma 7.14.** Let  $\Delta$  be a trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with history  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_h$  for  $h \geq 1$  and maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_h$  enumerated from bottom to top. If  $W_{j-1} \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}_j))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, h$  and  $W_h \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_h))$ , then there exists a reduced computation  $W_0 \to \dots \to W_h$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with history H.

**Lemma 7.15.** For any non-empty reduced computation  $W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with history H, there exists a trapezium  $\Delta$  such that:

- (a)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\Delta)) \equiv W_0$
- (b)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\Delta)) \equiv W_t$
- (c) The history of  $\Delta$  is H
- (d) Area( $\Delta$ )  $\leq t \max(||W_0||, \dots, ||W_t||)$

*Proof.* Note that for any  $\theta \in \Theta^+$ ,  $X_i(\theta) \subseteq Y_i$  for all *i*. Hence,  $l_{\theta}(W) = ||W||$  for any  $\theta$ -admissible word *W*. Thus, the statement follows by applying Lemma 7.12 to each rule and gluing the corresponding  $\theta$ -bands together along their trimmed tops and bottoms.

# 8. Diagarams over the Groups Associated to $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$

# 8.1. Compressed semi-trapezia.

Recall that in the particular setting of the machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , there is a notion of 'compressed' semicomputations in the 'special' input sector (see Section 5.1 and Section 6.6).

Hence, we now introduce another class of reduced diagrams unique to this setting which correspond to reduced compressed semi-computations of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector in exactly the same way that (semi-)trapezia correspond to reduced (semi-)computations.

Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  consisting only of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells over the 'special' input sector. Suppose the first and last cells of  $\mathcal{T}$  are  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells.

The maximal subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  whose first and last edges are  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges is called the *compressed* bottom of the band, denoted  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ . The compressed top  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$  is defined analogously. As with previous definitions, the compressed bottom and compressed top of  $\mathcal{T}$  are collectively called the compressed sides of the band.

Note that, as a consequence of its definition,  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  is the subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv \mathscr{C}(\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})))$ . An analogous observation may be made about  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$ .

Since the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  consists only of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of a particular sector, the following statement is an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.6:

**Lemma 8.1.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band with history  $\theta$  in a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the 'special' input sector. Suppose the first and last cells of  $\mathcal{T}$  are  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells. Then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) * \theta \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}))$ .

Similarly, the following statement is a consequence of Lemma 7.7:

**Lemma 8.2.** Let  $u \to v$  be a reduced compressed semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H of length 1, so that  $H = \theta \in \Theta$ . Then there exists a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  with history  $\theta$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the 'special' input sector whose first and last cells are  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells and such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv u$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv v$ . Moreover, the length of  $\mathcal{T}$  is ||u|| if  $\theta \in \Theta^+$  and ||v|| if  $\theta \in \Theta^-$ .

Proof. Suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^+$ . As u is  $\theta$ -applicable, Lemma 7.7 provides a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $l_{\theta}(u)$  with history  $\theta$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the 'special' input sector such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv u$ and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})) \equiv u \cdot \theta$ . By definition,  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})) = \mathscr{C}(u \cdot \theta) = v$ . Additionally, note that since the first and last letter of u is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter, by construction the first and last cells of  $\mathcal{T}$  are  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells. Finally, note that  $X_i(\theta) \subseteq Y_i^{\mathcal{L}}$  for all i, so that  $l_{\theta}(u) = ||u||$ .

Conversely, if  $\theta \in \Theta^-$ , then  $v \cdot \theta^{-1} = u$ , so that the same argument produces a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}'$  of length ||v|| with history  $\theta^{-1}$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the 'special' input sector such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv v$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv u$ . Taking the 'mirror' of each cell then produces a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfying the statement.

Now, let  $\Delta$  be a reduced circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells of the 'special' input sector such that  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  where:

- $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are sides of maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands
- $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are compressed sides of maximal  $\theta$ -bands

Then  $\Delta$  is called a *compressed semi-trapezium* over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector.

As in the setting trapezia,  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  is called the *standard factorization* of  $\Delta$ . Similarly,  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  are called the *compressed bottom* and *compressed top* of  $\Delta$ , respectively, and denoted  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\Delta)$  and  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\Delta)$ . The paths  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are called the *left* and *right sides* of  $\Delta$ .

Let  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  be the first edges of  $\mathbf{q}_1$ . Then, noting that  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge, let  $\mathcal{U}_i$  be the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  with  $\mathbf{e}_i^{-1} \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{U}_i}$ . So,  $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{U}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{U}_2)$ . The history of  $\Delta$  is the history of  $\mathcal{U}_2$ , while the length of this history is the compressed semi-trapezium's height.

Noting the similarity between the definitions of this section and those of Section 7.4, we have the following analogue of Lemma 7.13, which is proved in exactly the same way (with Lemma 7.3 used in place of Lemma 7.2):

**Lemma 8.3.** Let  $\Delta$  be a compressed semi-trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector with height h and standard factorization  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$ . Then  $\Delta$  can be decomposed into maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  such that:

- (1) For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, h\}$  and  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , an edge of  $\mathbf{p}_i$  is a defining edge of  $\mathcal{T}_i$
- (2)  $\mathscr{C}$ top $(\mathcal{T}_i) = \mathscr{C}$ bot $(\mathcal{T}_{i+1})$  for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, h-1\}$
- (3)  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\Delta) = \mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\Delta) = \mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_h)$

In this setting, the  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_h$  are again said to be enumerated from bottom to top.

Hence, an iteration of applications of Lemmas 8.1 and 8.2 imply the following statements:

**Lemma 8.4.** Let  $\Delta$  be a compressed semi-trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector with history  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_h$  for  $h \geq 1$  and maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_h$  enumerated from bottom to top. If  $w_{j-1} = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_j))$  for  $j = 1, \dots, h$  and  $w_h = \operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_h))$ , then there exists a reduced compressed semi-computation  $w_0 \to \dots \to w_h$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H. **Lemma 8.5.** For any non-empty reduced compressed semi-computation  $w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H, there exists a compressed semi-trapezium  $\Delta$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector such that:

- (a)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\Delta)) \equiv w_0$
- (b)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\Delta)) \equiv w_t$
- (c) The history of  $\Delta$  is H
- (d) Area( $\Delta$ )  $\leq t \max(||w_0||, \dots, ||w_t||)$

### 8.2. Disks.

Next, a new set of relations are added to the canonical presentations of the groups  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in much the same way as done in [32]. These relations are called *disk relations* and are given by all relations of the form W = 1 such that W is a configuration accepted by  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W) \leq 1$ , i.e so that either  $W = W_{ac}$  or there exists a one-machine computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting W (see Section 6.2).

**Lemma 8.6.** For any configuration W accepted by  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma_W$  over  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  containing a single hub such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_W) \equiv W$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an accepting computation of W and H be its history. By Lemma 7.15, there exists a trapezium  $\Delta$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\Delta)) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\Delta)) \equiv W_{ac}$ .

As this is a computation of the standard base and the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(L))^{-1}{t(1)}$ -sector has empty tape alphabet, no trimming is necessary in  $\Delta$ . So, the left and right sides of  $\Delta$  are labelled by the identical copies of H. Hence, we may past the sides of  $\Delta$  together to produce a reduced annular diagram  $\Delta'$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with outer contour label W and inner contour label  $W_{ac}^{-1}$ .

But a single hub can now be pasted into the center of  $\Delta'$  to produce a diagram  $\Gamma_W$  satisfying the statement.

As a result of Lemma 8.6, any configuration W accepted by  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Hence, the presentation given by adding the disk relations to the canonical presentation of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  defines a group isomorphic to  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Moreover, since  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is a quotient of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the same is true for the presentation given by adding disk relations to the canonical presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

These new presentations are called the *disk presentations* of the groups  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . For a diagram over the disk presentation of one of these groups, a cell corresponding to a disk relation (or its inverse) is referred to simply as a *disk*.

Note that, per this definition, hubs are specific types of disks. Further, in addition to the possibilities outlined in Section 5.2, a maximal q-band or maximal a-band (of any type) in a diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  may have an end on a disk.

Finally, note that Lemmas 7.2-7.4 have direct analogues for reduced circular diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ : If such a diagram  $\Delta$  contains a counterexample to one of these statements, then replacing any disk in  $\Delta$  with the corresponding diagram given by Lemma 8.6 (and making any necessary cancellations) produces a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta'$  over the canonical presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  contradicting the statement. Moreover, the following analogue of Lemma 7.4 for disks is implied in a similar manner:

**Lemma 8.7.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced circular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $\Pi$  is a disk in  $\Delta$ , then no *a*-band of positive length has two ends on  $\Pi$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{S}$  is an *a*-band has two ends on  $\Pi$ . Then, letting  $\Delta_0$  be the subdiagram of  $\Delta$ bounded by  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\partial \Pi$  (similar to Figure 7.4), every  $\theta$ -edge of  $\partial \Delta_0$  is on the side of  $\mathcal{S}$ . So, any  $\theta$ -edge of  $\partial \Delta_0$  is the defining edge of a maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  which crosses  $\mathcal{S}$  twice. But then  $\mathcal{T}$ and S provide a counterexample to Lemma 7.2(1).

As with Lemma 7.4, Lemma 8.7 does not rule out the possibility that an *a*-band of length 0 has two ends on the disk  $\Pi$ . In this case,  $\Pi$  is called a *pinched disk* and the corresponding *a*-edges are called *pinched edges* of  $\Pi$ . As in the setting of pinched *a*-cells, any maximal subpath **s** of  $\partial \Pi$ consisting of pinched edges induces a *pinched decomposition*  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1}\mathbf{qs}^{\mp 1}\mathbf{p}$  of  $\partial \Pi$  with respect to the pinched subpath s, so that  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  bounds a subdiagram  $\Psi_{\Pi,s}$  of  $\Delta$  not containing  $\Pi$  (see Figure 7.5).

Note that since disk relations are cyclically reduced by construction,  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{q}$  must be non-trivial subpaths of  $\partial \Pi$ . Moreover, by the structure of configurations of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , exactly one of **p** or **q** contains q-edges, while the other consists entirely of a-edges labelled by letters from the same tape alphabet as those of **s**.

# 8.3. Weights.

Next, in a way similar to that outlined in [32], the method with which one counts the area of a diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is altered. This is done by introducing a weight *function*, wt, on the cells of such diagrams. Before doing so, we first define several auxiliary unary functions on the natural numbers:

- $\chi(n) = nc_0^n$
- $h_{\mathcal{L}}(n) = nc_0$   $h_{\mathcal{L}}(n) = c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + L$   $f_{\mathcal{L}}(n) = c_1 \chi(h_{\mathcal{L}}(n))$   $g_{\mathcal{L}}(n) = c_0 n^3 + nf_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)$

It is easy to see that  $\chi$  is nondecreasing. Moreover, as it is the product of two computable functions,  $\chi$  is itself a computable function. Similarly, recall that  $TM_{\mathcal{L}}$  is nondecreasing and computable by definition. So, as computable (unary) functions are closed under sums, products, and composition, each of  $h_{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$ , and  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  is also nondecreasing and computable. Finally, it is important to note that since  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$  is nondecreasing,  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  is super-additive; that is, for any  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$g_{\mathcal{L}}(m+n) = c_0(m+n)^3 + (m+n)f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0(m+n))$$
  

$$\geq c_0(m^3+n^3) + mf_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0m+c_0n) + nf_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0m+c_0n)$$
  

$$\geq c_0m^3 + c_0n^3 + mf_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0m) + nf_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0n)$$
  

$$= g_{\mathcal{L}}(m) + g_{\mathcal{L}}(n)$$

Now, define the weight of a cell  $\Pi$  of a diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as follows:

- If  $\Pi$  is a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell (of any type), then wt $(\Pi) = 1$ .
- If  $\Pi$  is a disk, then letting W be the configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv W^{\pm 1}$ ,  $\operatorname{wt}(\Pi) = f_{\mathcal{L}}(\|W(2)\|).$
- If  $\Pi$  is an *a*-cell, then wt( $\Pi$ ) =  $g_{\mathcal{L}}(\|\partial \Pi\|)$ .

Naturally, this definition is extended to give the weight wt( $\Delta$ ) of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , so that it is given by the sum of the weights of the cells of  $\Delta$ .

#### 9. DIAGRAMS WITHOUT DISKS

#### 9.1. *M*-minimal diagrams.

The goal of this section is to study diagrams over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , yielding an upper bound on the weight of a reduced circular diagram in terms of its perimeter. However, this goal is not achieved for any possible reduced circular diagram over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , but rather for a specific class of such diagrams that will be shown to be 'generic' in a particular sense.

For any  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge **e** of a reduced circular diagram over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the (unique) maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band for which **e** is a defining edge is denoted  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$ . Then, given an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and a maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $E(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  is defined to be the set of  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges **e** of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  crosses  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Now, a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is called *M*-minimal if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (MM1) For any *a*-cell  $\pi$  and maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\Delta$ ,  $|E(\pi, \mathcal{T})| \leq \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .
- (MM2) Let  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  be two *a*-cells in  $\Delta$ . Suppose there exist three consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$  of  $\partial \pi_1$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_j)$  has an end on  $\pi_2$ . Let  $\Psi$  be the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  bounded by the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_j)$  and the corresponding subpaths of  $\partial \pi_1$  and  $\partial \pi_2$  such that  $\Psi$  does not contain  $\pi_1$  or  $\pi_2$  (see Figure 9.1). Then  $\Psi$  contains an *a*-cell.



FIGURE 9.1. Condition (MM2)

Note that it is a consequence of this definition that a subdiagram of a (smooth) M-minimal diagram is necessarily a (smooth) M-minimal diagram.

### 9.2. A-bands and $\theta$ -annuli in Smooth Diskless Diagrams.

The next goal is to study the makeup of smooth circular diagrams over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  to understand their makeup.

Given a smooth circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , let  $\mathcal{Q} = (\Pi_1, \ldots, \Pi_m)$  be a maximal positive q-band of length  $m \geq 1$ . Suppose there exists an a-cell  $\pi$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  has an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}) = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$  and  $\Pi_{\ell}$  be the  $(\theta, q)$ -cell on which  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  has this end. Then, define  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e})$  to be the sequence of cells

$$\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e}) = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k, \Pi_\ell, \ldots, \Pi_m)$$

By construction,  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e})$  can be identified with a union of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  with a subband of the q-band  $\mathcal{Q}$  (see Figure 9.2). So, since  $\pi_k$  and  $\Pi_\ell$  share a boundary edge,  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e})$  is a subdiagram of  $\Delta$ . While it is not itself a band,  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e})$  does have a band-like structure, connecting  $\mathbf{e}$  to  $\partial \Delta$  by a sequence of cells in which each consecutive pair of cells shares a boundary edge.



FIGURE 9.2. Construction of  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e})$  in the *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$ 

Let **f** be the end of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  which is on the boundary of  $\Pi_{\ell}$ . Then, by the construction of the relations,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a positive *q*-band corresponding to the part  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  of the state letters of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathbf{f}^{-1}$  is an edge of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q})$ .

Now, to any smooth circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , construct the (unoriented) graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  as follows:

- (1) The set of vertices is  $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$ , where each  $v_i$  for  $i \ge 1$  corresponds to one of the  $\ell$  *a*-cells of  $\Delta$  and  $v_0$  is a single exterior vertex.
- (2) For  $i, j \ge 1$  and for any positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which has ends on the *a*-cells corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_i, v_j)$ . Such an edge is called *internal*.
- (3) For  $i \ge 1$  and any positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which has one end on the *a*-cell corresponding to  $v_i$  and the other end on either a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or on  $\partial \Delta$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_0, v_i)$ . Such an edge is called *external*.

**Lemma 9.1.** For any smooth circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  can be constructed to be planar.

*Proof.* The graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  is constructed as an 'estimating graph' that is 'auxiliary' to the planar graph underlying the diagram  $\Delta$  (see Section 9.5 of [16]). Note the resemblance between this construction and that of the dual graph to  $\Delta$ .

Each interior vertex of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  is placed at the center of the corresponding *a*-cell in  $\Delta$ , while the exterior vertex is placed at some point in the unbounded component X of the complement of  $\partial \Delta$  in the plane.

To define the edges, we construct several arcs in the plane and implicitly appeal to the Jordan curve and Jordan-Schönflies theorems (see Section 9.1 of [16]). Viewing all arcs as images of the unit interval [0,1], two arcs  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are *disjoint* if  $\gamma_1(0,1) \cap \gamma_2(0,1) = \emptyset$ . Similarly, given a connected region U of the plane, the arc  $\gamma$  is *contained in* U if  $\gamma(0,1) \subseteq U$ .

Note that for any finite set F of points of  $\partial \Delta$ , one can construct a set of |F| (pairwise) disjoint arcs contained in X connecting  $v_0$  to the points of F. Hence, in place of an external edge of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ , it suffices to construct the subpath which connects the corresponding interior vertex to a distinct point of  $\partial \Delta$ .

First, let  $\pi_i$  be the *a*-cell corresponding to the vertex  $v_i$ . Then, as above we construct  $|\partial \pi_i|_{\mathcal{A}}$  disjoint arcs contained in the interior of  $\pi_i$  connecting the vertex  $v_i$  to the midpoints of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi_i$ . For an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\partial \pi_i$ , denote the corresponding arc by  $t_i(\mathbf{e})$ .

Next, let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which has an end on the *a*-cell  $\pi_i$ . For every cell  $\Pi$  comprising  $\mathcal{U}$ , construct an arc  $t_{\mathcal{U}}(\Pi)$  contained in the interior of  $\Pi$  connecting the midpoints of the corresponding defining edges of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{e}$  be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\partial \pi_i$  such that  $\mathbf{e}^{\pm 1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}$ . So,  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  consist of the same cells, but perhaps have different directions. Let  $\mathbf{f}$  be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge distinct from  $\mathbf{e}$  that is an end of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{U}$  has an end on the *a*-cell  $\pi_j$  for  $j \neq i$ . Consequently, **f** is an edge of  $(\partial \pi_j)^{-1}$ . Then, the arcs  $t_{\mathcal{U}}(\Pi)$ ,  $t_i(\mathbf{e})$ , and  $t_j(\mathbf{f}^{-1})$  together form an arc  $\gamma(\mathcal{U})$  connecting  $v_i$  to  $v_j$ . This arc is taken as the internal edge corresponding to  $\mathcal{U}$  (see Figure 9.3).



FIGURE 9.3. The construction of internal edges of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ 

Hence, by Lemma 7.4 and the assumption that  $\Delta$  is smooth, it suffices to assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  has an end on either a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or on  $\partial \Delta$ . Then, as above, the arcs  $t_{\mathcal{U}}(\Pi)$  and  $t_i(\mathbf{e})$  together form an arc  $\gamma(\mathcal{U})$  connecting  $v_i$  to the midpoint of  $\mathbf{f}$ .

If **f** is an edge of  $\partial \Delta$ , then  $\gamma(\mathcal{U})$  is taken as the subpath of the external edge corresponding to  $\mathcal{U}$ . Otherwise, **f** is an edge of **bot**( $\mathcal{Q}$ )<sup>-1</sup> for some maximal positive *q*-band  $\mathcal{Q} = (\Pi_1, \ldots, \Pi_m)$ . In this case, fix  $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$  such that **f** is an edge of  $(\partial \Pi_\ell)^{-1}$ . Note that, by the definition of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , **f**<sup>-1</sup> is the only  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\partial \Pi_\ell$ .

Letting  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_m)$  be the defining edge sequence of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , add m auxiliary vertices to the interior of each  $\mathbf{e}_j$ , enumerated by their proximity to  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q})$ . Then, we construct an arc  $t_{\ell}(\mathcal{U})$  contained in the interior of  $\Pi_{\ell}$  connecting the midpoint of  $\mathbf{f}$  and the  $\ell$ -th auxiliary vertex of  $\mathbf{e}_{\ell}$ .

Similarly, for each  $j \in \{\ell + 1, ..., m\}$ , construct the arc  $t_j(\mathcal{U})$  contained in the interior of  $\Pi_j$  connecting the  $\ell$ -th auxiliary vertices of  $\mathbf{e}_{j-1}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_j$ .

Then, the arcs  $\gamma(\mathcal{U})$  and  $t_j(\mathcal{U})$  for  $\ell \leq j \leq m$  together form an arc  $\rho(\mathcal{U})$  connecting  $v_i$  with the  $\ell$ -th auxiliary vertex of  $\mathbf{e}_m$ .

Note that, by construction, if two positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}'$  both have ends on  $(\theta, q)$ -cells of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , then these ends are on distinct  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. Hence, in this case the arcs  $\rho(\mathcal{U})$  and  $\rho(\mathcal{U}')$  can be constructed to be disjoint (see Figure 9.4).

Hence,  $\rho(\mathcal{U})$  can be taken as the subpath of the external edge corresponding to  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Thus, as distinct maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands cannot intersect and  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands and q-bands cannot cross, these arcs together define  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  as a planar graph.



FIGURE 9.4. The construction of external edges of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  for  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands with one end on an *a*-cell and the other on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell

Given a smooth circular diagram, Lemma 7.4 implies that  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  contains no loops. Further, letting d(v) be the degree of the interior vertex v in  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ , condition (L1) and Lemma 5.7 imply  $d(v) \geq C$ .

For two interior vertices v and w of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ , suppose there exist consecutive edges  $e_1, \ldots, e_\ell$  joining v and w such that  $e_i$  and  $e_{i+1}$  bound a 2-gon for all  $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$ . If  $\Delta$  satisfies (MM2), then  $\ell \leq 2$ . If in this case  $\ell = 2$ , then the edges  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are called a *doubled pair*.

The planar graph  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  is then formed from  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  by simply replacing any doubled pair of edges with a single edge. Note that the set of vertices of  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  can be identified with that of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ .

By construction,  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  contains no loop and also contains no 2-gon on a pair of interior vertices. Further, letting d'(v) be the degree of the interior vertex v in  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$ , then  $d'(v) \ge C/2$ .

These properties and the parameter choice  $C \ge 12$  imply the following statement:

**Lemma 9.2** (Lemma 3.2 of [15]). Suppose  $\Delta$  is a smooth circular diagram over the canonical presentation of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which satisfies condition (MM2). If  $\Delta$  contains at least one *a*-cell, then there exists an interior vertex v of  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  such that at least d'(v) - 3 consecutive edges join v with the exterior vertex and there are no other vertices between these edges.

The following is an immediate consequence of the construction of  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  from  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ :

**Lemma 9.3.** Suppose  $\Delta$  is a smooth circular diagram over the canonical presentation of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which satisfies condition (MM2). If  $\Delta$  contains at least one *a*-cell, then there exists an interior vertex v of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  such that at least d(v) - 6 consecutive edges join v with the exterior vertex and there are no other vertices between these edges.

Lemma 9.4. A smooth *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$  contains no  $\theta$ -annuli.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $\Delta$  contains a  $\theta$ -annulus S and let  $\Delta_S$  be the subdiagram bounded by a side of S which contains S.

As in the proof of Lemma 7.5,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  cannot contain any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, as such a cell would imply the existence of a  $(\theta, q)$ -annulus contradicting Lemma 7.2(1).

Further, Lemma 7.5 implies that  $\Delta_S$  must contain an *a*-cell. So, applying Lemma 9.3, there exists an interior vertex v of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta_S)$  such that at least d(v) - 6 edges join v to the exterior vertex.

Let  $\pi$  be the *a*-cell of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  corresponding to the vertex v. Then, an edge of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta_{\mathcal{S}})$  corresponds to a maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}$  which has ends on both  $\pi$  and on  $\partial\Delta$ . Letting  $\mathbf{e}$  be the edge of  $\partial\pi$ such that  $\mathbf{e}^{\pm 1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}$ , this implies  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  must cross  $\mathcal{S}$ . So,  $\mathbf{e} \in E(\pi, \mathcal{S})$ .

Hence,  $|E(\pi, \mathcal{S})| \ge d(v) - 6$ . But then the parameter choice C > 12 implies d(v) - 6 > d(v)/2, so that  $|E(\pi, \mathcal{S})| > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , contradicting (MM1).

Lemma 9.5. Any *M*-minimal diagram is smooth.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that the *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$  contains a pinched *a*-cell. Choose an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and a pinched subpath **s** of  $\partial \pi$  such that the subdiagram  $\Psi_{\pi,s}$  has minimal weight.

If  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  contains a pinched *a*-cell  $\pi'$ , then for any pinched subpath  $\mathbf{s}'$  of  $\partial \pi'$ ,  $\Psi_{\pi',\mathbf{s}'}$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  which does not contain  $\pi'$ . But then  $\operatorname{wt}(\Psi_{\pi',\mathbf{s}'}) < \operatorname{wt}(\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}})$ , contradicting the choice of  $\pi$  and  $\mathbf{s}$ .

Hence,  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  is a smooth *M*-minimal diagram.

Let  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1}\mathbf{qs}^{\mp 1}\mathbf{p}$  be the pinched factorization of  $\partial \pi$  with respect to  $\mathbf{s}$ . Since  $\mathbf{p}$  consists entirely of *a*-edges, Lemmas 7.2(2) and 9.4 imply that any (positive) cell of  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  is an *a*-cell. Moreover, since  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Omega$  is cyclically reduced,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  must be a non-trivial reduced word, so that  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  contains at least one *a*-cell.

As a result, Lemma 9.3 implies  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  contains an *a*-cell  $\pi_0$  and  $\ell \geq |\partial \pi_0|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6 \geq C - 6$  consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_\ell$  of  $\partial \pi_0$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_j)$  has an end on  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  and such that no *a*-cell is between these *a*-bands.

But since **p** is a subpath of  $\partial \pi$ , the parameter choice  $C \geq 9$  then implies  $\pi$  and  $\pi_0$  form a counterexample to condition (MM2).

_	_	_
_		

#### 9.3. *a*-scopes.

Before establishing the upper bound on the weight of M-minimal diagrams, we first study a consequence of Lemma 9.3 that will prove useful for future arguments.

Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell and **t** be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the canonical presentation of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  be  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  has an end on **t**. Suppose there exists a subpath **s** of  $\partial \pi$  such that **s**, a subpath of **t**, and the bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1), \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_2)$  bound a (circular) subdiagram  $\Psi$  of  $\Delta$  which contains neither  $\pi$  nor any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell.

Then  $\Psi$  is called an *a*-scope on **t** with associated *a*-cell  $\pi$ , associated subpath **s**, and size  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

If in this case  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , then  $\Psi$  is called a *big a-scope*. If  $\Psi$  contains no *a*-cell, then it is called a *pure a-scope*.

Note that there exists a subdiagram  $\tilde{\Psi}$  of  $\Delta$  consisting of  $\Psi$  and  $\pi$ . In this case,  $\tilde{\Psi}$  is called the *completion* of  $\Psi$ .

**Lemma 9.6.** Let **t** be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the canonical presentation of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Suppose  $\Delta$  contains an *a*-scope  $\Psi_0$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$  is smooth and satisfies condition (MM2). If  $\Psi_0$  is not a pure *a*-scope, then there exists a big *a*-scope  $\Psi_1$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ .

Proof. Let  $\mathbf{s}_0$  be the associated subpath of  $\Psi_0$  and let  $\mathbf{t}_0$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{t}$  which is shared with  $\partial \Psi_0$ . As  $\Psi_0$  is not pure, it contains at least one *a*-cell. So, since  $\Psi_0$  is itself smooth and satisfies condition (MM2), Lemma 9.3 implies the existence of an *a*-cell  $\pi$  in  $\Psi_0$  and  $\ell \geq |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6$ consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{\ell}$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1), \ldots, \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{\ell})$  in  $\Psi_0$  each correspond to external edges of the graph  $\Gamma_a(\Psi_0)$ . In particular, since  $\Psi_0$  contains no  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, each band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  ends on  $\partial \Psi_0$ .

As  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands cannot cross, each band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  must have an end on either  $\mathbf{s}_0^{-1}$  or on  $\mathbf{t}_0$ . Since  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$  satisfies condition (MM2), though, no three consecutive such bands can end on  $\mathbf{s}_0^{-1}$ . So, because condition (L1) and Lemma 5.7 imply that  $|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C$ , the parameter choice  $C \geq 12$  implies the existence of two indices  $i_1, i_2 \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{i_j})$  has an end on  $\mathbf{t}_0$ .

Now, let  $\mathbf{f}_1$  be the first edge of  $\mathbf{t}_0$  which is the end of an  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbf{f}_2$  be the last such edge of  $\mathbf{t}_0$ . Fix the indices  $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$  such that  $\mathbf{f}_i$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{k_i})$ .

Let **s** be the subpath of  $\partial \pi$  with first edge  $\mathbf{e}_{k_1}$  and last edge  $\mathbf{e}_{k_2}$ . As distinct  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands cannot cross, if  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  has an end on  $\mathbf{t}_0$ , then  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is an edge of **s**.

Hence,  $\mathbf{s}$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_0$ , and the bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{k_i})$  bound a subdiagram  $\Psi_1$  that does not contain  $\pi$ . Hence,  $\Psi_1$  is an *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{t}$  with associated *a*-cell  $\pi$ , associated subpath  $\mathbf{s}$ , and size  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Note that, by construction, the completion  $\Psi_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s}'$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{s}$  in  $\partial \pi$ .

Suppose there exist five indices  $m_1, \ldots, m_5 \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$  with  $m_i < m_{i+1}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_{m_i}$  is an edge of  $\mathbf{s}'$ . Since  $\mathbf{s}'$  is a subpath of  $\partial \pi$  containing these edges, if it does not contain  $\mathbf{e}_i$  for all  $m_1 \leq i \leq m_3$ , then it must contain  $\mathbf{e}_i$  for all  $m_3 \leq i \leq m_5$ . Either way,  $\mathbf{s}'$  must contain at least three consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_{i+1}, \mathbf{e}_{i+2}$ . But then  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i), \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{i+1})$ , and  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_{i+2})$  each has an end on  $\mathbf{s}_0^{-1}$ , producing a contradiction to condition (MM2).

Hence,  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} \ge \ell - 4 \ge |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - 10$ . Taking  $C \ge 21$  then implies that  $\Psi_1$  is a big *a*-scope.

**Lemma 9.7.** Let  $\mathbf{t}$  be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the canonical presentation of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Suppose  $\Delta$  contains an *a*-scope  $\Psi_0$  on  $\mathbf{t}$  such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$  is smooth and satisfies condition (MM2). If  $\Psi_0$  is not a pure *a*-scope, then there exists a pure big *a*-scope  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbf{t}$  such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}$  is a subdiagram  $\Psi_0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 9.6, there exists a big *a*-scope  $\Psi_1$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ . Note that this implies that  $\operatorname{Area}(\Psi_1) \leq \operatorname{Area}(\Psi_0) - 1$ .

As a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ ,  $\tilde{\Psi}_1$  must also be smooth and satisfy condition (MM2). So, if  $\Psi_1$  is not a pure *a*-scope, we may again apply Lemma 9.6 to find a big *a*-scope  $\Psi_2$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_2$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_1$ . Again, this implies  $\operatorname{Area}(\Psi_2) < \operatorname{Area}(\Psi_1) - 1$ .

Iterating, this process must terminate with a big *a*-scope  $\Psi$  on **t** which is also pure.

### 9.4. Upper bound on weights.

Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell in an *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$  and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a maximal positive *a*-band in  $\Delta$ which has an end on  $\pi$ . If the other end of  $\mathcal{U}$  is on another *a*-cell, then  $\mathcal{U}$  is called an *internal a*-band in  $\Delta$ . Otherwise,  $\mathcal{U}$  is called an *external a*-band.

Note that if  $\mathcal{U}$  is a maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band, then Lemmas 7.4 and 9.5 imply that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an internal *a*-band (i.e an internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band) if and only if it corresponds to an internal edge of the auxiliary graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$ . However, this definition now extends this to include *b*-bands.

For any *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$ , define the values:

- $\alpha_i(\Delta)$  is the number of internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands in  $\Delta$
- $\alpha_e(\Delta)$  is the number of external  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands in  $\Delta$
- $\beta_i(\Delta)$  is the number of internal *b*-bands in  $\Delta$
- $\beta_e(\Delta)$  is the number of external *b*-bands in  $\Delta$

**Lemma 9.8.** For any *M*-minimal diagram  $\Delta$ :

(1) 
$$\alpha_i(\Delta) \leq \frac{7}{C} \alpha_e(\Delta)$$
  
(2)  $\beta_i(\Delta) \leq \frac{49}{C} \beta_e(\Delta)$ 

*Proof.* We prove both statements simultaneously by induction on the number n of a-cells in  $\Delta$ , with the statement clear if n = 0, 1 as then Lemmas 7.4 and 9.5 imply  $\alpha_i(\Delta) = \beta_i(\Delta) = 0$ .

For the inductive step, as  $n \geq 2$ , there exists an interior vertex v of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  satisfying the statement of Lemma 9.3. Let  $\pi$  be the *a*-cell of  $\Delta$  corresponding to v and let  $e_1, \ldots, e_\ell$  be the  $\ell \geq d(v) - 6$ consecutive external edges of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  connecting v to  $v_0$ , enumerated counterclockwise about  $\partial \pi$ . For  $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_i$  be the maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band corresponding to  $e_i$ . Further, let  $\mathbf{e}_i$  be the edge of  $\partial \pi_i$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_i^{\pm 1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}_i$ .

Then, for  $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ , let  $S_i$  be:

- the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  if  $\mathcal{U}_i$  has an end on  $\partial \Delta$ , or
- the subdiagram  $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  if  $\mathcal{U}_i$  has an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell.

By construction,  $S_1, \ldots, S_\ell$  and  $\pi$  together bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  of  $\Delta$  (see Figure 9.5). Further, as there are no vertices between  $e_1, \ldots, e_\ell, \pi$  must be the only *a*-cell of  $\Delta_0$ .



FIGURE 9.5. The subdiagram  $\Delta_0$ 

Let  $\widetilde{\Delta}$  be the complement of  $\Delta_0$  in  $\Delta$ . Then  $\widetilde{\Delta}$  is an *M*-minimal diagram containing n-1 *a*-cells, so that the inductive hypotheses imply  $\alpha_i(\widetilde{\Delta}) \leq \frac{7}{C}\alpha_e(\widetilde{\Delta})$  and  $\beta_i(\widetilde{\Delta}) \leq \frac{49}{C}\beta_e(\widetilde{\Delta})$ .

Note that any external *a*-band of  $\Delta$  that has an end on an *a*-cell other than  $\pi$  corresponds to an external *a*-band of  $\widetilde{\Delta}$ .

Similarly, any internal *a*-band of  $\Delta$  that does not have an end on  $\pi$  corresponds to an internal *a*-band of  $\widetilde{\Delta}$ .

Consider the decomposition  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{st}$  where  $\mathbf{s}$  is the minimal subpath containing the  $\ell$  consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{\ell}$ . By construction, for any internal *a*-band of  $\Delta$  having an end on  $\pi$ , this end must be an edge of  $\mathbf{t}^{\pm 1}$ . On the other hand, each of these bands corresponds to an external *a*-band in  $\widetilde{\Delta}$ . Hence,  $\alpha_i(\Delta) \leq \alpha_i(\widetilde{\Delta}) + |\mathbf{t}|_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\beta_i(\Delta) \leq \beta_i(\widetilde{\Delta}) + |\mathbf{t}|_b$ .

Since the number of  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges in **t** is  $d(v) - \ell \leq 6$ , this implies  $\alpha_i(\Delta) \leq \alpha_i(\widetilde{\Delta}) + 6$ .

Conversely, the  $\ell$  consecutive external  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands with ends  $\mathbf{e}_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{\ell}^{\pm 1}$  of  $\Delta$  are completely removed in passing to  $\widetilde{\Delta}$ . So,  $\alpha_e(\widetilde{\Delta}) \leq \alpha_e(\Delta) - \ell + d(v) - \ell \leq \alpha_e(\Delta) - d(v) + 12$ .

Hence,  $\alpha_i(\Delta) \leq \frac{7}{C} \alpha_e(\widetilde{\Delta}) + 6 \leq \frac{7}{C} \alpha_e(\Delta) - \frac{7}{C} d(v) + \frac{84}{C} + 6.$ 

So, (1) holds if  $7d(v) \ge 6C + 84$ . But by condition (L1) and Lemma 5.7,  $d(v) \ge C$  and so the statement follows by the parameter choice  $C \ge 84$ .

Now, let  $w \in \Omega$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv w^{\pm 1}$ . If  $|w|_b = 0$ , then no internal or external *b*-band has an end on  $\pi$ , so that  $\beta_i(\Delta) = \beta_i(\widetilde{\Delta})$  and  $\beta_e(\Delta) = \beta_e(\widetilde{\Delta})$ . Hence, (2) follows by the inductive hypothesis.

Otherwise, there exists a word w' freely conjugate to w such that  $w' \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ . Letting t be the length of the semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(w')$  which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w', Lemma 6.25 implies both that  $|\mathbf{t}|_{b} \leq 12D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$  and that  $|\mathbf{s}|_{b} \geq \lfloor \frac{\ell-1}{2} \rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \geq \frac{\ell-2}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \geq \frac{C-8}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$ . So,  $\beta_{i}(\Delta) \leq \beta_{i}(\widetilde{\Delta}) + 12D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$ .

Further, as with the  $\ell$  consecutive external  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands with ends  $\pi$ , any maximal positive *b*-band of  $\Delta_0$  with one end on  $\mathbf{s}^{-1}$  is an external *b*-band which is removed in passing to  $\widetilde{\Delta}$ , and thus

$$\beta_e(\widetilde{\Delta}) \le \beta_e(\Delta) - \frac{C-8}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) + 12D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1)$$

Hence,  $\beta_i(\Delta) \leq \frac{49}{C} \beta_e(\widetilde{\Delta}) + 12D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \leq \frac{49}{C} \beta_e(\Delta) + D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \left(12 + \frac{49}{C} (12 - \frac{C-8}{4})\right).$ As above, (2) then holds if  $\frac{49}{C} (\frac{C-8}{4} - 12) \geq 12.$ 

But this is equivalent to the parameter choice  $C \geq 2744$ , so that the statement follows.

**Lemma 9.9.** If  $\Delta$  is an *M*-minimal diagram, then wt( $\Delta$ )  $\leq c_0 \|\partial \Delta\|^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 \|\partial \Delta\|^3)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a  $\theta$ -edge **e**. Then, Lemma 9.4 implies that **e** must be a defining edge of a unique maximal  $\theta$ -band which has two ends on  $\partial \Delta$ . In particular,  $\|\partial \Delta\| \ge 2$ .

Conversely, if  $\Delta$  contains no  $\theta$ -edge, then every cell must be an *a*-cell. In this case, assuming without loss of generality that wt( $\Delta$ ) > 0, Lemmas 9.5 and 9.3 imply  $\partial \Delta$  contains at least C - 6  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges. So, a parameter choice for C also implies  $\|\partial \Delta\| \ge 2$ .

Now, as above, Lemma 9.4 implies that any maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$  must have two ends on  $\partial\Delta$ . As a result, there are at most  $\frac{1}{2} \|\partial\Delta\|$  maximal positive  $\theta$ -bands in  $\Delta$ . Similarly, Lemma 7.2(2) implies that  $\Delta$  contains at most  $\frac{1}{2} \|\partial\Delta\|$  maximal positive q-bands. Hence, since any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\Delta$  is the crossing of a maximal positive  $\theta$ -band and a maximal positive q-band, it follows from Lemma 7.2(1) that  $\Delta$  contains at most  $\frac{1}{4} \|\partial \Delta\|^2$   $(\theta, q)$ -cells.

Let  $\alpha$  be the number of maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands in  $\Delta$  and set  $\alpha_i = \alpha_i(\Delta)$  and  $\alpha_e = \alpha_e(\Delta)$ . Note that a maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band need not be internal or external, as such  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands must have at least one end on an *a*-cell. Hence,  $\alpha_i + \alpha_e \leq \alpha$ .

Similarly, letting  $\beta$  be the number of maximal positive *b*-bands in  $\Delta$  and setting  $\beta_i = \beta_i(\Delta)$  and  $\beta_e = \beta_e(\Delta)$ , we have  $\beta_i + \beta_e \leq \beta$ .

By the makeup of the relations, the boundary of any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell can have at most one  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge. Hence, since Lemma 7.3(2) implies that any maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band that is not internal must have at least one end on  $\partial \Delta$  or on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell,  $\alpha - \alpha_i \leq ||\partial \Delta|| + \frac{1}{4} ||\partial \Delta||^2 \leq \frac{3}{4} ||\partial \Delta||^2$ .

Further, Lemma 9.8(1) implies that  $\alpha_i \leq \frac{7}{C}\alpha_e \leq \frac{7}{C}(\alpha - \alpha_i)$ , so that the parameter choice C > 21 implies  $\alpha_i \leq \frac{1}{3}(\alpha - \alpha_i)$ .

So,  $\alpha = \alpha_i + (\alpha - \alpha_i) \le \frac{4}{3}(\alpha - \alpha_i) \le ||\partial \Delta||^2$ .

Hence, as any  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell is the crossing of a maximal positive  $\theta$ -band and a maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band, Lemma 7.3(1) implies that the number of  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells in  $\Delta$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2} \|\partial \Delta\|^3$ .

Next, note that the boundary of any  $(\theta, q)$ - or  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell can have at most  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  b-edges. So, as above, since any maximal positive b-band that is not internal must have at least one end on  $\partial \Delta$ , on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, or on a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell,  $\beta - \beta_i \leq ||\partial \Delta|| + D_{\mathcal{A}}(\frac{1}{4}||\partial \Delta||^2 + \frac{1}{2}||\partial \Delta||^3) \leq ||\partial \Delta|| + \frac{3}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}||\partial \Delta||^3$ .

So, recalling that the value of  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  is dependent on C, a parameter choice for C then yields  $\beta - \beta_i \leq \frac{7}{8} D_{\mathcal{A}} \|\partial \Delta\|^3$ .

Lemma 9.8(2) then implies  $\beta_i \leq \frac{49}{C}\beta_e \leq \frac{49}{C}(\beta - \beta_i)$ , so that the parameter choice  $C \geq 343$  yields  $\beta_i \leq \frac{1}{7}(\beta - \beta_i)$ .

Hence, as above,  $\beta = \beta_i + (\beta - \beta_i) \leq \frac{8}{7}(\beta - \beta_i) \leq D_{\mathcal{A}} \|\partial \Delta\|^3$ , and so the number of  $(\theta, b)$ -cells in  $\Delta$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}} \|\partial \Delta\|^4$ .

Finally, note that the boundary of any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell contains at most one ordinary *a*-edge. So, since any maximal ordinary *a*-band have two ends which are on  $\partial \Delta$  or on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, the number of maximal positive ordinary *a*-bands in  $\Delta$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2}(\|\partial \Delta\| + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial \Delta\|^2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\partial \Delta\|^2$ . Hence, the number of ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cells in  $\Delta$  is at most  $\frac{1}{4}\|\partial \Delta\|^3$ .

Thus, letting  $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n$  be the *a*-cells of  $\Delta$ , a parameter choice for *C* implies:

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{wt}(\pi_{i}) + \frac{1}{4} \|\partial \Delta\|^{2} + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial \Delta\|^{3} + \frac{1}{2} D_{\mathcal{A}} \|\partial \Delta\|^{4} + \frac{1}{4} \|\partial \Delta\|^{3} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_{\mathcal{L}}(\|\partial \pi_{i}\|) + D_{\mathcal{A}} \|\partial \Delta\|^{4}$$

Since  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  is super-additive,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_{\mathcal{L}}(\|\partial \pi_i\|) \leq g_{\mathcal{L}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\partial \pi_i\|\right)$ . But since all of the edges on the boundary of an *a*-cell are  $\mathcal{A}$ - or *b*-edges,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\partial \pi_i\| \le 2(\alpha + \beta) \le 2\|\partial \Delta\|^2 + 2D_{\mathcal{A}}\|\partial \Delta\|^3 \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}\|\partial \Delta\|^3$$

Thus, the statement follows from the parameter choice  $c_0 >> C$ .

### 10. DIAGRAMS WITH DISKS

### 10.1. Minimal diagrams.

Analogous to the approach to diagrams over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in Section 9, the objective of this section is to study diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  for the purpose of finding an upper bound of the weight of a reduced circular diagram in terms of its perimeter. Again, this goal is not achieved for any possible reduced circular diagram, but rather for a 'generic' class of such diagrams.

Recall that the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  is  $(\{t(1)\}B_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{L}}(1))(\{t(2)\}B_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{L}}(2))\dots(\{t(L)\}B_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{L}}(L))$  where:

$$B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(i) = Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i)\dots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(i)(R_N^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}\dots (R_1^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$$

for each i = 1, ..., L. Letting  $\mathcal{X}$  be the generators of the groups associated to  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  (see Section 7.1), a *q*-letter of a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  of the form  $t(i)^{\pm 1}$  for  $2 \leq i \leq L$  is called a *t*-letter. Accordingly, a *q*-edge labelled by a *t*-letter is called a *t*-edge, a  $(\theta, q)$ -relation corresponding to a *t*-letter is called a  $(\theta, t)$ -relation, and a *q*-band corresponding to a part  $\{t(i)\}$  for  $i \geq 2$  is called a *t*-band.

Note that for each positive rule  $\theta$  and each *t*-letter, the corresponding  $(\theta, t)$ -relation is of the simple form  $\theta_j t(i) = t(i)\theta_{j+1}$ . Hence, a side of a *t*-band is labelled by the analogous copy of the band's history.

Now, as in [32], we introduce a 'grading' (see Section 13 of [16] for the general definition of graded presentations) on the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as follows:

For any diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , define the values:

- $\sigma_1(\Delta)$  is the number of disks in  $\Delta$
- $\sigma_2(\Delta)$  is the number of  $(\theta, t)$ -cells in  $\Delta$
- $\sigma_3(\Delta)$  is the number of *a*-cells in  $\Delta$
- $\sigma_4(\Delta)$  is the number of  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells in  $\Delta$

The signature of  $\Delta$  is taken to be the quadruple  $\tau(\Delta) = (\sigma_1(\Delta), \ldots, \sigma_4(\Delta))$ . For  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we also define the *j*-signature of  $\Delta$  to be the *j*-tuple  $\tau_j(\Delta) = (\sigma_1(\Delta), \ldots, \sigma_j(\Delta))$ .

Signatures of diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  are ordered lexicographically. That is, given two such diagrams  $\Delta$  and  $\Gamma$ ,  $\tau(\Delta) \leq \tau(\Gamma)$  if and only if:

• 
$$\sigma_1(\Delta) \leq \sigma_1(\Gamma)$$

• If  $\tau_j(\Delta) = \tau_j(\Gamma)$  for some  $1 \le j \le 3$ , then  $\sigma_{j+1}(\Delta) \le \sigma_{j+1}(\Gamma)$ 

The *j*-signatures of diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  are ordered similarly.

A circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is *minimal* if for any circular diagram  $\Gamma$  over this presentation satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Delta)$ , then  $\tau(\Delta) \leq \tau(\Gamma)$ .

Analogously, a circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is *j*-minimal if it has the smallest possible *j*-signature amongst all circular diagrams with the same contour label. Observe that minimal diagrams are necessarily *j*-minimal for any *j*, while *j*-minimal diagrams are necessarily (j - 1)-minimal for appropriate *j*.

Note that for a minimal diagram  $\Delta$  and a circular diagram  $\Gamma$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma)$ , it is not necessarily the case that  $\operatorname{wt}(\Delta) \leq \operatorname{wt}(\Gamma)$ . In particular, in the sequel we define operations that add many cells of 'low rank' in order to remove one or two cells of 'high rank'; such an operation reduces the type of the diagram but a priori increases the weight. However, despite this, the definition of minimal diagram provides a convenient setting for studying the structure of the group  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .
Further, observe that the removal of cancellable cells (see Figure 2.2) in a diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  can only decrease the (*j*)-signature of the diagram.

Hence, for any (j-)minimal diagram, there exists a reduced (j-)minimal diagram with the same contour label obtained by simply removing any pairs of cancellable cells.

Suppose W is a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the trivial element in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . It follows from van Kampen's Lemma (see Section 2.1) that there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma) \equiv W$ . As the lexicographic ordering on tuples of natural numbers is a well-ordering, without loss of generality  $\tau(\Gamma)$  (or  $\tau_j(\Gamma)$ ) is minimal amongst all such diagrams.

Hence, the next statement follows immediately, establishing the sense in which minimal diagrams are 'generic':

**Lemma 10.1.** Let W a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the trivial element in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Then there exists a reduced (j-)minimal diagram  $\Delta$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .

## 10.2. Removal surgeries.

In this section, we define two types of surgery on reduced diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which reduce the type of the diagram. These operations help describe the makeup of a minimal diagram, allowing for the estimates that follow.

## 10.2.1. Removing a-cells.

Our first operation uses the definition of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  to study the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands of reduced diagrams over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which have ends on *a*-cells, demonstrating the condition (MM2) in minimal diagrams.

**Lemma 10.2.** Suppose the circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  contains *a*-cells  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1), \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_2) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$
- There exists a simple path  $\mathbf{t}$  in  $\Delta$  between vertices of  $\partial \pi_1$  and  $\partial \pi_2$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t})$  is freely trivial

Then  $\Delta$  is not 3-minimal.

*Proof.* Let  $O_1$  and  $O_2$  be the vertices of  $\partial \pi_1$  and  $\partial \pi_2$  such that the initial and terminal points of **t** are  $O_1$  and  $O_2$ , respectively (see Figure 2.2).

Then, for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $w_i \in F(\mathcal{A})$  be  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_i)$  read starting at  $O_i$ .

The process of 0-refinement then produces a diagram  $\Delta_0$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  and  $\tau(\Delta_0) = \tau(\Delta)$  such that there exists a subdiagram  $\Gamma$  of  $\Delta_0$  with  $\tau_3(\Gamma) = (0, 0, 2)$  and

$$\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\pi_1)\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t})\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\pi_2)\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t})^{-1} =_{F(\mathcal{X})} w_1 w_2$$

By condition (L3),  $w_1, w_2 \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

So, by condition (L4),  $w_1w_2$  is either freely trivial or freely equal to an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Hence, there exists a (reduced) circular diagram  $\Gamma'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$  such that  $\tau_3(\Gamma') \leq (0,0,1) < \tau_3(\Gamma)$ .

But then excising  $\Gamma$  from  $\Delta_0$  and replacing it with  $\Gamma'$  produces a circular diagram  $\Delta'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  such that  $\tau_3(\Delta') < \tau_3(\Delta)$ .

**Lemma 10.3.** For any  $w \in \Omega$ , there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  satisfying:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma_w) \equiv w$
- $\tau_3(\Gamma_w) = (0, 0, 1)$
- Letting  $\pi$  be the unique *a*-cell of  $\Gamma_w$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\Omega$ , there exists a word  $w' \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  which is freely conjugate to w.

Then, Lemma 6.25 produces a (unique) semi-computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector  $\mathcal{S}(w'): w' \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w'.

By Lemma 7.9, there then exists a semi-trapezium  $\Delta_w$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\Delta_w)) \equiv w'$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\Delta_w)) \equiv w_t$ .

By definition,  $\tau_3(\Delta_w) = (0, 0, 0)$  and the sides of  $\Delta_w$  are labelled by identical copies of the history of  $\mathcal{S}(w')$ . So, pasting the sides of  $\Delta_w$  together produces an annular diagram  $\Delta'_w$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ with outer contour label w', inner contour label  $w_t^{-1}$ , and 3-signature  $\tau_3(\Delta'_w) = (0, 0, 0)$ .

As  $\mathcal{S}(w')$  is a  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepting computation, necessarily  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , and so  $w_t^{-1} \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  by Lemma 7.1. Hence, letting  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv w_t^{-1}$ ,  $\pi$  can be pasted into the center of  $\Delta'_w$  to produce a circular diagram  $\Gamma'_w$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma'_w) \equiv w'$  and  $\tau_3(\Gamma'_w) = (0, 0, 1)$ .

Thus, since w' is freely conjugate to w, applying 0-refinement (or gluing) and cancellation to  $\Gamma'_w$ produces a diagram  $\Gamma_w$  satisfying the statement.

**Lemma 10.4.** Let  $\Delta$  be a reduced circular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Then there exists a reduced diagram  $\Delta'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that:

• 
$$\tau_3(\Delta') \le \tau_3(\Delta)$$

Lab(∂Δ') ≡ Lab(∂Δ)
τ<sub>3</sub>(Δ') ≤ τ<sub>3</sub>(Δ)
For every *a*-cell π of Δ', Lab(∂π) ∈ Λ<sup>A</sup>

*Proof.* Letting  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell in  $\Delta$ , Lemma 7.1 implies there exists  $w \in \Omega$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv w$ . So, there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  given by Lemma 10.3. Hence,  $\pi$  may be excised from  $\Delta$  and  $\Gamma_w$  pasted in its place.

By construction, the diagram  $\Delta'$  obtained by performing this surgery for every a-cell (and removing any cancellable cells that may arise) satisfies the statement.

**Lemma 10.5.** Any 3-minimal diagram  $\Delta$  satisfies condition (MM2).

*Proof.* By Lemma 10.4, it may be assumed without loss of generality that the contour label of every a-cell in  $\Delta$  is an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Suppose  $\Delta$  does not satisfy (MM2). So, there exist *a*-cells  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  and a subdiagram  $\Psi$ contradicting the condition (see Figure 9.1).

Let  $\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3$  be the corresponding consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi_1$ . So, there exist edges  $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2, \mathbf{f}_3$  of  $\partial \pi_2$  such that  $\mathbf{f}_i^{-1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the subpath of  $(\partial \pi_1)^{-1}$  with initial edge  $\mathbf{e}_3^{-1}$  and final edge  $\mathbf{e}_1^{-1}$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the subpath of  $\partial \pi_2$  with initial edge  $\mathbf{f}_3$  and final edge  $\mathbf{f}_1$ .

Further, let  $\mathbf{t}_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_3))$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1))$ .

Then, since by hypothesis  $\Psi$  contains no *a*-cells,  $\Psi$  is a compressed semi-trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ in the 'special' input sector with standard factorization  $\mathbf{t}_1^{-1}\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{t}_2\mathbf{s}_2^{-1}$ . Letting H be the history of  $\Psi$ , note that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_i)$  is a copy of H.

By Lemma 8.4, there then exists a reduced compressed semi-computation  $S_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H such that  $w_0 \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1)$  and  $w_t \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2)$ .

As  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_1) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , there exist  $y_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w_0 \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2} y_3^{\delta_3}$ . Further, since  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_2) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , Lemma 5.7 implies there exist  $z_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $w_t \equiv z_1^{\varepsilon_1} z_2^{\varepsilon_2} z_3^{\varepsilon_3}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.23, so that H must be freely trivial.

But then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_j)$  is also freely trivial and so satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 10.2, yielding a contradiction.

## 10.2.2. Removing disks.

The next operation is used to study *t*-bands in minimal diagrams which have ends on two disks, yielding a similar condition to (MM2) for pairs of disks. This treatment is carried out in much the same way as in [32].

First, we construct a diagram to simulate the 'almost-extendability' of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  (see Section 6.3):

**Lemma 10.6.** Let  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$  and suppose  $\mathcal{C} : W_{ac}(j) \to \cdots \to W_{ac}(j)$  is a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with history H. Then there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^{-1}$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2) \equiv W_{ac}$
- $\mathbf{t}_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2$  are sides of maximal negative q-bands whose labels are identical copies of H
- The history of every maximal negative q-band in  $\Delta$  is H

*Proof.* Let  $H \equiv H_1 \dots H_k$  be the factorization of H such that for each  $i = 1, \dots, k, H_i$  is the history of a maximal one-machine subcomputation  $C_i$  of C.

By Lemma 6.10, there then exists a one-machine computation  $\mathcal{D}_i : U_i \to \cdots \to V_i$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the standard base with history  $H_i$  extending  $\mathcal{C}_i$ .

So, Lemma 7.15 provides a trapezium  $\Delta_i$  with  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\Delta_i)) \equiv U_i$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\Delta_i)) \equiv V_i$ , and history  $H_i$ . Note that by the definition of trapezia and Lemma 7.2, every maximal negative q-band of  $\Delta_i$  has history  $H_i$ .

Further, as the  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(L))^{-1}{t(1)}$ -sector is always locked, no trimming is necessary for trapezia that emulate computations of the standard base. The sides of  $\Delta_i$  are hence labelled by identical copies of  $H_i$ .

Now, Lemma 6.14 implies that for all  $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$ ,  $V_i$  and  $U_{i+1}$  differ by the insertion/deletion of an element of  $\mathcal{L}$  in the 'special' input sector. But conditions (L1) and (L5) imply  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \Omega$ , so that the top of  $\Delta_i$  and the bottom of  $\Delta_{i+1}$  can be glued along a single *a*-cell to produce a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Note that this procedure glues all maximal negative q-bands together, so that such a band is the concatenation of the corresponding bands in  $\Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_k$ .

Thus, the statement is satisfied by letting  $\mathbf{s}_1 = \mathbf{tbot}(\Delta_1)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{ttop}(\Delta_k)$ .

**Lemma 10.7.** Let  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  be accepted configurations of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W_1), \ell(W_2) \leq 1$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{C}: W_1(j) \to \cdots \to W_2(j)$  is a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with history H for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Then there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^{-1}$  such that:

- $Lab(\mathbf{s}_i) \equiv W_i$  for i = 1, 2
- $\mathbf{t}_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2$  are sides of maximal negative q-bands whose labels are identical copies of H
- The history of every maximal negative q-band in  $\Delta$  is H

*Proof.* For i = 1, 2, let  $C_i$  be a reduced computation of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting  $W_i$  with  $\ell(C_i) = \ell(W_i)$ . Let  $H_i$  be the history  $C_i$  and let  $\overline{C}_i$  be the inverse computation of  $C_i$ .

The restriction of  $C_i$  to the base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  is then a reduced computation with history  $H_i$  of the form  $W_i(j) \to \cdots \to W_{ac}(j)$ . Hence,  $H_1^{-1}HH_2$  is freely equal to the history of a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}': W_{ac}(j) \to \cdots \to W_{ac}(j)$ .

Let  $\Delta'$  be the diagram corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}'$  given by Lemma 10.6 with  $\partial \Delta' = (\mathbf{t}'_1)^{-1} (\mathbf{s}'_1) (\mathbf{t}'_2) (\mathbf{s}'_2)^{-1}$ .

Now, let  $\Delta_1$  be the trapezium corresponding to  $C_1$  by Lemma 7.15. Similarly, let  $\bar{\Delta}_2$  be the trapezium corresponding to the inverse computation  $\bar{C}_2$ .

Noting that  $\text{Lab}(\text{ttop}(\Delta_1)) \equiv W_{ac} \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}'_1)$  and  $\text{Lab}(\text{tbot}(\bar{\Delta}_2)) \equiv W_{ac} \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}'_2)$ , we can construct a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  by pasting together  $\Delta_1$ ,  $\Delta'$ , and  $\bar{\Delta}_2$  and making any necessary cancellations.

As in the proof of Lemma 10.6, all maximal negative q-bands of  $\Delta$  arise as the concatenation of such a band in  $\Delta_1$ ,  $\Delta'$ , and  $\bar{\Delta}_2$  (and making any necessary cancellations). By construction, the history of this band is then freely equal to  $H_1(H_1^{-1}HH_2)H_2^{-1}$ , and so is H.

Thus, the statement follows by letting  $\mathbf{s}_1 = \mathbf{tbot}(\Delta_1)$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2 = \mathbf{ttop}(\overline{\Delta}_2)$ .

Let  $\Pi$  be a disk in a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . A maximal *t*-band which has an end on  $\Pi$  is called a *t*-spoke of  $\Pi$ .

Given a *t*-edge  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\partial \Pi$ , the *t*-spoke of  $\Pi$  for which  $\mathbf{e}$  is a defining edge is denoted  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e})$ .

With Lemma 10.7, we now arrive at the following analogue of Lemma 10.5, providing an analogue of condition (MM2) for *t*-bands connecting disks:

**Lemma 10.8.** Let  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  be two disks of a reduced 1-minimal diagram  $\Delta$ . Suppose there exist consecutive *t*-edges  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  of  $\partial \Pi_1$  such that both  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_2)$  have ends on  $\Pi_2$ . Let  $\Psi$  be the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  bounded by  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  and subpaths of  $\partial \Pi_i$  such that neither  $\Pi_1$  nor  $\Pi_2$  is contained in  $\Psi$  (see Figure 10.1(a)). Then  $\Psi$  contains a disk.

*Proof.* For i = 1, 2, let  $\mathbf{f}_i$  be the *t*-edge of  $\partial \Pi_2$  such that  $\mathbf{f}_i^{-1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_i)$ . Then,  $\mathbf{f}_2$  and  $\mathbf{f}_1$  are consecutive *t*-edges of  $\partial \Pi_2$  and  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{f}_i)$  have ends on  $\Pi_1$ .

So, it may be assumed without loss of generality that for  $i = 1, 2, Q_i = Q(\mathbf{e}_i)$  is a negative *t*-band. In particular, there exist accepted configurations  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi_1) \equiv W_1^{-1}$ and  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi_2) \equiv W_2$ .

Assume  $\Psi$  contains no disk.

Then, perhaps replacing this subdiagram with a diagram with the same contour label, it may be assumed that  $\Psi$  is a 3-minimal diagram containing no disk.

Let  $\mathbf{q}_1$  be the subpath of  $(\partial \Pi_1)^{-1}$  with initial edge  $\mathbf{e}_2^{-1}$  and terminal edge  $\mathbf{e}_1^{-1}$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbf{q}_2$  be the subpath of  $\partial \Pi_2$  with initial edge  $\mathbf{f}_2$  and terminal edge  $\mathbf{f}_1$ .



(b) Adjacent *t*-letters are  $\{t(L), t(2)\}$ 

FIGURE 10.1. Lemma 10.8

First, suppose there exists j = 2, ..., L - 1 such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_2^{-1}) = t(j)$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_1^{-1}) = t(j+1)$ . Then,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_i) \equiv W_i(j)t(j+1)$  for i = 1, 2.

So, since the side of any t-band consists entirely of  $\theta$ -edges,  $\partial \Psi$  contains no  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge labelled by a letter from the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector. Further, as no q-edge of  $\partial \Psi$  is labelled by a letter of  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ , Lemma 7.2 implies that no  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\Psi$  has a boundary  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge labelled by such a letter of the 'special' input sector.

Hence, Lemma 10.5, Lemma 9.3, and the parameter choice  $C \geq 7$  imply that  $\Psi$  is a reduced circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Let  $\mathbf{p}_2 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_2)$ . Further, let  $\mathbf{y}_1$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  in  $(\partial \Pi_1)^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_2$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{q}_2$  in  $\partial \Pi_2$ .

Then,  $\Psi$  is a trapezium with standard factorization  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$ . Note that the history H of  $\Psi$  is also the history of both  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ .

Lemma 7.14 then provides a reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}' : \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1) \to \cdots \to \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2)$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with history H. So, the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}'$  to the base  $\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  is a reduced computation of the form  $\mathcal{C}: W_1(j) \to \cdots \to W_2(j)$  with history H.

Hence, Lemma 10.7 provides a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\partial \Gamma = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^{-1}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}$ .

For all  $2 \leq \ell \leq L$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_{\ell}$  be the maximal negative *t*-band of  $\Gamma$  corresponding to  $\{t(\ell)\}$ . Set  $\mathbf{z}_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_j)$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_{j+1})$ . Then, since the history of  $\mathcal{T}_{\ell}$  is *H* for each  $\ell$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_i) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_i)$  for i = 1, 2.

Cutting along  $\mathbf{z}_1$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2$  decomposes  $\Gamma$  into three subdiagrams  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$  (see Figure 10.2) such that there exist factorizations  $\mathbf{s}_i = \mathbf{s}_{i,1}\mathbf{s}_{i,2}\mathbf{s}_{i,3}$  with:

- $\partial \Gamma_1 = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{1,1} \mathbf{z}_1 \mathbf{s}_{2,1}^{-1}$   $\partial \Gamma_2 = \mathbf{z}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{1,2} \mathbf{z}_2 \mathbf{s}_{2,2}^{-1}$   $\partial \Gamma_3 = \mathbf{z}_2^{-1} \mathbf{s}_{1,3} \mathbf{t}_2 \mathbf{s}_{2,3}^{-1}$



FIGURE 10.2. The decomposition of  $\Gamma$  into  $\Gamma_1$ ,  $\Gamma_2$ , and  $\Gamma_3$ .

Note that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{i,2}) \equiv W_i(j)t(j+1) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_i)$  for i = 1, 2. Hence,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{i,3})\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{i,1}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}_i)$ . Since  $\mathbf{t}_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2$  are labelled identically,  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_3$  can be glued together along these paths. This construction yields a circular diagram  $\Gamma'$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\partial \Gamma' = \mathbf{z}_2^{-1} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{z}_1 \mathbf{u}_2^{-1}$ , where  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{u}_i) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{i,3}) \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{i,1}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}_i).$ 

Consider the subdiagram  $\Psi'$  of  $\Delta$  consisting of  $\Psi$ ,  $\Pi_1$ , and  $\Pi_2$ . Then,  $\partial \Psi' = \mathbf{y}_2 \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{y}_1^{-1} \mathbf{p}_2$ . As a result,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi')^{-1} \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_2)^{-1} \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}_1) \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_2)^{-1} \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_2^{-1} \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{z}_1 \mathbf{u}_2^{-1}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma')$ .

So, since  $\Gamma'$  is a circular diagram over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi')$  represents the trivial element of  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Hence, van Kampen's lemma provides a reduced circular diagram  $\Sigma$  over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Sigma) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi')$ .

But then excising  $\Psi'$  from  $\Delta$  and pasting  $\Sigma$  in its place produces a diagram  $\Delta'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  and  $\tau_1(\Delta') < \tau_1(\Delta)$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\Delta$  is 1-minimal.

Thus, it suffices to assume that  $Lab(\mathbf{e}_2^{-1}) = t(L)$  and  $Lab(\mathbf{e}_1^{-1}) = t(2)$ .

There then exists a maximal negative q-band  $\mathcal{Q}_3$  of  $\Psi$  corresponding to  $\{t(1)\}$  which has ends on both  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$ . But then letting  $\Psi_0$  be the subdiagram of  $\Psi$  bounded by  $\mathcal{Q}_2$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_3$  (see Figure 10.1(b), an identical argument to that provided above completes the proof.

With Lemma 10.8, we now adapt the methods of Section 9.2 to this context, defining an auxiliary graph to a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which is an estimating graph constructed from the disks of the diagram. Note that this treatment is analogous to that of [17], [23], [32], and others.

To any reduced circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , construct the (unoriented) graph  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  as follows:

- (1) The set of vertices is  $\{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$ , where each  $v_i$  for  $i \ge 1$  corresponds to one of the  $\ell$  disks of  $\Delta$  and  $v_0$  is a single exterior vertex.
- (2) For  $i, j \ge 1$  and for any positive t-band which has ends on the disks corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_i, v_j)$ . Such an edge is called *internal*.
- (3) For  $i \ge 1$  and any positive t-band with one end on the disk corresponding to  $v_i$  and the other end on  $\partial \Delta$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_0, v_i)$ . Such an edge is called *external*.

Analogous to the construction outlined in Lemma 9.1,  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  can be constructed by placing interior vertices in the interior of the corresponding disk and constructing arcs running through the corresponding *t*-bands. Hence, similar to that setting,  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  can be assumed to be a planar graph (note this observation is easier to see in this setting given the simpler makeup of external edges).

Note that by definition the label of the positive q-edges on the boundary of a disk is a representative of a different part of the state letters of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . Accordingly, a q-band can have at most one end on any particular disk. In particular, any maximal positive t-band with an end on a disk corresponds to an edge of  $\Gamma(\Delta)$ . Hence,  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  contains no 1-gons and the degree of any interior vertex is L-1.

Moreover, Lemma 10.8 implies that if  $\Delta$  is a reduced 1-minimal diagram, then no two internal edges of  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  bound a 2-gon.

Thus, the next statement is a given by taking  $L \ge 7$ , following in just the same way as Lemma 9.2, yielding a conclusion analogous to Lemma 9.3:

**Lemma 10.9** (Lemma 3.2 of [15]). If  $\Delta$  is a reduced 1-minimal diagram containing at least one disk, then  $\Delta$  contains a disk  $\Pi$  such that L-4 consecutive *t*-spokes  $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{L-4}$  of  $\Pi$  have ends on  $\partial \Delta$  and such that every subdiagram  $\Gamma_i$  bounded by  $Q_i$ ,  $Q_{i+1}$ ,  $\partial \Pi$ , and  $\partial \Delta$  ( $i = 1, \ldots, L-5$ ) contains no disks.



FIGURE 10.3. Lemma 10.9

#### 10.3. scopes.

As in Section 9.3, we now take a brief interlude to investigate a consequence to Lemma 10.9 that will be useful for future arguments.

Let  $\Pi$  be a disk and  $\mathbf{t}$  be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  be *t*-edges of  $\partial \Pi$  such that the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  has an end on  $\mathbf{t}$ . Suppose there exists a subpath  $\mathbf{s}$  of  $\partial \Pi$  such that  $\mathbf{s}$ , a subpath of  $\mathbf{t}$ , and the bands  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_1), \mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_2)$  bound a (circular) subdiagram  $\Psi$  of  $\Delta$  which does not contain  $\Pi$ .

Then  $\Psi$  is called a scope on t with associated disk  $\Pi$ , associated subpath s, and size  $|\mathbf{s}|_t$ .

Analogous to the terminology of *a*-scopes,  $\Psi$  is called a *pure scope* if it contains no disk. Further, the *completion* of  $\Psi$  is the subdiagram  $\tilde{\Psi}$  consisting of both  $\Psi$  and  $\Pi$ .

**Lemma 10.10.** Let **t** be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a scope  $\Psi_0$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$  is 1-minimal. If  $\Psi_0$  is not a pure scope, then there exists a scope  $\Psi_1$  on **t** of size  $\ell \geq L - 6$  such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows much the same outline as that of Lemma 9.6, using Lemma 10.8 in place of condition (MM2) and Lemma 10.9 in place of Lemma 9.3.

Similarly, the following statement is proved in much the same way as Lemma 9.7, using iterated applications of Lemma 10.10:

**Lemma 10.11.** Let **t** be a subpath of a boundary component of a reduced diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a scope  $\Psi_0$  on **t** such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$  is 1-minimal. If  $\Psi_0$  is not a pure scope, then there exists a pure scope  $\Psi$  on **t** of size  $\ell \geq L - 6$  such that the completion  $\tilde{\Psi}_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Psi_0$ .

# 10.4. Transposition.

Next, we define a process that allows us to move a  $\theta$ -band about an *a*-cell or a disk. These operations appear similar as those in [32]; however, the setting of the generalized *S*-machine  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  introduces some new obstructions for each.

## 10.4.1. Transposition of a $\theta$ -band and an a-cell.

Let  $\Delta$  be a circular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  containing an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and a reduced  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $|E(\pi, \mathcal{T})| \geq 5$ . By Lemma 7.1, there exists  $w \in \Omega$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv w$ . Let  $\theta$  be the history of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Suppose  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2$  where  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is a path satisfying:

- $\mathbf{s}_1$  contains at least 5 edges of  $E(\pi, \mathcal{T})$
- The first and last edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  are edges of  $E(\pi, \mathcal{T})$
- $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ .

Then, let  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  be the minimal (perhaps empty) subpaths of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  such that there exists a subband  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}') = \mathbf{ys}_1^{-1}\mathbf{z}_1$  (see Figure 10.4(a)). Denote by  $\Gamma$  the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  consisting of  $\pi$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .

Suppose  $\mathbf{y}$  is a non-trivial path. Then, there exists a cell  $\gamma$  of  $\mathcal{T}'$  such that  $\mathbf{y}$  is a subpath of  $\partial \gamma$ . In this case,  $\gamma$  is a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell and the last edge of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $(\partial \gamma)^{-1}$ . By the definition of the  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -relations,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}) \in F(\mathcal{B})$  and must be  $\theta$ -applicable with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \theta \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y})$ . Hence, Lemma 7.7 yields a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}}$  with history  $\theta$  consisting entirely of  $(\theta, b)$ -cells such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{y}})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y})$ .

Similarly, if  $\mathbf{z}$  is a non-trivial path, then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}) \in F(\mathcal{B})$  and Lemma 7.7 produces an analogous  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbf{z}}$ .

In particular, **bot**( $\mathcal{T}'$ ) contains no *q*-edges, and hence Lemma 7.2 implies that  $\mathcal{T}'$  consists entirely of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells.

Let  $\mathbf{s}_1''$  be the maximal subpath of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  such that there exists a subband  $\mathcal{T}''$  of  $\mathcal{T}'$  satisfying  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}'') = (\mathbf{s}_1'')^{-1}$ . Then, at most two cells of  $\mathcal{T}'$  are not contained in  $\mathcal{T}''$ , and so the makeup of the relations implies  $|\mathbf{s}_1''|_{\mathcal{A}} \ge |E(\pi, \mathcal{T})| - 2 \ge 3$ .



FIGURE 10.4. The transposition of a  $\theta$ -band with an *a*-cell

Applying Lemma 7.6 to the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}''$  then implies that  $\operatorname{Lab}((\mathbf{s}''_1)^{-1}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}''_1)^{-1}$  is  $\theta$ -applicable, and so Lemma 6.22 implies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}''_1)$  is also  $\theta$ -applicable. In particular,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}''_1)$  is a  $\theta$ -applicable subword of a cyclic permutation of w with  $|\mathbf{s}''_1|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 3$ , so that Lemma 6.27 implies that w is also  $\theta$ -applicable.

Let  $v_i \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_i)$  for i = 1, 2. As  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{s}_2)$  is a cyclic permutation of w, Lemma 6.22 implies  $v_1$ ,  $v_2$ , and  $v_1v_2$  are all  $\theta$ -applicable with  $(v_1v_2) \cdot \theta = (v_1 \cdot \theta)(v_2 \cdot \theta)$ .

Further, letting  $u_{\mathbf{y}} = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{y})$  and  $u_{\mathbf{z}} = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{z})$  (with these words taken to be trivial if the corresponding path is trivial), applying Lemma 7.6 to  $\mathcal{T}'$  implies  $u_{\mathbf{y}}v_1^{-1}u_{\mathbf{z}}$  is  $\theta$ -applicable with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv (u_{\mathbf{y}}v_1^{-1}u_{\mathbf{z}}) \cdot \theta = u_{\mathbf{y}}(v_1 \cdot \theta)^{-1}u_{\mathbf{z}}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the  $\theta$ -band given by Lemma 7.7 corresponding to the semi-computation  $v_2 \to (v_2 \cdot \theta)$ . So,  $\mathcal{S}$  has history  $\theta$  with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S}) \equiv v_2$  and  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{S}) \equiv v_2 \cdot \theta$ .

As  $w \in \Omega$ , there exists a word  $w' \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  which is freely conjugate to w. Let p be a word such that  $w' \equiv p^{-1}wp$ . Since w is  $\theta$ -applicable, Lemma 6.26 implies w' is also  $\theta$ -applicable. Since Lemma 6.22 also implies p is  $\theta$ -applicable,  $w' \cdot \theta = (p \cdot \theta)^{-1}(w \cdot \theta)(p \cdot \theta)$ . But  $w' \cdot \theta \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  by definition. Hence,  $w \cdot \theta$  is freely conjugate to  $w' \cdot \theta \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ , and so is freely conjugate to an element of  $\Omega$ .

In particular, 0-refining a single *a*-cell, one can construct a circular diagram  $\bar{\pi}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \bar{\pi}) \equiv w \cdot \theta$ such that  $\tau_3(\bar{\pi}) = (0, 0, 1)$ . Then,  $\text{Lab}(\partial \bar{\pi})$  is a cyclic permutation of  $(v_1 v_2) \cdot \theta$ , and so using 0refinement we may assume  $\partial \bar{\pi} = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_1 \bar{\mathbf{s}}_2$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_i) \equiv v_i \cdot \theta$ . So, we may glue S to  $\bar{\pi}$  by identifying  $\mathbf{top}(S)$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_2$ . Then, perhaps pasting  $S_{\mathbf{y}}$  and  $S_{\mathbf{z}}$  to the ends of S (and making any necessary cancellations) then produces a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma'$  with  $\mathrm{Lab}(\partial\Gamma') \equiv \mathrm{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$  (see Figure 10.4(b)).

In this case, excising  $\Gamma$  from  $\Delta$  and replacing it with  $\Gamma'$  is called the *transposition* of the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  with the *a*-cell  $\pi$  along  $\mathbf{s}_1$ .

Note that the circular diagram  $\Delta'$  resulting from the transposition has the same contour label as  $\Delta$ . Further,  $\tau(\Gamma) = (0, 0, 1, |\mathbf{s}_1|_{\mathcal{A}})$  and  $\tau(\Gamma') = (0, 0, 1, |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - |\mathbf{s}_1|_{\mathcal{A}})$ . Hence, if in this setting  $|\mathbf{s}_1|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , then this transposition demonstrates that  $\Delta$  is not minimal.

Indeed, the next statement shows that this observation applies in a more general setting:

**Lemma 10.12.** Any smooth minimal diagram over  $M_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is *M*-minimal.

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta$  be a counterexample diagram, i.e a smooth minimal diagram with no disks which is not *M*-minimal. By Lemma 10.5,  $\Delta$  does not satisfy (MM1).

Hence, there exists a pair  $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  where  $\pi$  is an *a*-cell and  $\mathcal{T}$  is a maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$  such that  $|E(\pi, \mathcal{T})| > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  be the set of all such pairs in  $\Delta$ .

For any  $(\pi, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{P}(\Delta)$ , define  $\mathcal{B}(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  to be the set of all tuples  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s)$  consisting of  $s > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$  maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands corresponding to edges of  $E(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  enumerated based on where they cross  $\mathcal{T}$ .

For fixed  $(\pi, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s) \in \mathcal{B}(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_0$  be the minimal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that each  $\mathcal{B}_i$  crosses  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . Then, there exists a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  not containing  $\pi$  which is bounded by the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_0$ , subbands of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{B}_i$ , and a subpath  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $\partial \pi$  (see Figure 10.5).

Now, fix  $(\pi, \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s) \in \mathcal{B}(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  such that the corresponding subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  is of minimal area.

If  $\Delta_0$  contains a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell, then Lemma 7.2(2) implies that there must exist a maximal q-band Q which has an end on  $\partial \Delta_0$ . So, since any q-edge of  $\partial \Delta_0$  is on the corresponding side of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ , Q must cross  $\mathcal{T}_0$  twice. But then this contradicts Lemma 7.2(1).



FIGURE 10.5. Lemma 10.12

Suppose  $\Delta_0$  contains a non-annular maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}'_0$  distinct from  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . Then, since any  $\theta$ -edge of  $\partial \Delta_0$  is on a side of one of  $\mathcal{B}_1$  or  $\mathcal{B}_s$ , Lemma 7.3(1) implies that  $\mathcal{T}'_0$  crosses every  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{B}_i$ . So, letting  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta$  containing  $\mathcal{T}'_0$  as a subband,  $E(\pi, \mathcal{T}) \subseteq E(\pi, \mathcal{T}')$ .

So,  $(\pi, \mathcal{T}') \in \mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s) \in \mathcal{B}(\pi, \mathcal{T}')$ . But then the corresponding subdiagram  $\Delta'_0$  is a subdiagram of  $\Delta_0$  not containing any cell of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ , yielding a contradiction to the choice of  $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s)$ .

Hence,  $\Delta_0$  cannot contain a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or a non-annular  $\theta$ -band apart from  $\mathcal{T}_0$ .

Next, suppose  $\Delta_0$  contains an *a*-cell. Let  $\tilde{\Delta}_0$  be the circular diagram consisting of both  $\pi$  and  $\Delta_0$ and let  $\mathbf{t}_0$  be the subpath of  $\partial \tilde{\Delta}_0$  corresponding to the side of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . Then, as a subdiagram of  $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ , it then follows that  $\Delta_0$  is a big *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{t}_0$  which is not pure.

Note that the completion of  $\Delta_0$  is then  $\Delta_0$ , and so is smooth by hypothesis and satisfies (MM2) by Lemma 10.5. Lemma 9.7 then implies there exists a pure big *a*-scope  $\Delta_1$  on  $\mathbf{t}_0$  such that the completion  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  is a subdiagram of  $\Delta_0$ . In particular,  $\operatorname{Area}(\Delta_1) < \operatorname{Area}(\Delta_0)$ .

Let  $\pi'$  be the associated *a*-cell and **s** be the associated subpath of  $\Delta_1$ . Then, as  $\Delta_1$  is pure, every  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of **s** must be an element of  $E(\pi', \mathcal{T})$ . So, since  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2}|\partial\pi'|_{\mathcal{A}}$  by the definition of big *a*-scope,  $(\pi', \mathcal{T}) \in \mathcal{P}(\Delta)$  and the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  corresponding to the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of **s** form an element of  $\mathcal{B}(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ . But then  $\Delta_1$  is the corresponding subdiagram, and so contradicts the choice of  $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_s)$ .

Thus,  $\Delta_0$  cannot contain any *a*-cell, so that Lemma 7.5 implies that  $\Delta_0$  cannot contain any cells apart from those of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ . Hence, **x** or **x**<sup>-1</sup> is a subpath of a side of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Let  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  be the  $\theta$ -band obtained from  $\mathcal{T}$  by reversing direction. By definition,  $E(\pi, \overline{\mathcal{T}}) = E(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ . Hence, without loss of generality we can assume that  $\mathbf{x}^{-1}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_0)$ .

Thus, as a parameter choice for C implies  $s \ge 5$ , we may transpose  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\pi$  along **x** to produce a reduced circular diagram  $\Delta'$ .

But then  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  and  $\tau(\Delta') < \tau(\Delta)$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\Delta$  is minimal.

Hence, Lemma 10.12 implies the following analogue of Lemma 9.5:

Lemma 10.13. Any reduced minimal diagram is smooth.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that the reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  contains a pinched *a*-cell. Choosen an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and a pinched subpath **s** of  $\partial \pi$  such that the subdiagram  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  has minimal weight.

As  $\partial \Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  consists entirely of *a*-edges, Lemma 10.9 implies it cannot contain a disk. So, since the choice of  $\pi$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  implies  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  must be smooth, Lemma 10.12 implies  $\Psi_{\pi,\mathbf{s}}$  must be an *M*-minimal diagram.

But then we arrive at a contradiction in exactly the same way as in the proof of Lemma 9.5:

Lemmas 7.2 and 9.4 imply that any cell of  $\Psi_{\pi,s}$  must be an *a*-cell. So, since  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Psi_{\pi,s})$  is non-trivial, Lemma 9.3 yields an *a*-cell  $\pi'$  in  $\Psi_{\pi,s}$  which, together with  $\pi$ , produces a counterexample to condition (MM1).

### 10.4.2. Transposition of a $\theta$ -band and a disk.

We now adjust the above procedure in order to move a  $\theta$ -band about a disk. Again, this is done in a manner similar to that of [32] (and [17], [23], etc), but with several more complications.

Let  $\Delta$  be a circular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  containing a disk  $\Pi$  and a reduced  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\theta$  be the history of  $\mathcal{T}$  and suppose  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv W^{-\varepsilon}$  where  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  and W is an accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\ell(W) \leq 1$ .

Suppose the following conditions hold:

- (1) W is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) \leq 1$
- (2) There exists a decomposition  $\partial \Pi = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2$  where  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is a path satisfying:
  - $\mathbf{s}_1$  contains  $\ell \geq 2$  *t*-edges
  - The first and last edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  are *t*-edges
  - $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ .

Note that each of the  $\ell$  t-edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$  then correspond to positive t-spokes  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_\ell$  of  $\Pi$  which cross  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the minimal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  which crosses each of these t-spokes. Then, since every  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1} \{t(i+1)\}$ - and  $\{t(i+1)\} Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(i+1)$ -sector is locked by each rule of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1} = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}')$ .

In particular,  $\Pi$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  form a subdiagram  $\Gamma$  of  $\Delta$  (see Figure 10.6(a)).



(a) The subdiagram  $\Gamma$ 

(b) The resulting subdiagram  $\overline{\Gamma}$ 

FIGURE 10.6. The transposition of a  $\theta$ -band with a disk

Let  $V_1 \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1)$  and  $V_2 \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2)$ . Then, since  $V_1V_2$  is a cyclic permutation of the admissible word  $W^{-\varepsilon}$  and  $V_1$  begins and ends with a *t*-letter,  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are both admissible words. Moreover, since W is  $\theta$ -admissible,  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are  $\theta$ -admissible with  $(V_1 \cdot \theta) (V_2 \cdot \theta)$  a cyclic permutation of  $(W \cdot \theta)^{-\varepsilon}$ . Hence, since  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) \leq 1$ , we may construct the disk  $\overline{\Pi}$  with  $\partial \overline{\Pi} = \overline{\mathbf{s}}_1 \overline{\mathbf{s}}_2$  with  $\text{Lab}(\overline{\mathbf{s}}_i) \equiv V_i \cdot \theta$  for i = 1, 2.

Applying Lemma 7.11 to  $\mathcal{T}'$  implies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}) \cdot \theta \equiv (V_1 \cdot \theta)^{-1} \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1)^{-1}$ . As the first and last cells of  $\mathcal{T}'$  are  $(\theta, t)$ -cells, no trimming is necessary in the band  $\mathcal{T}'$ , i.e  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}')) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}_1)^{-1}$ .

Conversely, construct the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{S}$  given by Lemma 7.12 corresponding to the computation  $V_2 \to V_2 \cdot \theta$ . So,  $\mathcal{S}$  has history  $\theta$  with  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{tbot}(\mathcal{S})) \equiv V_2$  and  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{ttop}(\mathcal{S})) \equiv V_2 \cdot \theta$ . As above, no trimming is necessary in the band  $\mathcal{S}$ , so that  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})) \equiv V_2$  and  $\text{Lab}(\textbf{top}(\mathcal{S})) \equiv V_2 \cdot \theta$ .

So, we may glue  $\mathcal{S}$  to  $\overline{\Pi}$  by identifying  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $\overline{\mathbf{s}}_2$ , producing a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma'$  which satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$  (see Figure 10.6(b)).

In this case, excising  $\Gamma$  from  $\Delta$  and replacing it with  $\Gamma'$  is called the *transposition* of the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  with the disk  $\Pi$  along  $\mathbf{s}_1$ .

Note that the circular diagram  $\Delta'$  resulting from the transposition of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\Pi$  has the same contour label as  $\Delta$ . Further,  $\tau_2(\Gamma) = (1, \ell)$  and  $\tau_2(\Gamma') = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ . Hence, if in this setting  $\ell > (L-1)/2$ , then this transposition demonstrates that  $\Delta$  is not 2-minimal, and so not minimal.

Now, we adapt this procedure to a more general setting, assuming the disk is labelled by an arbitrary configuration and allowing some *a*-cells between the  $\theta$ -band and the disk.

Let  $\Phi$  be a reduced circular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Suppose there exists a decomposition  $\partial \Phi = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{t}^{-1}$  such that:

- $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are defining edges of a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\Phi$
- $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$
- **t** contains  $\ell \geq 2$  *t*-edges
- The first and last edges of **t** are *t*-edges
- $\mathbf{s}_2$  is a subpath of  $\partial \Pi$  where  $\Pi$  is the unique disk in  $\Phi$

Let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{s}_2$  in  $\partial \Pi$ . By definition,  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{t}^{-1}$  is the contour of a subdiagram  $\Psi$  of  $\Phi$  which contains  $\mathcal{T}$  but not  $\Pi$ . If any cell of  $\Psi$  other than those comprising  $\mathcal{T}$  is an *a*-cell, then the diagram  $\Phi$  is called a *profile* and the subdiagram  $\Psi$  is called its *half-hat*.

In this case,  $\ell$  is called the *size* of the profile  $\Phi$ . Note that necessarily  $\tau_2(\Phi) = (1, \ell)$ .

The history of  $\Phi$  is taken to be the history of the associated  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ . Further, the accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi)^{-\varepsilon} \equiv W$  for some  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  is called the *defining* configuration of  $\Phi$ . Finally, the decomposition  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{s}_2\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{t}^{-1}$  is called the standard factorization of  $\partial \Phi$ , while  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is called the hidden path of  $\Phi$ .

If the half-hat  $\Psi$  is a minimal diagram, then  $\Phi$  is called *flat profile*. Conversely, if  $\Psi$  contains no *a*-cells (i.e  $\Psi$  is simply the associated  $\theta$ -band) then  $\Phi$  is called a *simple profile*.

**Lemma 10.14.** Let  $\Phi$  be a profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W. Then, there exists a reduced circular diagram  $\Phi'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M})$  such that:

- (1)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$
- (2)  $\tau_2(\Phi') = \tau_2(\Phi)$
- (3)  $\Phi'$  contains a subdiagram  $\Phi'_0$  which is a flat profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}\mathbf{s}_2\mathbf{p}_2\mathbf{t}^{-1}$  be the standard factorization of  $\partial\Phi$  and  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the hidden path of  $\Phi$ .

Letting  $\Psi$  be the half-hat of  $\Phi$ , let  $\Psi'$  be a reduced minimal diagram with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi)$ . So, there exists a decomposition  $\partial \Psi' = (\mathbf{p}_1')^{-1} (\mathbf{s}_1')^{-1} \mathbf{p}_2'(\mathbf{t}')^{-1}$  with corresponding labels, i.e such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_i') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_i)$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1)$ , and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Psi'$  for which  $\mathbf{p}'_1$  is a defining edge. Then, since  $|\mathbf{t}'|_{\theta} = |\mathbf{s}'_1|_{\theta} = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{p}'_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}'_2$  must be the ends of  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Since  $\tau(\Psi') \leq \tau(\Psi)$  and  $\Psi$  is a half-hat,  $\Psi'$  also contains no disks. Hence, Lemmas 10.13, 10.5, and 9.3 imply that  $\Psi'$  contains no  $\theta$ -annuli.

Thus, any cell of  $\Psi'$  other than those comprising  $\mathcal{T}'$  is an *a*-cell. In particular, any cell between  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')$  and  $\mathbf{t}'$  is an *a*-cell, so that every *t*-edge of  $\mathbf{t}'$  is also an edge of  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')$ .

Now, let  $\Phi'$  be the diagram obtained from  $\Phi$  by replacing  $\Psi$  with  $\Psi'$ . Then, it follows immediately that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Phi') \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$  and  $\tau_2(\Phi') \leq \tau_2(\Phi)$ .

Let  $\Phi'_0$  be the subdiagram of  $\Phi'$  obtained by removing any *a*-cells of  $\Psi'$  between  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')$  and  $\mathbf{t}'$ . Then, by construction,  $\Phi'_0$  is a flat profile satisfying (3), and so  $\tau_2(\Phi') \ge \tau_2(\Phi'_0) = (1, \ell) = \tau_2(\Phi)$ .

Let  $\Phi$  be a profile with associated  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k$  be the enumeration of the *q*-edges of **bot**( $\mathcal{T}$ ). By definition, these *q*-edges are in correspondence with the *q*-edges of the hidden path  $\mathbf{s}_1$  of  $\Phi$ , and so  $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k$  is also the enumeration of the *q*-edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$ . Letting  $\Pi$  be the disk of  $\Phi$ , we can then continue this to obtain an enumeration  $\mathbf{e}_0, \mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_n$  of the *q*-edges of  $(\partial \Pi)^{-1}$ .

In this case, the sequence  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k; \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_n)$  is called the *q*-enumeration of  $\Phi$ . Note that the value of *n* is determined by simply the length of the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , while the value of *k* depends on the size (and makeup) of the profile.

For every  $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ , let  $\mathbf{y}_i$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpath of  $(\partial \Pi)^{-1}$  between  $\mathbf{e}_{i-1}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_i$ . Then, by the definition of disk relations,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{i-1}\mathbf{y}_i\mathbf{e}_i)$  is an admissible word with reduced twoletter base  $U_iV_i$ , where  $V_i = U_{i+1}$ . In particular, there exists a unique index  $s = s(\Phi) \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that  $U_sV_s = (Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1))^{\pm 1}$ .

Now, for any  $j \in \{0, ..., k\}$ , let  $\gamma_j$  be the  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_j$  is an edge of  $\partial \gamma_j$ . With this, for every  $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_i$  be the minimal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing both  $\gamma_{i-1}$  and  $\gamma_i$ . Then, define the *i*-th cover of the half-hat of  $\Phi$  to be the subdiagram  $\Psi_i$  bounded by  $\mathcal{T}_i$  and  $\mathbf{y}_i$ .

Note that, as indicated by the name, every cell of the half-hat is contained in a cover  $\Psi_i$ . Moreover,  $\gamma_i$  is the unique cell contained in both  $\Psi_i$  and  $\Psi_{i+1}$ , while  $\Psi_i$  and  $\Psi_j$  share no cells if  $|j-i| \ge 2$ .

Further, note that Lemma 7.11 implies  $\text{Lab}(\text{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_i))$  is, like  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{i-1}\mathbf{y}_i\mathbf{e}_i)$ , an admissible word with base  $U_iV_i$ . Hence, any *a*-edge of  $\text{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_i)$  or of  $\mathbf{y}_i$  is labelled by an *a*-letter from the tape alphabet of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  corresponding to the  $U_iV_i$ -sector. In particular, any *a*-edge of  $\partial \Psi_i$  which is on the boundary of either a  $(\theta, a)$ - or an *a*-cell is labelled by an *a*-letter of this tape alphabet.

**Lemma 10.15.** Let  $\Phi$  be a flat profile with q-enumeration  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \dots, \mathbf{e}_k; \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n)$ . If  $\Phi$  is not a simple profile, then  $s = s(\Phi) \leq k$  and any a-cell in  $\Phi$  is contained in  $\Psi_s$ .

*Proof.* As  $\Phi$  is not a simple profile, there exists  $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$  such that  $\Psi_i$  contains an *a*-cell. Since  $\Phi$  is flat, this subdiagram  $\Psi_i$  is a minimal diagram. So, Lemmas 10.13, 10.12, and 9.3 imply that there exists an *a*-cell  $\pi$  in  $\Psi_i$  and  $m \geq C - 6$  consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}'_m$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that each maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}'_i)$  of  $\Psi_i$  has an end on either a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or on  $\partial \Psi_i$ .

Note that the contour of any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell contains at most one  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge. So, since  $\Psi_i$  contains exactly two  $(\theta, q)$ -cells, the parameter choice  $C \geq 9$  implies that at least one  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}'_j)$  has an end which is an edge of  $\partial \Psi_i$ . This end is thus an *a*-edge of  $\partial \Psi_i$  which is on the boundary of a  $(\theta, a)$ or an *a*-cell and is labelled by an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter of the 'special' input sector. Therefore, the index *i* must correspond to the 'special' input sector, i.e i = s.

**Lemma 10.16.** Let  $\Phi$  be a flat profile with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W. Then, W(2) is  $\theta$ -admissible.

*Proof.* Note that by the parallel nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , it suffices to show that W(j) is  $\theta$ -admissible for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ .

Let  $\Pi$  be the disk in  $\Phi$  and fix  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Pi)^{-\varepsilon} \equiv W$ . Further, let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the associated  $\theta$ -band and  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the hidden path of  $\Phi$ .

Suppose  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$  has a subpath  $\mathbf{x}$  shared with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  such that  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  is an admissible word with base  $(\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)\{t(j+1)\})^{\varepsilon}$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Since  $\mathbf{x}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$ , it then follows that  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv (W(j)t(j+1))^{\varepsilon}$ .

What's more, since **x** is a subpath of **bot**( $\mathcal{T}$ ), there exist ( $\theta, q$ )-cells  $\pi_j$  and  $\pi_{j+1}$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\partial \pi_j$  (resp.  $\partial \pi_{j+1}$ ) contains an edge labelled by t(j) (resp. t(j+1)). Then, letting  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the minimal

subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing both  $\pi_j$  and  $\pi_{j+1}$ ,  $\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}') = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}') = \mathbf{x}$ . Applying Lemma 7.11 to  $\mathcal{T}'$ , it then follows that  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  is  $\theta$ -admissible. Hence, the admissible subword W(j) of  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{x})^{\varepsilon}$  is  $\theta$ -admissible.

Now, let  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k; \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_n)$  be the *q*-enumeration of  $\Phi$  and set  $m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$  as the minimal index such that  $\mathbf{e}_m$  is a *t*-edge. As the size of a profile is at least 2, it must hold that  $m \leq k$ . Let  $\mathbf{z}$  be the initial subpath of  $\mathbf{s}_1^{-1}$  whose last edge is  $\mathbf{e}_m$ .

First, suppose  $\{\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_0), \text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_m)\} = \{t(j)^{\varepsilon}, t(j+1)^{\varepsilon}\}$  for some  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L-1\}$ . Then, by definition,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z})$  is then an admissible word with base  $(\{t(j)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j)\{t(j+1)\})^{\varepsilon}$ . But then  $s(\Phi) \notin \{0, \ldots, m\}$ , so that Lemma 10.15 implies  $\mathbf{z}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ . Hence, setting  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{z}$  as above, we conclude that W(j) is  $\theta$ -admissible.

Otherwise,  $\{\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_0), \text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_m)\} = \{t(L)^{\varepsilon}, t(2)^{\varepsilon}\}$ . By the makeup of the standard base, there then exists  $r \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_r) = t(1)^{\varepsilon}$ . Define the subpath  $\mathbf{z}'$  of  $\mathbf{z}$  by:

- If  $\varepsilon = 1$ , then  $\mathbf{z}'$  is the initial subpath of  $\mathbf{z}$  whose last edge is  $\mathbf{e}_r$
- If  $\varepsilon = -1$ , then  $\mathbf{z}'$  is the terminal subpath of  $\mathbf{z}$  whose first edge is  $\mathbf{e}_r$

In either case,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}')$  is an admissible word with base  $(\{t(L)\}B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(L)\{t(1)\})^{\varepsilon}$ . But then Lemma 10.15 again implies  $\mathbf{z}'$  is a subpath of  $\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ , so that W(L) is  $\theta$ -admissible.

**Lemma 10.17.** Let  $\Phi$  be a flat profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W. If W is  $\theta$ -admissible, then there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that:

- (1)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$
- (2)  $\tau_2(\Phi') = \tau_2(\Phi)$
- (3) There exists a subdiagram  $\Phi'_0$  of  $\Phi'$  which is a simple profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W.

*Proof.* If  $\Phi$  is itself simple, then the statement is satisfied for  $\Phi' = \Phi$ . Hence, it suffices to assume that  $\Phi$  is not simple.

Let  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k; \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_n)$  be the *q*-enumeration of  $\Phi$ . By Lemma 10.15, it then follows that  $s = s(\Phi) \leq k$  and every *a*-cell of  $\Phi$  is contained in the subdiagram  $\Psi_s$  of the half-hat.

Define the  $(\theta, q)$ -cells  $\gamma_i$ , the subbands  $\mathcal{T}_i$  of the associated  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the paths  $\mathbf{y}_i$  as above. For each *i*, fix the decomposition  $\partial \gamma_i = \mathbf{p}_i^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{q}_i \mathbf{f}_i^{-1}$  such that  $\mathbf{f}_i$  is a *q*-edge of  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$ . Then,  $\partial \Psi_s = \mathbf{p}_{s-1}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_{s-1}\mathbf{y}_s\mathbf{e}_s)\mathbf{q}_s\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_s)^{-1}$ .

As  $\mathbf{e}_{s-1}\mathbf{y}_s\mathbf{e}_s$  is a subpath of  $(\partial\Pi)^{-1}$  for  $\Pi$  the unique disk of  $\Phi$ ,  $W'_s \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{s-1}\mathbf{y}_s\mathbf{e}_s)$  is the admissible subword of  $W^{\varepsilon}$  with base  $(Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1))^{\varepsilon}$ . Hence,  $W'_s$  is  $\theta$ -admissible.

Applying Lemma 7.12 to the computation  $W'_s \to W'_s \cdot \theta$  then produces a  $\theta$ -band S with history  $\theta$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{tbot}(S)) \equiv W'_s$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(S)) \equiv W'_s \cdot \theta$ . Note that the first and last cells of S are copies of  $\gamma_{s-1}$  and  $\gamma_s$ , respectively. So,  $\partial S = (\mathbf{p}'_{s-1})^{-1}\operatorname{tbot}(S)\mathbf{q}'_s\operatorname{ttop}(S)^{-1}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_{s-1}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{s-1})$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}'_s) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_s)$ . Note that no q-edge of  $\partial S$  is a t-edge, and so Lemma 7.2 implies  $\tau_2(S) = (0, 0)$ .

Next, consider the 'mirror'  $\theta$ -band  $\overline{S}$  of S (see Figure 7.7), i.e the  $\theta$ -band with history  $\theta^{-1}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\overline{S})) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(S))$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\overline{S})) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(S))$ . Then,

$$\partial \overline{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{p}_{s-1}'' \mathbf{tbot}(\overline{\mathcal{S}}) (\mathbf{q}_s'')^{-1} \mathbf{ttop}(\overline{\mathcal{S}})^{-1}$$

where  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{s-1}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{s-1})$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_s'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_s)$ .

Now, construct the (unreduced) circular diagram I over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  obtained by pasting  $\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{S})$  to  $\mathbf{tbot}(\overline{\mathcal{S}})$ . Then,  $\partial \mathbf{I} = \mathbf{p}_{s-1}''(\mathbf{p}_{s-1}')^{-1}\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{S})\mathbf{q}_{s}'(\mathbf{q}_{s}'')^{-1}\mathbf{ttop}(\overline{\mathcal{S}})^{-1}$ .

Further, as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{ttop}(\overline{\mathcal{S}})) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{tbot}(\mathcal{S})) \equiv W'_s \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{s-1}\mathbf{y}_s\mathbf{e}_s)$ , we can paste I to  $\Psi_s$  by identifying the subpath  $\mathbf{p}_{s-1}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_{s-1}\mathbf{y}_s\mathbf{e}_s)\mathbf{q}_s$  of  $\partial\Psi_s$  with the subpath  $(\mathbf{p}'_{s-1})^{-1}\operatorname{ttop}(\overline{\mathcal{S}})\mathbf{q}''_s$  of  $(\partial I)^{-1}$ . This produces an unreduced circular diagram  $\Psi'_s$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\partial\Psi'_s = (\mathbf{p}'_{s-1})^{-1}\operatorname{tbot}(\mathcal{S})\mathbf{q}'_s\operatorname{ttop}(\mathcal{T}_s)^{-1}$ .

Hence,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi'_s) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi_s)$ , and so we can construct the circular diagram  $\Phi'$  by excising  $\Psi_s$  from  $\Phi$  and pasting  $\Psi'_s$  in its place.

By construction, there exists a maximal reduced  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{S}'$  of  $\Phi'$  obtained from  $\mathcal{T}$  by replacing  $\mathcal{T}_s$  with  $\mathcal{S}$ . By Lemma 10.15,  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S}')$  is a subpath of  $(\partial \Pi)^{-1}$ .

Thus, the subdiagram  $\Phi'_0$  of  $\Phi'$  consisting of  $\Pi$  and  $\mathcal{S}'$  is a flat profile satisfying the statement.

**Lemma 10.18.** Let  $\Phi$  be a profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W. Suppose W is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) \leq 1$ . Then there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$  such that  $\tau_2(\Phi') = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemmas 10.14 and 10.17, there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Phi)$
- $\tau_2(\Gamma) = \tau_2(\Phi)$
- There exists a subdiagram  $\Gamma_0$  of  $\Gamma$  which is a simple profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta$  and defining configuration W

Let  $\mathcal{T}_0$  be the associated  $\theta$ -band,  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the hidden path, and  $\Pi$  be the (unique) disk of  $\Gamma_0$ . Then,  $\mathcal{T}_0$  and  $\Pi$  may be transposed along  $\mathbf{s}_1$ , producing a diagram  $\Gamma'_0$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma'_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_0)$  and  $\tau_2(\Gamma'_0) = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ .

Thus, letting  $\Phi'$  be the diagram obtained from  $\Gamma$  by excising  $\Gamma_0$  and pasting  $\Gamma'_0$  in its place satisfies the statement.

Finally, the next statement demonstrates Lemma 10.18 in the general case, removing any assumption on the defining configuration:

**Lemma 10.19.** Let  $\Phi$  be a profile of size  $\ell$ . Then there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Phi') \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$  such that  $\tau_2(\Phi') = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\theta$  be the history, W the defining configuration, and  $(\mathbf{e}_0, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k; \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_n)$  be the q-enumeration of  $\Phi$ . Letting  $\Pi$  be the disk of  $\Phi$ , let  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi)^{\varepsilon} \equiv W$ .

By Lemma 10.18, the statement holds if W is  $\theta$ -admissible and  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) \leq 1$ .

First, suppose W is not  $\theta$ -admissible. Then Lemma 6.16 implies that  $\theta = \theta(s)_2$  and  $W \equiv I(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ . By condition (L5), we can construct a circular diagram  $\Sigma$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\tau(\Sigma) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$  such that:

- The single disk  $\overline{\Pi}$  of  $\Sigma$  satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \overline{\Pi})^{\varepsilon} \equiv J(w)$
- The single *a*-cell  $\pi$  of  $\Sigma$  satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi)^{\varepsilon} \equiv w$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Sigma)^{\varepsilon} \equiv W$

Excising  $\Pi$  from  $\Phi$  and replacing it with  $\Sigma$  then yields a circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$  and  $\tau_2(\Delta) = \tau_2(\Phi)$ .

If  $s(\Phi) \leq k$ , then  $\Delta = \Gamma$  is a profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta(s)_2$  and defining configuration J(w).

Otherwise, if  $s(\Phi) > k$ , then let  $\Gamma$  be the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  obtained by removing  $\pi$ . Then  $\Gamma$  is a profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta(s)_2$  and defining configuration J(w) such that  $\tau_2(\Gamma) = \tau_2(\Phi)$ .

Note that J(w) is  $\theta(s)_2$ -admissible and  $\ell(J(w) \cdot \theta(s)_2) = 1$ .

Hence, by Lemma 10.18, there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi_0$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Phi_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Gamma)$  and  $\tau_2(\Phi_0) = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ .

Thus, the circular diagram  $\Phi'$  obtained from  $\Delta$  by replacing  $\Gamma$  with  $\Phi_0$  satisfies the statement.

Now, suppose W is  $\theta$ -admissible but  $\ell(W \cdot \theta) > 1$ . Then Lemma 6.17 implies that  $\theta = \theta(s)_1$  and  $W \equiv J(w)$  for some  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ . As above, we can then construct a reduced diagram  $\Sigma'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\tau(\Sigma') = (1, 0, 1, 0)$  such that:

- The single disk  $\overline{\Pi}'$  of  $\Sigma'$  satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \overline{\Pi}')^{\varepsilon} \equiv I(w)$
- The single *a*-cell  $\pi'$  of  $\Sigma'$  satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \overline{\Pi}')^{\varepsilon} \equiv w$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Sigma')^{\varepsilon} \equiv W$

Again, excising  $\Pi$  from  $\Phi$  and replacing it with  $\Sigma'$  then yields a circular diagram  $\Delta'$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi)$  and  $\tau_2(\Delta') = \tau_2(\Phi)$ .

As above, the value of  $s(\Phi)$  then determines a subdiagram  $\Gamma'$  of  $\Delta'$  which is a profile of size  $\ell$  with history  $\theta(s)_1$  and defining configuration I(w). As  $\ell(I(w) \cdot \theta(s)_1) = 1$ , again Lemma 10.18 provides a circular diagram  $\Phi'_0$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Phi'_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \Gamma')$  and  $\tau_2(\Phi'_0) = (1, L - 1 - \ell)$ .

Thus, the circular diagram  $\Phi'$  obtained from  $\Delta'$  by replacing  $\Gamma'$  with  $\Phi'_0$  satisfies the statement.

Note that it is an immediate consequence that for any (2-)minimal diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the size of any profile  $\Phi$  which is a subdiagram of  $\Delta$  is at most (L-1)/2. Now, as with the transposition of a  $\theta$ -band and an *a*-cell, the following analogue of Lemma 10.12 shows that this observation applies in a more general setting:

**Lemma 10.20.** Let  $\Pi$  be a disk and  $\mathcal{T}$  be a maximal  $\theta$ -band in a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}$  crosses at most (L-1)/2 positive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Delta$  is a reduced diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  containing a  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  which crosses  $\ell > (L-1)/2$  positive *t*-spokes of a disk  $\Pi$ .

Let  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_\ell$  be the positive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$  crossing  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then, let  $\mathbf{x}$  be the minimal subpath of  $\partial \Pi$  containing the *t*-edges corresponding to the ends of the positive *t*-spokes  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ . Finally, let  $\mathcal{T}_0$  be the minimal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  crossing each *t*-spoke  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ .

Then, there exists a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  of  $\Delta$  not containing  $\Pi$  which is bounded by  $\mathcal{T}_0$ , subbands of the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ , and the path  $\mathbf{x}$  (similar to Figure 10.5).

As in the proof of Lemma 10.12, it may be assumed that the disk  $\Pi$ , the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ , and the *t*-spokes  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  are chosen so that the corresponding subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  has minimal area. In the same way as in that setting, it follows immediately that  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is the only non-annular maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta_0$ . Moreover, using Lemma 10.11 in place of Lemma 9.7 (and a parameter choice for L), the same argument implies that  $\Delta_0$  contains no disk.

Perhaps replacing  $\Delta_0$  with a minimal diagram with the same contour label, Lemmas 9.4 and 10.12 imply that  $\Delta_0$  contains no  $\theta$ -annuli. Hence, any cell of  $\Delta_0$  which is not a part of  $\mathcal{T}_0$  is an *a*-cell.

Finally, as in the proof of Lemma 10.12, perhaps passing to the  $\theta$ -band  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  with opposite direction, it may be assumed that  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_0)$  have the same endpoints.

But then the subdiagram  $\Phi$  of  $\Delta$  consisting of  $\Pi$  and  $\Delta_0$  is a profile of size  $\ell$  with associated  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ , so that Lemma 10.19 implies  $\Delta$  is not minimal.

Lemma 10.21. A reduced minimal diagram contains no  $\theta$ -annuli.

*Proof.* Suppose the reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  contains a  $\theta$ -annulus S. Let  $\Delta_S$  be the subdiagram of  $\Delta$  bounded by the outer contour of S.

By Lemmas 10.13, 10.12, and 9.4,  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  must contain a disk. So, Lemma 10.9 yields a disk  $\Pi$  of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$  such that L - 4 consecutive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$  (in  $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ ) have ends on  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ .

But taking  $L \ge 8$ , then L - 4 > (L - 1)/2 and so the  $\theta$ -band S and the disk  $\Pi$  provide a contradiction to Lemma 10.20.

As a consequence, we arrive at the following statement, essential for the proofs of Theorems 1.1-1.6 are embeddings:

**Lemma 10.22.** Suppose  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ . Then, letting k be the number of a-cells of  $\Delta$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is freely equal to a product  $w_1 \dots w_k$  such that each  $w_i$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$  freely conjugate to an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* First, note that  $v^{-1}(w_1 \dots w_k)v =_{F(\mathcal{A})} \prod_{i=1}^k (v^{-1}w_iv)$  for any word v over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ , and so the condition is independent of the vertex from which  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is read. Further, using 0-refinement (or gluing), it may be assumed that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is a reduced word.

Now, as  $\partial \Delta$  consists entirely of *a*-edges, Lemma 10.21 implies  $\Delta$  cannot contain any  $\theta$ -band. Similarly, Lemma 10.9 implies  $\Delta$  cannot contain a disk. Hence,  $\Delta$  must consist entirely of *a*-cells.

We now proceed by induction on k:

If k = 0, then every cell of  $\Delta$  is a 0-cell, i.e  $\Delta$  is a diagram over the presentation  $\langle \mathcal{A} \mid \emptyset \rangle$  of the free group. Hence, van Kampen's lemma then necessitates that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is freely trivial, so that the statement is trivially satisfied.

Conversely, assuming  $k \geq 1$ , Lemmas 10.13, 10.12, and 9.3 yield an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and  $\ell \geq |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6$  consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{\ell}$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that each  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  has an end on  $\partial \Delta$  and there are no *a*-cells between these  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands.

In particular, since every (positive) cell of the diagram is an *a*-cell, there are no (positive) cells between the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands. So, since  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta)$  is a reduced word, the minimal subpath  $\mathbf{s}_1$  of  $\partial \pi$ containing  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_\ell$  is a subpath of  $\partial \Delta$ . As it is assumed that the label of each edge of  $\partial \Delta$  is a letter of  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ , Lemma 6.25 implies  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  in  $\partial \pi$ , i.e  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2$ . Note that condition (L3) implies the word  $w_1 = \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2)$  is an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Let **t** be the complement of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  in  $\partial \Delta$ , i.e  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{t}$ .

Then,  $\pi$  may be removed from  $\Delta$  by cutting along  $\mathbf{s}_2$ , yielding a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta'$  with  $\partial \Delta' = \mathbf{s}_2^{-1} \mathbf{t}$ . As  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2^{-1})$  is a subword of  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta')$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ .

So, since  $\Delta'$  consists of k - 1 *a*-cells, the inductive hypothesis implies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2^{-1}\mathbf{t}) =_{F(\mathcal{A})} w_2 \dots w_k$ where each word  $w_2, \dots, w_k$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$  freely conjugate to an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Hence,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{t}) =_{F(\mathcal{A})} \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{s}_2) \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2^{-1}\mathbf{t}) =_{F(\mathcal{A})} w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$ , implying the statement.

Similarly, the next two statements are essential for establishing the malnormality of the embeddings (see Lemma 11.14):

**Lemma 10.23.** Let  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are reduced words over  $\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}$ . Identifying  $\mathcal{B}$  with the corresponding subset of the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector, suppose  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  represent the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Then  $w_1 \equiv w_2$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta$  be a reduced minimal diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv w_1 w_2^{-1}$ .

As  $\partial \Delta$  consists entirely of *b*-edges, Lemma 10.9 implies  $\Delta$  contains no disks. It then follows from Lemma 7.2 that  $\Delta$  has no  $(\theta, q)$ -cells.

Similarly, Lemma 10.21 implies  $\Delta$  contains no  $(\theta, a)$ -cells, while Lemma 9.3 implies  $\Delta$  contains no *a*-cells.

Hence,  $\Delta$  is a circular diagram over the free group, so that the statement follows from the hypothesis that  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  are reduced.

**Lemma 10.24.** Let  $\Delta$  be a compressed semi-trapezium over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\Delta)) \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} \dots y_k^{\delta_k}$  for some  $y_i \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\delta_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Suppose:

(1)  $y_1^{\delta_1} \dots y_k^{\delta_k}$  is cyclically reduced

(2) 
$$\delta_1 \neq -1$$
 or  $\delta_k \neq 1$ 

(3) The history of  $\Delta$  can be factored as  $\theta(s)_1 H \theta(s)_1^{-1}$ 

Then the label of the sides of  $\Delta$  are not equal in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

*Proof.* As the history of  $\Delta$  is reduced, H must be a non-trivial word consisting entirely of working rules. In particular, letting  $H \equiv \theta_1 \dots \theta_\ell$ , there exists  $z_j \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$  and  $\varepsilon_j \in \{\pm 1\}$  such that  $\theta_j$  is the copy of the rule  $\theta_{z_j}^{\varepsilon_j}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  in  $\Theta_1$ .

Now, for any rule  $\theta \in \Theta_1$ , let  $\theta'$  be the copy of  $\theta$  in T which is used to define the  $(\theta, a)$ -relations corresponding to the 'special' input sector.

Then, letting  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  be the standard factorization of  $\Delta$ , we have:

• If 
$$\delta_1 = 1$$
, then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1) = \theta(s)'_1 \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\theta'_j v(z_j, y_1))^{\varepsilon_j} \right) (\theta(s)'_1)^{-1}$   
• If  $\delta_1 = -1$ , then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1) = \theta(s)'_1 \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\theta'_j)^{\varepsilon_j} \right) (\theta(s)'_1)^{-1}$   
• If  $\delta_k = 1$ , then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_2) = \theta(s)'_1 \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\theta'_j v(z_j, y_2))^{\varepsilon_j} \right) (\theta(s)'_1)^{-1}$   
• If  $\delta_k = -1$ , then  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1) = \theta(s)'_1 \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (\theta'_j)^{\varepsilon_j} \right) (\theta(s)'_1)^{-1}$ 

Note that the definition of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_1^{\mathcal{A}}$  implies that all letters  $\theta'_j$  commute with any *b*-letters in these products.

First, suppose  $\delta_1 = 1 = \delta_k$ . Then, assuming that the statement is false, the word  $\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} v(z_j, y_1))^{\varepsilon_j}$ must represent the identity in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Lemma 10.23 then implies that this word is freely trivial. But Lemma 5.1 then implies that H must be freely trivial, so that the history of  $\Delta$  is also trivial. Similarly, if  $\delta_1 = -1 = \delta_k$ , then assuming the statement is false implies word  $\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} v(z_j, y_2))^{\varepsilon_j}$  is

freely trivial, which yields a contradiction in the same way.

Finally, suppose  $\delta_1 = 1$  and  $\delta_k = -1$ . Then, assuming the statement is false, the words  $\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} v(z_j, y_1)^{\varepsilon_j}$  and  $\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} v(z_j, y_2)^{\varepsilon_j}$  must be equal in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Again, Lemma 10.23 then implies that these words are freely trivial. But then Lemma 5.1 implies that  $y_1 = y_2$ , so that the word  $y_1^{\delta_1} \dots y_k^{\delta_k}$  is not cyclically reduced.

# 10.5. Upper bound on weights.

To aid with the weight estimates established in the next section, we now study the arrangement of particular maximal bands in a reduced minimal diagram. This is done in an analogous manner as that employed in Section 9.4 to study of the positive  $\mathcal{A}$ - and b-bands of an M-minimal diagram.

Let  $\Pi$  be a disk in a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  and let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a maximal positive q-band in  $\Delta$  which has an end on  $\Pi$ . If  $\mathcal{Q}$  has an end on another disk, then  $\mathcal{Q}$  is called an *internal q-band* in  $\Delta$ . Otherwise,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is called an *external q-band* in  $\Delta$ .

Note that the makeup of the disk relations dictates that no q-band can have two ends on the same disk. In particular, the internal t-bands of  $\Delta$  correspond to the internal edges of  $\Gamma(\Delta)$ .

For a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ , define the following values:

- $\rho_i(\Delta)$  is the number of internal q-bands in  $\Delta$
- $\rho_e(\Delta)$  is the number of external q-bands in  $\Delta$
- $\mu_q(\Delta)$  is the number of  $(\theta, q)$ -cells in  $\Delta$

The next statement then provides an analogue of Lemma 9.8 in this setting:

**Lemma 10.25.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram, then  $\rho_i(\Delta) \leq \rho_e(\Delta)$ .

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by induction on the number n of disks in  $\Delta$ , with the statement clear if n = 0, 1 as then  $\rho_i(\Delta) = 0$ .

Let  $\Pi$  be the disk and  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{L-4}$  the consecutive positive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$  given by Lemma 10.9. Let  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{L-4}$  be the *t*-edges of  $\partial \Pi$  such that  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  is the *t*-spoke corresponding to  $\mathcal{Q}_i$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the subpath of  $\partial \Pi$  with first edge  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and last edge  $\mathbf{e}_{L-4}$ . Then, letting  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the complement of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  in  $\partial \Pi$ , let  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_{L-4}))^{-1}\mathbf{s}_2\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_1))$ .

Cutting along **p** separates  $\Delta$  into two subdiagrams  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$ , where  $\Delta_1$  is the subdiagram consisting of  $\Pi$  and the subdiagrams  $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{L-5}$  defined in Lemma 10.9. Let  $\Delta_1$  be the subdiagram of  $\overline{\Delta}_1$  obtained by removing  $\Pi$  (see Figure 10.7).

By construction,  $\Delta_2$  is a minimal diagram containing n-1 disks, so that the inductive hypothesis implies  $\rho_i(\Delta_2) \leq \rho_e(\Delta_2)$ .



FIGURE 10.7. Reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ 

Note that any external q-band of  $\Delta$  that has an end on a disk other than  $\Pi$  corresponds to an external q-band of  $\Delta_2$ . Similarly, any internal q-band of  $\Delta$  that does not have an end on  $\Pi$  corresponds to an internal q-band of  $\Delta_2$ .

Now, for any internal q-band of  $\Delta$  which has an end on  $\Pi$ , this end must be an edge of  $\mathbf{s}_2^{\pm 1}$ . On the other hand, each of these bands corresponds to an external q-band in  $\Delta_2$ .

Conversely, every q-edge of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  corresponds to an external q-band of  $\Delta$  which is removed entirely when passing to  $\Delta_2$ .

Hence, 
$$\rho_i(\Delta) \leq \rho_i(\Delta_2) + |\mathbf{s}_2|_q$$
 and  $\rho_e(\Delta_2) \leq \rho_e(\Delta) - |\mathbf{s}_1|_q + |\mathbf{s}_2|_q$ , so that  
 $\rho_i(\Delta) \leq \rho_i(\Delta_2) + |\mathbf{s}_2|_q \leq \rho_e(\Delta_2) + |\mathbf{s}_2|_q \leq \rho_e(\Delta) - |\mathbf{s}_1|_q + 2|\mathbf{s}_2|_q$ 

As  $|\mathbf{s}_2|_t = 3$ , though, the makeup of the disk relations implies  $|\mathbf{s}_2|_q \leq 10(N+1) + 4$ . But since  $|\mathbf{s}_1|_t = L - 4$ , the parameter choice L >> N then implies  $|\mathbf{s}_2|_q \leq \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{s}_1|_q$ , thus implying the statement.

**Lemma 10.26.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram, then  $\mu_q(\Delta) \leq ||\partial \Delta||^2$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 7.2(2), any maximal positive q-band of  $\Delta$  which is not an internal q-band must have an end on  $\partial \Delta$ . So, letting  $\rho(\Delta)$  be the number of maximal positive q-bands in  $\Delta$ ,  $\rho(\Delta) - \rho_i(\Delta) \leq ||\partial \Delta||$ .

But Lemma 10.25 implies  $\rho_i(\Delta) \leq \rho_e(\Delta)$ , so that  $\rho(\Delta) \geq \rho_i(\Delta) + \rho_e(\Delta) \geq 2\rho_i(\Delta)$ . Hence,  $\rho(\Delta) \leq 2 \|\partial \Delta\|$ .

Further, Lemma 10.21 implies that any maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$  must have two ends on  $\partial \Delta$ . So, the number of maximal positive  $\theta$ -bands in  $\Delta$  is at most  $\frac{1}{2} \|\partial \Delta\|$ .

Thus, as each  $(\theta, q)$ -cell marks the crossing of a maximal positive  $\theta$ -band and a maximal positive q-band, Lemma 7.2(1) implies the statement.

Now, let  $a \in Y_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i) \cup \mathcal{Y}_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$  for some  $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$  and  $i \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ , i.e *a* is an *a*-letter from the tape alphabet of either the  $Q_{j-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(i)Q_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i)$ - or  $(R_j^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}(R_{j-1}^{\mathcal{L}}(i))^{-1}$ -sector of the standard base. Then  $a^{\pm 1}$  is called an *unrestricted a-letter*.

As with other types of letters, an *a*-edge **e** in a reduced minimal diagram is called an *unrestricted* a-edge if Lab(**e**) is an unrestricted *a*-letter. Accordingly, the unrestricted *a*-edges are partitioned into three types: *unrestricted* A-edges, *unrestricted* b-edges, and *unrestricted* ordinary *a*-edges.

Further,  $(\theta, a)$ -cells and *a*-bands in reduced minimal diagrams are called *unrestricted*  $(\theta, a)$ -cells and *unrestricted a-bands* if they correspond to unrestricted *a*-letters.

Naturally, unrestricted  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells, unrestricted  $(\theta, b)$ -cells, unrestricted ordinary  $(\theta, a)$ -cells, unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands, unrestricted b-bands, and unrestricted ordinary a-bands are defined in the obvious way.

Note that no unrestricted *a*-band can have an end on an *a*-cell.

**Lemma 10.27.** Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a maximal unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -band in a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ . If  $\mathcal{U}$  has two ends on disks, then these ends are on distinct disks.

*Proof.* Assume toward contradiction that  $\mathcal{U}$  has two ends on the disk  $\Pi$ . By Lemma 8.7,  $\mathcal{U}$  must then be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of length 0, so that  $\Pi$  is a pinched disk.

So,  $\mathcal{U}$  has a unique defining edge **e**, and both **e** and  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}$  are edges of  $\partial \Pi$ . Let **s** be the pinched subpath of  $\partial \Pi$  containing the edge **e** and let  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1}\mathbf{q}\mathbf{s}^{\mp 1}\mathbf{p}$  be the pinched factorization of  $\partial \Pi$  with respect to **s**. Then,  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  bounds a subdiagram  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$ . By the definition of disk relators,  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  no  $\theta$ -edges, so that Lemma 10.21 implies  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  contains no  $\theta$ -bands. In particular,  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  must consist entirely of disks and *a*-cells.

Suppose  $\Psi_{\Pi,s}$  contains a disk. Then, Lemma 10.9 provides a disk  $\Pi'$  in  $\Psi_{\Pi,s}$  such that at least L-4 consecutive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi'$  have ends on  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,s}$  with no disks between these spokes. But then taking  $L \geq 6$ ,  $\Pi$ ,  $\Pi'$ , and these *t*-spokes form a counterexample to Lemma 10.8.

Hence,  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  must be a reduced minimal diagram consisting entirely of *a*-cells. In particular, since disk relators are cyclically reduced by construction,  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  must contain at least one *a*-cell. Lemmas 10.13, 10.12, and 9.3 then produce an *a*-cell  $\pi$  in  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  and at least C-6 maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands which have ends on both  $\pi$  and  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$ . Taking  $C \geq 7$ , there exists an edge  $\mathbf{e}'$  of  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  corresponding to the end of such an  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}'$ . Note that since  $\mathcal{U}'$  has an end on an *a*-cell, it cannot be an unrestricted *a*-band. In particular,  $\mathbf{e}'$  cannot be an unrestricted *a*-edge.

As  $\Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  consists entirely of *a*-cells, any maximal *q*-band must be of length 0 and have two ends on  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$ . But by construction,  $\mathbf{p}^{-1}$  contains at most one *q*-edge labelled by a letter corresponding to any particular part of the standard base, so that such a *q*-band cannot exist. As a result,  $|\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}|_q = 0$ , so that the label of every edge of  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  and of  $\mathbf{s}$  is from the same tape alphabet.

But this implies that every edge of  $\partial \Psi_{\Pi,\mathbf{s}}$  is, like  $\mathbf{e}$ , an unrestricted *a*-edge, contradicting the presence of  $\mathbf{e}'$ .

A maximal positive unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -band is called *D*-internal if it has two ends on (distinct) disks. For any reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ , define the values:

- $\rho'_i(\Delta)$  is the number of D-internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands in  $\Delta$
- $\rho'(\Delta)$  is the number of maximal positive unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands in  $\Delta$
- $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta)$  is the number of unrestricted  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cells in  $\Delta$

**Lemma 10.28.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram, then  $\rho'_i(\Delta) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho'(\Delta)$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows by induction on the number n of disks in  $\Delta$ , with base cases n = 0, 1 following immediately from Lemma 10.27.

Let  $\Pi$  be the disk and  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{L-4}$  be the consecutive positive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$  given by Lemma 10.9. Let  $\partial \Pi = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{s}_2$  and define the subdiagrams  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  as in the proof of Lemma 10.25 (see Figure 10.7). Finally, let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{t}_2$  where  $\mathbf{t}_i$  is a subpath of  $\partial \Delta_i$ .

The inductive hypothesis implies  $\rho'_i(\Delta_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho'(\Delta_2)$ .

Note that any internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  which does not have an end on  $\Pi$  corresponds to an internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta_2$ . Conversely, for any internal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  which has an end on  $\Pi$ , this end must be an unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\mathbf{s}_2^{\pm 1}$ .

Let W be the configuration corresponding to  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi)$ . Then, the parallel nature of the rules implies  $|W(j)|_{\mathcal{A}} = |W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$  for each  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . In particular, the number of unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\mathbf{s}_2$  is equal to  $4|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence,  $\rho'_i(\Delta) \leq \rho'_i(\Delta_2) + 4|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho'(\Delta_2) + 4|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

However, each of the  $(L-5)|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$  unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  corresponds to a maximal positive unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  which cannot be internal. This implies  $\rho'(\Delta) \ge \rho'(\Delta_2) + (L-5)|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , i.e  $\rho'_i(\Delta) \le \frac{1}{2}\rho'(\Delta) - \frac{L-5}{2}|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}} + 4|W(2)|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Thus, the statement follows from the parameter choice  $L \ge 13$ .

**Lemma 10.29.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram, then  $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}(\Delta) \leq |\partial \Delta|_{\theta}(\mu_q(\Delta) + |\partial \Delta|_{\mathcal{A}})$ .

*Proof.* Note that any maximal positive unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which is not internal must have one end which is on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell or on  $\partial \Delta$ . So, since any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell has at most one boundary  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge,  $\rho'(\Delta) - \rho'_i(\Delta) \leq \mu_q(\Delta) + |\partial \Delta|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence, Lemma 10.28 implies  $\rho'(\Delta) \leq 2(\mu_q(\Delta) + |\partial \Delta|_{\mathcal{A}})$ .

Now, any unrestricted  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell in  $\Delta$  marks the crossing of a maximal positive  $\theta$ -band and a maximal positive unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -band. Thus, since Lemma 10.21 implies there are  $\frac{1}{2}|\partial\Delta|_{\theta}$ maximal positive  $\theta$ -bands, the statement follows from Lemma 7.3(1).

For any reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$ , define the parameter  $\mu(\Delta) = \mu_q(\Delta) + \mu_A(\Delta)$ . Lemma 10.30. If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram with  $m_2 \ge 1$  disks, then  $m_2 + 1 \le |\partial \Delta|_q$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows by induction on  $m_2$ .

Suppose  $m_2 = 1$  and let  $\Pi$  be the unique disk in  $\Delta$ . Then, every *q*-edge of  $\Pi$  is a defining edge (and an end) of a maximal *q*-band of  $\Delta$  which must have an end on  $\partial \Pi$ . As a result,  $|\partial \Delta|_q \ge |\partial \Pi|_q = L(2N+3) \ge 2$ .

Now, suppose  $m_2 \geq 2$ . Let  $\Pi$  be the disk and  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{L-4}$  be the consecutive positive *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$  given by Lemma 10.9. Further, let  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  be the subdiagrams of  $\Delta$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_i$ , and  $\mathbf{p}$  be the paths as in Lemma 10.25 (see Figure 10.7). Every *q*-edge of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  is a defining edge (and an end) of a maximal *q*-band of  $\Delta_1$  which must have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ . So,  $|\mathbf{t}_1|_q \geq |\mathbf{s}_1|_q \geq (L-5)(2N+3)$ . Conversely, since the sides of *q*-bands contain no *q*-edges,  $|\mathbf{p}|_q = |\mathbf{s}_2|_q \leq 5(2N+3)$ . In particular, since  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{t}_2$  while  $\partial \Delta_2 = \mathbf{p}^{-1} \mathbf{t}_2$ ,  $|\partial \Delta|_q - |\partial \Delta_2|_q \geq (L-10)(2N+3) \geq 1$ .

But  $\Delta_2$  is a reduced minimal diagram containing  $m_2 - 1 \ge 1$  disks, so that the inductive hypothesis implies  $m_2 \le |\partial \Delta_2|_q \le |\partial \Delta_2|_q - 1$ .

We now establish an upper bound on the weight of a reduced minimal diagram:

**Lemma 10.31.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram with  $m_2$  disks, then for  $m_1 = ||\partial\Delta|| + \mu(\Delta)$ :

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta) \le (m_2 + 1) \left( Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1) \right)$$

*Proof.* The proof follows by induction on the number  $m_2$  of disks in the diagram.

If  $m_2 = 0$ , then Lemmas 10.12 and 9.9 imply wt $(\Delta) \leq c_0 \|\partial \Delta\|^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 \|\partial \Delta\|^3)$ . So, the statement follows from  $|\partial \Delta| \leq m_1$  and the parameter choice  $L >> c_0$ .

Now, suppose  $m_2 \geq 1$ . Again, let  $\Pi$  be the disk and  $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_{L-4}$  be the consecutive positive t-spokes of  $\Pi$  given by Lemma 10.9. Further, let  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta_2$  be the subdiagrams of  $\Delta$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$  and  $\mathbf{t}_i$  be the paths as in Lemma 10.25 (see Figure 10.7).

Let  $\mathbf{p}_1$  be the subpath of  $\partial \Delta_1$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_1^{\pm 1}$  is a side of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$ . Then, as  $\mathcal{Q}_1$  is a *t*-band,  $h_1 = ||\mathbf{p}_1||$  is the length of the band's history. Similarly, define the subpath  $\mathbf{p}_{L-4}$  of  $\partial \Delta_1$  and set  $h_{L-4} = \|\mathbf{p}_{L-4}\|$ .

Let **e** be an edge of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$ . Then, **e** is a  $\theta$ -edge, and so there exists a maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbf{e}}$  of  $\Delta_1$ for which e is a defining edge (and an end). Since  $s_1$  contains no  $\theta$ -edges, Lemma 7.2(1) implies that  $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbf{e}}$  must also have an end on either  $\mathbf{t}_1$  or on  $\mathbf{p}_{L-4}$ . By Lemma 10.21, there exists a unique maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{e}}$  which contains  $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbf{e}}$  as a subband. If  $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbf{e}}$  has an end  $\mathbf{p}_{L-4}$ , then  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{e}}$  must cross every t-spoke  $Q_i$  of  $\Pi$ . But the parameter choice  $L \geq 8$  then implies that  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{e}}$  and  $\Pi$  form a counterexample to Lemma 10.20.

Hence,  $\mathcal{T}'_{\mathbf{e}}$  must have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ .

Similarly, every edge of  $\mathbf{p}_{L-4}$  is a defining edge of a maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta_1$  which has an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ . As a result,  $h_1 + h_{L-4} \leq |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta}$ .

Next, let W be the accepted configuration of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv W^{\pm 1}$ . Then, the parallel nature of the machine and Lemma 6.9 imply that  $|W(1)|_a \leq |W(2)|_a = |W(j)|_a$  for every  $j \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ .

So, by construction:

- $(L-5)|W(2)|_a \le |\mathbf{s}_1|_a \le (L-4)|W(2)|_a$   $(L-5)(2N+3)+1 \le |\mathbf{s}_1|_q \le (L-4)(2N+3)+1$

 $\|$ 

•  $|\mathbf{s}_2|_a \le 5|W(2)|_a$ •  $|\mathbf{s}_2|_q \le 5(2N+3)$ 

Taking  $L \ge 10$ , it then follows that  $|\mathbf{s}_1|_q \ge 5(2N+3) + 1 \ge |\mathbf{s}_2|_q + 1$ . Note that each q-edge of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  corresponds to a maximal q-band of  $\Delta_1$  which, by the makeup of disk relations, must have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ . So,  $|\mathbf{s}_1|_q \leq |\mathbf{t}_1|_q$ .

Since  $\partial \Delta_2 = \mathbf{t}_2 (\mathbf{p}_{L-4} \mathbf{s}_2 \mathbf{p}_1)^{-1}$ , this implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \Delta_2 \| &= \|\mathbf{t}_2\| + h_1 + h_{L-4} + \|\mathbf{s}_2\| \le \|\mathbf{t}_2\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{s}_2|_q + |\mathbf{s}_2|_a \\ &\le \|\mathbf{t}_2\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta} + (|\mathbf{s}_1|_q - 1) + |\mathbf{s}_2|_a \le \|\mathbf{t}_2\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{t}_1|_q + |\mathbf{s}_2|_a \\ &\le \|\partial \Delta\| - |\mathbf{t}_1|_a + 5|W(2)|_a \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $\partial \Delta_1 = \mathbf{p}_{L-4} \mathbf{s}_1^{-1} \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{t}_1$ , so that:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial \Delta_1\| &= h_1 + h_{L-4} + \|\mathbf{t}_1\| + \|\mathbf{s}_1\| \le \|\mathbf{t}_1\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{s}_1|_q + |\mathbf{s}_1|_a \le \|\mathbf{t}_1\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{t}_1|_q + |\mathbf{s}_1|_a \\ &\le 2\|\mathbf{t}_1\| - |\mathbf{t}_1|_a + (L-4)|W(2)|_a \end{aligned}$$

Now, let  $\kappa_o$  be the number of unrestricted ordinary *a*-edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$ . Similarly, let  $\kappa_A$  and  $\kappa_b$  be the number of unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ - and b-edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$ . By construction,  $\kappa_o + \kappa_{\mathcal{A}} + \kappa_b = (L-5)|W(2)|_a$ .

Let **e** be an unrestricted *a*-edge of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the maximal *a*-band of  $\Delta_1$  for which **e** is a defining edge (and end). Note that if  $\mathcal{U}$  has two ends on  $\partial \Delta_1$ , then Lemma 10.27 and the makeup of the  $(\theta, t)$ -relations imply that  $\mathcal{U}$  must have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ .

If **e** is an ordinary *a*-edge, then  $\mathcal{U}$  must have an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\Delta_1$  or on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ . Since Lemma 4.1 implies that any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell has at most one boundary ordinary *a*-edge, it follows that at least  $\max(\kappa_o - \mu_q(\Delta_1), 0)$  unrestricted ordinary *a*-edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  are defining edges of *a*-bands which have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ .

Similarly, if **e** is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge, then  $\mathcal{U}$  must have an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\Delta_1$  or on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ . The makeup the rules implies that any  $(\theta, q)$ -cell has at most one boundary  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge, and so at least  $\max(\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} - \mu_q(\Delta_1), 0)$  unrestricted  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\mathbf{s}_1$  are defining edges of *a*-bands which have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ .

Finally, if **e** is a *b*-edge, then  $\mathcal{U}$  must have an end on a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell of  $\Delta_1$ , on a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell of  $\Delta_1$ , or on **t**<sub>1</sub>. Since every  $(\theta, q)$ - and  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell has at most  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  boundary *b*-edges, it follows that at least max $(\kappa_b - D\mu(\Delta_1), 0)$  unrestricted *b*-edges of **s**<sub>1</sub> are defining edges of *a*-bands which have an end on **t**<sub>1</sub>.

Hence, at least  $\max((L-5)|W(2)|_a - (D_A + 2)\mu(\Delta_1), 0)$  distinct unrestricted *a*-bands have an end on  $\mathbf{t}_1$ , i.e  $|\mathbf{t}_1|_a \ge (L-5)|W(2)|_a - (D_A + 2)\mu(\Delta_1)$ .

Set  $m'_1 = \|\partial \Delta_2\| + \mu(\Delta_2)$ . Since  $\Delta_2$  consists of  $m_2 - 1$  disks, the inductive hypothesis implies:

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta_2) \le m_2(L(m_1')^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(L(m_1')^3) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1'))$$

**1.** Suppose  $|W(2)|_a \leq \frac{2(D_A+2)}{L-4}\mu(\Delta_1)$ .

The parameter choice L >> C (recalling that  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  depends on C) then implies

$$\|\partial \Delta_2\| \le \|\partial \Delta\| + 5|W(2)|_a \le \|\partial \Delta\| + \mu(\Delta_1)$$

As a result, noting that  $\mu(\Delta) = \mu(\Delta_1) + \mu(\Delta_2)$ , we have  $m'_1 \leq m_1$ . Since  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  are nondecreasing functions, this means

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta_2) \le m_2(Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1))$$

Further,  $\|\partial \Delta_1\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{t}_1\| + (L-4)\|W(2)\|_a \leq 2\|\mathbf{t}_1\| + 2(D_{\mathcal{A}}+2)\mu(\Delta_1) \leq 2(D_{\mathcal{A}}+2)m_1$ . Hence, since  $\Delta_1$  is an *M*-minimal diagram, Lemma 9.9 and the parameter choices  $L \gg c_0 \gg C$  yield  $\operatorname{wt}(\Delta_1) \leq Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3)$ .

Finally,  $||W(2)|| \leq |\mathbf{s}_1|_q + |W(2)|_a \leq |\mathbf{t}_1|_q + \mu(\Delta_1) \leq ||\partial\Delta|| + \mu(\Delta) = m_1$ , and so as a consequence wt( $\Pi$ ) =  $f_{\mathcal{L}}(||W(2)||) \leq f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1)$ . Thus,

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta) = \operatorname{wt}(\Delta_1) + \operatorname{wt}(\Delta_2) + \operatorname{wt}(\Pi) \le (m_2 + 1)(Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1))$$

**2.** Suppose  $|W(2)|_a \ge \frac{2(D_A+2)}{L-4}\mu(\Delta_1)$ .

Then,  $|\mathbf{t}_1|_a \ge (L-5)|W(2)|_a - (D_{\mathcal{A}}+2)\mu(\Delta_1) \ge (\frac{1}{2}L-3)|W(2)|_a$ . Taking  $L \ge 16$ , this yields  $|\mathbf{t}_1|_a \ge 5|W(2)|_a$ , so that  $\|\partial \Delta_2\| \le \|\partial \Delta\|$ . It immediately follows that  $m'_1 \le m_1$ , so that as in the previous case

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta_2) \le m_2(Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1))$$

Further,  $\|\partial \Delta_1\| \leq 2\|\mathbf{t}_1\| - |\mathbf{t}_1|_a + (L-4)|W(2)|_a \leq 2\|\mathbf{t}_1\| + |\mathbf{t}_1|_a \leq 3\|\partial \Delta\| \leq 3m_1$ , so that Lemma 9.9 and the parameter choice  $L >> c_0$  yields  $\operatorname{wt}(\Delta_1) \leq Lm_1^4 + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Lm_1^3)$ .

Finally, 
$$||W(2)|| = |W(2)|_a + |\mathbf{s}_1|_q \le |\mathbf{t}_1|_a + |\mathbf{t}_1|_q \le ||\partial\Delta|| \le m_1$$
, so that wt(II)  $\le f_{\mathcal{L}}(m_1)$ .  
Thus, the desired bound again follows.

**Lemma 10.32.** If  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram with  $n = ||\partial \Delta||$ , then:

$$\operatorname{wt}(\Delta) \le n \left( K n^{12} + g_{\mathcal{L}}(K n^9) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(K n^3) \right)$$

*Proof.* If n = 0, then  $Lab(\partial \Delta)$  is freely trivial, and van Kampen's Lemma and the minimality assumption imply  $wt(\Delta) = 0$ .

As in Lemma 10.31, let  $m_2$  be the number of disks in  $\Delta$  and  $m_1 = ||\partial \Delta|| + \mu(\Delta)$ .

Note that Lemma 10.30 and the assumption  $n \ge 1$  implies  $m_2 + 1 \le n$ . Further, Lemmas 10.26 and 10.29 imply  $\mu(\Delta) \le n^2 + n(n^2 + n) = n^3 + 2n^2$ , so that  $m_1 \le 4n^3$ .

Thus, the statement follows from Lemma 10.31 and the parameter choice K >> L.

### 11. ANNULAR DIAGRAMS

The goal of this section is to exhibit the malnormality of the subgroup  $H_{\mathcal{A}} = \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$  of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ (recall that  $\mathcal{A}$  is identified with the subset of the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector). To achieve this, we study the structure of annular diagrams over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Note that given the intricate nature of the necessary arguments, we must access the full power of 0-refinement, and so generally cannot ignore the presence of 0-edges and 0-cells in this section. This slightly alters some of the ways in which we refer to the structures described in previous sections. For example, references to bands now involve 0-cells, so that the 'defining edge sequence' of a band of length 0 need not be a single edge but rather a sequence of edges such that any pair of consecutive edges are immediately adjacent. That said, this does not alter these conceptualizations in any meaningful way, as the presence of 0-cells was simply implicit in previous settings.

Throughout this section, we assume  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$  is not a malnormal subgroup of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and fix group elements demonstrating this, i.e  $g \in G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}) \setminus H_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $h_1, h_2 \in H_{\mathcal{A}} \setminus \{1\}$  with  $g^{-1}h_1g = h_2$ .

Let  $\Delta$  be an annular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that:

- There exists a vertex  $O_1$  of the outer contour  $\mathbf{q}_1$  of  $\Delta$  such that the word  $w_1$  given by reading  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1)$  from  $O_1$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  that represents  $h_1$  in  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$
- There exists a vertex  $O_2$  of the inner contour  $\mathbf{q}_2$  of  $\Delta$  such that the word  $w_2$  given by reading  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2^{-1})$  from  $O_2$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  that represents  $h_2$  in  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$
- There exists a path  $\mathbf{t}$  in  $\Delta$  with  $\mathbf{t}_{-} = O_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_{+} = O_2$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t})$  is a word u over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  that represents g in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$

Then,  $\Delta$  is called a *counterexample annulus*.

In this case, the path  $\mathbf{t}$  is called a *g*-path and the tuple of words  $(u, w_1, w_2)$  is called the *defining* triple of  $\Delta$  with respect to  $\mathbf{t}$ . Note that for any word  $u \in (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1})^*$  that represents g in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and any pair of words  $w_1, w_2 \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  such that  $w_i$  represents  $h_i$  in  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ , van Kampen's Lemma (see Section 3) implies the existence of a counterexample annulus for which  $(u, w_1, w_2)$  is a defining triple.

Hence, by hypothesis there must exist counterexample annuli.

The diagram  $\Delta$  is called a *minimal counterexample annulus* if  $\tau(\Delta) \leq \tau(\Delta')$  for any counterexample annulus  $\Delta'$ . A *j-minimal counterexample annulus* is defined analogously. Note that the existence of counterexample annuli implies the existence of (j)-minimal counterexample annuli. A counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  is called *reduced* if it is a reduced annular diagram over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . A *reduced* (*j*-)*minimal counterexample annulus* is defined analogously.

**Lemma 11.1.** If **p** is a simple closed path in a counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  which is not combinatorially null-homotopic, then Lab(**p**) represents a non-trivial element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Proof. Cutting along  $\mathbf{p}$  separates  $\Delta$  into two connected components, each of which is an annular diagram with one boundary component identified with  $\mathbf{p}^{\pm 1}$  and the other identified with a boundary component of  $\Delta$ . As a result, van Kampen's Lemma implies that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  (or  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})^{-1}$ ) represents an element h of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which is conjugate to both  $h_1$  and  $h_2$ . But  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are non-trivial elements of  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$  by hypothesis, so that h must be a non-trivial element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

**Lemma 11.2.** Let  $\Delta$  be a counterexample annulus with outer contour  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and inner contour  $\mathbf{q}_2$ . For any path  $\mathbf{p}$  in  $\Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_-$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_+$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{q}_2$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  represents an element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}) \setminus H_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* Let **t** be a *g*-path of  $\Delta$  and let  $(u, w_1, w_2)$  be the defining triple of  $\Delta$  with respect to **t**. Let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  with  $(\mathbf{s}_1)_- = \mathbf{t}_-$  and  $(\mathbf{s}_1)_+ = \mathbf{p}_-$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}_2$  with  $(\mathbf{s}_2)_- = \mathbf{p}_+$  and  $(\mathbf{s}_2)_+ = \mathbf{t}_+$ .

Then,  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{p} \mathbf{s}_2$  is a path with  $\mathbf{t}'_- = \mathbf{t}_-$  and  $\mathbf{t}'_+ = \mathbf{t}_+$ .

As a consequence of van Kampen's Lemma (see Lemma 11.4 of [16]), there then exists an integer k such that  $w_1^k \text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}')$  represents g in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

By definition,  $Lab(\mathbf{s}_1), Lab(\mathbf{s}_2)$  represent elements of  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

So, assuming  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  represents an element of  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}')$  represents an element  $h' \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

But then  $g = h_1^k h' \in H_A$ , contradicting the definition of g.

**Lemma 11.3.** Suppose  $\Gamma$  is a subdiagram of a counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . Then there exists a counterexample annulus  $\Delta_0$  containing a subdiagram  $\Gamma_0$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_0) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$
- $\tau(\Gamma_0) = \tau(\Gamma)$
- $\tau(\Delta_0) = \tau(\Delta)$
- There exists a g-path  $\mathbf{t}_0$  of  $\Delta_0$  which is disjoint from  $\Gamma_0$
- $\Gamma_0$  is disjoint from the boundary of  $\Delta_0$

*Proof.* Let **t** be a *g*-path of  $\Delta$ . If **t** and  $\Gamma$  are disjoint, then the statement is satisfied by letting  $\Delta_0 = \Delta$ ,  $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$ , and  $\mathbf{t}_0 = \mathbf{t}$ .

Otherwise, let  $\mathbf{p}$  be a maximal subpath of  $\mathbf{t}$  which is contained in  $\Gamma$ .

By construction,  $\mathbf{p}_{-}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{+}$  must be vertices of  $\partial\Gamma$ . So, there exists a subpath  $\mathbf{p}'$  of  $\partial\Gamma$  with  $\mathbf{p}'_{-} = \mathbf{p}_{-}$  and  $\mathbf{p}'_{+} = \mathbf{p}_{+}$ . By construction,  $\mathbf{p}'$  and  $\mathbf{p}$  are combinatorially homotopic, and so  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}')$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p})$  represent the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Hence, replacing all maximal subpaths **p** of **t** with the corresponding path **p'** produces a *g*-path **t'** with  $\mathbf{t}'_{-} = \mathbf{t}_{-}$  and  $\mathbf{t}'_{+} = \mathbf{t}_{+}$ .

Now, we use 0-refinement to produce the annular diagram  $\Delta_0$ , replacing  $\Gamma$  with the circular diagram  $\Gamma'$  obtained from  $\Gamma$  by adding a layer of 0-cells along its contour.

Letting  $\Gamma_0$  be the subdiagram of  $\Gamma'$  given by removing these added 0-cells, it is immediate that  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma), \ \tau(\Gamma_0) = \tau(\Gamma), \ \text{and} \ \tau(\Delta_0) = \tau(\Delta).$  Note that no vertex of  $\Gamma_0$  is a vertex of  $\partial\Gamma'$ .

As  $\mathbf{t}'$  intersects  $\Gamma$  only on its contour, this path can be identified with a path  $\mathbf{t}_0$  in  $\Delta_0$  which intersects  $\Gamma'$  only on its contour. Hence,  $\mathbf{t}_0$  is disjoint from  $\Gamma_0$  and satisfies  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_0) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}')$ .

Finally, the 0-refinement used to pass from  $\Delta$  to  $\Delta_0$  allows the boundary components of  $\Delta_0$  to be identified with those of  $\Delta$ . Thus,  $\Delta_0$  is itself a counterexample annulus with g-path  $\mathbf{t}_0$ .

The following statement guarantees the existence of a reduced minimal counterexample annulus:

**Lemma 11.4.** For any counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ , there exists a reduced counterexample annulus  $\tilde{\Delta}$  satisfying  $\tau(\tilde{\Delta}) \leq \tau(\Delta)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Delta$  contains a pair of cancellable cells  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$ . Using 0-refinement, we can assume that  $\Delta$  contains a subdiagram  $\Gamma$  consisting of this pair of cancellable cells (and 0-cells) such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$  is freely trivial. By Lemma 11.3, it may be assumed that  $\Gamma$  is disjoint from both a g-path **t** and the boundary of  $\Delta$ .

As  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$  is freely trivial, van Kampen's Lemma implies there exists a diagram  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  consisting entirely of 0-cells such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial\tilde{\Gamma}) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)$ . Let  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  be the annular diagram obtained from  $\Delta$  by excising  $\Gamma$  and pasting  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  in its place.

As no vertex of  $\Gamma$  is on the boundary of  $\Delta$ , the boundary components of  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  can be identified with those of  $\Delta$ . In particular, the endpoints of **t** can be identified with vertices of  $\partial \tilde{\Delta}_1$  and the boundary labels of  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  are the same as those of  $\Delta$ .

Moreover, since t is disjoint from  $\Gamma$ , the path is undisturbed by the operation passing from  $\Delta$  to  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$ .

Hence,  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  is itself a counterexample diagram. Note that  $\tilde{\Delta}_1$  can be viewed as the annular diagram obtained from  $\Delta$  by removing the pair of cancellable cells, so that  $\tau(\tilde{\Delta}_1) \leq \tau(\Delta)$ .

Iterating this process then produces the desired counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 11.5.** Any subdiagram of a reduced (j-)minimal counterexample annulus is a reduced (j-)minimal circular diagram.

*Proof.* Let  $\Gamma$  be a subdiagram of a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  and let  $\mathbf{t}$  be a g-path of  $\Delta$ . Using the 0-refinement of Lemma 11.3, we may assume that  $\Gamma$  is disjoint from both the g-path  $\mathbf{t}$  and the boundary of  $\Delta$ .

Let  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  be a minimal diagram with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \tilde{\Gamma}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma)$ . Then, let  $\tilde{\Delta}$  be the annular diagram obtained from  $\Delta$  by excising  $\Gamma$  and pasting  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  in its place.

As in the proof of Lemma 11.4,  $\Delta$  is itself a counterexample diagram.

Since  $\Delta$  is a minimal counterexample annulus, it then follows that  $\tau(\Delta) \leq \tau(\tilde{\Delta})$ . On the other hand, as  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  is minimal,  $\tau(\tilde{\Gamma}) \leq \tau(\Gamma)$ , and hence  $\tau(\tilde{\Delta}) \leq \tau(\Delta)$ .

But then  $\tau(\Delta) = \tau(\tilde{\Delta})$  implies  $\tau(\tilde{\Gamma}) = \tau(\Gamma)$  by construction, so that  $\Gamma$  must itself be minimal.

If  $\Delta$  is a reduced *j*-minimal counterexample annulus, then an analogous argument applies.

**Lemma 11.6.** Let  $\Delta$  be a reduced 1-minimal counterexample annulus. Then  $\Delta$  contains no disks.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Delta$  contains at least one disk.

Similar to the construction of Section 10.2.2 (but omitting external edges), we construct the auxiliary graph  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  as follows:

- (1) The set of vertices is  $\{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$ , where each  $v_i$  corresponds to one of the  $\ell$  disks of  $\Delta$ .
- (2) For  $i, j \ge 1$  and for any positive t-band which has ends on the disks corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_i, v_j)$ .

As in that setting, this graph can be constructed as an auxiliary graph to the graph underlying  $\Delta$ . Hence,  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  is constructed on an annulus.

It follows immediately from the definition of the disk relations that  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  can have no 1-gons. Further, Lemmas 11.5 and 10.8 imply that  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  can have no 2-gons.

Hence, an appeal to the Euler characteristic of the annulus (see, for example, Lemma 10.1 of [16]) implies there must exist a vertex v of  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  with degree at most 18.

Note that, by definition, every boundary edge of  $\Delta$  is an *a*-edge. In particular, any maximal non-annular *t*-band of  $\Delta$  must have two ends on (distinct) disks. But then the degree of every vertex of  $\Gamma(\Delta)$  must be L - 1, so that a parameter choice for L provides a contradiction.

**Lemma 11.7.** A reduced 1-minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  contains no q-annuli or a-annuli.

*Proof.* Assuming the statement is false, let S be a maximal q-annulus or a-annulus in  $\Delta$ . Then, each side of S can be assumed to be (perhaps with 0-refinement) a simple closed path in  $\Delta$ .

If a side of S is combinatorially null-homotopic, then S bounds a subdiagram  $\Gamma_0$  of  $\Delta$ . But then  $\Gamma_0$  is a reduced circular diagram, so that the presence of S provides a contradiction to either Lemma 7.2(2) or Lemma 7.3(2).

Hence, each side of S is not combinatorially null-homotopic, so that Lemma 11.1 implies the labels of these sides represent non-trivial elements of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . In particular, S must be a band of length  $\ell > 0$ .

Cutting along  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})$  then separates  $\Delta$  into two connected components, each of which is an annular diagram with one boundary component identified with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})^{\pm 1}$  and the other identified with a boundary component of  $\Delta$ . Note that one of these connected components, denoted  $\Delta_1$ , contains  $\mathcal{S}$ .

As  $|\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})|_{\theta} = \ell$ , there exists a  $\theta$ -edge  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta_1$  for which  $\mathbf{e}$  is a defining edge (indeed an end). Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have another end on a boundary of  $\Delta_1$ . Since  $\Delta$  has no boundary  $\theta$ -edges, though, any boundary  $\theta$ -edge of  $\Delta_1$  is an edge of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{S})^{\pm 1}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  must cross  $\mathcal{S}$  twice.

Now, cutting along  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  separates  $\Delta_1$  into two connected components, one of which is an reduced annular diagram and one of which is a reduced circular diagram. Denote the circular diagram by  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{b}}$ .

Similarly, cutting along  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$  separates  $\Delta_1$  into two connected components, one of which is a reduced circular diagram. Denote this subdiagram by  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{t}}$ .

Note that exactly one of  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{b}}$  or  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{t}}$  contains  $\mathcal{T}$ , while the other is the diagram obtained by removing  $\mathcal{T}$ . Hence, it may be assumed without loss of generality that  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{b}}$  contains  $\mathcal{T}$ .

As a result,  $\mathcal{T}$  and a subband of  $\mathcal{S}$  form a  $(\theta, q)$ - or  $(\theta, a)$ -annulus in  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{b}}$ . But since  $\Delta_{1,\mathbf{b}}$  is a reduced circular diagram, the presence of this annulus provides a contradiction to either Lemma 7.2(1) or Lemma 7.3(1).

**Lemma 11.8.** Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell in a 3-minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . Then no edge of  $\partial \pi$  is a boundary edge of  $\Delta$ .

*Proof.* Suppose there is an edge  $\mathbf{e}$  of  $\partial \pi$  which is also an edge of the outer contour  $\mathbf{q}_1$  of  $\Delta$ . Then, letting  $\mathbf{t}$  be a *g*-path of  $\Delta$ , let  $\mathbf{yez}$  be the decomposition of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  as a loop about the vertex  $o = \mathbf{t}_-$ , i.e such that  $\mathbf{y}_- = \mathbf{z}_+ = o$ .

Further, let **s** be the complement of **e** in  $\partial \pi$ . Perhaps 0-refining, we may assume that no edge of **s** is a boundary edge of  $\Delta$ .

Note that since **e** is a boundary edge of  $\Delta$ , Lab(**e**)  $\in \mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ . So, Lemma 6.25 implies Lab( $\partial \pi$ )  $\in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . In particular, Lab(**s**)  $\in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  and Lab(**e**) represents the same word as Lab(**s**)<sup>-1</sup> in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Now, consider the annular diagram  $\tilde{\Delta}$  obtained by removing  $\pi$ . By construction, the outer contour  $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1$  of  $\tilde{\Delta}$  has a copy of the vertex o, so that the decomposition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1$  as a loop about this vertex can be identified with  $\mathbf{ys}^{-1}\mathbf{z}$ . By construction,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{ys}^{-1}\mathbf{z})$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  which is equal to  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{yez})$  in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . In particular,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\tilde{\mathbf{q}}_1)$  read starting at o represents  $h_1$ .

Similarly, replacing in  $\mathbf{t}$  any occurrence of the edge  $\mathbf{e}^{\pm 1}$  with the subpath  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1}$  produces a path  $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$  in  $\tilde{\Delta}$  whose label represents g in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Hence, since the inner contour of  $\Delta$  is undisturbed in passing to  $\tilde{\Delta}$ , it follows that  $\tilde{\Delta}$  is itself a counterexample annulus.

By construction  $\Delta$  has the same number of disks and  $(\theta, q)$ -cells as  $\Delta$  and one less *a*-cell, so that  $\tau_3(\tilde{\Delta}) < \tau_3(\Delta)$ . But then this contradicts the hypothesis that  $\Delta$  is a 3-minimal counterexample annulus.

If there is an edge **e** of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}$  is an edge of the inner contour, then an analogous argument produces a contradiction in the same way.

**Lemma 11.9.** Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell and  $\mathbf{q}$  be a boundary component in a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . If  $\Psi$  is an *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{q}$  with associated *a*-cell  $\pi$  and size  $\ell \geq 5$ , then  $\Psi$  is not a pure *a*-scope.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that  $\Psi$  is pure. By the definition of pure *a*-scope, every cell of  $\Psi$  is then a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell.

Let  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_\ell$  be the consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi$  which comprise the associated subpath of  $\Psi$ . By Lemma 11.5, both  $\Psi$  and its completion  $\tilde{\Psi}$  are reduced minimal diagrams. Hence, Lemmas 7.4, 10.13, and 11.8 imply that each  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  is of positive length and has an end on  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Further, Lemma 10.21 implies  $\Psi$  contains only non-annular  $\theta$ -bands. In particular, since  $\Delta$  contains no boundary  $\theta$ -edges, the positive cells of  $\Psi$  consist entirely of those forming  $\theta$ -bands that all cross each of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1), \ldots, \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_\ell)$ .

Using the 0-refinement procedure of Lemma 11.3, we may construct a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta_0$  containing a subdiagram identified with  $\tilde{\Psi}$  which is disjoint from both the boundary of  $\Delta_0$  and and a g-path  $\mathbf{t}_0$  of  $\Delta_0$ .

As  $\ell \geq 5$  and  $\Psi$  contains no *a*-cells, we may then iteratively transpose  $\pi$  with each of the  $\theta$ -bands of  $\Psi$ , producing an annular diagram  $\Delta'_0$  with corresponding subdiagram  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ . As  $\tilde{\Psi}$  is disjoint from both  $\mathbf{t}_0$  and the boundary of  $\Delta_0$ ,  $\Delta'_0$  is itself a counterexample annulus. Moreover, since the transposition of a  $\theta$ -band and an *a*-cell changes only the number of  $(\theta, a)$ -cells in the diagram,  $\tau_3(\Delta'_0) = \tau_3(\Delta_0)$ . In particular,  $\Delta'_0$  is a 3-minimal counterexample annulus.

Now, let  $\pi'$  be the *a*-cell of  $\tilde{\Psi}_0$ . By construction, each of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}'_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}'_{\ell}$  of  $\partial \pi'$  is adjacent to an edge of the boundary of  $\Delta'_0$ . But then removing the corresponding 0-cells produces a counterexample annulus with the same 3-signature and containing an *a*-cell that shares a boundary  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge (indeed  $\ell$  such edges) with the boundary of the diagram, yielding a contradiction to Lemma 11.8.

**Lemma 11.10.** Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell and **q** be a boundary component of a minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . Then at most 4 positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands have ends on both  $\pi$  and on **q**.

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that there exist  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_5$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that each maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1), \ldots, \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_5)$  has an end on  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Perhaps with 0-refinement, there then exists a subpath  $\mathbf{s}$  of  $\partial \pi$  containing each of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_i$  such that  $\mathbf{s}$ , a subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$ , and the  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  bound a subdiagram  $\Psi_0$  of  $\Delta$  not containing  $\pi$ . As Lemma 11.7 implies  $\Delta$  contains no  $(\theta, q)$ -cell,  $\Psi_0$  is an *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{q}$  with associated *a*-cell  $\pi$  and associated subpath  $\mathbf{s}$ .

So, the size of  $\Psi_0$  is  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} \ge 5$ , so that Lemma 11.9 implies  $\Psi_0$  cannot be a pure *a*-scope.

Further, Lemmas 11.5, 10.5, and 10.13 imply that the completion  $\Psi_0$  is smooth and satisfies condition (MM2). Hence, Lemma 9.7 implies the existence of a pure big *a*-scope  $\Psi$  on **q**.

By the definition of big *a*-scopes, the size of  $\Psi$  is greater than  $\frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi'|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , where  $\pi'$  be the associated *a*-cell of  $\Psi$ . But condition (L1) and Lemma 5.7 imply  $|\partial \pi'|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C$ , so that the parameter choice  $C \geq 10$  yields a contradiction to Lemma 11.9.

Lemma 11.11. A reduced minimal counterexample annulus contains no *a*-cells.

*Proof.* Suppose the reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  contains at least one *a*-cell.

Similar to the proof of Lemma 11.6, we begin by adapting the construction of the auxiliary graphs of Section 9.1. To this end, we construct the graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  as follows:

- (1) The set of vertices is  $\{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$ , where each  $v_i$  corresponds to one of the  $\ell$  a-cells of  $\Delta$ .
- (2) For  $i, j \ge 1$  and for any positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which has ends on the *a*-cells corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , there is a corresponding edge  $(v_i, v_j)$ .

As in the proof of Lemma 9.1, the graph  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  can be constructed as an auxiliary graph to the graph underlying  $\Delta$ , and so constructed on an annulus (indeed, the lack of  $(\theta, q)$ -cells makes this a simple version of that presented in Lemma 9.1).

Suppose  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  contains a 1-gon. So, there exists an *a*-cell  $\pi$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}$  which has two ends on  $\pi$  such that  $\pi$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  bound a circular subdiagram  $\Gamma$  of  $\Delta$ . But Lemma 11.5 implies  $\Gamma$  is a reduced minimal diagram, so that Lemmas 10.13 and 7.4 preclude the presence of  $\pi$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Next, suppose  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  contains edges  $e_1, \ldots, e_m$  connecting the vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$  such that  $e_k$  and  $e_{k+1}$  bound a 2-gon for each  $k = 1, \ldots, m-1$ . Let  $\pi_i$  and  $\pi_j$  be the *a*-cells corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , respectively, and let  $\mathcal{U}_k$  be the maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -band corresponding to  $e_k$ .

Suppose  $m \geq 3$ . Then  $\pi_i$ ,  $\pi_j$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_3$  bound a circular subdiagram  $\Gamma'$  of  $\Delta$ . As  $e_k$  and  $e_{k+1}$  bound a 2-gon, the only *a*-cells in  $\Gamma'$  are  $\pi_i$  and  $\pi_j$ .

Let **e** be an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\partial \pi_i$  such that  $\mathbf{e}^{-1}$  is an edge of  $\partial \Gamma'$ . As  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands cannot cross, the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  must be completely contained in  $\Gamma'$ . Moreover, since  $\partial \Gamma'$  contains no q-edge, Lemma 7.2 implies  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  must have two ends on a-cells. So, since  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  contains no 1-gon,  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e})$  must correspond to one of  $\mathcal{U}_1, \mathcal{U}_2$ , or  $\mathcal{U}_3$ .

But then  $\Gamma'$  does not satisfy condition (MM2), contradicting Lemmas 11.5 and 10.5.

Hence, as in Section 9.1, any 2-gon in  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  arises in the form of a doubled pair of edges. As in this previous setting, we construct the graph  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  by simply replacing any doubled pair of edges with a single edge.

By construction,  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  has no 1-gons or 2-gons, and thus as in the proof of Lemma 11.6 the Euler characteristic of the annulus implies the graph must contain a vertex with degree at most 18.

Now, by Lemma 11.10, for any *a*-cell  $\pi$  in  $\Delta$ , at most 8 maximal positive  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands have an end on  $\pi$  and on a boundary component. Hence, the degree of the vertex of  $\Gamma_a(\Delta)$  corresponding to  $\pi$  is at least  $|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - 8$ . By construction, the degree of the vertex of  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  corresponding to  $\pi$  is then at least  $\frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - 4$ .

Condition (L1) and Lemma 5.7 then imply that the degree of every vertex of  $\Gamma'_a(\Delta)$  is at least  $\frac{1}{2}C-4$ . But then the parameter choice C > 44 provides a counterexample to the bound given by the Euler characteristic above.

Combining Lemmas 11.11, 11.7, and 11.6, a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$  is a reduced annular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in which every (positive) cell is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell.

**Lemma 11.12.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a maximal  $\theta$ -band in a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . Then  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $\theta$ -annulus of positive length.

*Proof.* As  $\Delta$  contains no boundary  $\theta$ -edge,  $\mathcal{T}$  must be a  $\theta$ -annulus.

Suppose a side of  $\mathcal{T}$  is combinatorially null-homotopic. Then one side of  $\mathcal{T}$  bounds a subdiagram  $\Gamma$  of  $\Delta$  containing  $\mathcal{T}$ . By Lemma 11.5,  $\Gamma$  is a reduced minimal diagram. But then the existence of  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\Gamma$  contradicts Lemma 10.21.

Hence,  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$  is not combinatorially null-homotopic, so that Lemma 11.1 implies  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}))$ represents a non-trivial element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . In particular  $\mathcal{T}$  must be a band of positive length.

**Lemma 11.13.** Let  $\mathbf{q}_1$  be the outer contour and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  be the inner contour of a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ .

- (1) Any maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of length 0 has two ends on  $\mathbf{q}_i$  for some i = 1, 2
- (2) Any maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of positive length has an end on  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and an end on  $\mathbf{q}_2$
- (3)  $\Delta$  contains at least one  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of positive length

*Proof.* Lemmas 11.7 and 11.11 imply that any maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band must have two ends on the boundary of  $\Delta$ .

First, note that if an edge of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  is adjacent to an edge of  $\mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$ , then this adjacency induces a path between vertices of  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  consisting entirely of 0-edges. But then the existence of this path contradicts Lemma 11.2. Hence, (1) follows immediately.

Next, suppose  $\mathcal{U}$  is a maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of positive length which has two ends on  $\mathbf{q}_i$  for some i = 1, 2. Then, a side  $\mathbf{s}$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  and a subpath of  $\mathbf{q}_i$  bound a reduced circular subdiagram  $\Gamma$  of  $\Delta$ 

which contains  $\mathcal{U}$ . As  $\Delta$  has no boundary  $\theta$ -edges, any  $\theta$ -edge of  $\partial \Gamma$  corresponds to a  $\theta$ -edge of s. So, letting e be a  $\theta$ -edge of s, the maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Gamma$  for which e is a defining edge must have two ends on  $\mathbf{s}^{\pm 1}$ . But then  $\mathcal{T}$  must cross  $\mathcal{U}$  twice, so that the presence of these two bands in  $\Gamma$  provides a counterexample to Lemma 7.2(1). Hence, (2) must hold.

Finally, suppose every  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  has length 0. In particular,  $\Delta$  contains no  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell. So, Lemmas 11.7 and 11.11 imply that any maximal a-band must have two ends on the boundary of  $\Delta$ . As the boundary of  $\Delta$  consists entirely of  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges, though, this means that  $\Delta$  has no positive cells at all. In particular, the only a-edges of  $\Delta$  are boundary edges, and so are  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges labelled by letters of the 'special' input sector. Lemma 11.12 further implies that  $\Delta$  contains no  $\theta$ -edge, while Lemmas 11.6 and 11.7 imply  $\Delta$  contains no q-edge. Thus, for any path **p** in  $\Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_{-}$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{q}_{1}$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{+}$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{q}_{2}$ , the only positive edges of  $\mathbf{p}$  are boundary edges. But then  $Lab(\mathbf{p})$  represents an element of  $H_A$ , contradicting Lemma 11.2.

We now reach the desired contradiction:

**Lemma 11.14.** There is no counterexample annulus.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{q}_1$  be the outer contour and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  be the inner contour of a reduced minimal counterexample annulus  $\Delta$ . By Lemma 11.13, there exists an  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge **e** of  $\mathbf{q}_1^{-1}$  which is a defining edge (indeed an end) of a maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}$  which has an end on  $\mathbf{q}_2$ .

By Lemma 11.2,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{U}))$  must be an element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}) \setminus H_{\mathcal{A}}$ . In particular, this label must be non-trivial, so that the history H of  $\mathcal{U}$  is a reduced word with ||H|| > 0.

Cutting  $\Delta$  along  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{U})$  then produces a reduced circular diagram  $\Gamma$  containing a maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ band identified with  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\partial \Gamma = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{s}_2^{-1}$  where:

- $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{U})$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_2) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1)$
- s<sub>1</sub> is identified with q<sub>1</sub> read starting at e<sub>+</sub> = (top(U))<sub>-</sub>
  s<sub>2</sub> is identified with q<sub>2</sub><sup>-1</sup> read starting at (top(U))<sub>+</sub>

By Lemmas 11.6, 11.7, and 11.11, any positive cell of  $\Gamma$  is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell.

Enumerate the  $\theta$ -edges of  $\mathbf{p}_1$  by  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_\ell$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_i$  be the maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Gamma$  for which  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is an end. As  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is on the boundary of a  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ -cell of  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}_i$  cannot have two ends on  $\mathbf{p}_1^{-1}$ , and so must have an end on  $\mathbf{p}_2$ . In particular, since  $|\mathbf{p}_2|_{\theta} = \ell$ , every positive cell must be contained in one and only one  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_i$ .

Let  $\mathbf{t}_1 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_\ell)$ . Then, as any cell between  $\mathbf{t}_i$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$  must be a 0-cell,  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_i)$ and  $Lab(\mathbf{s}_i)$  must be equal in  $F(\mathcal{X})$ . As  $Lab(\mathbf{t}_i)$  is freely reduced,  $Lab(\mathbf{t}_i)$  and is conjugate in  $F(\mathcal{A})$  to a word that represents  $h_i$ . In particular,  $Lab(\mathbf{t}_i)$  must be a non-trivial word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ .

Let  $\Gamma'$  be the subdiagram of  $\Gamma$  obtained by removing any 0-cells between  $\mathbf{t}_i$  and  $\mathbf{s}_i$ . Then, letting  $\mathcal{U}'$  be the subband of  $\mathcal{U}$  obtained by removing any initial or terminal subsequence of 0-cells,  $\partial \Gamma' = (\mathbf{p}'_1)^{-1} \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}'_2 \mathbf{t}_2^{-1}$ , where  $\mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{U}')$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_2) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_1)$ . Note that, by definition, the history of  $\mathcal{U}'$  is H.

Let **f** be the initial edge of  $\mathbf{t}_1^{-1}$  and let  $\mathcal{V}'$  be the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Gamma'$  with end **f** (note that it is possible that  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{f}$ , in which case  $\mathcal{V}' = \mathcal{U}'$ ). Then, let  $\mathbf{p}_2'' = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{V}')$ . By construction,  $\mathbf{p}_2''$  and  $\mathbf{p}'_2$  are combinatorially homotopic, so that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}''_2)$  is freely equal to  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_1)$ .

Now, let  $\Psi$  be the subdiagram of  $\Gamma'$  with  $\partial \Psi = (\mathbf{p}'_1)^{-1} \mathbf{t}_1 \mathbf{p}''_2 \mathbf{t}_2^{-1}$ . Then, by construction,  $\Psi$  is a compressed semi-trapezium in the 'special' input sector with standard factorization  $(\mathbf{p}_1')^{-1}\mathbf{t}_1\mathbf{p}_2''\mathbf{t}_2^{-1}$ . Further, the maximal  $\theta$ -bands  $\mathcal{T}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{T}_{\ell}$  are enumerated from bottom to top.

Hence, letting  $w_{j-1} = \text{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_j))$  for  $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$  and  $w_{\ell} = \text{Lab}(\mathscr{C}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_\ell))$ , Lemma 8.4 yields an associated reduced compressed semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}: w_0 \to \cdots \to w_\ell$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H.

Suppose  $||w_0|| \geq 3$ . Then, letting  $v_i$  be the minimal prefix of  $w_i$  with  $|v_i|_{\mathcal{A}} = 3$ , there exists a reduced compressed semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}'_{\mathscr{C}}: v_0 \to \cdots \to v_\ell$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector with history H. As  $v_0 \in F(\mathcal{A})$  with  $||v_0|| = 3$ ,  $\mathcal{S}'_{\mathscr{C}}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.23. Hence,  $v_\ell$  must be a non-trivial word over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ . But  $w_\ell \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_2)$ , yielding a contradiction.

Similarly, if  $w_0 \equiv y_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2} \in F(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $\delta_1 \neq 1$  or  $\delta_2 \neq -1$ , then  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathscr{C}}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 6.24. But then this implies  $w_\ell$  is a non-trivial word over  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \sqcup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$ , again yielding a contradiction.

Hence, we may assume that  $w_0 \equiv y_1 y_2^{-1} \in F(\mathcal{A})$  or  $w_0 \in \mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ . Either way,  $\Psi$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 10.24. But then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_1)$  and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}''_2)$  do not represent the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , yielding a contradiction.

Thus, Lemma 11.14 immediately implies:

Lemma 11.15.  $H_{\mathcal{A}} \leq_{mal} G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}).$ 

## 12. DISTORTION DIAGRAMS

The goal of this sections is to demonstrate that the subgroup  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$  is undistorted in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . This is accomplished by studying minimal diagrams with a particular contour decomposition, resembling the treatment of 'q-minimal diagrams' in [32].

Before this, though, it will prove convenient to first modify the length of words over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and, by extension, the paths in diagrams over these presentations. This is done in a way resembling that used in [17], [23], and [32], but with a few significant differences.

# 12.1. Modified length function.

To begin, a word u over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  is called a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable if:

- $|u|_{\theta} = 1$
- $|u|_q = 0$   $|u|_{\mathcal{A}} + |u|_o \le 1$

Note that, by definition, a single  $\theta$ -letter is a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. Further, note that there is no bound put on the number of b-letters present in a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. Finally, note that u is a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable if and only if  $u^{-1}$  is also.

Now, given a general word w over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$ , a decomposition of w is a factorization  $w \equiv u_1 \dots u_k$ such that each  $u_i$  is either a single letter or a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. The *length* of such a decomposition is then taken to be  $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda(u_i)$  where:

- $\lambda(u_i) = 1$  if  $u_i$  is a q-letter or a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable
- $\lambda(u_i) = \delta$  if  $u_i$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter or an ordinary *a*-letter
- $\lambda(u_i) = 0$  if  $u_i$  is a *b*-letter

As indicated in Section 2.2, the parameter  $\delta$  assigned to be the length of an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter or ordinary *a*-letter may be thought of as a very small positive number.

Finally, the *length* of the word w, denoted |w|, is the minimal length of any of its decompositions.

**Lemma 12.1** (Compare to Lemma 6.2 of [23]). Let  $w \equiv w_1 w_2$  be a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$ .

- (a)  $|w^{-1}| = |w|$
- (b)  $|w| \ge |w|_q + |w|_{\theta} + \delta \max(0, |w|_{\mathcal{A}} |w|_{\theta}) + \delta \max(0, |w|_o |w|_{\theta})$
- (c)  $|w_1| + |w_2| \delta \le |w| \le |w_1| + |w_2|$
- (d) If the last letter of  $w_1$  or the first letter of  $w_2$  is a q-letter, then  $|w| = |w_1| + |w_2|$

*Proof.* (a) By definition, there exists a correspondence between the decompositions of w and those of  $w^{-1}$ , where the decomposition  $u_1 \dots u_k$  of w corresponds to the decomposition  $u_k^{-1} \dots u_1^{-1}$  of  $w^{-1}$ . As  $\lambda(u_i) = \lambda(u_i^{-1})$  for all i, the lengths of these corresponding decompositions are equal, and so the statement follows.

(b) Fix a decomposition  $u_1 \dots u_k$  of w whose length is |w|.

By the definition of decomposition, any  $\theta$ -letters of w must be part of distinct factors, each of which is a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. As a result, exactly  $|w|_{\theta}$  factors of  $u_1 \dots u_k$  are  $(\theta, a)$ -syllables, contributing  $|w|_{\theta}$  to the length of the decomposition.

Similarly, each q-letter corresponds to a single-letter factor of the decomposition  $u_1 \dots u_k$ , contributing  $|w|_q$  to its length.

Now, any  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter of w is either part of a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable of  $u_1, \ldots, u_k$  or corresponds to a singleletter factor of the decomposition. So, since  $(\theta, a)$ -syllables contain at most one  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter, at least  $\max(0, |w|_{\mathcal{A}} - |w|_{\theta})$  of the factors comprising this decomposition are single  $\mathcal{A}$ -letters.

Analogously, at least  $\max(0, |w|_{\rho} - |w|_{\theta})$  of the factors  $u_1, \ldots, u_k$  are single ordinary *a*-letters.

Hence, the statement follows by noting that any single  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter or ordinary *a*-letter contributes  $\delta$  to the length of the decomposition.

(c) The concatenation of any decomposition of  $w_1$  with any decomposition of  $w_2$  gives a decomposition of w, so that  $|w| \leq |w_1| + |w_2|$ .

Now, suppose |w| is given by a decomposition which is not a concatenation of decompositions as above. In particular, there exists a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable of this decomposition formed by some suffix of  $w_1$  and some prefix of  $w_2$ .

Let  $w \equiv w'_1 u w'_2$  where u is this  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. Note that this implies that  $|w| = |w'_1| + |w'_2| + 1$ . Further, let  $u \equiv u_1 u_2$  such that  $u_i$  is a (perhaps trivial) subword of  $u_i$ , so that  $w_1 \equiv w'_1 u_1$  and  $w_2 \equiv u_2 w'_2$ .

Assume without loss of generality that  $|u_1|_{\theta} = 1$ . This implies that  $u_1$  is itself a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable, so that  $|w_1| \le |w_1'| + |u_1| \le |w_1'| + 1$ .

Since  $|u_2|_{\theta} = 0$ , any decomposition of  $u_2$  consists entirely of single letters. By the definition of  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable,  $u_2$  then consists entirely of *a*-letters, with at most one an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter or an ordinary *a*-letter. This then implies that  $|w_2| \leq |w'_2| + |u_2| \leq |w'_2| + \delta$ , so that

$$|w| = |w_1'| + |w_2'| + 1 \ge |w_1| + |w_2| - \delta$$

(d) By definition, any q-letter of w must appear in a single-letter factor of any decomposition. So, by hypothesis, any decomposition of w must correspond to the concatenation of a decomposition of  $w_1$  with a decomposition of  $w_2$ . The statement then follows.

Naturally, given a diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the *length* of a path  $\mathbf{s}$  in  $\Delta$  is defined to be the length of its label, i.e  $|\mathbf{s}| = |\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s})|$ .

**Lemma 12.2** (Compare to Lemma 6.2 of [23]). Let **s** be a path in a diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

- (a) If **s** is a side of a *q*-band, then  $|\mathbf{s}| = |\mathbf{s}|_{\theta}$
- (b) If **s** is a side of a  $\theta$ -band, then  $|\mathbf{s}| = |\mathbf{s}|_q + \delta |\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} + \delta |\mathbf{s}|_o$

*Proof.* (a) It follows from Lemma 12.1(b) that  $|\mathbf{s}| \ge |\mathbf{s}|_{\theta}$ .

Conversely, note that if we view a single  $(\theta, q)$ -cell as a q-band of length 1, then by construction the label of either side of this band is a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. Hence, letting  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the q-band for which s is a side, the cells of  $\mathcal{Q}$  give a decomposition of Lab(s) into  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\theta}$   $(\theta, a)$ -syllables.

(b) As **s** is a side of a  $\theta$ -band,  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\theta} = 0$ . In particular, there is only one possible decomposition of Lab(**s**), which is given by its factorization into single letters. The statement then follows from the length assignments of each type of letter.

**Lemma 12.3.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a  $\theta$ -band of positive length in a diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Letting  $l_b$  be the length of the base of  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $-2\delta l_b \leq |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})| - |\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})| \leq 2\delta l_b$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\theta$  be the history of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $\theta \in \Theta^+$ .

First, suppose  $l_b = 0$ . Then, every cell of  $\mathcal{T}$  is a  $(\theta, a)$ -cell. Moreover, the defining  $\theta$ -edges must be labelled identically, so that the  $(\theta, a)$ -cells are all of the same sector. Lemma 7.6 then implies that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}))$  is  $\theta$ -applicable with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \cdot \theta \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}))$ .

If this semi-computation is of a non-input sector, then the definition of the rules necessitates that  $Lab(bot(\mathcal{T})) \equiv Lab(top(\mathcal{T}))$ , and so  $|bot(\mathcal{T})| = |top(\mathcal{T})|$ .

Conversely, if  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})) \to \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T}))$  is a semi-computation of an input sector, then Lemma 5.7 implies  $|\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})|_{\mathcal{A}} = |\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T})|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence, as no letter of an input alphabet is an ordinary *a*-letter, Lemma 12.2(b) implies  $|\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{T})| = |\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{T})|$ .

Now suppose  $l_b > 0$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}'$  be the minimal subband of  $\mathcal{T}$  containing every  $(\theta, q)$ -cell in the band. Further, let  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  be the subbands of  $\mathcal{T}$  (perhaps of length 0) consisting of any cells not contained in  $\mathcal{T}'$ , i.e so that  $\mathcal{T}$  can be viewed as the concatenation of  $\mathcal{T}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  in that order.

By construction, the first and last cells of  $\mathcal{T}'$  are  $(\theta, q)$ -cells. As a result, Lemma 7.11 implies that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}'))$  is  $\theta$ -admissible with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}')) \cdot \theta \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}'))$ .

Further,  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is either a  $\theta$ -band of length 0 or a  $\theta$ -band with base of length 0. Hence, setting  $|\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_i)| = |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_i)| = 0$  if it is a band of length 0, then as above  $|\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_i)| = |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_i)|$ .

By the definition of the rules of  $\Theta$ , Lemma 4.1, and Lemma 5.7, any sector of an admissible word is altered by at most two  $\mathcal{A}$ -letters or ordinary *a*-letters, with one such alteration precluding the other. Hence, Lemma 12.2(b) implies  $-2\delta(l_b - 1) \leq |\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}')| - |\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}')| \leq 2\delta(l_b - 1)$ .

Moreover, by the construction of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  and the assumption  $\theta \in \Theta^+$ ,  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}') = \mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}')$  while  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')$  contains at most two  $\mathcal{A}$ - or ordinary *a*-edges which are not part of  $\mathbf{ttop}(\mathcal{T}')$ . So, Lemma 12.2(b) again yields  $|\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})| = |\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)| + |\mathbf{tbot}(\mathcal{T}')| + |\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_2)|$  and:

 $|\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_1)| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_2)| - 2\delta \leq |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})| \leq |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_1)| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}')| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T}_2)| + 2\delta$ 

Thus, the statement follows.
### 12.2. *h*-distortion diagrams.

Throughout the rest of this argument, we fix an element  $h \in H_A$ .

Recall that  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the subgroup of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ . Hence, we may define  $|h|_{\mathcal{A}}$  in the standard way, i.e the minimal number of letters of  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  necessary to produce a word which represents h.

Conversely, since h is an element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , we define |h| to be the minimal length of a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  (in the sense defined in the previous section) which represents h in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Let w be a word realizing this length. It should be noted that, by definition, w need not be a reduced word; indeed, w may have a freely trivial subword of arbitrarily large size consisting of b-letters. However, as free reduction cannot increase the length of the word, the reduced word w' obtained from w by a sequence of cancellations is another word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  realizing |h|.

Note that by definition and Lemma 12.1(a),  $|h^{-1}|_{\mathcal{A}} = |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $|h^{-1}| = |h|$ .

Then, a circular diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is called an *h*-distortion diagram if there exists a factorization  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q} \mathbf{p}$  such that for some  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ :

- Lab(**q**) is a reduced word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  representing  $h^{\varepsilon}$  such that  $|\mathbf{q}| = |h|$
- Lab(**p**) is a (reduced) word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  representing  $h^{-\varepsilon}$  satisfying  $\|\mathbf{p}\| = |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$

In this case,  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  is called the *standard factorization* of the contour of the *h*-distortion diagram. Further,  $\varepsilon$  is called the *sign* of the *h*-distortion diagram.

Note that per the definition, for any *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ , there exists an *h*-distortion diagram  $\overline{\Delta}$  with opposite sign formed by taking the 'mirror copy' of each cell of  $\Delta$ , so that any cell  $\pi$  of  $\Delta$  corresponds to a cell  $\overline{\pi}$  in  $\overline{\Delta}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \overline{\pi}) \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \pi)^{-1}$ . As such,  $\overline{\Delta}$  is called the *mirror* of  $\Delta$ .

**Lemma 12.4.** Any maximal q-band of a reduced h-distortion diagram  $\Delta$  has an end on a disk.

*Proof.* Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of  $\Delta$  and  $\varepsilon$  be the sign of  $\Delta$ . As  $|\mathbf{p}|_q = 0$ , any q-edge of  $\partial \Delta$  must be an edge of  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Suppose there exists a maximal q-band which has no end on a disk. Then, Lemma 7.2(2) implies that this band has two ends on  $\mathbf{q}$ .

Now, enumerate the q-edges  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k$  of  $\partial \Delta$  so that  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{u}_0 \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \ldots \mathbf{u}_{k-1} \mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{u}_k$  for some (perhaps trivial) subpaths  $\mathbf{u}_i$ . Then, for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  be the maximal q-band of  $\Delta$  for which  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is a defining edge.

By hypothesis, there then exists a pair of indices  $i, j \in \{1, ..., k\}$  with i < j such that  $\mathbf{e}_i^{-1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}'$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$  with initial edge  $\mathbf{e}_i$  and terminal edge  $\mathbf{e}_j$ . Further, let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the subpaths of  $\mathbf{q}$  so that  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{q}' \mathbf{s}_2$ .

Then,  $\mathbf{q}'$  and  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)$  bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  of  $\Delta$  containing  $\mathcal{Q}$ . By Lemma 7.2(1), any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta_0$  must have at least one end on  $\mathbf{q}'$ . Hence,  $|\mathbf{q}'|_{\theta} \geq |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)|_{\theta}$ , so that Lemma 12.1(b) implies  $|\mathbf{q}'| \geq |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)|_{\theta} + 2$ . Lemma 12.2(a) then implies  $|\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)| = |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)|_{\theta} < |\mathbf{q}'|$ .

By Lemma 12.1(c),  $|\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j) \mathbf{s}_2| \le |\mathbf{s}_1| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j)| + |\mathbf{s}_2|$ . Meanwhile, since  $\mathbf{q}'$  starts and ends with q-edges, Lemma 12.1(d) implies  $|\mathbf{q}| = |\mathbf{s}_1| + |\mathbf{q}'| + |\mathbf{s}_2|$ . Hence,  $|\mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j) \mathbf{s}_2| < |\mathbf{q}|$ .

But applying van Kampen's Lemma to  $\Delta_0$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}')$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j))$  represent the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , so that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1 \operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j) \mathbf{s}_2)$  is a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  representing  $h^{\varepsilon}$ . Thus,  $|\mathbf{s}_1 \operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_j) \mathbf{s}_2| < |\mathbf{q}| = |h|$  yields a contradiction.

**Lemma 12.5.** Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of an *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ . Then no  $\mathcal{A}$ -band of  $\Delta$  has two ends on  $\mathbf{p}$ .

*Proof.* Analogous to the proof of Lemma 12.4, enumerate the  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\mathbf{p}$  by  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_k$ . Note that by definition,  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{e}_1 \ldots \mathbf{e}_k$ .

For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ , let  $\mathcal{U}_i$  be the maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band for which  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is a defining edge. Then, assuming the statement is false, there must exist  $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$  with i < j such that  $\mathbf{e}_j^{-1}$  is an end of  $\mathcal{U}_i$ .

Let  $\mathbf{p}' = \mathbf{e}_i \dots \mathbf{e}_j$  and let  $\mathbf{s}_1$  and  $\mathbf{s}_2$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of  $\mathbf{p}$  such that  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{s}_1 \mathbf{p}' \mathbf{s}_2$ . Then, analogous to the proof of Lemma 12.4, let  $\mathbf{p}'$  and  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{U}_i)$  bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  of  $\Delta$  containing  $\mathcal{U}$ . By Lemma 7.3(1), any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta_0$  must have at least one end on  $\mathbf{p}'$ . But  $|\mathbf{p}'|_{\theta} = 0$  by definition, so that  $\Delta_0$  must contain no  $\theta$ -bands.

In particular, this implies  $\mathcal{U}_i$  must be a  $\theta$ -band of length 0, so that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{U}_i)) \equiv 1$ .

But then letting  $\varepsilon$  be the sign of  $\Delta$ ,  $w \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_1)\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_2)$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  representing  $h^{-\varepsilon}$  with  $||w|| = ||\mathbf{s}_1|| + ||\mathbf{s}_2|| < ||\mathbf{p}|| = |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , contradiction the definition of  $|h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

**Lemma 12.6.** Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of an *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ . Suppose there exists a subpath  $\mathbf{x}$  of  $\mathbf{p}$  or  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}$  is a subpath of  $\partial \pi$  for some *a*-cell  $\pi$ . Then  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* Assume toward contradiction that  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$  and let  $\varepsilon$  be the sign of  $\Delta$ .

Set  $\mathbf{y}$  be the subpath of  $(\partial \pi)^{-1}$  such that  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}^{-1}$ . So,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y})$  is a word consisting entirely of  $\mathcal{A}$ -letters and b-letters with  $|\mathbf{y}|_{\mathcal{A}} < |\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Moreover,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  represent the same element as  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

First, suppose **x** is a subpath of **p**. Then,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  is a non-trivial word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ , so that Lemma 6.25 implies  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Let  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_2$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of **p** satisfying  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{x} \mathbf{p}_2$ . But then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{p}_2)$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  representing  $h^{-\varepsilon}$  and satisfying  $\|\mathbf{p}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{p}_2\| < \|\mathbf{p}\|$ , contradicting the definition of *h*-distortion diagram.

Now, suppose **x** is a subpath of **q**. Similar to the previous setting, let **q**<sub>1</sub> and **q**<sub>2</sub> be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of **q** satisfying **q** = **q**<sub>1</sub>**xq**<sub>2</sub>. Then, Lab(**q**<sub>1</sub>**yq**<sub>2</sub>) is a word representing  $h^{\varepsilon}$  in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Hence, the definition of *h*-distortion diagram necessitates  $|\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{y}\mathbf{q}_2| \geq |\mathbf{q}|$ .

If  $|\mathbf{y}|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq 1$ , then  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} = |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}} - |\mathbf{y}|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C - 1$ , so that a parameter choice for *C* implies  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} > 3$ . As Lab( $\mathbf{x}$ ) and Lab( $\mathbf{y}$ ) both consist entirely of  $\mathcal{A}$ -letters and *b*-letters, Lemma 12.1(a) then implies  $|\mathbf{y}| \leq \delta$  and  $|\mathbf{x}| > 3\delta$ . But then Lemma 12.1(c) yields the contradiction:

$$|\mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{q}_2| \le |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{y}| + |\mathbf{q}_2| \le |\mathbf{q}_1| + \delta + |\mathbf{q}_2| < |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{x}| - 2\delta + |\mathbf{q}_2 \le |\mathbf{q}|$$

Hence, it may be assumed that  $|\mathbf{y}|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 2$ .

Let  $u_1 \ldots u_k$  be a decomposition of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q})$  realizing the length  $|\mathbf{q}|$ . Then, let  $u_r \ldots u_s$  be the minimal subword containing every letter of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$ .

Let  $u_r \equiv u'_r v_1$  be the factorization such that  $u'_r$  is a (perhaps trivial) suffix of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1)$  and  $v_1$  is a prefix of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$ . Similarly, let  $u_s \equiv v_2 u'_s$  be the factorization such that  $v_2$  is a suffix of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  and  $u'_s$  is a (perhaps trivial) prefix of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2)$ .

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 12.1(c),

$$|\mathbf{q}| - (|\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{q}_2|) = (|u'_r| + |v_1| - |u_r|) + (|v_2| + |u'_s| - |u_s|)$$
<sup>110</sup>

If  $|u'_r| + |v_1| > |u_r|$ , then  $u_r$  must be a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable. So, since  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{x})$  consists entirely of  $\mathcal{A}$ -letters and b-letters,  $|u'_r|_{\theta} = |v_1|_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$ . Similarly, if  $|v_2| + |u'_s| > |u_s|$ , then  $|u'_s|_{\theta} = |v_2|_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$ . So, letting  $\ell = |u'_r|_{\theta}|v_1|_{\mathcal{A}} + |u'_s|_{\theta}|v_2|_{\mathcal{A}} \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ , then  $|\mathbf{q}| = |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{q}_2| - \ell \delta$ . Let  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv z_1 \dots z_t$ . If  $|u'_r|_{\theta}|v_1|_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$ , then let m be the minimal index such that  $z_m$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter. Then, letting  $v'_1 \equiv z_1 \dots z_m$ , it follows that  $u'_r v'_1$  is a  $(\theta, a)$ -syllable with  $|u'_r v'_1| = |u'_r| + |v'_1| - \delta$ . Otherwise, let m = 0 and  $v'_1 = 1$ . Similarly, if  $|u'_s|_{\theta}|v_2|_{\mathcal{A}} = 1$ , then let n be the maximal index such that  $z_n$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -letter. Then, letting  $v'_2 \equiv z_n \dots z_t$ , it follows that  $|v'_2 u'_s| = |v'_2| + |u'_s| - \delta$ . Otherwise, let n = t + 1 and  $v'_2 = 1$ . Then,  $u_1 \dots u_{r-1}(u'_r v'_1) z_{m+1} \dots z_{n-1}(v'_2 u'_s) u_{s+1} \dots u_k$  is a decomposition of  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{q}_2)$  with length  $|\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{y}| + |\mathbf{q}_2| - \ell \delta$ . But this implies  $|\mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{y} \mathbf{q}_2| \leq |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{y}| + |\mathbf{q}_2| - \ell \delta < |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{x}| + |\mathbf{q}_2| - \ell \delta = |\mathbf{q}|$ 

again yielding a contradiction.

**Lemma 12.7.** Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of a reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ . Then there exists no big *a*-scope on **p**.

*Proof.* Suppose  $\Psi$  is such a big *a*-scope on **p**. By Lemma 9.7, it may be assumed that  $\Psi$  is a pure big *a*-scope.

Let  $\pi$  be the associated *a*-cell and **s** be the associated subpath of  $\Psi$ . Then, there exist  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  of  $\partial \pi$  such that  $\Psi$  is bounded by  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1), \mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_2)$ , **s**, and a subpath **t** of **p**.

By Lemma 10.13, every  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge of  $\mathbf{s}$  is the end of a maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ -band which has an end on  $\mathbf{t}$ . So, if a  $\theta$ -band of  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Psi$  crosses both  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_2)$ , then it crosses the  $|\mathbf{s}|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$  maximal  $\mathcal{A}$ bands of  $\Psi$  that have ends on  $\mathbf{s}^{-1}$ . But Lemmas 10.13 and 10.12 imply that  $\Delta$  satisfies condition (MM1), yielding a contradiction. Hence, no  $\theta$ -band can cross both  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_2)$ .

By Lemma 7.3(1), it then follows that every maximal  $\theta$ -band which has an end on the side of  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  has an end on  $\mathbf{t}$ . But  $|\mathbf{t}|_{\theta} = 0$ , so that  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_1)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{e}_2)$  must be  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands of length 0. As a result,  $\Psi$  contains no  $\theta$ -bands at all, so that it must consist entirely of 0-cells as it is pure.

Since  $Lab(\mathbf{s})$  and  $Lab(\mathbf{t})$  are both reduced words over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  which are freely equal,  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\mathbf{t}$  can be identified as paths in  $\Delta$ . But then  $\pi$  and  $\mathbf{s}$  form a contradiction to Lemma 12.6.

Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of an *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ . Note that since  $|\mathbf{p}|_{\theta} = 0$ , any maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  which has an end on  $\partial \Delta$  must have two ends on  $\mathbf{q}$ . Let  $\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  are the  $\theta$ -edges corresponding to the ends of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Without loss of generality, let  $\mathbf{e}_1^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$  be defining edges (indeed, the ends) of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

If any positive cell of  $\Delta$  between **b** and **bot**( $\mathcal{T}$ ) is an *a*-cell, then  $\mathcal{T}$  is called a *quasi-rim*  $\theta$ -band. Further, if there are no such *a*-cells (i.e if **b** = **bot**( $\mathcal{T}$ )), then  $\mathcal{T}$  is called a *rim*  $\theta$ -band.

**Lemma 12.8.** The base of a rim  $\theta$ -band in a reduced *h*-distortion  $\Delta$  has length  $l_b > K$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a rim  $\theta$ -band. Then, letting  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of  $\partial \Delta$ , let  $\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{T}$ . Further, let  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2\mathbf{q}_2$ .

As  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})$ , then Lemma 12.3 implies  $|\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})| \leq |\mathbf{b}| + 2\delta l_b$ . Further, since  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\mathbf{e_1be_2}$  bound a subdiagram of  $\Delta$ , then for  $\varepsilon$  the sign of  $\Delta$ ,  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{q_1top}(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{q_2})$  represents  $h^{\varepsilon}$  in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . So,  $|\mathbf{q_1top}(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{q_2}| \geq |h| = |\mathbf{q}|$ .

But Lemma 12.1(c) implies

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{q}_{1}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})\mathbf{q}_{2}| &\leq |\mathbf{q}_{1}| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{T})| + |\mathbf{q}_{2}| \leq |\mathbf{q}_{1}| + |\mathbf{b}| + |\mathbf{q}_{2}| + 2\delta l_{b} \\ &\leq |\mathbf{q}_{1}| + |\mathbf{e}_{1}| + |\mathbf{b}| + |\mathbf{e}_{2}| + |\mathbf{q}_{2}| + 2\delta l_{b} - 2 \leq |\mathbf{q}| + 2\delta(l_{b} + 2) - 2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $l_b \ge \delta^{-1} - 2$ , so that the parameter choice  $\delta^{-1} >> K$  implies  $l_b > K$ .

**Lemma 12.9.** The base of a quasi-rim  $\theta$ -band in a reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$  has length  $l_b > K$ .

*Proof.* As in the previous setting, let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of  $\partial \Delta$ , let  $\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$  corresponding to the quasi-rim  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$ , and let  $\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{b}\mathbf{e}_2\mathbf{q}_2$ .

By Lemma 12.8, it suffices to assume that (through 0-refinement) **b** and **bot**( $\mathcal{T}$ ) bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_0$  of  $\Delta$  consisting of the *a*-cells  $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k$ .

Suppose there exists an *a*-scope on **b** in  $\Delta_0$  which is not pure. Then, Lemma 9.7 implies the existence of a pure big *a*-scope on **b**. Since Lab(**b**) is reduced, the associated subpath of this pure big *a*-scope can be identified with a subpath of **b**. But then this provides a contradiction to Lemma 12.6.

So, any *a*-scope on **b** with associated *a*-cell  $\pi_i$  is a pure *a*-scope that is not big. In particular, since  $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k$  comprise every positive cell of  $\Delta_0$ , for each *i* there exists a maximal (perhaps trivial) subpath  $\mathbf{t}_i$  of  $\partial \pi_i$  shared with **b** such that every  $\mathcal{A}$ -edge shared by  $\partial \pi_i$  and **b** is an edge of  $\mathbf{t}_i$ . Note that since this is not a big *a*-scope,  $|\mathbf{t}_i|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi_i|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

As  $\Delta_0$  is an *M*-minimal diagram by Lemma 10.12, Lemma 9.3 implies there exists  $j_1 \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$  such that  $|\partial \pi_{j_1}|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6$   $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi_{j_1}$  are shared with  $\partial \Delta_0$ . Since  $|\mathbf{t}_{j_1}|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi_{j_1}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , at least  $\frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi_{j_1}|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6 \geq \frac{1}{2}C - 6$   $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi_{j_1}$  are shared with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$ .

So, Lemma 9.7 and the parameter choice  $C \geq 26$  implies there exists a pure *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$  of size at least 7. Letting  $\pi_{\ell_1}$  be the associated *a*-cell of this pure *a*-scope, the associated subpath  $\mathbf{s}_{\ell_1}$  is a subpath of both  $\partial \pi_{\ell_1}$  and  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T})^{-1}$  and satisfies  $|\mathbf{s}_{\ell_1}|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 7$ . Hence, since  $\mathcal{A}$ -bands and *q*-bands cannot cross,  $\mathbf{s}_{\ell_1}$  contains at least 5 edges of  $E(\pi_{\ell_1}, \mathcal{T})$ , and so we may perform the transposition of  $\pi_{\ell_1}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  along  $\mathbf{s}_{\ell_1}$ .

Using 0-refinement, it can be assumed that this transposition does not alter the boundary of the diagram, and so results in a reduced *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta_1$ . By construction, the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_1$  arising from  $\mathcal{T}$  has the same base. Further, identifying **b** with a subpath of  $\partial \Delta_1$ , **bot**( $\mathcal{T}_1$ ) and **b** bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_{1,0}$  comprised of k-1 *a*-cells identified with the subdiagram of  $\Delta_0$  obtained by removing  $\pi_{\ell_1}$ .

In particular,  $\Delta_{1,0}$  is an *M*-minimal diagram, and so Lemma 9.3 implies the existence of an index  $j_2 \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus \{\ell_1\}$  such that  $|\partial \pi_{j_2}|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6$   $\mathcal{A}$ -edges of  $\partial \pi_{j_2}$  are shared with  $\partial \Delta_{1,0}$ . Again, Lemma 12.6 then implies the existence of a pure *a*-scope of size at least 7 on  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)^{-1}$ , so that there exists  $\ell_2 \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \setminus \{\ell_1\}$  and a subpath  $\mathbf{s}_{\ell_2}$  of  $\partial \pi_{\ell_2}$  shared with  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{T}_1)^{-1}$  such that  $|\mathbf{s}_{\ell_2}|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq 7$ . Hence, we may again perform the transposition of  $\pi_{\ell_2}$  and  $\mathcal{T}_1$  along  $\mathbf{s}_{\ell_2}$ .

As above, this results in a reduced *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta_2$  with corresponding  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_2$  having the same base as  $\mathcal{T}$  such that **bot**( $\mathcal{T}_2$ ) and **b** bound a subdiagram  $\Delta_{2,0}$  comprised of k-2 *a*-cells identified with the subdiagram of  $\Delta_{1,0}$  obtained by removing  $\pi_{\ell_2}$ .

Hence, this process may be iterated to produce a reduced *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta_k$  with a rim  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}_k$  whose base is the same as that of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Thus, Lemma 12.8 implies  $l_b > K$ .

# 12.3. Disks in *h*-distortion diagrams.

Our next goal is to show that a reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram cannot contain any disks. To present this argument as efficiently as possible, we introduce auxiliary terminology specific to this setting.

Fix a reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$  containing a disk. Let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of the contour and  $\varepsilon$  be the sign of  $\Delta$ . Lemmas 10.9 and 10.11 then imply the existence of a pure scope  $\Psi$  on  $\mathbf{q}$  of size L - 6.

Let **s** be the associated subpath and  $\Pi$  be the associated disk of  $\Psi$ . Perhaps passing to the mirror  $\overline{\Delta}$ , it may be assumed that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv W$  for some accepted configuration W of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Enumerate the *t*-edges of **s** by  $\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{L-6}$ . Then, for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-6\}$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  be the *t*-spoke  $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{e}_i)$  of  $\Pi$ . As  $\Psi$  is a pure scope, each  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  must have an end on **q**. In particular, there exists a factorization  $\partial \Psi = \mathbf{s}^{-1}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1))\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))^{-1}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{z}$  be the subpath of  $(\partial \Pi)^{-1}$  such that  $\mathbf{z}^{-1}$  is the complement of  $\mathbf{s}$  in  $\partial \Pi$ , i.e  $\partial \Pi = \mathbf{s}\mathbf{z}^{-1}$ . Then, define the path  $\mathbf{t}_0 = (\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1)^{-1})\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))$  in  $\Delta$ . Note that, by definition,  $\mathbf{t}_0$  is combinatorially homotopic to  $\mathbf{t}$ .

**Lemma 12.10.** For any word w over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_0), |w| \geq |\mathbf{t}|$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{q}_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_2$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths of  $\mathbf{q}$  such that  $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{t} \mathbf{q}_2$ . Then,  $(\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1))w(\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2))$  represents  $h^{\varepsilon}$  in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . So, Lemma 12.1(c) implies:

$$|\mathbf{q}_1| + |w| + |\mathbf{q}_2| = |\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1)| + |w| + |\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2)| \ge |(\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1))w(\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2))| \ge |h|$$

Conversely, since the first and last edges of  $\mathbf{t}$  are q-edges, Lemma 12.1(d) implies

$$|h| = |\mathbf{q}| = |\mathbf{q}_1| + |\mathbf{t}| + |\mathbf{q}_2|$$

Hence,  $|w| \ge |\mathbf{t}|$ .

Now, for each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-7\}$ , let  $\Gamma_i$  be the subdiagram of  $\Psi$  bounded by the *t*-bands  $Q_i$  and  $Q_{i+1}$  (see Figure 12.1). Each such subdiagram  $\Gamma_i$  is called a *clove*. Note that for each *i*, there exist subpaths  $\mathbf{s}_i$  and  $\mathbf{t}_i$  of  $\mathbf{s}$  and  $\mathbf{t}$ , respectively, such that  $\partial \Gamma_i = \mathbf{s}_i^{-1}(\mathbf{bot}(Q_i))\mathbf{t}_i(\mathbf{top}(Q_{i+1}))^{-1}$ . For each *i*,  $\Gamma_i$  and  $\Gamma_{i+1}$  intersect along the *t*-band  $Q_{i+1}$ . So, the cloves  $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{L-7}$  form a 'cover' of  $\Psi$ . Moreover, for any  $1 \leq k < \ell \leq L - 7$ , there exists a subdiagram  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$  'covered' by  $\Gamma_k, \ldots, \Gamma_{\ell-1}$ ; in other words,  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$  is the subdiagram of  $\Psi$  bounded by  $Q_k$  and  $Q_\ell$ . Note that it follows from this definition that  $\Psi_{1,L-6} = \Psi$  and  $\Psi_{i,i+1} = \Gamma_i$ .

Let  $\mathbf{s}_{k,\ell}$  be the minimal subpath of  $\mathbf{s}$  containing each subpath  $\mathbf{s}_i$  for  $k \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ . Similarly, let  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$  be the minimal subpath of  $\mathbf{t}$  containing each  $\mathbf{t}_i$ . Then  $\partial \Psi_{k,\ell} = \mathbf{s}_{k,\ell}^{-1}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_k))\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_\ell))^{-1}$ .



FIGURE 12.1. Cloves formed by the disk  $\Pi$  in the *h*-distortion diagram  $\Delta$ 

**Lemma 12.11.** Let  $k, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, L-6\}$  such that  $\ell - k > (L-3)/2$ . Then any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$  has exactly one end on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$  and crosses exactly one of either  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  or  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$ . By Lemma 10.21,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have two ends on  $\partial \Psi_{k,\ell}$ . As  $|\mathbf{s}_{k,\ell}|_{\theta} = 0$ , these ends must be on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$ , on  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_k)$ , or on  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell})^{-1}$ .

By Lemma 7.2(1),  $\mathcal{T}$  can cross any q-band at most once. So,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have at most one end on **bot**( $\mathcal{Q}_k$ ) and at most one end on **top**( $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ )<sup>-1</sup>.

First, suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  crosses both  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_\ell$ .

Then,  $\mathcal{T}$  crosses each of the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  for  $k \leq i \leq \ell$ . In particular, viewing it as a  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$  crosses  $\ell - k + 1 > (L - 1)/2$  *t*-spokes of  $\Pi$ . But  $\Delta$  is a reduced minimal diagram, so that  $\Pi$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  contradict Lemma 10.20.

Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  must have at least one end on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$ .

Now, suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  has two ends on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$ .

By Lemma 12.4 and the makeup of the disk relations, any maximal q-band of  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$  has ends on both  $\mathbf{s}_{k,\ell}^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$ . So, since  $\mathcal{T}$  crosses any of these bands at most once, the length of the base of  $\mathcal{T}$  is at most  $|\mathbf{s}_{k,\ell}|_q \leq 3LN$ . In particular, the parameter assignments  $K \gg L \gg N$  imply that the length of the base of  $\mathcal{T}$  is at most K.

But then this implies the existence of a quasi-rim  $\theta$ -band in  $\Delta$  with base of length at most K, contradicting Lemma 12.9.

Thus,  $\mathcal{T}$  has exactly one end on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$ , so that the statement follows.

For every  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-6\}$ , let  $H_i$  be the history of  $Q_i$ .

For  $2 \leq k < (L-9)/2$ , applying Lemma 12.11 to  $\Psi_{k,L-6}$  and to  $\Psi_{k-1,L-6}$  implies that any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Psi_{k-1,L-6}$  that crosses  $\mathcal{Q}_k$  must have ends on  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1})$  and on  $\mathbf{t}_{k,L-6}$ . In particular, this implies  $H_k$  is a prefix of  $H_{k-1}$ .

Similarly, for  $(L-1)/2 < \ell \leq L-7$ , any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Psi_{1,\ell+1}$  that crosses  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$  has ends on  $\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1})^{-1}$  and on  $\mathbf{t}_{1,\ell}$ , so that  $H_{\ell}$  is a prefix of  $H_{\ell+1}$ .

Hence, letting  $h_i = ||H_i||$  for each *i*, the parameter choice L > 23 implies  $h_1 \ge \cdots \ge h_7$  and  $h_{L-12} \le \cdots \le h_{L-6}$ .

For each  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-6\}$ , fix the index  $j_i \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$  such that  $Q_i$  is a *t*-band corresponding to the part  $\{t(j_i)\}$  of the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ . If there exists an index  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-7\}$  such that  $j_i = L$ , then  $\Gamma_i$  is called the *distinguished clove*. Note that the makeup of the disk relations immediately implies that there is at most one distinguished clove.

Note that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_i) \equiv W(L)W(1)t(2)$  if  $\Gamma_i$  is the distinguished clove, while  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_i) \equiv W(j_i)t(j_i+1)$  otherwise.

**Lemma 12.12.** If  $\Gamma_i$  is not the distinguished clove, then it contains no *a*-cells.

*Proof.* By Lemma 12.4, every maximal q-band of  $\Gamma_i$  has an end on  $\mathbf{s}_i^{-1}$ . So, since  $\Gamma_i$  is not the distinguished clove, every q-band corresponds to a part of the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  with coordinate  $j_i$  or  $j_{i+1}$ . In particular, no q-band corresponds to a part with coordinate 1.

Further, since Lemma 12.11 implies that every  $\theta$ -band must cross at least one q-band, no  $(\theta, \mathcal{A})$ cell of  $\Gamma_i$  can correspond to a relation of the 'special' input sector.

Hence, every  $\mathcal{A}$ -band with one end on an *a*-cell must be of length 0.

Now, suppose  $\Gamma_i$  contains an *a*-cell. Then, Lemmas 9.3, 10.12, and 10.13 imply the existence of an *a*-cell  $\pi_0$  and  $\ell \geq |\partial \pi_0|_{\mathcal{A}} - 6$  consecutive  $\mathcal{A}$ -edges  $\mathbf{f}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{f}_\ell$  of  $\partial \pi_0$  such that each  $\mathcal{A}$ -band  $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{f}_j)$  is external. As such, each  $\mathbf{f}_j$  must be an edge of  $\mathbf{t}_i$ .

As  $|\partial \pi_0|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C$ , the parameter choice  $C \geq 13$  then implies the existence of a big *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{t}_i$  with associated *a*-cell  $\pi_0$ . Lemma 9.7 then implies the existence of a pure big *a*-scope on  $\mathbf{t}_i$ .

Letting  $\pi$  be the associated *a*-cell and **x** the associated subpath of this pure *a*-scope, **x** is a subpath of  $\partial \pi$  and each edge of **x** is an edge of **t**<sub>i</sub>. But then since  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_i)$  is reduced, **x** is a subpath of  $\mathbf{t}_i$  with  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} > \frac{1}{2} |\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , contradicting Lemma 12.6.

Fix  $j \in \{2, ..., L\}$  and suppose  $\Sigma$  is a circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that every cell has coordinate j and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell. So, for any cell  $\pi$  in  $\Sigma$ , Lab $(\partial \pi)$  is given by either a  $(\theta, q)$ -or a  $(\theta, a)$ -relation with coordinate j. Then, for any  $r \in \{2, ..., L\}$ , the parallel nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  implies the existence of another such relation obtained from this relation by:

- Switching the coordinate of any q-letter from j to r
- Taking the copy of any *a*-letter in the tape alphabet of the corresponding sector of  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(r)$
- Adjusting the index of the  $\theta$ -letters accordingly

The relation obtained can then be written on the boundary of a cell to produce a 'copy'  $\pi(r)$  of  $\pi$ , with the structure of the cell remaining much the same. Replacing every cell of  $\Sigma$  with its 'copy' then produces a circular diagram  $\Sigma(r)$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with much the same structure such that every cell has coordinate r and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell.

Note that by construction, if  $\Sigma$  is a trapezium, then the label of the trimmed side of any maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Sigma(r)$  is a coordinate shift (see Section 6.3) of the label of the trimmed side of the corresponding  $\theta$ -band of  $\Sigma$ . As such,  $\Sigma(r)$  is called a *coordinate shift* of  $\Sigma$ .

Further, suppose that for any  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $\Sigma$  whose history is a rule of the second machine, no cell comprising  $\mathcal{T}$  is either:

- a (θ, q)-cell which is part of a q-band corresponding to the part Q<sub>1</sub><sup>L</sup>(j), or
  a (θ, a)-cell of the input Q<sub>0</sub><sup>L</sup>(j)Q<sub>1</sub><sup>L</sup>(j)-sector.

Then in the same way as above, we may construct the coordinate shift  $\Sigma(1)$ . In this case,  $\Sigma$  is called *exceptional*.

Next, recall the symmetry of the machine  $\mathbf{M}_{4}^{\mathcal{L}}$  arising from the 'reflected copies' of the machine  $\mathbf{M}_{3}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in its construction (see Section 5.4). As such, for any cell  $\pi$  in  $\Sigma$ , the  $(\theta, q)$ - or  $(\theta, a)$ -relation defining  $Lab(\partial \pi)$  corresponds to a 'reflected' such relation obtained by:

- Taking the inverse of maximal (cyclic) subwords not containing  $\theta$ -letters
- Replacing any remaining q-letter of Q<sub>i</sub><sup>L</sup>(j) with its copy in R<sub>i</sub><sup>L</sup>(j), and vice versa
  Replacing any remaining a-letter of Y<sub>i</sub><sup>L</sup>(j) with its copy in Y<sub>i</sub><sup>L</sup>(j), and vice versa
- Adjusting the index of the  $\theta$ -letters accordingly

The relation obtained can then be written on the boundary of a cell to produce a 'reflected copy'  $\bar{\pi}$ of  $\pi$  whose structure is that of a 'mirror image' of  $\pi$  (see Section 12.3(a)). As such, for any maximal positive  $\theta$ -band  $(\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$  of  $\Sigma$ , we may construct a maximal positive  $\theta$ -band  $(\bar{\pi}_k, \ldots, \bar{\pi}_1)$  with the same history. Doing so for all maximal positive  $\theta$ -bands produces a circular diagram  $\bar{\Sigma}$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that every cell has coordinate j and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell (see Section 12.3(b)). Accordingly,  $\overline{\Sigma}$  is called the *reflected copy* of  $\Sigma$ .



(a) The 'reflected copy'  $\bar{\pi}$  of a  $(\theta, q)$ -cell  $\pi$ corresponding to a relation involving a part  $Q_i^{\mathcal{L}}(j)$  of the standard base



(b) The reflected copy  $\bar{\Sigma}$  of a circular diagram  $\Sigma$ 

Now, fix an index  $i \in \{1, \ldots, L-7\}$  such that  $\Gamma_i$  is not the distinguished clove. Let  $\Sigma_i$  be the subdiagram of  $\Gamma_i$  obtained by removing the t-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}$ . Combining Lemmas 12.11 and 12.12,  $\Sigma_i$  is a circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that every cell has coordinate  $j_i$  and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell. Hence, we may construct the reflected copy  $\Sigma_i$ .

Consider the factorization  $\partial \Sigma_i = \mathbf{x}_i^{-1} \mathbf{p}_{i,1} \mathbf{y}_i \mathbf{p}_{i,2}^{-1}$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_{i,1} = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_i), \mathbf{p}_{i,2} = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{i+1})$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i$  are subpaths of  $\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{t}_i$ , respectively. Then, there exists a factorization  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}_i = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,1} \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,2}^{-1})^{-1}$ where the naming of each subpath is indicative of its correspondence to a subpath of  $\partial \Sigma_i$ . By construction,  $|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i| = |\mathbf{x}_i|, |\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i| = |\mathbf{y}_i|$ , and  $|\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,k}| = |\mathbf{p}_{i,k}|$ .

As  $Lab(\mathbf{x}_i)$  is an admissible subword of the accepted configuration W with base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(j_i)$ , the symmetric nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  then implies that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{x}_i) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{\bar{x}}_i^{-1})$ . Moreover,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{\bar{p}}_{i,1})$ is the word over  $T \cup T^{-1}$  obtained from  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{i,1})$  by switching the index of each  $\theta$ -letter to that of the letters comprising  $Lab(\mathbf{p}_{i,2})$ ;  $Lab(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,2})$  is obtained from the words  $Lab(\mathbf{p}_{i,k})$  analogously.

Since  $\bar{\Sigma}_i$  is a circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that every cell has coordinate  $j_i$  and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell, we may then construct its coordinate shift  $\bar{\Sigma}_i(r)$  for any  $r \in \{2, \ldots, L\}$ . Then, there exists a factorization  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}_i(r) = ((\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(r))^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,1}(r) \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i(r) (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,2}(r))^{-1})^{-1}$  such that each subpath arises from the corresponding subpath of  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}_i$  in the natural way. As such,  $\operatorname{Lab}((\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i(r))^{-1})$  is the coordinate shift of  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  with base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(r)$  while  $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,k}(r))$  is the word over  $T \cup T^{-1}$  obtained simply by changing the indices of each  $\theta$ -letter of  $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,k})$  accordingly.

Let  $\mathcal{Q}_i(r, 1)$  be the positive t-band corresponding to the part  $\{t(r+1)\}$  with history  $H_i$  (where L+1 is taken to be 1). Then,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_i(r, 1))) \equiv \text{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,1}(r))$ .

Similarly, letting  $Q_i(r,2)$  be the positive t-band corresponding to the part  $\{t(r)\}$  with history  $H_{i+1}$ , then  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(Q_i(r,2))) \equiv \text{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{i,2}(r))$ .

Hence, the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i(r, 1)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_i(r, 2)$  may be pasted to  $\overline{\Sigma}_i(r)$  by identifying the corresponding paths, yielding a circular diagram  $\overline{\Gamma}_i(r)$ . By construction, there exists a factorization

 $\partial \overline{\Gamma}_i(r) = (\mathbf{s}_i(r))^{-1} \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_i(r,2)) \mathbf{t}_i(r) \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_i(r,1))^{-1}$ 

such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_i(r)) \equiv W(r)t(r+1)$  and  $|\mathbf{t}_i(r)| = |\mathbf{t}_i|$ . As such,  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_i(r))$  is an admissible subword of W, and so  $\mathbf{s}_i(r)$  can be identified with a subpath of  $\partial \Pi$ .

Suppose neither  $\Gamma_i$  nor  $\Gamma_{i+1}$  are the distinguished clove and that we may construct both  $\overline{\Gamma}_i(r)$ and  $\overline{\Gamma}_{i+1}(r+1)$ . By construction, the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i(r,2)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{i+1}(r+1,1)$  are then identical. As such, we may paste  $\overline{\Gamma}_i(r)$  and  $\overline{\Gamma}_{i+1}(r+1)$  together by identifying these bands, producing a circular diagram  $\overline{\Psi}_{i,i+2}(r)$  whose structure is that of a 'mirror copy' of the diagram  $\Psi_{i,i+2}$ . Iterating this construction produces a circular diagram  $\overline{\Psi}_{k,\ell}(r)$  whose structure is that of a 'mirror copy' of  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$ for appropriate choices of  $k, \ell$ , and r.

Similarly, suppose that neither  $\Gamma_i$  nor  $\Gamma_{i-1}$  are the distinguished clove and that we may construct both  $\overline{\Gamma}_i(r)$  and  $\overline{\Gamma}_{i-1}(r-1)$ . Then, the *t*-bands  $\mathcal{Q}_i(r,1)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{i-1}(r-1,2)$  are identical, and so  $\overline{\Gamma}_i(r)$  and  $\overline{\Gamma}_{i-1}(r-1)$  may be pasted along these bands to produce a circular diagram  $\overline{\Psi}'_{i,i+2}(r)$ . Again, this construction can then be iterated to produce a circular diagram  $\overline{\Psi}'_{k,\ell}(r)$  for appropriate choices of  $k, \ell$ , and r.

**Lemma 12.13.** There is no distinguished clove in  $\Psi$ .

Proof. Assume toward contradiction that  $\Gamma_d$  is the distinguished clove for some  $d \in \{1, \ldots, L-7\}$ . Then,  $j_{L-6} \in \{2, \ldots, L-7\}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{L-6}\mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) \equiv W(j_{L-6}) \ldots W(j_{L-6}+6)t(j_{L-6}+7)$ .

Suppose  $d \geq 7$ . Then, we may construct the circular diagram  $\bar{\Psi}_{1,7}(j_1-1)$ . By construction, there exists a factorization  $\partial \bar{\Psi}_{1,7}(j_1-1) = (\mathbf{s}'_{1,7})^{-1} \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_6(j_1-6,2)) \mathbf{t}'_{1,7} \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_1(j_1-1,1))^{-1}$  such that  $|\mathbf{t}'_{1,7}| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,7}|$  and  $\mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{s}'_{1,7}) \equiv \mathrm{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{L-6}\mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1)$ .

Note that, by construction,  $Q_1(j_1 - 1, 1)$  is identical to  $Q_1$ . Further,  $Q_6(j_1 - 6, 2)$  is a *t*-band with history  $H_7$  corresponding to the part  $\{t(j_{L-6})\}$  of the standard base.

Let  $\bar{\Phi}_{1,7}$  be the diagram obtained from  $\bar{\Psi}_{1,7}(j_1 - 1)$  by removing the *t*-bands  $Q_1(j_1 - 1, 1)$  and  $Q_6(j_1 - 6, 2)$ . Then, applying Lemma 12.1(d) and Lemma 12.2(a), there exists a factorization  $\partial \bar{\Phi}_{1,7} = (\mathbf{s}''_{1,7})^{-1} \mathbf{p}''_1 \mathbf{t}''_{1,7} (\mathbf{p}''_2)^{-1}$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{1\,7}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}^{-1})$
- $|\mathbf{t}_{1,7}''| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,7}| 2$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_2'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1))$

• 
$$|\mathbf{p}_1''| = h_7$$

In particular,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1''\mathbf{t}_{1,7}')^{-1}$  represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1)^{-1}\mathbf{z})$  and, by Lemma 12.1(c),  $|\mathbf{p}''_{1,7}\mathbf{t}''_{1,7}| \le h_7 + |\mathbf{t}_{1,7}| - 2$ . As a result,  $w \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}''_{1,7}\mathbf{t}''_{1,7})^{-1}\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))$ represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_0)$  and satisfies  $|w| \leq h_7 + |\mathbf{t}_{1,7}| - 2 + h_{L-6}$ .

But Lemma 12.11 and a parameter choice for L imply that  $|\mathbf{t}_{7,L-6}|_{\theta} = h_7 + h_{L-6}$ , so that Lemma 12.1 yields  $|w| < |\mathbf{t}_{1,7}| + |\mathbf{t}_{7,L-6}| - 1 = |\mathbf{t}|$ , contradicting Lemma 12.10.

Hence, it may be assumed that  $d \leq 6$ . By a parameter choice for L, we may then assume that  $L-12 \ge d$ . This implies the ability to construct the diagram  $\bar{\Psi}'_{L-12,L-6}(j_{L-7}+1)$ , and then to remove the t-bands  $Q_{L-12}(j_{L-7}+6,1)$  and  $Q_{L-7}(j_{L-7}+1,2)$  to produce the circular diagram  $\bar{\Phi}'_{L-12,L-6}$ . Analogous to the arguments in the previous setting, there then exists a factorization  $\partial \bar{\Phi}'_{L-12,L-6} = (\mathbf{s}''_{L-12,L-6})^{-1} \mathbf{q}''_1 \mathbf{t}''_{L-12,L-6} (\mathbf{q}''_2)^{-1}$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{L-12,L-6}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}^{-1})$
- $|\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}''| = |\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}| 2$   $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_1'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))$
- $|\mathbf{q}_{2}''| = h_{L-12}$

So,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}^{\prime\prime}(\mathbf{q}_{2}^{\prime\prime})^{-1})^{-1}$  represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{ztop}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))$ , with Lemma 12.1(c) implying the bound  $|\mathbf{t}''_{L-12,L-6}(\mathbf{q}''_2)^{-1}| \leq |\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}| - 2 + h_{L-12}$ . In particular,  $v \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1))\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}'(\mathbf{q}_2'')^{-1})^{-1}$  represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_0)$ and satisfies  $|v| \leq h_1 + |\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}| - 2 + h_{L-12}$ .

But then as above, Lemma 12.11, Lemma 12.1, and a parameter choice for L imply

$$|v| < |\mathbf{t}_{1,L-12}| + |\mathbf{t}_{L-12,L-6}| - 1 = |\mathbf{t}|$$

providing a contradiction to Lemma 12.10.

By Lemma 12.13, there exists  $k \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$  such that:

 $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}_{L-6}\mathbf{z}^{-1}\mathbf{e}_1) \equiv W(L-k+1)\dots W(L)W(1)\dots W(7-k)t(8-k)$ 

Let  $\mathbf{z}_2$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{z}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_2^{-1})$  is an admissible word with base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ . Further, let  $\mathbf{z}_1$  and  $\mathbf{z}_3$  be the (perhaps trivial) subpaths such that  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_1 \mathbf{z}_2 \mathbf{z}_3$ .

If  $k \geq 2$ , then we may construct the circular diagram  $\overline{\Psi}_{1,k}(j_1-1)$ . In this case, let  $\overline{\Phi}_{1,k}$  be the diagram obtained from  $\overline{\Psi}_{1,k}(j_1-1)$  by removing the t-band  $\mathcal{Q}_1(j_1-1,1)$ . Then, as in the proof of Lemma 12.13, there exists a contour factorization  $\partial \bar{\Phi}_{1,k} = (\mathbf{s}''_{1,k})^{-1} \mathbf{p}''_{1,k} \mathbf{t}''_{1,k} (\mathbf{p}''_{2,k})^{-1}$  where:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{1,k}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_1^{-1})$
- $|\mathbf{t}_{1,k}''| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,k}| 1$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{2,k}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_1))$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_{1,k}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))$

For completeness, if k = 1, then define:

- $\mathbf{t}_{1,1}$  as the single *t*-edge of  $\mathbf{t}$  corresponding to the end of  $\mathcal{Q}_1$ ,
- $\mathbf{t}_{1,1}''$  as the trivial path at  $(\mathbf{t}_0)_{-}$ , and
- $Q_0(2,2) = Q_1$ .

Then, for any  $k \in \{1, ..., 6\}$  we have  $|\mathbf{t}''_{1,k}| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,k}| - 1$  and:

$$Lab(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{1})^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{1}) =_{G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})} Lab((\mathbf{t}_{1,k}'')^{-1}) Lab(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))^{-1}$$
(12.1)

Conversely, letting  $\ell = L - 6 - k$ , we may construct the circular diagram  $\bar{\Psi}'_{\ell,L-6}(j_{L-7}+1)$ . As above, let  $\bar{\Phi}'_{\ell,L-6}$  be the diagram obtained from  $\bar{\Psi}'_{\ell,L-6}(j_{L-7}+1)$  by removing the t-band  $\mathcal{Q}(j_{L-7}+1,2)$ . Then, again as in the proof of Lemma 12.13, there exists a contour factorization  $\partial \bar{\Phi}'_{\ell,L-6} = (\mathbf{s}''_{\ell,L-6})^{-1} \mathbf{q}''_{1,\ell} \mathbf{t}''_{\ell,L-6} (\mathbf{q}_{2,\ell})^{-1}$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{s}_{\ell,L-6}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_3^{-1})$
- $|\mathbf{t}''_{\ell,L-6}| = |\mathbf{t}_{\ell,L-6}| 1$   $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}''_{1,\ell}) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6}))$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_{2,\ell}'') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)))$

Then, we have:

$$\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{3}\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{L-6})) =_{G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})} \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1))) \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}_{\ell,L-6}'')^{-1}$$
(12.2)

**Lemma 12.14.** For any word w over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))^{-1}\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_2)\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1))), |w| \ge |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|.$ 

*Proof.* Applying (12.1) and (12.2),  $v \equiv (\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}''_{1,k})^{-1})w(\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}''_{\ell,L-6})^{-1})$  represents  $h^{\varepsilon}$  in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . So,  $|v| \ge |h| = |\mathbf{t}|$ .

Note that by construction, the last letter of  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}''_{\ell,L-6})$  is a *t*-letter. As such, Lemma 12.1(d) implies  $|v| = |\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{t}''_{1,k})^{-1}w| + |\mathbf{t}''_{\ell,L-6}|.$ 

Similarly, if  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{t}''_{1,k})$  is non-trivial (i.e if  $k \geq 2$ ), then its first letter is a *t*-letter, so that Lemma 12.1(d) yields  $|v| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,k}''| + |w| + |\mathbf{t}_{\ell,L-6}'|$ .

Hence,  $|v| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,k}| + |w| + |\mathbf{t}_{\ell,L-6}| - 2.$ 

But Lemma 12.1 also implies  $|\mathbf{t}| = |\mathbf{t}_{1,k}| + |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}| + |\mathbf{t}_{\ell,L-6}| - 2$ , implying the statement.

Now, let  $\mathbf{z}_{2,2}$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{z}_2$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,2}^{-1})$  is the admissible subword of W with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ . By structure of the standard base of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$ , there exists a factorization  $\mathbf{z}_2 = \mathbf{z}_{2,1}\mathbf{z}_{2,2}$ . Then, letting **f** be the first edge of  $\mathbf{e}_{2,2}$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{f}^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{2,1}^{-1})$  is the admissible subword of W(1) with base  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1) \dots Q_N^{\mathcal{L}}(1) (R_N^{\mathcal{L}}(1))^{-1} \dots (R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1))^{-1}$ . In particular, as W is an accepted configuration, the parallel nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  implies that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{f}^{-1}\mathbf{z}_{2,1}^{-1})$  is a coordinate shift of the corresponding admissible subword of W(j) for any j.

**Lemma 12.15.** For any word w over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,2})\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1))), |w| \ge h_{\ell} + |\mathbf{t}_{k+1,\ell}|_q + 3.$ 

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{e}'_k$  be the edge of  $\mathbf{s}_k$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{e}'_k) \in (R_1^{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}))^{-1}$ . Then, let  $\mathcal{Q}'_k$  be the maximal positive q-band of  $\Sigma_k$  for which  $\mathbf{e}'_k$  is a defining edge.

Cutting along  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}'_k)$  separates  $\Sigma_k$  into two subdiagrams, one of which,  $\Sigma'_k$ , does not contain  $\mathcal{Q}'_k$ . By construction, there exists a decomposition  $(\mathbf{x}'_k)^{-1}\mathbf{p}_{1,k}\mathbf{y}'_k(\mathbf{p}'_{2,k})^{-1}$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_{1,k} = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_k)$ ,  $\mathbf{p}'_{2,k} = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}'_k), \mathbf{x}'_k$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{x}_k$ , and  $\mathbf{y}'_k$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{y}_k$ .

Let  $\mathbf{x}_k''$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{x}_k$  such that  $\mathbf{x}_k = \mathbf{x}_k' \mathbf{x}_k''$ . Since  $k \leq 6$ ,  $\ell - k = L - 6 - 2k \geq L - 18$ . So, the parameter choice L > 33 implies  $\Psi_{k,\ell}$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 12.11. As such,  $|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|_{\theta} = h_k + h_\ell$  and every maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Sigma'_k$  has an end on  $\mathbf{p}_{1,k}$ .

So, letting  $H'_k$  be the history of  $\mathcal{Q}'_k$ ,

$$h_k = |\mathbf{p}_{1,k}|_{ heta} = |\mathbf{y}_k'|_{ heta} + |\mathbf{p}_{2,k}'|_{ heta} = |\mathbf{y}_k'|_{ heta} + \|H_k'\|_{ heta}$$

Further, Lemma 12.2(a) implies  $|\mathbf{p}'_{2,k}| = ||H'_k||$ .

Let  $\mathbf{f}_k$  be the edge of  $\mathbf{t}$  which is an end of  $\mathcal{Q}_k$ . Then, let  $\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}$  be the subpath of  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}$  such that  $\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell} = \mathbf{f}_k \mathbf{y}'_k \mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}$ . By construction,  $|\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_q = |\mathbf{t}_{k+1,\ell}|_q + 2$  and the first edge of  $\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}$  is a q-edge. So, Lemma 12.1(d) implies

$$|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}| = |\mathbf{f}_k| + |\mathbf{y}'_k| + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| = |\mathbf{y}'_k| + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| + 1$$
  
$$\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{\ell} \text{ so that } |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{\ell} = h_k + h_{\ell} - |\mathbf{y}'_{k,\ell}|_{\ell} = ||H'_{\ell}|| + l$$

Further,  $|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|_{\theta} = |\mathbf{y}'_k|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{\theta}$ , so that  $|\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{\theta} = h_k + h_\ell - |\mathbf{y}'_k|_{\theta} = ||H'_k|| + h_\ell$ .

Since  $\Sigma'_k$  is a subdiagram of  $\Sigma_k$ , it is a circular diagram over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that every cell has coordinate  $j_k$  and no cell is a  $(\theta, t)$ -cell. As such, we may construct the reflected copy  $\overline{\Sigma}'_k$ .

Let  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}'_k = ((\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{1,k} \bar{\mathbf{y}}'_k (\bar{\mathbf{p}}'_{2,k})^{-1})^{-1}$  with the naming indicative of the correspondence to the subpaths of  $\partial \Sigma'_k$ . Then, since W is an accepted configuration, the parallel nature of the rules of  $\mathbf{M}_4^{\mathcal{L}}$  imply  $W(j_k) \equiv t(j_k) \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k)^{-1} \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{x}''_k)$ .

As  $\Sigma'_k$  contains no *q*-bands corresponding to the parts  $(R_1^{\mathcal{L}}(j_k))^{-1}$  or  $(R_0^{\mathcal{L}}(j_k))^{-1}$  of the standard base,  $\bar{\Sigma}'_k$  contains no *q*-bands corresponding to the parts  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(j_k)$  or  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(j_k)$ . In particular,  $\bar{\Sigma}'_k$  is exceptional, so that we may construct  $\bar{\Sigma}'_k(1)$ .

As above, let  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}'_k = ((\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k(1))^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{1,k}(1) \bar{\mathbf{y}}'_k(1) (\bar{\mathbf{p}}'_{2,k}(1))^{-1})^{-1}$ . Then, we have:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_k(1)) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,1}^{-1})$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{1,k}(1)) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{bot}}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))$
- $|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_k'(1)| = |\mathbf{y}_k'|$

• 
$$|\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{2,k}'(1)| = |\mathbf{p}_{2,k}'|$$

So,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))^{-1}\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,1}) =_{G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})} \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}'_{k}(1)(\bar{\mathbf{p}}'_{2,k}(1))^{-1}).$ 

In particular,  $v \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}'_{k}(1)(\bar{\mathbf{p}}'_{2,k}(1))^{-1})w$  is a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))^{-1}\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2})\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)))$ . Lemma 12.14 then implies  $|v| \geq |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|$ .

On the other hand, Lemma 12.1(c) implies:

 $\begin{aligned} |v| &\leq |\bar{\mathbf{y}}'_{k}(1)| + |\bar{\mathbf{p}}'_{2,k}(1)| + |w| = |\mathbf{y}'_{k}| + |\mathbf{p}'_{2,k}| + |w| = |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}| - |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| - 1 + |\mathbf{p}'_{2,k}| + |w| \\ \text{Hence, } |w| &\geq |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| - |\mathbf{p}'_{2,k}| + 1 = |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| - ||H'_{k}|| + 1. \\ \text{But Lemma 12.1(b) } |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}| &\geq |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{\theta} + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{q} = ||H'_{k}|| + h_{\ell} + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{q}, \text{ so that} \\ |w| &\geq h_{\ell} + |\mathbf{t}'_{k,\ell}|_{q} + 1 = h_{\ell} + |\mathbf{t}_{k+1,\ell}|_{q} + 3 \end{aligned}$ 

Lemma 12.16. W is accepted by a one-machine computation of the first machine.

*Proof.* Suppose to the contrary that W is accepted by a one-machine computation of the second machine. As every rule of the second machine locks the 'special' input sector, the admissible subword of W with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  has empty tape word. In particular,  $|\mathbf{z}_{2,2}| = 2$ .

But then Lemmas 12.1(d) and 12.2(a) imply  $w \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,2})\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)))$  itself satisfies  $|w| = |\mathbf{z}_{2,2}| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1))| = h_{\ell} + 2 < h_{\ell} + |\mathbf{t}_{k+1,\ell}| + 3$ , contradicting Lemma 12.15.

**Lemma 12.17.** The reflected copy  $\Sigma_{\ell-1}$  is not exceptional.

*Proof.* Assuming  $\bar{\Sigma}_{\ell-1}$  is exceptional,  $\partial \bar{\Sigma}_{\ell-1}(1) = ((\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell-1}(1))^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,1}(1) \bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\ell-1}(1) (\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,2}(1))^{-1})^{-1}$ where:

- Lab $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell-1}(1)^{-1})$  is the coordinate shift of Lab $(\mathbf{x}_{\ell-1})$  with base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,2}(1)) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)))$
- $|\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,1}(1)| = h_{\ell-1}$   $|\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\ell-1}(1)| = |\mathbf{y}_{\ell-1}|$

It then follows from Lemma 12.16 and the parallel nature of the rules of the first machine that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell-1}(1)^{-1})$  is the admissible subword of W with base  $B_4^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ , and so  $\operatorname{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\ell-1}(1)) \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_2)$ . As a result,  $v \equiv \text{Lab}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,1}(1)\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\ell-1}(1))$  is a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_2)\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1))).$ 

Hence,  $w \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2)))^{-1}v$  satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 12.14, so that  $|w| \ge |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|$ . As  $k \leq 6$ ,  $\ell - 1 - k = L - 7 - 2k \geq L - 19$ . So, taking L > 35, k and  $\ell - 1$  satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 12.11. As a result,  $|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell-1}|_{\theta} = h_k + h_{\ell-1}$ .

Further, Lemma 12.1(d) implies  $|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}| = |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell-1}| + |\mathbf{y}_{\ell-1}| + 1$ , so that Lemma 12.1(b) implies  $|\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}| \ge h_k + h_{\ell-1} + |\mathbf{y}_{\ell-1}| + 1.$ 

But Lemmas 12.1 and 12.2 imply

$$|w| \le |\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{k-1}(2,2))| + |v| \le h_k + |\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell-1,1}(1)| + |\bar{\mathbf{y}}_{\ell-1}(1)| = h_k + h_{\ell-1} + |\mathbf{y}_{\ell-1}| < |\mathbf{t}_{k,\ell}|$$

yielding a contradiction.

Finally, the following statement yields the desired contradiction:

Lemma 12.18. A reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram contains no disks.

*Proof.* By Lemma 12.17, the reflected copy  $\bar{\Sigma}_{\ell-1}$  cannot be exceptional.

In particular, there must exist a maximal  $\theta$ -band in  $\bar{\Sigma}_{\ell-1}$  whose history is a rule of the second machine.

By construction, this implies the existence of a maximal  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\Sigma_{\ell-1}$  whose history is a rule of the second machine.

Recall that  $1 \le k \le 6$  and  $\ell = L - 6 - k$ . So, the parameter choice L > 23 yields the bounds  $(L-1)/2 < \ell \le L-7$ . So, Lemma 12.11 implies:

- (1) Every maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Gamma_{\ell-1}$  crosses  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$ .
- (2) Every maximal  $\theta$ -band of  $\Psi_{1,\ell+1}$  that crosses  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$  also crosses  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1}$ .

Now, let  $H'_{\ell}$  be the maximal (perhaps empty) prefix  $H_{\ell}$  consisting entirely of rules of the first machine. The existence of the  $\theta$ -band  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\Sigma_{\ell-1}$  and condition (1) then imply that  $H'_{\ell}$  is a proper prefix of  $H_{\ell}$ .

Suppose  $H'_{\ell}$  is non-empty. Condition (2) then implies that each of the maximal  $\theta$ -bands of  $\Gamma_{\ell}$ corresponding to the rules comprising the subword  $H'_{\ell}$  of  $H_{\ell}$  cross both  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1}$ .

So, Lemmas 12.12 and 12.13 imply that these  $\theta$ -bands form a subdiagram  $\Gamma'_{\ell}$  of  $\Gamma_{\ell}$  which is a trapezium with history  $H'_{\ell}$ .

Let  $\partial \Gamma'_{\ell} = \mathbf{p}_1^{-1} \mathbf{q}_1 \mathbf{p}_2 \mathbf{q}_2^{-1}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of this trapezium. Then by construction:

- $\mathbf{q}_1 = \mathbf{s}_\ell^{-1}$
- $\mathbf{p}_1$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell+1})$
- $\mathbf{p}_2$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_\ell)$

In particular, Lemma 7.14 implies that  $(W(j_{\ell})t(j_{\ell+1}))^{-1}$  is  $H'_{\ell}$ -admissible, so that  $W(j_{\ell})$  is also  $H'_{\ell}$ -admissible. The corresponding computation  $\mathcal{D}: W(j_{\ell}) \equiv V_0 \to \cdots \to V_t$  is thus a onemachine computation of the first machine, so that Lemma 6.10 yields a one-machine computation  $\mathcal{C}: W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t$  of the first machine in the standard base with history  $H'_{\ell}$ .

By Lemma 12.16 and the construction of Lemma 6.10,  $W_0 \equiv W$ . As a result,  $W_t$  is an accepted configuration with  $\ell(W_t) \leq 1$ .

However, since  $H'_{\ell}$  is a proper prefix of  $H_{\ell}$ ,  $W_t(j_{\ell}) \equiv W(j_{\ell}) \cdot H'_{\ell}$  must be  $\theta$ -admissible for some  $\theta \in \Theta_2$ . As a result, either:

- (i)  $W_t$  is  $\theta$ -admissible, in which case  $W_t$  has empty 'special' input sector, or
- (ii)  $W_t$  is not  $\theta$ -admissible, in which case Lemma 6.16 implies  $W \equiv I(u)$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{L}$ .

Note that in case (ii), condition (L5) implies that the tape word of  $W_t$  in the 'special' input sector represents the identity in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}'$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{C}$  to the 'special' input sector and let  $\Delta_{\mathcal{C}}$  be the trapezium corresponding to  $\mathcal{C}'$  given by Lemma 7.15. Then, letting  $\partial \Delta_{\mathcal{C}} = (\mathbf{p}'_1)^{-1} \mathbf{q}'_1 \mathbf{p}'_2 (\mathbf{q}'_2)^{-1}$  be the standard factorization of the contour of this trapezium, by construction:

- (a)  $Lab(\mathbf{q}'_1)$  and  $Lab(\mathbf{q}'_2)$  are the admissible subwords of W and  $W_t$ , respectively, with base  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ (b)  $\mathbf{p}'_1 = \mathbf{bot}(\mathcal{Q}_{0,\mathcal{C}})$  where  $\mathcal{Q}_{0,\mathcal{C}}$  is a positive *q*-band corresponding to the part  $Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  of the
- standard base with history  $H'_{\ell}$
- (c)  $\mathbf{p}'_2 = \mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{1,\mathcal{C}})$  where  $\mathcal{Q}_{1,\mathcal{C}}$  is a positive q-band corresponding to the part  $Q_1^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$  of the standard base with history  $H'_{\ell}$

By the definition of the path  $\mathbf{z}_{2,2}$ , (a) implies that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{q}'_1) \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,2}^{-1})$ .

Further, note that  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)$  can be viewed as the concatenation of two subbands,  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)'$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)''$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)'$  has history  $H'_{\ell}$ .

Then, since every rule of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  locks the  $\{t(1)\}Q_0^{\mathcal{L}}(1)$ -sector, (b) implies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{p}_1') \equiv \operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)'))$ .

Finally, as the tape word of  $W_t$  in the 'special' input sector represents the identity in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , there exists a word v with  $|v| = |v|_q = 2$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{q}_2').$ 

Hence,  $w \equiv \text{Lab}(\mathbf{p}'_2)v^{-1}\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)''))$  is a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the same element of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  as  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{z}_{2,2})$ Lab $(\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_{\ell}(L,1)))$  and, by Lemmas 12.1 and 12.2, satisfies:

$$|w| \le |\mathbf{p}_2'| + |v| + |\mathbf{top}(\mathcal{Q}_\ell(L, 1)'')| = ||H_\ell''|| + 2 + h_\ell - ||H_\ell''|| = h_\ell + 2$$

But this contradicts Lemma 12.15.

#### 12.4. Equivalence of length functions.

In this section, we study the immediate consequences of Lemma 12.18, establishing the equivalence that assures the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 12.19.  $|h| = \delta |h|_{A}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta$  be a reduced minimal *h*-distortion diagram and let  $\partial \Delta = \mathbf{q}\mathbf{p}$  be the standard factorization of its contour.

By Lemma 12.18,  $\Delta$  contains no disk. As a result, Lemma 12.4 implies  $\Delta$  has no q-band. So, the base of any  $\theta$ -band of  $\Delta$  must have length 0. But then the existence of a  $\theta$ -band implies the existence of a quasi-rim  $\theta$ -band, which would then contradict Lemma 12.9.

Hence, every positive cell of  $\Delta$  must be an *a*-cell.

Now, fix an *a*-cell  $\pi$  in  $\Delta$  and suppose an edge **e** of  $\partial \pi$  is an edge of **p**. As Lab(**e**)  $\in \mathcal{A}$ , Lemma 6.25 implies Lab $(\partial \pi) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Suppose an edge of  $\partial \pi$  is on the boundary of an *a*-cell  $\pi'$ . By Lemma 10.13,  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  are distinct *a*-cells. Further, Lemma 6.25 again implies  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi') \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . But then  $\pi$  and  $\pi'$  provide a contradiction to Lemma 10.2.

So, every edge of  $\partial \pi$  is an edge of  $\partial \Delta$ . In particular, there exists a factorization  $\partial \pi = \mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  is a subpath of  $\mathbf{q}$ . Lemma 12.6 then implies that  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}}, |\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , and so  $|\mathbf{x}|_{\mathcal{A}} = |\mathbf{y}|_{\mathcal{A}} = \frac{1}{2}|\partial \pi|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Hence, as Lemma 12.5 implies that any edge of  $\mathbf{p}$  which is not on the boundary of an *a*-cell is adjacent to an edge of  $\mathbf{q}^{-1}$ , it follows that  $|\mathbf{q}|_{\mathcal{A}} \ge |\mathbf{p}|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . As  $|\mathbf{q}|_{\theta} = 0$ , Lemma 12.1(b) then implies  $|h| = |\mathbf{q}| \ge \delta |\mathbf{p}|_{\mathcal{A}} = \delta ||\mathbf{p}|| = \delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . But by definition  $|h| \le \delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ , so that the statement follows.

Thus, the following vital statement follows:

Lemma 12.20.  $\delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}} \leq |h|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

*Proof.* As  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , it follows immediately that  $|h|_{\mathcal{X}} \leq |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Conversely, let w be a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  representing h in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  satisfying  $||w|| = |h|_{\mathcal{X}}$ . Then, Lemma 12.19 implies  $|w| \ge |h| = \delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Letting  $w \equiv u_1 \dots u_k$  be a decomposition of w which realizes |w|, then  $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda(u_i) \ge \delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

But  $0 \le \lambda(u_i) \le 1 \le ||u_i||$  for all *i*, so that  $||w|| = \sum_{i=1}^k ||u_i|| \ge \delta |h|_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

### 13. Proof of Theorem 1.1

We now complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Fix a finitely a finitely generated recursively presented group R. Then, using a 'standard trick' (see Lemma 12.17 and Exercise 12.12 of [25]), there exists a presentation  $\langle Y | S \rangle$  of R such that  $|Y| < \infty$  and S is a recursive set of positive words in Y. As cofinite sets and intersections of recursive sets are recursive, it may be assumed without loss of generality that S does not contain the trivial word. Hence,  $\langle Y | S \rangle$  satisfies conditions (R1)-(R3) (see Section 3).

Now, let  $R_C$  be the group with presentation  $\langle Y_C | S_C \rangle$  constructed in Section 3. By this construction and Lemma 3.5, there exists a malnormal embedding of R into the group  $R_C$ . Hence, by the transitive property of malnormal subgroups, it suffices to find a malnormal embedding of  $R_C$  into a finitely presented group.

We now specify the assignments made throughout the construction of our groups  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , verifying the relevant hypotheses along the way.

For the setting of this proof, the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  is taken to be in bijection with the generating set  $Y_C$  of the group  $R_C$ , with  $\zeta: Y_C \to \mathcal{A}$  a fixed bijection.

Extend  $\zeta$  to a bijection  $\tilde{\zeta} : (Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1})^* \to (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$  in the natural way. That is, if  $w \equiv x_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots x_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  for some  $x_i \in Y_C$  and  $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ , then  $\tilde{\zeta}(w) \equiv \zeta(x_1)^{\varepsilon_1} \dots \zeta(x_k)^{\varepsilon_k}$ .

With this, the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is taken to be of the the corresponding copy of the set of relators  $\mathcal{S}_C$ , i.e  $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\zeta}(\mathcal{S}_C)$ . Note that since  $\mathcal{S}$  is assumed to be a recursive subset of  $Y^*$ , then  $\mathcal{L}$  is similarly a recursive subset of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ .

Then,  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  is taken to be the set of all non-trivial cyclically reduced words over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  whose copy over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  is a word which represents the identity in the group  $R_C$ , i.e

$$\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} = \{ w \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^* \setminus \{1\} : w \text{ is cyclically reduced}, \, \tilde{\zeta}^{-1}(w) =_{R_C} 1 \}$$

It must be noted that this choice satisfies condition (L1) by Lemma 3.3; conditions (L2)-(L5) are immediately satisfied by construction.

The following statements illustrate the purpose of the choices of the previous section:

**Lemma 13.1.** For any  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ , the relation w = 1 holds in the group  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

*Proof.* Lemmas 6.3 and 8.6 imply that the words corresponding to the configurations I(w) and J(w) are trivial over the group  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . These two words differ only by the insertion of the word w in the 'special' input sector, so that w = 1 in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

**Lemma 13.2.** The groups  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  are isomorphic.

*Proof.* By the definition of these two groups, it suffices to show that every element of  $\Omega$  represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . What's more, by the definition of  $\Omega$ , it suffices to show that every element of  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$  represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Identifying  $\mathcal{A}$  with the corresponding subset of the tape alphabet of the 'special' input sector,  $\zeta$  may be identified with a map  $Y_C \to G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Lemma 13.1 and the theorem of von Dyck (Theorem 4.5 of [16]) then imply that this map extends to a homomorphism  $\phi : R_C \to G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

In particular, since  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  consists of the images under  $\tilde{\zeta}$  of the words which represent the trivial element of  $R_C$ , every word of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Now, let  $w \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ . Then, there exists a semi-computation  $\mathcal{S} : w \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w.

Lemma 7.9 then provides a semi-trapezium  $\Delta$  corresponding to S, i.e so that  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\Delta)) \equiv w$ and  $\text{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\Delta)) \equiv w_t$ . Hence, as the sides of any semi-trapezium are labelled by identical copies of the corresponding semi-computation, w and  $w_t$  are conjugate in  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , and so are conjugate in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

But  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  and so represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Thus, w = 1 in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

**Lemma 13.3.** The group  $R_C$  embeds in the group  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

*Proof.* As in the proof of Lemma 13.2, the map  $Y_C \to G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  induced by  $\zeta$  extends to a homomorphism  $\phi : R_C \to G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ .

Let  $g \in R_C$  such that  $\phi(g) = 1$  and let w be a word over  $Y_C^{\pm 1}$  which represents g in  $R_C$ . Then,  $\tilde{w} = \tilde{\zeta}(w)$  represents 1 in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , so that there exists a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  over  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv \tilde{w}$ .

By construction,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv \tilde{w}$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A}^{\pm 1}$ . So, letting k be the number of a-cells in  $\Delta$ , Lemma 10.22 implies there exists a factorization  $\tilde{w} =_{F(\mathcal{A})} \tilde{w}_1 \dots \tilde{w}_k$  such that each  $\tilde{w}_i$  is freely conjugate to an element of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ .

Letting  $w_i = \tilde{\zeta}^{-1}(\tilde{w}_i)$ , it follows from the definition of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  that  $w_i =_{R_C} 1$ . But this implies  $w =_{F(Y_C)} w_1 \dots w_k =_{Y_C} 1$ , so that g = 1.

Since  $R_C$  is generated by  $Y_C$ , by construction the image of  $\phi$  is the subgroup generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ , i.e  $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Thus, by Lemmas 11.15 and 13.2,  $R_C$  malnormally embeds into the group  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , completing the proof Theorem 1.1.

### 14. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Letting  $\varphi : R \to R_C$  be the embedding given in Section 3, consider the embedding  $\psi : R \to G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  given by  $\psi = \phi \circ \varphi$  constructed in Section 13.

Fix  $r \in R$ . By Lemma 3.4,  $|\varphi(r)|_{Y_C} = C|r|_Y$ . Moreover, as  $\psi(r) = \phi(\varphi(r)) \in H_A$ , Lemma 12.20 implies  $\delta |\psi(r)|_A \leq |\psi(r)|_A \leq |\psi(r)|_A$ .

But as  $\phi$  is induced by  $\zeta$ , by construction  $|\psi(r)|_{\mathcal{A}} = |\varphi(r)|_{Y_C}$ . Thus, we have:

$$\delta C|r|_Y \le |\psi(r)|_{\mathcal{X}} \le C|r|_Y$$

completing the proof of Theorem 1.2.

#### 15. Proof of Theorem 1.4

As in the setting of Section 13, fix a recursive presentation  $\langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$  for the group R with finite generating set  $Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_m\}$  which satisfies conditions (R1)-(R3). Then, define the group  $R_C$  given by the presentation  $\langle Y_C \mid \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  constructed as in Section 3.

Recall that in this setting there exists an embedding  $\varphi : R \to R_C$  induced by the map which sends each letter  $y_i$  to the (positive) word  $A_i \equiv a_{1,i} \dots a_{C,i}$  over  $Y_C$ . As such, the set of words  $\mathcal{D} = \{A_1, \dots, A_m\}$  forms a basis for a free subgroup F of  $F(Y_C)$  with  $\varphi(R) \cong \langle \mathcal{D} | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$ .

Now, let N be a normal subgroup of R. Then, since  $R \cong \varphi(R) \cong F/\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ , there exists a normal subgroup  $M \triangleleft F$  containing  $\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$  such that  $\varphi(N) \cong M/\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ .

As in Section 3, let  $T_M$  be the set of non-trivial cyclically reduced words over  $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^{-1}$  which are elements of M. Note that by construction, every element of  $T_M$  is cyclically reduced as a word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$ . Further, as in that setting, let  $L_M = \langle \langle M \rangle \rangle^{F(Y_C)}$ .

Finally, let  $\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$  be the set of non-trivial cyclically reduced words w over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  which satisfy  $\tilde{\zeta}^{-1}(w) \in L_M$ .

By Lemma 3.2, every word  $w \in \Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} \geq C$ . As such,  $\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies condition (L1). What's more, since  $L_M \triangleleft F(Y_C)$ , it follows immediately that  $\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies conditions (L2)-(L4). Lastly, setting  $\mathcal{L} = \tilde{\zeta}(\mathcal{S}_C)$  as in Section 13, as  $\mathcal{S}_C \subseteq M$ ,  $\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies condition (L5).

Hence, letting  $\Omega_N$  be the set of cyclically reduced words over  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$  which are freely conjugate to an element of  $\mathcal{E}(\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}})$ , the group  $G_{\Omega_N}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}) \cong G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})/\langle \langle \Omega_N \rangle \rangle^{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})}$  satisfies the hypotheses necessary for the treatment of Sections 6-12.

Let  $g \in \langle \langle \Omega_N \rangle \rangle^{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})} \cap \psi(R)$ . Then, letting  $r = \psi^{-1}(g) \in R$ , there exists a word  $V \in F$  which represents  $\varphi(r)$ . So,  $W \equiv \tilde{\zeta}(V)$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  which represents g.

As W represents an element of the normal subgroup  $\langle \langle \Omega_N \rangle \rangle^{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})}$  of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , there exists a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega_N}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ . Lemma 10.22 then yields a factorization  $W =_{F(\mathcal{A})} w_1 \dots w_k$  where each  $w_i$  is a word over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  that is freely conjugate to an element of  $\Lambda_N^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Hence, as  $L_M \triangleleft F(Y_C)$ , it follows that  $V \in L_M$ .

This implies  $V \in L_M \cap F$ , so that Lemma 3.1 implies  $V \in M$ . But then the definition of  $\varphi$  implies  $r \in N$ , so that  $g \in \psi(N)$ .

So,  $\langle \langle \Omega_N \rangle \rangle^{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})}$  is a normal subgroup of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  which satisfies  $\langle \langle \Omega_N \rangle \rangle^{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})} \cap \psi(R) = \psi(N)$ . Thus,  $\psi(R) \leq_{CEP} G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , completing the proof of Theorem 1.4.

## 16. Proof of Theorem 1.6

While the proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.4 presented in Sections 14 and 15 can be understood as observations pertaining to the malnormal embedding constructed in Section 13 for the proof of Theorem 1.1, a new setup is necessary for the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Let R be a finitely generated group with decidable Word problem. Letting X be a finite generating set for R, define  $\mathcal{R}$  to be the set of all non-trivial words over  $X \cup X^{-1}$  which represent the identity in R. As the set of non-trivial words over  $X \cup X^{-1}$  is a cofinite subset  $(X \cup X^{-1})^*$ ,  $\mathcal{R}$  is itself a recursive subset of  $(X \cup X^{-1})^*$ . Note that  $\langle X | \mathcal{R} \rangle$  is then a presentation of R.

We then employ the 'standard trick' referenced in Section 13:

Let  $Y = X \sqcup \overline{X}$ , where  $\overline{X}$  is a copy of X with defining bijection  $\tau : \overline{X} \to X$ . Then, define the bijection  $\xi : Y \to X \cup X^{-1}$  by  $\xi(x) = x$  for all  $x \in X$  and  $\xi(\overline{x}) = \tau(\overline{x})^{-1}$  for all  $\overline{x} \in \overline{X}$ .

The map  $\xi$  then extends to a map  $\tilde{\xi} : (Y \cup Y^{-1})^* \to (X \cup X^{-1})^*$  which restricts to a bijection  $\tilde{\xi}_0 : Y^* \to (X \cup X^{-1})^*$ . With this, define  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \tilde{\xi}_0^{-1}(\mathcal{R})$ .

By construction,  $S_1$  is a set of (positive) words over Y which does not contain the trivial word. Moreover, as  $\mathcal{R}$  is a recursive subset of  $(X \cup X^{-1})^*$ ,  $S_1$  is a recursive subset of  $Y^*$ .

Finally, letting  $S_2 = \{x \cdot \tau^{-1}(x) \mid x \in X\}$ , define the set  $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ .

Note that since  $S_2$  is a finite subset of  $Y^*$  which does not contain the trivial word, S is again a recursive subset of  $Y^*$  which does not contain the trivial word.

**Lemma 16.1.** Let w be a non-trivial word over  $Y \cup Y^{-1}$  such that  $\tilde{\xi}(w) =_R 1$ . Then there exists a circular diagram  $\Psi_w$  over  $\langle Y | S \rangle$  such that:

- (1)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi_w) \equiv w$
- (2)  $\operatorname{Area}(\Psi_w) \leq ||w||$
- (3) For every positive cell  $\pi$  of  $\Psi_w$ ,  $\|\partial \pi\| \leq 2\|w\|$

*Proof.* Let  $w \equiv y_1^{\varepsilon_1} \dots y_k^{\varepsilon_k}$  where  $y_1, \dots, y_k \in Y$  and  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k \in \{\pm 1\}$ .

Let  $I = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \mid \varepsilon_i = -1\}$ . Perhaps passing to  $w^{-1}$ , we may assume that  $|I| \leq \frac{1}{2} ||w||$ . Note that if ||w|| = 1, then |I| = 0 so that ||w|| - |I| = ||w|| = 1; otherwise,  $||w|| - |I| \ge \frac{1}{2} ||w|| \ge 1$ . If  $y_i \in X$  for  $i \in I$ , then  $y_i \cdot \tau^{-1}(y_i) \in S_2$ . In this case, we may construct a cell  $\pi_i$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi_i) \equiv (y_i \cdot \tau^{-1}(y_i))^{-1}$ .

Similarly, if  $y_i \in \overline{X}$  for  $i \in I$ , then  $\tau(y_i) \cdot y_i \in S_2$ , so that we may construct a cell  $\pi_i$  satisfying  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \pi_i) \equiv (\tau(y_i) \cdot y_i)^{-1}.$ 

Then, there exists an annular diagram  $\Psi'_w$  over  $\langle Y | \mathcal{S} \rangle$  consisting of the |I| cells  $\pi_i$  with outer contour label w and inner contour label  $v^{-1}$ , where  $v \in Y^*$  and satisfies  $\tilde{\xi}(v) \equiv \tilde{\xi}(w)$ .

In particular,  $\tilde{\xi}_0(v) =_R 1$ , so that  $V \in \mathcal{S}_1$ . Hence, we may paste a single cell in the middle of the annulus  $\Psi'_w$  to produce a circular diagram  $\Psi_w$  over  $\langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$  which satisfies the statement.

Identifying  $\xi$  with a map  $Y \to \langle X \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$ , Lemma 16.1 and the theorem of von Dyck imply that  $\xi$  extends to a homomorphism  $\langle Y | \mathcal{S} \rangle \rightarrow \langle X | \mathcal{R} \rangle$ . Similarly, identifying the natural injection  $X \to Y$  with a map  $X \to \langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$ , this map extends to a homomorphism  $\langle X \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle \to \langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$ . Indeed, since  $\xi$  restricts to the identity on X, these homomorphisms are inverses.

Hence,  $\langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$  is a presentation of R which satisfies conditions (R1)-(R3). As such, we may define the group  $R_C$  with presentation  $\langle Y_C \mid \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  as constructed in Section 3.

The terminology of Section 3 is adopted for this setting. In particular, the set  $\mathcal{D}$  forms a basis for a free subgroup F of  $F(Y_C)$ .

**Lemma 16.2.** Let w be a non-trivial word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  which is a cyclic permutation of an element of  $\langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ . Then there exists a circular diagram  $\Psi_w^C$  over  $\langle Y_C | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  such that:

- (1)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi_w^C) \equiv w$ (2)  $\operatorname{Area}(\Psi_w^C) \leq \frac{1}{C} \|w\|$ (3) For every positive cell  $\pi$  of  $\Psi_w^C$ ,  $\|\partial \pi\| \leq 2\|w\|$

*Proof.* Since the contour label can be read as a cyclic word, we may assume without loss of generality that  $w \in \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ . Hence, w is a word over  $\mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}^{-1}$ , and so corresponds in the natural way to a non-trivial word u over  $Y \cup Y^{-1}$  with  $||u|| = \frac{1}{C} ||w||$ .

As  $w \in \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_C \rangle \rangle^F$ , it follows that  $u \in \langle \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle \rangle^{F(Y)}$ , so that  $\tilde{\xi}(u) =_R 1$ . So, Lemma 16.1 produces a circular diagram  $\Psi_u$  over  $\langle Y \mid \mathcal{S} \rangle$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Psi_u) \equiv u$ ,  $\text{Area}(\Psi_u) \leq ||u||$ , and every positive cell  $\pi$  of  $\Psi_u$  satisfies  $\|\partial \pi\| \leq 2\|u\|$ .

But then subdividing each edge of  $\Psi_u$  into an F-subpath of length C labelled by the corresponding element of  $\mathcal{D}$  produces a circular diagram  $\Psi_w^C$  over  $\langle Y_C | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  satisfying the statement.

**Lemma 16.3.** Let w be a word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  which represents the identity in  $R_C$ . Then there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi_w$  over  $\langle Y_C \mid \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  such that:

- (1)  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi_w) \equiv w$
- (2) Area $(\Phi_w) \leq \frac{1}{C} \|w\|$
- (3) For every positive cell  $\pi$  of  $\Phi_w$ ,  $\|\partial \pi\| \leq 2\|w\|$

*Proof.* The proof follows induction on ||w||. For the base case ||w|| = 0, there exists a circular diagram  $\Phi_w$  with  $\text{Lab}(\Phi_w) \equiv w$  consisting entirely of 0-cells, and so satisfies the statement. Now assume  $||w|| \ge 1$ .

First, suppose w is not cyclically reduced. This implies that w is freely conjugate to a word z satisfying ||z|| < ||w||. Then, z is a word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  which represents the identity in  $R_C$ , so that the inductive hypothesis may be applied to produce a circular diagram  $\Phi_z$ . Further, since w and z are freely conjugate, there exists an annular diagram over  $\langle Y_C | S_C \rangle$  consisting entirely of 0-cells with outer contour label w and inner contour label  $z^{-1}$ . But then pasting  $\Phi_z$  into the center of this annular diagram produces a circular diagram  $\Phi_w$  satisfying the statement.

Otherwise, Lemma 3.3 implies the existence of a factorization  $w' \equiv uv$  of a cyclic permutation w' of w such that u is a non-trivial cyclic permutation of an element of  $\langle \langle S_C \rangle \rangle^F$ . As such, u must represent the identity in  $R_C$ , and so v must as well.

Lemma 16.2 then implies the existence of a circular diagram  $\Psi_u^C$  over  $\langle Y_C | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Psi_u^C) \equiv u$ ,  $\operatorname{Area}(\Psi_u^C) \leq \frac{1}{C} ||u||$ , and  $||\partial \pi|| \leq 2||u|| \leq 2||w||$  for every positive cell  $\pi$  in  $\Psi_u^C$ . So, if v is trivial, then  $w \equiv u$  and so the statement is satisfied for  $\Phi_w = \Psi_u^C$ .

Conversely, if v is non-trivial, then the inductive hypothesis produces a circular diagram  $\Phi_v$  over  $\langle Y_C | \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Phi_v) \equiv v$ ,  $\text{Area}(\Phi_v) \leq \frac{1}{C} ||v||$ , and  $||\partial \pi|| \leq 2||v|| \leq 2||w||$  for every positive cell  $\pi$  in  $\Phi_v$ . Hence, pasting together  $\Psi_u^C$  and  $\Phi_v$  (and using 0-refinement) yields a circular diagram  $\Phi_w$  satisfying the statement.

Similar to the construction of Section 13, the alphabet  $\mathcal{A}$  is taken to be in bijection with the generating set  $Y_C$ , with  $\zeta : Y_C \to \mathcal{A}$  a fixed bijection. Then, extending  $\zeta$  in the natural way to a bijection  $\tilde{\zeta} : (Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1})^* \to (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^*$ , the language  $\mathcal{L}$  is taken to be  $\tilde{\zeta}(\mathcal{S}_C)$ . Again, since  $\mathcal{S}$  is a recursive subset of  $Y^*$ ,  $\mathcal{L}$  is similarly a recursive subset of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ .

Let  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  be the set of all non-trivial cyclically reduced words over  $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1}$  whose copy over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  is a word which represents the identity in  $R_C$ , i.e

 $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}} = \{ w \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}^{-1})^* \setminus \{1\} : w \text{ is cyclically reduced}, \tilde{\zeta}^{-1}(w) =_{R_C} 1 \}$ 

Then, as in Section 13, Lemma 3.3 implies  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies conditions (L1)-(L5).

Hence, exact analogues of Lemmas 13.1-13.3 imply that the map  $\zeta$  induces a malnormal embedding  $\phi : R_C \to G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . Moreover, repeating the arguments of Sections 14 and 15 implies that  $\psi = \phi \circ \varphi : R \to G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  is a malnormal CEP-embedding such that the restriction of  $|\cdot|_{G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})}$  to R is equivalent to  $|\cdot|_R$ .

Now, letting  $\mathcal{P}$  be the canonical (finite) presentation of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , recall the following definitions:

- Given a word W over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the trivial element of  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , the *area* of W with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$ , denoted  $\operatorname{Area}_{\mathcal{P}}(W)$ , is the minimal area of a circular diagram  $\Delta$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  which satisfies  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W$ .
- The Dehn function of  $\mathcal{P}$  is the function  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}} : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  given by

$$\delta_{\mathcal{P}}(n) = \max\{\operatorname{Area}_{\mathcal{P}}(W) : \|W\| \le n\}$$

The Dehn function of a finite presentation was first introduced by Madlener and Otto in [12] as a useful invariant for studying the group. Indeed, the Dehn function of two finite presentations of quasi-isometric groups are equivalent with respect to the asymptotic equivalence on functions  $\mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  induced by the preorder  $\preccurlyeq$  given by  $f \preccurlyeq g$  if and only if there exists C > 0 such that  $f(n) \leq Cg(Cn) + Cn + C$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . As such, with respect to this equivalence, the Dehn function of a finitely presented group is invariant of the choice of finite presentation.

Among its numerous uses, the Dehn function encodes the decidability of the group's Word problem: A finitely presented group has decidable Word problem if and only if the Dehn function with respect to one of (equivalently, any of) its finite presentations of it is bounded above by (and so equivalent to) a computable function (see Theorem 2.1 of [8]).

Thus, to show that  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  has decidable Word Problem, it suffices to find a computable function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}} \leq f$ .

For this, we begin by justifying the assignments of weights in Section 8.3.

**Lemma 16.4.** For any disk relator W for  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ , there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma_W$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_W) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Area}(\Gamma_W) \leq f_{\mathcal{L}}(||W(2)||)$ .

*Proof.* Let n = ||W(2)||.

If  $W = W_{ac}$ , then a single hub produces a diagram  $\Gamma$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Area}(\Gamma) = 1$ . As n = 2N + 1 in this case,  $f_{\mathcal{L}}(n) \geq 1$ , so that the statement is satisfied for  $\Gamma_W = \Gamma$ .

Otherwise, Lemma 6.20 yields a non-empty reduced computation  $\mathcal{C}: W \equiv W_0 \to \cdots \to W_t \equiv W_{ac}$ of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  accepting W and satisfying  $t \leq c_0 \operatorname{TM}_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 n)^3 + nc_0^n + c_0 n + 2c_0$ . So, the parameter choice  $L >> c_0$  implies  $t \leq h_{\mathcal{L}}(n)$ .

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 8.6, Lemma 7.15 produces a trapezium  $\Gamma'_W$  over the canonical presentation of  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\Gamma'_W)) \equiv W$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\operatorname{top}(\Gamma'_W)) \equiv W_{ac}$
- the sides of  $\Gamma'_W$  are labelled by identical copies of the history of  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- Area $(\Gamma'_W) \leq t \max(||W_0||, \dots, ||W_t||)$

Now, identical to the construction in the proof of Lemma 8.6, gluing the sides of  $\Gamma'_W$  together and pasting a single hub produces a circular diagram  $\Gamma_W$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_W) \equiv W$  and  $\text{Area}(\Gamma_W) = \text{Area}(\Gamma'_W) + 1.$ 

Note that for all  $0 \le i \le t$ , Lemma 6.19 implies  $|W_i|_a \le 4c_0^t LN$ , so that a parameter choice for  $c_0$  implies:

$$||W_i|| \le 4c_0^t LN + |W_i|_q \le 4c_0^t LN + (2N+1)L \le 7c_0^t LN$$

Hence, the parameter choices  $c_1 >> L >> N$  imply:

Area
$$(\Gamma_W) \le t \max(||W_0||, \dots, ||W_t||) + 1 \le 7tc_0^t LN + 1 \le 8LN\chi(t) \le f_{\mathcal{L}}(n)$$

**Lemma 16.5.** For any  $w \in \mathcal{L}$ , there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Sigma_w) \equiv w$ and  $\text{Area}(\Sigma_w) \leq 2f_{\mathcal{L}}(3||w||)$ .

*Proof.* Lemmas 6.3 and 16.4 produce two circular diagrams  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  such that:

- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_1) \equiv I(w)$  and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_1) \leq f_{\mathcal{L}}(||I(w,2)||)$
- $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial\Gamma_2) \equiv J(w)$  and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_2) \leq f_{\mathcal{L}}(\|J(w,2)\|)$

Note that ||I(w,2)|| = ||J(w,2)|| = 2||w|| + (2N+1).

As  $w \in \mathcal{L}$  implies  $||w|| \ge C$ , the parameter choice C >> N implies  $||I(w,2)|| = ||J(w,2)|| \le 3||w||$ .

Hence, as I(w) and J(w) differ only by w, gluing  $\Gamma_2$  to  $\Gamma_1$  along its contour produces a circular diagram  $\Sigma_w$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Sigma_w) \equiv w$  and

$$\operatorname{Area}(\Sigma_w) = \operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_1) + \operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_2) \le 2f_{\mathcal{L}}(3||w||)$$

**Lemma 16.6.** For any  $w \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Gamma_w) \equiv w$ and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_w) \leq \|w\| f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 \|w\|)$ .

Proof. By the definition of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ ,  $v \equiv \tilde{\zeta}^{-1}(w)$  is a word over  $Y_C \cup Y_C^{-1}$  which represents the identity in  $R_C$ . So, Lemma 16.3 produces a circular diagram  $\Phi_v$  over  $\langle Y_C \mid \mathcal{S}_C \rangle$  such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Phi_v) \equiv v$ ,  $\operatorname{Area}(\Phi_v) \leq \frac{1}{C} \|v\| = \frac{1}{C} \|w\|$ , and  $\|\partial \pi\| \leq 2 \|v\| = 2 \|w\|$  for every positive cell  $\pi$ .

Let  $\pi$  be a positive cell of  $\Phi_v$ . Then,  $u \equiv \text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \in \mathcal{S}_C^{\pm 1}$ , so that  $\tilde{\zeta}(u) \in \mathcal{L}^{\pm 1}$ . As a result, Lemma 16.5 produces a circular diagram  $\Sigma_{\pi}$  over the presentation  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Sigma_{\pi}) \equiv \tilde{\zeta}(u)$ and  $\text{Area}(\Sigma_{\pi}) \leq 2f_{\mathcal{L}}(3\|\partial \pi\|)$ . So, noting that  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$  is non-decreasing, then  $\text{Area}(\Sigma_{\pi}) \leq 2f_{\mathcal{L}}(6\|w\|)$ .

Now, consider the diagram  $\Gamma_w$  obtained from  $\Phi_v$  by applying  $\zeta$  to the label of each edge and replacing any positive cell  $\pi$  with the circular diagram  $\Sigma_{\pi}$ . Then,  $\Gamma_w$  is a circular diagram over  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial\Gamma)_w \equiv w$  and

$$\operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_w) = \sum_{\pi} \operatorname{Area}(\Sigma_{\pi}) \le \sum_{\pi} 2f_{\mathcal{L}}(6||w||) \le \frac{2}{C} ||w|| f_{\mathcal{L}}(6||w||)$$

Thus, the statement follows from the parameter choices  $C \ge 2$  and  $c_0 \ge 6$ .

**Lemma 16.7.** For any  $w \in \Omega$ , there exists a circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Gamma_w) \equiv w$ and  $\text{Area}(\Gamma_w) \leq g_{\mathcal{L}}(\|w\|)$ .

Proof. Per the definition of  $\Omega$ , w is a cyclically reduced word over  $(\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{B})^{\pm 1}$  which is freely conjugate to a word  $w' \in \mathcal{E}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}})$ . By Lemma 6.25, there then exists a unique semi-computation  $\mathcal{S}(w'): w' \equiv w_0 \to \cdots \to w_t$  of  $\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}}$  in the 'special' input sector which  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ -accepts w'.

Suppose  $w' \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then, as  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$  consists of cyclically reduced words, w is a cyclic permutation of w'. So, the statement follows from Lemma 16.6 and the definition of  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$ .

Hence, by Lemma 6.25, it suffices to assume that  $w' \in \mathcal{E}_1(\Lambda_1^{\mathcal{A}})$ . In particular, this implies  $\mathcal{S}(w')$  is a non-empty semi-computation.

Lemma 7.9 then provides a semi-trapezium  $\Delta'_w$  over  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  in the 'special' input sector such that  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{bot}(\Delta'_w)) \equiv w'$ ,  $\operatorname{Lab}(\mathbf{top}(\Delta'_w)) \equiv w_t$ , and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Delta'_w) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} ||w_i||$ .

As the sides of any semi-trapezium are labelled by identical copies of the history of the corresponding semi-computation, we may then paste the sides of  $\Delta'_w$  together to form an annular diagram  $\Delta_w$  over the canonical presentation of  $M(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  with outer contour label w', inner contour label  $w_t^{-1}$ , and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Delta_w) = \operatorname{Area}(\Delta'_w)$ .

Since  $w_t \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , we may then paste the diagram  $\Gamma_{w_t}$  arising from Lemma 16.6 into the center of  $\Delta_w$ , producing a circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  over  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Gamma_w) \equiv w$  and

$$\operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_w) = \operatorname{Area}(\Gamma_{w_t}) + \operatorname{Area}(\Delta_w) \le ||w_t|| f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 ||w_t||) + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} ||w_i||$$

Let  $k = ||w_t||$ . By Lemma 5.7, there exist  $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in A_1, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k$ , and  $u_{0,i}, u_{1,i}, \ldots, u_{k,i} \in F(\mathcal{B})$ such that  $w_i \equiv u_{0,i} x_1^{\delta_1} u_{1,i} x_2^{\delta_2} \ldots u_{k-1,0} x_k^{\delta_k} u_{k,i}$  for all  $0 \le i \le t-1$ .

As  $w_t$  is cyclically reduced,  $x_1^{\delta_1} u_{1,0} x_2^{\delta_2} \dots u_{k-1,0} x_k^{\delta_k}$  is a subword of w, i.e  $|w|_{\mathcal{A}} = k$ . In particular, since  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$  is non-decreasing,  $||w_t||f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0||w_t||) \leq ||w||f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0||w||)$ .

For any i, Lemma 6.25 implies:

(1)  $\frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-i-1) \le ||u_{j-1,i}|| + ||u_{j,i}|| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-i-1)$  for any  $j \in \{2, \dots, k-1\}$ (2)  $||u_{0,i}||, ||u_{k,i}|| \le D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-i-1)$ 

If t = 1, then this implies  $||u_{j,0}|| = 0$  for all j, so that  $||w_0|| = |w_0|_{\mathcal{A}} = k = ||w||$ . In particular, Area $(\Gamma_w) \le ||w|| f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 ||w||) + ||w|| \le g_{\mathcal{L}}(||w||)$ .

Otherwise, 
$$\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \|w_i\| = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \left( k + \sum_{j=0}^k \|u_{j,i}\| \right) \le \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} (k + 3D_{\mathcal{A}}ki) \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}kt^2.$$

As  $k \geq C$  by the definition of  $\Lambda^{\mathcal{A}}$ , a parameter choice for C implies there exists  $\ell \in \{2, \ldots, k-1\}$  such that  $x_{\ell-1}^{\delta_{\ell-1}} u_{\ell-1,0} x_{\ell}^{\delta_{\ell}} u_{\ell,0} x_{\ell+1}^{\delta_{\ell+1}}$  is a subword of w. So, as  $D_{\mathcal{A}}$  is dependent on C, a parameter choice for C implies:

$$||w|| \ge k + ||u_{\ell-1,0}|| + ||u_{\ell,0}|| \ge k + \frac{1}{2}D_{\mathcal{A}}(t-1) \ge k + \frac{1}{4}D_{\mathcal{A}}t \ge k+t$$

Hence, the parameter choice  $c_0 >> C$  then yields:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \|w_i\| \le 3D_{\mathcal{A}}kt^2 \le 3c_0kt^2 \le c_0(k+t)^3 \le c_0\|w\|^3$$

Thus, Area $(\Gamma_w) \le ||w|| f_{\mathcal{L}}(c_0 ||w||) + c_0 ||w||^3 = g_{\mathcal{L}}(||w||).$ 

**Lemma 16.8.** For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}}(n) \leq n \left(Kn^{12} + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^9) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^3)\right)$ 

*Proof.* Let  $W_0$  be a word over  $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^{-1}$  which represents the identity in  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  and satisfies  $||W_0|| \leq n$ .

By the analogue of Lemma 13.2 in this setting,  $W_0$  represents the identity in  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$ . As such, there exists a reduced minimal diagram  $\Delta$  over the disk presentation of  $G_{\Omega}(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  satisfying  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W_0$ . So, Lemma 10.32 implies wt $(\Delta) \leq n \left(Kn^{12} + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^9) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^3)\right)$ .

Now, consider the diagram  $\tilde{\Delta}$  constructed as follows:

- Let  $\Pi$  be a disk in  $\Delta$ . Then letting  $\text{Lab}(\partial \Pi) \equiv W$ , replace  $\Pi$  with the circular diagram  $\Gamma_W$  constructed in Lemma 16.4. Note that  $\text{Area}(\Gamma_W) \leq \text{wt}(\Pi)$ .
- Let  $\pi$  be an *a*-cell in  $\Delta$ . Then, letting  $\text{Lab}(\partial \pi) \equiv w$ , replace  $\pi$  with the circular diagram  $\Gamma_w$  constructed in Lemma 16.7. Note that  $\text{Area}(\Gamma_w) \leq \text{wt}(\pi)$ .

Then,  $\Delta$  is a circular diagram over  $\mathcal{P}$  with  $\operatorname{Lab}(\partial \Delta) \equiv W_0$  and  $\operatorname{Area}(\Delta) \leq \operatorname{wt}(\Delta)$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{Area}_{\mathcal{P}}(W_0) \leq n \left(Kn^{12} + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^9) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^3)\right)$ , implying the statement.

Since  $f_{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $g_{\mathcal{L}}$  are computable functions, Lemma 16.8 implies  $\delta_{\mathcal{P}}$  is bounded above by the computable function  $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  given by  $f(n) = n \left( Kn^{12} + g_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^9) + f_{\mathcal{L}}(Kn^3) \right)$ . Thus,  $G(\mathbf{M}^{\mathcal{L}})$  has decidable Word problem, completing the proof of Theorem 1.6.

#### References

- [1] S. Aanderaa. A proof of Higman's embedding theorem using Britton extensions of groups. In Word Problems, volume 71 of Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, pages 1–18. Elsevier, 1973.
- [2] G. Baumslag. Subgroups of finitely presented metabelian groups. Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, 16(1):98–110, 1973.
- [3] J.-C. Birget. Time-complexity of the word problem for semigroups and the higman embedding theorem. *Inter*national Journal of Algebra and Computation, 08, 11 2011.
- [4] J.-C. Birget, A. Yu. Ol'shanskii, E. Rips, and M. V. Sapir. Isoperimetric functions of groups and computational complexity of the word problem. *Annals of Mathematics*, 156, 12 1998.
- [5] W. W. Boone and G. Higman. An algebraic characterization of groups with soluble word problem. Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, 18(1):41–53, 1974.
- [6] B. Chornomaz and F. Wagner. Quasilinear emulation of Turing machines by S-machines, 2023.
- [7] C. R. J. Clapham. An embedding theorem for finitely generated groups. proceedings of the london mathematical society, ser. 3 vol. 17 (1967), pp. 419–430. The Journal of Symbolic Logic, 35(2):340–341, 1970.
- [8] S. M. Gersten. Isoperimetric and Isodiametric Functions of Finite Presentations, pages 79–96. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [9] G. Higman. Subgroups of finitely presented groups. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 262(1311):455–475, 1961.
- [10] ADL (https://mathoverflow.net/users/6503/adl). A malnormal embedding theorem? MathOverflow. URL:https://mathoverflow.net/q/123239 (version: 2013-02-28).
- [11] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp. Combinatorial Group Theory, volume 188. Springer, 1977.
- [12] K. Madlener and F. Otto. Pseudo-natural algorithms for the word problem for finitely presented monoids and groups. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 1(4):383–418, 1985.
- [13] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii. The SQ-universality of hyperbolic groups. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 186(8):1199, 1995.
- [14] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii. Distortion functions for subgroups. Proceedings of the conference on geometric group theory (Canberra, July 1996), 1997.
- [15] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii. On subgroup distortion in finitely presented groups. Sbornik: Mathematics, 188(11), 1997.
- [16] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii. Geometry of Defining Relations in Groups, volume 70. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [17] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii. Polynomially-bounded Dehn functions of groups. Journal of Combinatorial Algebra, 2(4):311–433, 2018.
- [18] A. Yu. Olshanskii. Subgroups of groups finitely presented in burnside varieties. arXiv: Group Theory, 2019.
- [19] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. Length and area functions on groups and quasi-isometric Higman embeddings. International Journal of Algebra and Computation, 11(02):137–170, 2001.
- [20] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. Non-amenable finitely presented torsion-by-cyclic groups. Publications Mathématiques de l'Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques, 96(1):43–169, 2003.
- [21] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. The conjugacy problem and Higman embeddings, volume 170. American Mathematical Soc., 2004.
- [22] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. Groups with small Dehn functions and bipartite chord diagrams. Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA, 16(6):1324–1376, 2006.
- [23] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. Conjugacy problem in groups with quadratic Dehn function. Bulletin of Mathematical Sciences, 10, 11 2019.
- [24] A. Yu. Ol'shanskii and M. V. Sapir. Algorithmic problems in groups with quadratic Dehn function. Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics, 16(4):1289–1339, 2022.
- [25] J. Rotman. An Introduction to the Theory of Groups, volume 148. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [26] M. V. Sapir. Algorithmic and asymptotic properties of groups. International Congress of Mathematicians, ICM 2006, 2, 03 2006.
- [27] M. V. Sapir. Aspherical groups and manifolds with extreme properties. 03 2011.
- [28] M. V. Sapir. Combinatorial algebra: Syntax and semantics. Springer, 2014.
- [29] M. V. Sapir, J.-C. Birget, and E. Rips. Isoperimetric and isodiametric functions of groups. Annals of Mathematics, 156:345–466, 1998.
- [30] M. K. Valiev. On polynomial reducibility of word problem under embedding of recursively presented groups in finitely presented groups. pages 432–438, 1975.
- [31] E. van Kampen. On some lemmas in the theory of groups. American Journal of Mathematics, 55(1):268–273, 1933.
- [32] F. Wagner. Torsion Subgroups of Groups with Quadratic Dehn Function. PhD thesis, Vanderbilt University, 2021.