

## ON THE ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY OF COULHON AND SALOFF-COSTE

BRUNO LUIZ SANTOS CORREIA

ABSTRACT. We improve the isoperimetric inequality of Coulhon and Saloff-Coste following a method of mass transport proposed by Gromov.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The isoperimetric inequality proved in 1993 by Coulhon and Saloff-Coste is related to the growth of finitely generated groups [1, Théorème1, page 295]. Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated group and  $S = \{a_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_m^{\pm 1}\} \subset \Gamma$  a finite symmetric set of generators  $\Gamma$ . The length  $\|g\|$  of an element  $g \in \Gamma$  is the minimal integer  $n$  such that  $g$  can be written as  $g = a_{i_1}^{\epsilon_1} \cdots a_{i_n}^{\epsilon_n}$  with  $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \{-1, +1\}$ .

Let  $e \in \Gamma$  be the identity element and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote by  $B(e, r) := \{g \in \Gamma : \|g\| \leq r\}$  the ball of center  $e$  and radius  $r$ . The growth function of  $\Gamma$  (relative to  $S$ ) is defined by  $\gamma(r) := \text{Card}(B(e, r))$  for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and the inverse growth function is defined by  $\phi_S(v) := \min\{r \in \mathbb{N} : \text{Card}(B(e, r)) > v\}$  for  $v \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The Coulhon Saloff-Coste's inequality [3, Theorem 3.2, page 296] tells us that for an infinite finitely generated group  $\Gamma$ , with  $S$  as above and for all  $D \subset \Gamma$  finite,  $\partial_C D := \{x \in D : \exists s \in S : x \cdot s \in \Gamma \setminus D\}$  we have:

$$\frac{\text{Card}(\partial_C D)}{\text{Card}(D)} \geq \frac{1}{4 \cdot \text{Card}(S) \cdot \phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D))}.$$

This result can be expressed in terms of a slightly different definition of the boundaries. Following [2, page 348] we define the boundary of a finite subset  $D \subset \Gamma$  by  $\partial D := \{a \in \Gamma : \text{dist}(a, D) = 1\}$ . It is straightforward to show that  $|\partial D| \leq |S| \cdot |\partial_C D|$ . Hence the Coulhon Saloff-Coste's inequality is a consequence of the following inequality:

$$\frac{\text{Card}(\partial D)}{\text{Card}(D)} \geq \frac{1}{4 \cdot \phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D))}.$$

The main part of this article focus on improving the last inequality by a factor 2, by following Gromov's idea based on a mass transport method [2, pages 346 - 348].

Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a non trivial finitely generated group with generator  $S = S^{-1}$ ,  $\text{Card}(S) < \infty$ .*

*For all finite non empty subset  $D \subset \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Card}(D) < \frac{\text{Card}(\Gamma)}{2}$ , we have:*

$$\frac{\text{Card}(\partial D)}{\text{Card}(D)} > \frac{1}{2 \cdot \phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D))}.$$

We note that if  $\Gamma$  is infinite then the hypothesis  $\text{Card}(D) < \frac{\text{Card}(\Gamma)}{2}$  is always verified since  $\text{Card}(D) < \infty$ .

The inequality in the Theorem improves the lower bound in [3, Theorem 3.2, page 296] by a factor 2, furthermore the choice of the definition of the boundary  $\partial D = \{a \in \Gamma : \text{dist}(a, D) = 1\}$  allows us to obtain a strict inequality in the previous theorem. However our inequality is not optimal: as an example if we choose  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \pm 1$ , the non strict inequality can be improved by a factor 4.

---

*Date:* February 18, 2022.

## 2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Christophe Pittet, my Master thesis director, for the discussions on the subject, his availability, his advice and his patience. I thank you to Aitor Perez Perez, for discussions on the subject of amenability. I want to thank Grégoire Schneeberger for his carefully reading of the manuscript and his remarks. I want to thank Pierre de la Harpe, for his remarks and clarifications on the subject.

## 3. MASS TRANSPORT ACCORDING TO GROMOV IN A FINITELY GENERATED GROUP

Let  $D \subset \Gamma$  be a finite subset, we transport  $D$  or an element of  $\Gamma$  by left translation. The left translation by  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , is the map  $\delta \mapsto \gamma\delta$ , for any element  $\delta \in D$ . Here  $\Gamma$  is equipped with the metric associated to  $S$ , which is invariant by right multiplication, namely  $\text{dist}_\Gamma(\delta, \gamma \cdot \delta) = \|\delta \cdot (\gamma \cdot \delta)^{-1}\| = \|\gamma\|$ , therefore  $\delta$  is moved by a distance  $\|\gamma\|$  and as we prove in the lemma below, the amount of mass which is transported out of  $D$  does not exceed  $\|\gamma\| \cdot \text{Card}(\partial D)$ . In the following we consider  $d \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ .

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\varphi_d$  be the smoothing of  $\varphi$  by the smoothing kernel:*

$$(1) \quad \text{That is } S(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} & \text{for } \text{dist}(x, y) \leq d, \\ 0 & \text{for } \text{dist}(x, y) > d, \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \Gamma.$$

We define  $\varphi_d$  as:

$$\varphi_d(y) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} S(x, y) \cdot \varphi(x), \text{ for all } \varphi \text{ probability density function.}$$

We compute  $\varphi_d$  according to its definition for  $\varphi := \mathbf{1}_D$  the characteristic function of  $D$ :

$$\varphi_d(y) = \sum_{x \in \Gamma} S(x, y) \cdot \mathbf{1}_D(x) = \sum_{x \in D} S(x, y) = \sum_{x \in D \cap B(y, d)} \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} = \frac{\text{Card}(D \cap B(y, d))}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))}.$$

**Theorem 3.1.** ([2, page 343]) *Let  $\Gamma$  a group finitely generated by  $S = S^{-1}$ ,  $\text{Card}(S) < \infty$ .*

*For all finite subsets  $D \subset \Gamma$ , for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and for  $\varphi := \mathbf{1}_D$  we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} i) \quad \sum_{y \in D} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_d(y)| &= \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \text{Card}(xD \setminus D), \\ ii) \quad \sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D) &= \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \text{Card}(xD \setminus D). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We calculate the following variation:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \in D} |\varphi(y) - \varphi_d(y)| &= \sum_{y \in D} \frac{|\text{Card}(B(e, d)) - \text{Card}(D \cap B(y, d))|}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \\ &= \sum_{y \in D} \frac{\text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus [D \cap B(y, d)])}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \\ &= \sum_{y \in D} \frac{\text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D)}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \\ (2) \quad &= \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D). \end{aligned}$$

Due to the formula (2) it is sufficient to prove *ii*):

$$\sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D) = \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \text{Card}(xD \setminus D) .$$

We notice that for all  $y \in D$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D) &= \text{Card}(\{z \in \Gamma : \text{dist}(y, z) \leq d\} \setminus D) \\ &= \text{Card}(\{z \in \Gamma \setminus D : \text{dist}(y, z) \leq d\}) \\ (3) \quad &= \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma \setminus D}(x \cdot y) \\ &= \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \mathbf{1}_{D^c}(x \cdot y) . \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore for  $x \in \Gamma$  we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Card}(xD \setminus D) &= \text{Card}(\{x \cdot y : y \in D\} \setminus D) \\ &= \text{Card}(\{y \in D : x \cdot y \in \Gamma \setminus D\}) \\ (4) \quad &= \sum_{y \in D} \mathbf{1}_{\Gamma \setminus D}(x \cdot y) \\ &= \sum_{y \in D} \mathbf{1}_{D^c}(x \cdot y) . \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D) \stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{y \in D} \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \mathbf{1}_{D^c}(x \cdot y) = \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \sum_{y \in D} \mathbf{1}_{D^c}(x \cdot y) \stackrel{(4)}{=} \sum_{x \in B(e, d)} \text{Card}(xD \setminus D).$$

□

**Proposition (Half mass transportation) 3.1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finitely generated group and  $S$  a finite symmetric set as above. Let  $D \subset \Gamma$  be non empty and let  $\Gamma$  be non trivial.*

*Assume  $\text{Card}(D) < \frac{\text{Card}(\Gamma)}{2}$ . Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  be minimal such that  $\text{Card}(B(e, d)) > 2 \cdot \text{Card}(D)$ .*

*Then there exists  $x \in B(e, d)$  such that  $\text{Card}(xD \setminus D) > \frac{\text{Card}(D)}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi = \mathbf{1}_D$ . We have:

$$(5) \quad \sum_{y \in D} \underbrace{|\varphi(y) - \varphi_d(y)|}_{=1} > \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{Card}(D).$$

Let  $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $f(x) = \text{Card}(xD \setminus D)$ . We have:

$$\frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \cdot \sum_{y \in B(e, d)} f(y) \stackrel{\text{ii) Lemma above}}{=} \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e, d))} \cdot \sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y, d) \setminus D).$$

Since  $\mu(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e,d))} & \text{if } y \in B(e,d), \\ 0 & \text{if } y \notin B(e,d), \end{cases}$  defines a measure of probability on  $\Gamma$  and since  $f$  is positive we have:

$$\sum_{x \in \Gamma} f(x) \cdot \mu(x) = \sum_{x \in B(e,d)} f(x) \cdot \mu(x) \leq \max_{x \in B(e,d)} f(x) \cdot \sum_{x \in B(e,d)} \mu(x) = \max_{x \in B(e,d)} f(x).$$

Which implies:

$$(6) \quad \exists x \in B(e,d) : f(x) \geq \frac{1}{\text{Card}(B(e,d))} \cdot \sum_{y \in D} \text{Card}(B(y,d) \setminus D).$$

By (5), (6) and (i) Lemma3.1 we obtain that :

$$(7) \quad \text{Card}(xD \setminus D) > \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{Card}(D), \text{ for a } x \in B(e,d).$$

This ends the proof of the Proposition. □

Now we want to show that:

$$d \cdot \text{Card}(\partial D) \geq \text{Card}(xD \setminus D), \text{ for } \|x\| \leq d.$$

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $D \subset \Gamma$  be a finite subset.*

*Let  $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$  such that  $\|\gamma_0\|_S \leq d$ .*

*Let  $\partial D = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : d(\gamma, D) = 1\}$ .*

*Then  $\text{Card}(\gamma_0 D \setminus D) \leq d \cdot \text{Card}(\partial D)$ .*

*Proof.* First choose  $s_1, \dots, s_k \in S$  such that  $\gamma_0 = s_k \cdots s_1$  with  $k = \|\gamma_0\|_S$ .

Let  $x \in \gamma_0 D \setminus D$ . Then  $x = \gamma_0 \omega_x$  with  $\omega_x \in D$ , therefore  $\gamma_0^{-1} \cdot x = \omega_x \in D$ .

We note  $M_x = \max_{1 \leq n \leq k} \{n : s_n \cdot s_{n-1} \cdots s_1 \cdot \omega_x \in \partial D\}$ .

We define

$$f : \gamma_0 D \setminus D \longrightarrow \partial D \\ x \mapsto s_{M_x} \cdot s_{M_x-1} \cdots s_1 \cdot \omega_x,$$

where geometrically  $f(x)$  is the first point of  $\partial D$  that intersect the geodesic path from  $x$  to  $\omega_x$  defined by the choice of  $s_1, \dots, s_k$ . (Remember that our word metric is right invariant). We illustrate geometrically this definition in Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Let us first demonstrate the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $z \in \partial D$ .*



*Then  $\text{Card}(f^{-1}(z)) \leq d$ .*

*Proof.* If  $f^{-1}(z)$  is non empty, we fix  $x \in f^{-1}(z)$  such that  $M_x$  is maximal among the points of  $f^{-1}(z)$ . Let  $y \in f^{-1}(z)$ .

We compare the writing of  $f(x)$  with the one of  $f(y)$

$$x = \gamma_0 \cdot \omega_x$$

$$y = \gamma_0 \cdot \omega_y, \text{ with } \omega_x, \omega_y \in D$$


 FIGURE 1. Geometric representation of the application  $f$ .

 FIGURE 2. Geometric representation allowing to see  $M_x$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(x) = z = f(y) &\Leftrightarrow s_{M_x} \cdot s_{M_x-1} \cdots s_1 \omega_x = z = s_{M_y} \cdot s_{M_y-1} \cdots s_1 \cdot \omega_y \\
 &\text{with } M_x \geq M_y \\
 \underbrace{s_{M_x} \cdot s_{M_x-1} \cdots s_1}_{h} \cdot \underbrace{s_{M_y} \cdots s_1}_{g} \cdot \omega_x &= \underbrace{s_{M_y} \cdots s_1}_{g} \cdot \omega_y \Leftrightarrow hg\omega_x = g\omega_y \\
 &\Leftrightarrow g^{-1}hg\omega_x = \omega_y.
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $y = \gamma_0 \omega_y = \gamma_0 g^{-1} h g \omega_x$  and  $g^{-1} h g$  is completely determined by the value of  $M_y$ . We have  $1 \leq M_y \leq M_x \leq k \leq d$ . Thus we have  $d$  possibilities for  $y$ .

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We consider the application  $f : \gamma_0 D \setminus D \rightarrow \partial D$ . According to the previous result each point of  $\partial D$  has at most  $d$  preimages. Therefore

$$(8) \quad \text{Card}(\gamma_0 D \setminus D) \leq d \cdot \text{Card}(\partial D).$$

This ends the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

As mentioned in the introduction the following theorem is our main result.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a non trivial group finitely generated by  $S = S^{-1}$ ,  $\text{Card}(S) < \infty$ . For all finite non empty subset  $D \subset \Gamma$  such that  $\text{Card}(D) < \frac{\text{Card}(\Gamma)}{2}$ , we have:*

$$\frac{\text{Card}(\partial D)}{\text{Card}(D)} > \frac{1}{2 \cdot \phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D))} .$$

*Proof.* By definition  $\phi_S(v) = \min\{r : \text{Card}(B(e, r)) > v\}$ .

We choose  $d$  minimum such that  $\text{Card}(B(e, d)) > 2 \cdot \text{Card}(D)$ , which means  $\phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D)) = d$ .

Furthermore, applying Proposition 3.1 and Proposition (Half mass transportation), we obtain:  $d \cdot \text{Card}(\partial D) > \frac{\text{Card}(D)}{2}$  therefore

$$\frac{\text{Card}(\partial D)}{\text{Card}(D)} > \frac{1}{2 \cdot d} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot \phi_S(2 \cdot \text{Card}(D))} .$$

This finishes the proof of the theorem. □

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Thierry Coulhon and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Isopérimétrie pour les groupes et les variétés. *Revista Matemática Iberoamericana*, 9(2):293–314, 1993.
- [2] Mikhail Gromov. *Metric structures for Riemannian and non-Riemannian spaces*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [3] Christophe Pittet and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Amenable groups, isoperimetric profiles and random walks. *Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996)*, pages 293–316, 1999.