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Abstract. We show that the semidefinite programs involved in the computer proofs for Kazhdan’s Property (T) satisfy strong duality, and that the dual problem has a geometric interpretation similar to Property (FH). Using SDP duality, we simplify the SDP proof for SL(n, Z) to an almost humanly computable level. We also give a relatively fast SDP proof for Aut(F_n), n ≥ 4.

1. Introduction

Kazhdan’s Property (T) is a strong rigidity property for groups. It has long been studied, and there are various equivalent characterizations of this property, highlighting different aspects (see [2] for a good general reference). According to one common definition, a discrete group Γ, generated by a finite symmetric set \( S = S^{-1} \subset \Gamma \), has Property (T), iff the Laplace operator in the maximal C*-algebra, \( \Delta_S = |S| \cdot 1 - \sum_{s \in S} s \in C_{\text{max}}^*(\Gamma) \), has a spectral gap at zero.

Traditionally, it is difficult to prove that a particular group satisfies Property (T). But in recent years Ozawa’s article [13] has kicked off a new approach to proving Property (T) with the computer. Ozawa showed that if the Laplacian \( \Delta_S \) has a spectral gap, this fact is witnessed in the group algebra \( \mathbb{R}[\Gamma] \). Namely, there exist \( \epsilon > 0 \) and \( w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}[\Gamma] \), such that

\[
\Delta_S^2 - \epsilon \Delta_S = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^* w_i.
\]

Hence, Ozawa observed that computer proofs for Property (T) should be viable.

The first implementation of such a proof was worked out for SL(3, Z) by Netzer and Thom [12] in the framework of semidefinite programs (SDP). Since then the SDP approach has been used in [6] to obtain quantitative results, giving improved estimates of the spectral gap size for various Laplacians of Property (T) groups. It has also been used to prove that the automorphism groups of the free groups, \( \text{Aut}(F_n) \), satisfy Property (T) for \( n \geq 5 \) [8]. Although the groups \( \text{Aut}(F_n) \), \( n \geq 4 \) had long been suspected to satisfy Property (T), the problem of proving this even for large \( n \) had been an important open question. This demonstrates the power of the SDP approach in practice.
From a theoretical standpoint the SDP proofs are remarkable in their mathematical simplicity. The computer finds a witness $\epsilon, w_1, \ldots, w_n$ as in Equation 1.1, and functional calculus suffices to conclude that $\Delta_S$ has the required spectral gap. Furthermore, the only information about the group $\Gamma$ that is used to find the witness is a finite and, in practice, relatively small part of the Cayley graph of $(\Gamma, S)$.

The downside is that even when a witness for Property (T) is found, the computer output consists of seemingly arbitrary numbers that do not allow any further insight into the nature of the group $\Gamma$. Still, we hope that, in the medium term, evidence obtained from the computer proofs can serve as a guide towards a new human way to prove Property (T) for groups such as $\text{Aut}(F_n)$. The present article is meant to be a first step in that direction.

In order to find a Property (T) witness the computer has to compose and then numerically solve a certain semidefinite program. As a special case of a convex program, this boils down to finding the maximum or minimum of some functional over a convex subset of a finite dimensional vector space. For these kinds of problems there exists a notion of a dual problem. We show that the Property (T) SDP can be formulated in such a way that strong duality holds, i.e. the optima of the primal and the dual problem are the same.

Even though the witness can only be obtained from solving the primal SDP, switching back and forth between the primal and the dual perspective can be used to simplify the problem. Furthermore, the dual problem has a geometric interpretation very similar to Property (FH). Recall that Property (FH), which is equivalent to Property (T) for countable discrete groups, says that for any affine representation of $\Gamma$ on a Hilbert space, the orbit of 0 under the action is bounded. Applying strong duality to the Property (T) SDP gives the following dichotomy.

**Theorem 2.10.** Let $\Gamma$ be a discrete group and let $S \subset \Gamma$ be a finite symmetric generating set. Then exactly one of the following is true:

1. there exists a witness $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^* w_i$, $w_i \in \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$, proving Property (T) for $\Gamma$, or
2. there exists a (non-trivial) isometric affine representation $\rho$ of $\Gamma$ on some Hilbert space, such that $\sum_{s \in S} \rho(s)(0) = 0$. In this case $\Gamma$ does not satisfy Property (T).

This also recovers the main result of [13].

We make use of the dual characterization in an attempt to simplify the SDP proof for the groups $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$. While we were not quite able to simplify the SDP to the level of a human proof, we found some relatively simple SDPs that still suffice. For example, after dividing out some symmetry, the SDP proof can be carried out by looking only at the group algebra of the discrete Heisenberg group. This reflects the structure of the usual group presentation for $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$ in terms of elementary matrices. It is also reminiscent of the classical two-step approach to prove Property (T) via relative Property (T) for the pair $(\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathbb{Z}^2, \mathbb{Z}^2))$. 
Even without the simplifications, our SDP proofs for $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ ran significantly faster than the times reported in the literature. This is most likely due to a more efficient implementation of the semidefinite program, which we did by hand instead of using a general purpose toolbox. Taking advantage of this, we proved Property (T) for the group $\text{Aut}(F_4)$. This was the last $\text{Aut}(F_n)$ group for which a proof had still been missing, as it is known that $\text{Aut}(F_n)$ does not satisfy Property (T) for $n \in \{2, 3\}$.

**Theorem 4.2.** The group $\text{Aut}(F_4)$, the automorphism group of the free group over four generators, satisfies Property (T).

We provide the code we wrote to carry out the SDP proof for $\text{Aut}(F_4)$. On the author’s laptop the whole calculation takes about 20 minutes. This should be fast enough that it is viable to experiment with the computer proof, like we did for $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, to obtain guidance towards a human proof in the future.

**2. The dual Property (T) SDP and its geometric interpretation**

**2.1. The primal Property (T) SDP.** We start by recapitulating the setup of the Property (T) semidefinite program from [12]. We will later proceed to use this setup with a small modification, explained at the end of this subsection.

To build the SDP one first fixes a finite subset $E \subset \Gamma$, containing the generating set $S$ and the neutral element. The goal is to find the maximal $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ such that there exist $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$, with support contained in $E$, satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^\ast w_i = \Delta^2 - \epsilon \Delta,$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_S$ is the Laplacian for a fixed symmetric finite generating set $S \subset \Gamma$, as in the introduction. The group $\Gamma$ satisfies Property (T), iff $\epsilon > 0$ can be achieved with $E$ sufficiently large.

The map that sends a formal sum $W = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^\ast w_i \in \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}}(\text{Span}(E))^n$ to the corresponding group algebra element factors through the vector space of real bilinear forms over $\text{Span}(E) \subset \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$, identified via the basis $\{\gamma\}_{\gamma \in E}$ with real symmetric matrices:

$$\{\text{formal sums } \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i^\ast w_i \text{ with all } w_i \text{ supported in } E\} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \mathbb{M}(|E|, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$$

By the spectral theorem, the image of $\Psi$ is exactly the cone of positive semidefinite matrices, $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{M}(|E|, \mathbb{R})$. Therefore, instead of searching for formal sums, we can search for positive semidefinite matrices. Then, the constraint $\Phi \Psi(W) \in \Delta^2 - \mathbb{R} \Delta$ turns into

$$\text{pr}^\bot_\Delta \circ \Phi(\lambda) = \text{pr}^\bot_\Delta(\Delta^2), \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{K},$$

where $\text{pr}^\bot_\Delta : \text{Span}(E) \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} \Delta)^\perp \subset \text{Span}(E^*E)$ is the orthogonal projection. After fixing bases for $\mathbb{M}(|E|, \mathbb{R})$ and $(\mathbb{R} \Delta)^\perp$, we can write the linear map $\text{pr}^\bot_\Delta \circ \Phi$ as a matrix $A$ with
linearly independent row vectors, and \( p_{\Delta}^{\perp}(\Delta^2) \) as a column vector \( c \). When the constraint is met, such that \( \Phi\Psi(W) \) is of the form \( \Delta^2 - \epsilon\Delta \), the value of \( \epsilon \) can then be recovered by

\[
\epsilon - 2|S| = \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot (\Phi(\Psi(W)), \sum_{s \in S} s).
\]

We identify the functional \( \xi \mapsto \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot (\Phi(\xi), \sum_{s \in S} s) \) with an element \( b \in M(|E|, \mathbb{R}) \) via the entrywise scalar product on \( M(|E|, \mathbb{R}) \).

The problem is now in the standard form for semidefinite programs:

\[
(P) \quad \text{maximize} \quad \langle b, \lambda \rangle \quad \text{under constraints} \quad A\lambda = c, \quad \lambda \in K
\]

To prove that \( \Gamma \) has Property (T), we have to achieve \( \langle b, \lambda \rangle > -2|S| \), i.e. \( \epsilon > 0 \). We will call this semidefinite program the primal Property (T) SDP for the group \( \Gamma \) (with generating set \( S \), on the support \( E \)). It can be solved numerically with the computer.

The computer output will be only an approximation to the solution. Building on the following lemma by Ozawa, Netzer and Thom showed how to obtain a true witness. For convenience, we include the argument behind both results.

**Lemma 2.1 (Ozawa [13])**. Let \( I[\Gamma] \subset \mathbb{R}[\Gamma] \) be the augmentation ideal, with the ordering

\[
a \geq b :\iff \exists v_1, \ldots, v_n \in I[\Gamma]: a - b = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i^*v_i.
\]

For every \( x \in I[\Gamma] \) there exists \( M_x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \), such that \( M_x \Delta \geq x \), i.e. \( \Delta \) is an order unit for \( I[\Gamma] \).

**Proof.** Given \( x \in I[\Gamma] \), with support in some ball \( S^m \subset \Gamma \), we first add positive elements of the form \( (2 \cdot 1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^* (2 \cdot 1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \), \( \gamma_1 \in S^1, \gamma_2 \in S^{m-1} \), until \( x \) has non-negative coefficients on \( S^m \setminus S^{m-1} \). Proceeding inductively, we can achieve that the only positive coefficients of \( x \) are over \( S^1 = S \). After further adding positive elements of the form \( (1 - \gamma)^*(1 - \gamma) \), \( \gamma \in \Gamma \), we obtain a positive multiple of the Laplacian, \( M_x \Delta \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.2 (Netzer-Thom [12]).** In the preceding proof an upper bound for \( M_x \) can be given in terms of the support of \( x \) and a bound on the absolute values of its coefficients. Hence, an approximate witness

\[
0 \approx x = (\sum w_i^*w_i) - (\Delta^2 - \epsilon\Delta)
\]

can be turned into the true witness

\[
\Delta^2 - (\epsilon - M_x)\Delta = (\Delta^2 - \epsilon\Delta + x) + (M_x\Delta - x) = (\sum w_i^*w_i) + (M_x\Delta - x) \geq 0,
\]

where \( M_x \to 0 \) as the approximation improves.

Finally, for reasons that will become apparent soon, we make a small adjustment to the setup of [12]. Since the Laplacian belongs to the augmentation ideal of \( \mathbb{R}[\Gamma] \), the same must be true for any witness. Hence, we have the constraint \( \lambda \left( \sum_{\gamma \in E} \gamma \right) = 0 \), which
means that $\lambda$ cannot be strictly positive. We remove this singularity by restricting from the vector space $\text{Span}(E)$ to the codimension-1 subspace $V' = E \cap I[\Gamma]$ of group algebra elements that lie in the augmentation ideal.

Concretely, we fix the basis $\{\gamma - 1\}_{\gamma \in E \setminus \{1\}}$ for $V'$ and identify the bilinear forms on $V'$ with $M(|E| - 1, \mathbb{R})$. Let $I_{V'}: M(|E| - 1, \mathbb{R}) \to M(|E|, \mathbb{R})$ be the embedding that arises from the decomposition $\text{Span}(E) = V' \oplus (V')^\perp$. We define the cone and objective of the restricted SDP as

$$K' = \{ m \in M(|E| - 1, \mathbb{R}) \mid m \geq 0 \}, \quad b' = b \circ I_{V'}.$$

As for the linear constraints, the restricted map $A \circ I_{V'} = pr_{\Delta}^\perp \circ \Phi \circ I_{V'}$ is not surjective because its image is contained in the codimension-1 subspace $I[\Gamma] \cap (\mathbb{R}\Delta)^\perp \cap \text{Span}(E^*E) \subset (\mathbb{R}\Delta)^\perp \cap \text{Span}(E^*E)$. To remedy this, we divide $pr_{\Delta}^\perp(\mathbb{R}1)$ out of the codomain and define the linear constraints by

$$A' = pr_{\mathbb{R}1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\Delta}^\perp \circ \Phi \circ I_{V'}, \quad c' = pr_{\mathbb{R}1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\Delta}(\Delta^2),$$

where $pr_{\mathbb{R}1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\Delta}$ is the orthogonal projection onto $(\mathbb{R}1 \oplus \mathbb{R}\Delta)^\perp \subset \text{Span}(E^*E)$.

### 2.2. The dual Property (T) SDP.

Next, we recapitulate some basic facts about SDP duality and apply them to the Property (T) SDP.

In optimization duality results take different forms depending on the level of generalization. We take the viewpoint of conic programming, which is slightly more general than semidefinite programming in that it allows for the subset $\mathcal{K}$ to be replaced by any convex cone inside a finite dimensional vector space. See [3] for a textbook reference.

**Definition 2.3.** The dual program of Program $P$ is defined as:

$$\text{(D)} \quad \text{minimize } \langle c, x \rangle \quad \text{under constraints } \quad A^T x - b \in \mathcal{K}^*, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^k$$

Here, $A^T$ is the transposed matrix and $\mathcal{K}^*$ denotes the dual of the cone $\mathcal{K}$, that is $\mathcal{K} = \{ \ell: M(|E|, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R} \text{ linear} \mid \ell|_\mathcal{K} \geq 0 \}$. In our case $\mathcal{K}^*$ is identified with $\mathcal{K}$ under the scalar product.

**Remark 2.4.** The apparent asymmetry between the primal and the dual problem is just a matter of notation convention. Indeed, up to a constant summand and a sign the dual takes the same form as the primal problem when we substitute $\mu = A^T x - b$ and express the condition $\mu + b \in \text{Im} A^T$ by a linear equation. The dual of the dual is again the primal SDP. There does not seem to be a clear convention for when the notations of Program $P$ or Program $D$ are used.

In general, it may happen, for both the primal and the dual problem, that the optimal value is only a supremum/infimum that is not attained. Furthermore, it may happen that the problem constraints are not satisfiable. A conic program is called feasible if the affine subspace defined by the linear constraints intersects the cone $\mathcal{K}$, and strictly feasible if it
intersects the cone’s interior. It is bounded if on feasible points the objective is bounded from above (below) in the notation of Program P (Program D).

A simple calculation shows that the objective of any primal feasible point must be less than the objective of any dual feasible point. This is called weak duality. Strong duality holds if no gap exists between the two objectives. A sufficient condition for this is Slater’s constraint qualification:

**Theorem 2.5** ([3, Theorem 2.4.1]). If a conic program is bounded and strictly feasible, then its dual is feasible, attains its optimum, and strong duality holds.

We note that the proof of this fundamental result boils down to a simple application of the hyperplane separation theorem.

We can now apply duality to the restricted Property (T) SDP:

**Lemma 2.6.** Assume that the support $E \subset \Gamma$ contains $\{1\} \cup S$ and is connected in the Cayley graph of $(\Gamma, S)$. Both the restricted Property (T) SDP and its dual are bounded and strictly feasible. Consequently, both the primal and the dual SDP attain their optima, and the values of these optima coincide.

**Proof.** To obtain a strictly feasible point for the primal SDP we start with the identity matrix $I_{|E| - 1} \in M(|E| - 1, \mathbb{R})$ and denote the corresponding group ring element by $x \in I[\Gamma]$. Just as in the proof of Ozawa’s Lemma we obtain an element $\Delta^2 - x + M_{\Delta} \in I[\Gamma]$ that is positive and can even be expressed by a positive semidefinite matrix $Y \in M(|E| - 1, \mathbb{R})$.

The point $1_{|E| - 1} + Y$ is strictly feasible.

For the dual SDP, the point $\hat{x} := -\frac{1}{|S|} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in E^* \setminus (S \cup \{1\})} \gamma$ is strictly feasible because

$$A^T \hat{x} - b' = I_{V'}^T \circ \Phi^T \left( -\frac{1}{|S|} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in E^* \setminus (S \cup \{1\})} \gamma \right) - b'$$

$$= I_{V'}^T \circ \Phi^T \left( -\frac{1}{|S|} \left( \sum_{\gamma \in E^* \setminus (S \cup \{1\})} \gamma \right) - \frac{1}{|S|} \left( \sum_{s \in S} s \right) \right)$$

$$= I_{V'}^T \circ \Phi^T \left( -\frac{1}{|S|} \cdot \sum_{\gamma \in E^* \setminus \{1\}} \gamma \right) + I_{V'}^T \circ \Phi^T \left( \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{\gamma \in E^* \setminus \{1\}} \gamma \right)$$

$$= I_{V'}^T \circ \Phi^T \left( \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot 1 \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot I_{V'}^T (1_{|E|}) \in \mathcal{K}^*.$$

Since both the primal and the dual SDP are feasible, they are also bounded by weak duality. □
Remark 2.7. This result is the reason for our modification to the SDP. Strong duality holds even for the original SDP because its dual is bounded and strictly feasible. But we also want for the dual to attain its optimal objective. Usually this does not happen for the original SDP, as can be seen in the case $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$.

2.3. The geometric interpretation of the dual SDP. The dual SDP has a simple geometric interpretation. The idea is that the feasible points of the dual Property (T) SDP can be interpreted as partially defined functions $\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ of conditionally positive type (see [2, Section I.2.10]). Since we want to take a geometric viewpoint as much as possible, we phrase the result in terms of maps from $E \subset \Gamma$ into a Hilbert space.

Definition 2.8. By a spacial arrangement of $E \subset \Gamma$ we mean a map $\alpha : E \to H$ into a separable Hilbert space that is $\Gamma$-invariant in the sense that

$$|\alpha(\gamma_1) - \alpha(\gamma_2)| = |\alpha(\gamma_1\gamma) - \alpha(\gamma_2)| \quad \forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in E.$$ 

We also impose the normalizing conditions $\alpha(1) = 0$ and

$$\sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(s)|^2 = |S|.$$ 

We say that $\alpha$ is $S$-flat if

$$\sum_{s \in S} \alpha(s) = |S| \cdot \alpha(1) = 0.$$ 

The linear extension of $\alpha$ to $\text{Span}(E) \subset \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$ will also be denoted by $\alpha$.

Lemma 2.9. Let $L$ be the set of spacial arrangements of $E$ modulo isometries on the Hilbert space.

There is a one-to-one correspondence of elements in $L$ and feasible points for the dual restricted Property (T) SDP. For each spacial arrangement $\alpha$ the objective of the corresponding feasible point $x_{[\alpha]}$ is given by

$$\langle c, x_{[\alpha]} \rangle = \frac{2}{|S|} \cdot \left( \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(s)|^2 \right)^2 - 2|S|.$$ 

In particular, the Property (T) SDP for $(\Gamma, S, E)$ cannot find a witness to prove that $\Gamma$ has Property (T), iff $E$ has an $S$-flat spacial arrangement.

Proof. Firstly, the process of restricting the scalar product on $H$ to the subspace $\text{Span}\{\alpha(\gamma) - \alpha(1) \}_{\gamma \in E}$ defines a canonical one-to-one correspondence between $L$ and the set of positive semidefinite bilinear forms on $V'$, which we identified with $K'$, the cone of both the restricted SDP and its dual. The symmetric matrix $\mu_\alpha \in K'$ corresponding to a representation $\alpha$ can be further interpreted as a candidate for a dual feasible point $x$ by the correspondence $x \mapsto \mu_x := \frac{|S|}{2} (A^T x - b') = \frac{|S|}{2} \cdot \tilde{I}_V \Phi^T \left( \left( \text{pr}_{\tilde{E} \oplus \tilde{\Delta}} \right)^T x - \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} s \right)$. 

In order to actually represent a feasible point, $\mu_\alpha$ must be of the form $(\Phi \circ \tilde{I}_V)' \tilde{\pi}$, where $\langle \tilde{\pi}, 1 \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \tilde{\pi}, \Delta \rangle = \frac{|S|}{2} \cdot \langle - \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} s, \Delta \rangle = \frac{|S|}{2}$.
The condition \( \mu_\alpha = (\Phi \circ I_{V'})^T \pi \), \( \langle \pi, 1 \rangle = 0 \) is equivalent to Equation 2.1: The forward implication follows directly from the definition of \( \Phi \). For the backward implication we can compute the coefficients of a suitable \( \pi \) to be \( \langle \pi, 1 \rangle = 0 \), and \( 2\langle \pi, \gamma \rangle = |\alpha(\gamma_1) - \alpha(\gamma_2)|^2 \) for any choice of \( \gamma_2^{-1}\gamma_1 = \gamma \). This is well-defined by Equation 2.1. The resulting bilinear form \((\Phi \circ I_{V'})^T \pi \) produces the correct norms for vectors of the form \((\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\). Since these vectors span \( V' \), it agrees with \( \mu_\alpha \).

With the first conditions satisfied, the remaining condition, \( \langle \pi, \Delta \rangle = \frac{|S|}{2} \), is precisely Equation 2.2, since

\[
\sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(s) - \alpha(1)|^2 = \sum_{s \in S} (1 - s)^T \mu_\alpha (1 - s) \\
= \langle \mu_\alpha, \Psi (\sum_{s \in S} (1 - s)^*(1 - s)) \rangle \\
= \langle (\Phi \circ I_{V'})^T \pi, \Psi (\sum_{s \in S} (1 - s)^*(1 - s)) \rangle \\
= \langle \pi, \Phi \circ I_{V'} \circ \Psi (\sum_{s \in S} (1 - s)^*(1 - s)) \rangle \\
= \langle \pi, 2\Delta \rangle.
\]

For the second part of the statement, we compute

\[
\left| \left( \sum_{s \in S} \alpha(s) \right) - |S| \cdot \alpha(1) \right|^2 = \left( |S| \cdot 1 - \sum_{s \in S} s \right)^* \mu_\alpha \left( |S| \cdot 1 - \sum_{s \in S} s \right) \\
= \langle \pi, \Phi \circ I_{V'} \circ \Psi \left( \left( |S| \cdot 1 - \sum_{s \in S} s \right)^* \left( |S| \cdot 1 - \sum_{s \in S} s \right) \right) \rangle \\
= \langle \pi, \Delta^2 \rangle = \frac{|S|}{2} \cdot \langle (p_{\mathbb{R}^1 \oplus \mathbb{R} \Delta})^T x_{[\alpha]} - \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{s \in S} s, \Delta^2 \rangle \\
= \frac{|S|}{2} \left( \langle x_{[\alpha]}, c \rangle + 2|S| \right). \quad \square
\]

Taking the colimit \( E \to \Gamma \), we obtain:

**Theorem 2.10.** Let \( \Gamma \) be a discrete group and let \( S \subset \Gamma \) be a finite symmetric generating set. Then exactly one of the following is true:

1. there exists a witness \( \sum_{i=1}^n w_i^* w_i \), \( w_i \in \mathbb{R}[\Gamma] \), proving Property (T) for \( \Gamma \), or
2. there exists a (non-trivial) isometric affine representation \( \rho \) of \( \Gamma \) on some Hilbert space, such that \( \sum_{s \in S} \rho(s)(0) = 0 \). In this case \( \Gamma \) does not satisfy Property (T).

**Proof.** Let \( \{1\} \cup S = E_0 \subset E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \ldots \) be an exhaustion of \( \Gamma = \bigcup E_i \) by finite sets, and fix a flag \( \mathbb{R}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \subset \ldots \) in \( \mathcal{H} \). If no witness for Property (T) exists, then by Lemma 2.9 we find for each \( E_i \) an element \( [\alpha_i] \in \mathcal{L} \) such that \( \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_i(s) = |S| \cdot \alpha_i(1) = 0. \)
We choose the representatives $\alpha_i$ such that $\alpha_j(E_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^{|E_i|}$ for all $j > i$, and extend $\alpha_i$ to $\Gamma$ by $\alpha_i(\gamma) = 0$ for $\gamma \notin E_i$.

Now, for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the sequence $(\alpha_i(\gamma))_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is contained in a finite dimensional vector space. Writing $\gamma = s_1 s_2 \ldots s_n$, $s_i \in S$, we see from the triangle inequality that the sequence is bounded by $\alpha_i(\gamma) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |s_1 \ldots s_{j+1} - s_1 \ldots s_j| = \sum_{j=1}^{n} |s_j| \leq n \cdot |S|$. Hence, the sequence $(\alpha_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ has an accumulation point $\alpha$ in the topology of pointwise convergence. If we restrict $\mathcal{H}$ to the closure of $\text{Span}(\alpha(\Gamma))$, then for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$ the map $\alpha(\gamma') \mapsto \alpha(\gamma')$ extends uniquely to an affine isometry $\rho_\gamma : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$. The map $\rho : \gamma \mapsto \rho_\gamma$ is an affine representation of $\Gamma$ and satisfies $\sum_{s \in S} \rho(s)(0) = 0$. It also satisfies the normalizing condition $\sum_{s \in S} |\rho(s)(0) - 0|^2 = |S|$, making it non-trivial.

In the other direction, if Property (T) can be proven for $\Gamma$, then $\Gamma$ has Property (FH), and hence every affine isometric representation $\rho : \Gamma \rightrightarrows \mathcal{H}$ must be bounded. Then, $\rho(\Gamma)(0)$ has a barycenter $\xi$, which has the same distance to all $\rho(\gamma)(0)$. But this means that, for any $S$, $\sum_{s \in S} \rho(s)(0) = \{0\}$ can only hold if $\rho(\Gamma)(0) = \{0\}$, in which case $\rho$ is trivial. \hfill \Box

**Remark 2.11.** The theorem also recovers the main result of [13]. The main ingredient was the duality result Theorem 2.5. The use of the triangle inequality in the above proof, to show $|\alpha_i(\gamma)| \leq n \cdot |S|$ is the “dual version” of the argument behind Ozawa’s Lemma and its quantitative refinement in [12].

From now on we assume the perspective of the dual SDP and ask whether $E$ has an $S$-flat spacial arrangement. This geometric interpretation appears to be much more intuitive than the original SDP. For example, the primal perspective obscures the fact that finite groups satisfy Property (T) – it is non-trivial to find a witness even for $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

Computationally, nothing has changed so far. The easiest way to prove that the dual objective cannot reach a certain value is to find feasible points for its dual, the primal SDP, and apply weak duality. But the geometric picture helps us to simplify the SDP.

**2.4. Simplifying the SDP.** When we ask the binary question whether $E \subset \Gamma$ has $S$-flat spacial arrangements or not, we completely neglect the size of the spectral gap in the case that $\Gamma$ does have Property (T). The upside is that, since we are only interested in contradicting $\sum_{S} \alpha(s) = |S| \cdot \alpha(1)$, we may assume this equation as given and add all its consequences as constraints to the problem.

**Example 2.12.** If for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ it happens that $s\gamma \in E$ for all $s \in S$, we may assume that the position of $\gamma$ is determined by $\alpha(\gamma) = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{S} \alpha(\gamma s)$. If $E = B_r(1)$ is a ball around 1, we can even solve a linear equation system to obtain the position of all $\gamma \in B_{r-1}(1)$ from the positions of the elements in $B_r(1) \setminus B_{r-1}(1)$. For the SDP this means that we drop the subset $B_{r-1}(1)$ from $E$ and formulate all constraints involving its elements in terms of $B_r(1) \setminus B_{r-1}(1)$.

This procedure also induces a simplification on the constraints because the distance $|\alpha(\gamma') - \alpha(\gamma)|$ is now determined by the distances $\{|\alpha(\gamma') - \alpha(\gamma s)|\}_{s \in S}$. For the SDP
this means that we reduce the number of dual variables, i.e. we take a quotient of the codomain of $A$.

Unfortunately, we were unable to bring the above simplification into a more conceptually pleasing form. Also, we did not use it in our own computations, since we did not expect a significant benefit for our choices of $E$. Instead we used the following observation.

**Lemma 2.13.** Let $S \subset \Gamma$ be as before, and let $\alpha: \Gamma \to \mathcal{H}$ be an $S$-flat spacial arrangement.

If $t \in \Gamma$ conjugates $S$ into itself, then the difference $\alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma) \in \mathcal{H}$ does not depend on $\gamma \in \Gamma$. In particular, if $t$ has finite order, $\alpha(\gamma t) = \alpha(\gamma)$.

**Proof.** The idea is that if two sets of points $\{p_i\}, \{q_i\} \subset \mathcal{H}$ satisfy $|p_i - q_i| = 1 \ \forall i$, then the distance between their means is 1 only if $\{q_i\}$ is a translate of $\{p_i\}$. Formally, we can calculate for arbitrary $\gamma \in \Gamma$:

$$|S| \cdot \langle \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma), \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma) \rangle = \langle \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma), \left(\sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma ts)\right) - \left(\sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma s)\right) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma), \left(\sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma st)\right) - \left(\sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma s)\right) \rangle$$

$$= \langle \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma), \sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma st) - \sum_{s \in S} \alpha(\gamma s) \rangle$$

$$\leq \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma)| \cdot |\alpha(\gamma st) - \alpha(\gamma s)|$$

$$= \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma)| \cdot |\alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma)|$$

$$= |S| \cdot \langle \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma), \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma) \rangle$$

Equality must hold, and this can only be the case if $\alpha(\gamma st) - \alpha(\gamma s) = \alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma)$ for all $s \in S$. Since $\gamma$ was arbitrary and $S$ generates $\Gamma$, it follows that the difference $\alpha(\gamma t) - \alpha(\gamma)$ does not depend on $\gamma$.

If $t$ has finite order, $t^n = 1$, then $0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha(t^i) - \alpha(t^{i-1}) = n \cdot (\alpha(t) - \alpha(1))$. \qed

We use Lemma 2.13 to simplify the Property (T) SDP as follows.

**Simplification 1.** We say that two elements $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ represent the same point $[\gamma_1]_{pt} = [\gamma_2]_{pt}$, iff $\gamma_1^* \gamma_2$ lies in the subgroup generated by all finite order elements $t \in \Gamma$ that conjugate $S$ into itself.

In this case we enforce $\alpha(\gamma_1) = \alpha(\gamma_2)$ in the Property (T) SDP. This reduces the number of relevant elements in $E$. Moreover, it forces the distances $|\alpha(\gamma_1)|$ and $|\alpha(\gamma_2)|$ to be equal, reducing the dimension of $\text{Im} A$. 


Remark 2.14. With some care the proof of Lemma 2.13 can be dualized. The corresponding result on the primal side is an explicit procedure that turns a witness for the simplified primal Property (T) SDP,

$$\sum w_i^* w_i \equiv \Delta^2 - \epsilon \Delta \mod \text{Span}({\gamma - \gamma t}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}), \quad t^n = 1, t^* S t = S, \epsilon > 0,$$

into a witness for the original Property (T) SDP, $$\sum (w_i^*)^* w_i^t = \Delta^2 - \epsilon' \Delta,$$ with $$0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon.$$ The dual proof turns out to be somewhat long and technical – even dualizing the triangle inequality requires a quantifier – and so we refrain from including it here.

To illustrate both the geometric picture of the dual SDP and the result of Lemma 2.13, we treat the example of the discrete Heisenberg group. This group appears as a “building block” for the groups $$\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Example 2.15. Let $$\Gamma = H_3(\mathbb{Z}) := \langle e, f, g \mid [e, f] = [f, g] = 1, [e, g] = f \rangle$$ be the Heisenberg group. Since $$\Gamma$$ does not have Property (T), there exist $$\Delta_{S}$$-flat isometric affine representations for all finite symmetric generating sets $$S.$$ But, independent on $$S,$$ all such representations must send $$e$$ and $$g$$ to a translation, and $$f$$ to the identity.

Proof. Let $$\rho$$ be a $$\Delta_{S}$$-flat isometric affine representation, and $$\alpha: \gamma \mapsto \rho(\gamma).0$$ the orbit of the origin. Lemma 2.13 applies to $$t = f,$$ and it follows that $$\alpha(f \gamma) - \alpha(\gamma) = \alpha(g f) - \alpha(\gamma)$$ does not depend on $$\gamma \in \Gamma.$$ Hence, $$f$$ must act as a translation. But for all $$m, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$mn \cdot |\alpha(f)| = |\alpha(f^mn)| = |\alpha([e^m, g^n])| \leq m|\alpha(e)| + m|\alpha(e^{-1})| + n|\alpha(g)| + n|\alpha(g^{-1})|.$$ Letting $$m = n \to \infty,$$ we see that $$f$$ must act trivially. This means that the affine representation factors as the quotient map $$q: \Gamma \to \Gamma/\langle f \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$$ composed with a $$q(S)$$-flat representation of $$\mathbb{Z}^2.$$ Since the images $$q(e)$$ and $$q(g)$$ lie in the center of $$\mathbb{Z}^2,$$ it follows, again by Lemma 2.13, that $$e$$ and $$g$$ must act by a translation. \hfill \Box

Remark 2.16. To show $$\alpha(f) = 0$$ we gave a limit argument, letting $$|E| \to \infty.$$ At least for $$S = \{e^{\pm 1}, f^{\pm 1}, g^{\pm 1}\}$$ one can also use a slightly more involved calculation to carry out the proof on only a small finite set of support $$E.$$

Remark 2.17. We just saw that both $$\mathbb{Z}^n$$ and the Heisenberg group have very few flat affine representations. In general, there are many more, e.g., for the free group $$\Gamma = F_2.$$

In addition to Simplification 1 there is one other simplification that we incorporate in our computations, which has already been carried out in [9]: Let $$\text{Aut}_S(\Gamma) \subset \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$$ denote the – necessarily finite – subgroup of automorphisms that map $$S$$ into itself. Then, since $$\Delta$$ is $$\text{Aut}_S(\Gamma)$$-invariant, every feasible point of the dual SDP can be averaged over $$\text{Aut}_S(\Gamma)$$ to a feasible point with the same objective value. Therefore, we may add the constraint that the distances $$|\alpha(\gamma)|$$ should be $$\text{Aut}_S(\Gamma)$$-invariant. We note that the simplification resulting from Simplification 1 already enforces invariance under all inner automorphisms that fix $$S,$$ and another way to think about this step would be to adjoin the group $$\text{Aut}_S(\Gamma)$$ to $$\Gamma,$$ add it to $$S$$ and then apply Simplification 1.
Simplification 2. We say that two elements $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ represent the same distance $[\gamma_1]_{\text{dst}} = [\gamma_2]_{\text{dst}}$, iff $\eta(\gamma_1)h = \gamma_2^{\pm}1$ for some automorphism $\eta \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ satisfying $\eta(S) = S$, and for some element $h \in \Gamma$ in the subgroup generated by all finite order elements that conjugate $S$ into itself.

In this case we enforce $|\alpha(\gamma_1)| = |\alpha(\gamma_2)|$ in the Property (T) SDP by modding out the distance equivalence relation from the codomain of $A$.

3. Application to $SL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ and $St_n(\mathbb{Z})$

We now discuss the example of the special linear groups $\Gamma = SL_n(\mathbb{Z}), n \geq 3$, arguably the most prominent example for Property (T) groups, from the perspective of the dual SDP.

3.1. Setup. We start by setting up the simplified SDP for $\Gamma = SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ with the generating set $S = \{E_{i,j}\}^{\pm 1}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n}$ containing the elementary matrices and their inverses.

The subgroup $H < GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ generated by the diagonal matrices with entries $\pm 1$ and by the permutation matrices acts on $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ by conjugation. The subgroup that appears in Simplification 1 is precisely $H \cap SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$. The group of those automorphisms of $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ that map $S$ into itself – featured in Simplification 2 – is generated by the conjugations with elements in $H$ and the "exceptional automorphism" $X \mapsto (X^T)^{-1}$. The last automorphism was not considered in [9], most likely because it does not lift to $\text{Aut}(F_n)$.

At this point we note that the Steinberg groups

$$St(n, \mathbb{Z}) = \langle \{E_{i,j}\}^{1}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \mid [E_{i,j}, E_{j,k}] = E_{i,k} \forall i \neq k; [E_{i,j}, E_{k,l}] = 1 \forall i \neq l, j \neq k \rangle$$

give the exact same SDP as $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ because Lemma 2.13 applies to the non-trivial element in $\ker(St(3, \mathbb{Z}) \to SL(3, \mathbb{Z}))$ (see [10, §10]). Hence, all SDP proofs work for both $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ and $St(n, \mathbb{Z})$. Similarly, the general linear groups $GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ give the same SDP if one starts with an appropriate generating set $S$.

As a consequence of the second simplification, all generators are forced have the same distance to $\mathbf{1}$ in each spatial arrangement of $\Gamma$. The normalizing condition Equation 2.2 becomes $|S| = \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(s)|^2 = |S| \cdot |\alpha(E_{1,2})|^2$, or $|\alpha(E_{1,2})| = 1$. The objective that the arrangement is $S$-flat can be slightly rephrased as

$$0 = \sum_{i \neq j} \alpha(\Delta_{i,j}),$$

where $\Delta_{i,j} = 4 \cdot \mathbf{1} - E_{i,j} - E_{i,j}^* - E_{j,i} - E_{j,i}^* \in \mathbb{R}[\Gamma]$ is the Laplacian for the subgroup $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong \langle E_{i,j}, E_{j,i} \rangle < \Gamma$.

We recall that all scalar products $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle, \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$, can be expressed in terms of the distances $\{|\alpha(\gamma)|^2\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ by

$$2\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle = -|\alpha(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)|^2 + |\alpha(\gamma_1)|^2 + |\alpha(\gamma_2)|^2 = |\alpha(\gamma_1)|^2 + |\alpha(\gamma_2)|^2 - |\alpha(\gamma_1^* \gamma_2)|^2,$$
and scalar products between elements in $\text{Span}(E)$ can be linearly expanded and then expressed as above. For $i, j, k, l$ pairwise distinct, the scalar product

$$\langle \alpha(\Delta_{i,j}), \alpha(\Delta_{k,l}) \rangle = 32 \cdot |\alpha(E_{1,2})|^2 - 16 \cdot |\alpha(E_{i,j}E_{k,l})|^2$$

$$= \langle \alpha(1 + E_{i,j}E_{k,l} - E_{i,j} - E_{k,l}), \alpha(1 + E_{i,j}E_{k,l} - E_{i,j} - E_{k,l}) \rangle$$

is non-negative. If we can show that the scalar products, $\langle \alpha(\Delta_{i,j}), \alpha(\Delta_{j,k}) \rangle$, are strictly positive, i.e.

$$(3.2) \quad 0 < \langle \alpha(\Delta_{i,j}), \alpha(\Delta_{j,k}) \rangle = 32 - 8 \cdot |\alpha(E_{1,2}E_{2,3})|^2 - 8 \cdot |\alpha(E_{1,2}E_{3,2})|^2,$$

then Equation 3.1 cannot possibly hold and we have proven Property (T). To obtain a computer proof for Equation 3.2, one simply replaces the dual objective of the SDP, $c = pr_{\frac{1}{2}1 + \Delta}(\Delta^2) = \sum_{s,s' \in S} s^*s' \in \mathbb{R}[\Delta]/\sim_{dst}$, by $[E_{1,2}E_{1,3}] + [E_{1,2}E_{2,3}]$, and asks the computer for a primal feasible point showing that the dual objective is $< 4$. The analog of this argument on the primal SDP side is precisely the idea at the heart of [9]. The authors proceeded to prove Equation 3.2 with the computer, proving Property (T) for all $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, $n \geq 3$. The computation works even with the supporting set $E$ of the SDP contained in $\text{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z}) < \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$.

Even though we came from a slightly different perspective, the SDP we obtained is very similar to that of [9]. The most noticeable consequence of the simplification from Lemma 2.13 is that we enforce $\alpha(E_{i,j}E_{j,i}^*) = \alpha(E_{j,i})$ and $\alpha(E_{i,j}^*E_{j,i}) = \alpha(E_{j,i}^*)$. From now on we consider the task of proving Equation 3.2 for $\Gamma = \text{SL}(3, \mathbb{Z})$. For convenience we write $S = \{ e^{\pm 1}, e^{\pm 1}, f^{\pm 1}, f^{\pm 1}, g^{\pm 1}, g^{\pm 1} \}$, where

$$e = E_{1,2}, \quad f = E_{1,3}, \quad g = E_{2,3},$$

$$\bar{e} = E_{2,1}, \quad \bar{f} = E_{3,1}, \quad \bar{g} = E_{3,2}.$$  

For the supporting set $E$ we lift the restriction $S \cup \{ 1 \} \subset E$, made in the previous section, and allow all supports on which the normalizing condition and the objective of the simplified SDP can be expressed, i.e. where $[e]_{dst}, [ef]_{dst}, [eg]_{dst} \in E^*E/\sim_{dst}$.

### 3.2. Observations.

Our investigation of the geometry of the Property (T) SDP for $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ led to the following observations:

1. Simple geometric calculations suffice to prove bounds for $|\alpha(ef)|^2$ and $|\alpha(eg)|^2$ that are already quite close to those required for proving Property (T): The left diagram in Figure 1 shows that $|\alpha(ef)|^2$ is strictly less than 2. In fact, it leads to the bound $|\alpha(ef)|^2 \leq \text{largest root of } 2x^3 - 2x^2 - 4x + 1 \approx 1.91$. The right diagram in Figure 1 leads, via a straightforward calculation, to the bound $|\alpha(eg)|^2 \leq 1 + \frac{x^2}{2} \cdot |\alpha(ef)|^2$.

2. It is comparatively easy to show that $|\alpha(\Delta_{i,j})| > 0$, where $\Delta_{i,j} = 4 \cdot 1 - E_{i,j} - E_{i,j}^* - E_{j,i} - E_{j,i}^*$ as before. Indeed, if we assume $|\alpha(\Delta_{i,j})| = 0$, we can simplify the
Figure 1. The spatial arrangements of the sets of group elements \( \{1, e, f, g, fg\} \) and \( \{1, e, \bar{e}, f, ef, f\bar{e}\} \) involve only three distances: \( |\alpha(e)| = 1 \) (solid), \( |\alpha(ef)| \) (dashed), and \( |\alpha(eg)| \) (dotted).

SDP like in Example 2.12, drastically reducing the number of occurring distances even for larger supporting sets \( E \).

(3) The inequality \( 0 \leq |\alpha(e + e^* + \bar{f} + f^* + g + g^*) - \alpha(\bar{e} + e^* + f + f^* + \bar{g} + g^*)|^2 \) shows that \( 4 \cdot (|\alpha(eg)|^2 - |\alpha(ef)|^2) \leq 1 + |\alpha(e\bar{e})|^2 - |\alpha(ef)|^2. \) Empirically, the inequality usually becomes an equality for the computer calculated optimal solutions, which suggests that this constraint is highly relevant.

We did not find a viable way to prove better bounds than \( |\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < \approx 4.06 \) by hand. Still, empirical evidence from computer calculations shows that only slightly more complicated SDPs suffice to prove Property (T):

(4) The smallest set of points on which we were able to prove \( |\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4 \) is \( \{1, e, f, g, f^*, e^*, ef, e^*f, fg, eg, \bar{e}f, \bar{f}g, \bar{f}g^*, fe, fg, f\bar{e}, \bar{g}e, f\bar{e}^*\} \). The SDP involves 19 points, 10 differences and Observation 3. To find this set of points, we looked at an optimal dual solution for a large number of points and searched for subsets where the maximal distance between two points was bounded by a chosen value.

(5) Having more points does not necessarily make the SDP more complex if there is some symmetry. This idea has already been explored in [9] for the special case of the group \( H \cap \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \) acting by left-multiplication. But other (finite) symmetry groups are also interesting. One example is shown in Figure 2. This point set is symmetric under the dihedral group \( D_{12} \), generated by

\[
X \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot (X^T)^{-1} \] (rotation) and \( X \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot X \) (reflection)

Note that \( 4 - |\alpha(ef)|^2 - |\alpha(eg)|^2 = 2 \cdot \langle \alpha(g), \alpha(f + \bar{f}) \rangle \).

As our set of points we consider the \( D_{12}\)-orbit of the linear combination \( \alpha(g + f + \bar{f}) \), and this time we assume that \( \alpha(1 + f + \bar{f}) \) lies in the origin instead of \( \alpha(1) \). Since the irreducible (complex) representations of \( D_{12} \) have dimension \( \leq 2 \), the resulting SDP is relatively simple. Unfortunately, it is not quite enough
Figure 2. This set of points is symmetric under the dihedral group $D_{12}$. Solid lines denote the unit distance.

to prove Property (T). But when we add an additional point, e.g. $\bar{g}e + \bar{g}e + f + \bar{f}$, and use Observation 3, this is enough to show $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$.

(6) When we consider the task of arranging multiple sets of points simultaneously, while disregarding all distances between points from different sets, we obtain an SDP where the semidefinite variable $\lambda$ is the direct sum of the semidefinite variables for the individual point sets. We applied this strategy to point sets similar as in Observation 5 and were able to show $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$ with an SDP where the semidefinite variable is a sum of matrices of size $\leq 2$. From the dual perspective this means that $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$ can be shown by applying the triangle inequality (and semidefiniteness of the norm) to certain meaningful linear combinations of group elements.

(7) Using SDPLR \[5\] we found a feasible primal point that proves $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$ and is a matrix of only rank 1. The point set was $S^2$, but smaller sets suffice. Rank 1 solutions also exist if we only use Simplification 2. In the dual perspective this means that $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$ can be shown by looking at the norm of a single linear combination $\xi \in \mathbb{R}[SL(3,\mathbb{Z})]$. There did not appear to be a visible pattern in the coefficients of $\xi$.

(8) To prove $|\alpha(ef)|^2 + |\alpha(eg)|^2 < 4$ one can also take a point set that is a subset of the Heisenberg group $H_3 < SL(3,\mathbb{Z})$. For example, it is sufficient to look at the points $\{a^ib^jc^k \mid a \in \{0,1,2,3,4\}, b \in \{0,1,2,3\}, c \in \{0,1\}\}$. Therefore, just as St$(n,\mathbb{Z})$ can be thought of as a number of Heisenberg groups glued together in a symmetric way, the SDP proof can be carried out in $H_3$ after the symmetry is divided out via the simplifications. This observation is also reminiscent of how Property (T) can be proved for $SL(n,\mathbb{Z})$ via relative Property (T) for $(SL(2,\mathbb{Z}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}^2, \mathbb{Z}^2)$.

### 3.3. Connection to Harper’s operator

Motivated by Observation 8 and the estimate for $|\alpha(eg)|^2$ in Observation 1 one may try to find an upper bound for $|\alpha(ef)|^2$ by
looking at only the Heisenberg group. Taking the primal perspective, we then search for
\(\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \eta_1 \geq 1\), such that
\[
T := (e + e^* + g + g^*)(f + f^*) - 8 - 2\eta_1(e + e^* + g + g^* - 4) - 4\eta_2(f + f^* - 2) \in C^*(H_3)
\]
is a positive operator and \(\eta_1 + \eta_2\) is minimal (here we make use of \(|\alpha(f)| = |\alpha(e)|\), but not of \(|\alpha(e^j f^k)| = |\alpha(e^{j+k})|\)). The operator \(T\) is positive, iff its images are positive under the family of \(C^*\)-homomorphisms \(\pi_\theta: C^*(H_3) \to B(L^2(\mathbb{Z})), \theta \in [0,1]\), that map \(e\) to the shift operator \(S\), \(f\) to \(\exp(2\pi i\theta) \cdot 1\), and \(g\) to multiplication with the function \(\exp(2\pi i\theta)\).

Thus, the condition that \(T\) is positive is equivalent to
\[
\forall \theta: H_\theta := S + S^* + 2\cos(2\pi \theta) \cdot 1 \leq \frac{4(\mu_1 + \mu_2 - 1) - 4\mu_2 \cos \theta}{\mu_1 - \cos \theta} \cdot 1
\]
The operator \(H_\theta\) is Harper’s operator, a special case of the almost Mathieu operator, which has been much studied in physics. The Hofstadter butterfly arises from plotting its spectrum for rational values of \(\theta\). In [1] a norm estimate of \(H_\theta\) is used to establish the spectrum of the random walk operator for \(H_3\) with generating set \(\{e^\pm 1, f^\pm 1, g^\pm 1\}\). In [4] it is proved that \(\|H_\theta\| \leq 2\sqrt{2}\) for \(\theta \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}]\), and for \(\theta \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]\) the bound
\[
\|H_\theta\| \leq \sqrt{8 + 8(\cos \pi \theta - \sin \pi \theta)} \cos \pi \theta
\]
is proved. It turns out that these bounds do not help with the Property (T) SDP. Instead, even simple SDPs produce bounds that are better than Equation 3.3 on some interval.

For example, we may take the SDP used to bound \(|\alpha(ef)|^2\) in Observation 1 and consider the primal feasible point \(0 \leq (e+2f+2g-2fg-3\cdot 1)^*(e+2f+2g-2fg-3\cdot 1)\) (the coefficients of the optimal primal solution are slightly more complicated). By averaging this equation over the automorphisms of \(H_3\) that map \(\{e^\pm 1, g^\pm 1\}\) into itself, and applying the homomorphisms \(\pi_\theta\), we get
\[
\forall \theta: \|H_\theta\| \leq \frac{44 - 40 \cdot \cos 2\pi \theta}{13 - 12 \cdot \cos 2\pi \theta},
\]
which improves upon Equation 3.3 on the interval from \(\theta \approx 0.025\) to \(\theta \approx 0.119\).

In theory, of course, appropriate SDPs – not necessarily of the Property (T) kind – can be used to obtain non-exact but arbitrarily precise bounds for \(\|H_\theta\|\).

4. Application to \(\text{Aut}(F_n)\)

For \(\Gamma = \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\) the SDPs resulting from our setup in section 2 were solved by the computer in a relatively short time. We made use of this efficiency by applying the same algorithms to the automorphism groups of the free groups \(F_n = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle\) for \(n \geq 4\). The mathematical setup is very similar to that in [9]. Instead of the full group \(\text{Aut}(F_n)\) we take the subgroup \(\Gamma = \text{SAut}(F_n)\), the preimage of \(\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\) under the canonical homomorphism \(q: \text{Aut}(F_n) \to \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\). Since \(\text{SAut}(F_n) < \text{Aut}(F_n)\) is a finite index subgroup, it suffices to prove Property (T) for \(\text{SAut}(F_n)\). As the generating set we take \(S = \{E_{f_i^{\pm 1}, f_j^{\mp 1}}\}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n},\)
where $E_{f,f'}$ denotes the Nielsen map that sends $f$ to $ff'$ and leaves all other generators in $S \setminus \{f^{\pm 1}\}$ unchanged.

All the automorphisms of $\Gamma$ that fix $S$ are given by conjugation by elements in the subgroup $H < \text{Aut}(F_n)$ generated by the diagonal automorphisms ($f_i \mapsto f_i^{\pm 1}$) and the permutations of the set $\{f_i\}$. The subgroup appearing in Simplification 1 is $H \cap \text{SAut}(F_n)$.

As a consequence of Simplification 2 all generators $E_{f_i^{\pm 1}, f_j^{\pm 1}}$ are forced to have the same distance to 1 in each spacial arrangement of $\Gamma$, and so the normalizing condition Equation 2.2 becomes $|\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2})| = 1$. The objective that the arrangement is $S$-flat becomes

\[(4.1)\]

\[
0 = \frac{2}{|S|} \cdot \langle \alpha \left( \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot \mathbf{1} - \sum_{s \in S} s \right), \alpha \left( \frac{1}{|S|} \cdot \mathbf{1} - \sum_{s \in S} s \right) \rangle 
- \frac{1}{|S|} \left( 2|S|^2 - \sum_{s,s' \in S} |\alpha(s^s')|^2 \right) 
- \sum_{s \in S} |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}s)|^2 + 2|S| 
- 1 \cdot (|\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1,f_2})|^2 + 0 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1^{-1},f_2})|^2 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1^{-1},f_2^{-1}})|^2 
+ |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1^{-1},f_2})|^2 + 1 + 2 \cdot |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_2,f_1})|^2) 
\]

\[= 2(n-2) \cdot (2 \cdot |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_2,f_3})|^2 + 0 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_3,f_1})|^2 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1,f_3})|^2 
+ |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_3,f_2})|^2 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1^{-1},f_2})|^2 + |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_1^{-1},f_2^{-1}})|^2) 
\]

\[-4(n-2)(n-3) \cdot |\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_3,f_4})|^2 + 8n(n-1). \]

We attach the annotated source code of a Java program that produces the Property (T) SDP for the group $\text{SAut}(F_4)$. The program is optimized to be memory-efficient so as to be able to deal with large sets of points in $\text{SAut}(F_4)$: In order to obtain the point- and distance equivalence classes of individual group elements it finds a canonical representative by direct computation instead of using a large hash table. Also, the matrix $A$ of the SDP is not kept in memory but written to disk as it is computed.

We also attach an annotated MATLAB script that solves the SDP and verifies the solution. The SDP solver used is SeDuMi [14]. To speed up the computation we made use of the fact that the symmetry group $H$ acts on our chosen set of points $E \subset \Gamma$, exactly as already done in [9]. (This is the special case mentioned in Observation 5.)

The estimate that the numerical solution is close enough to an actual solution to prove Property (T) is done as in [12] (see Corollary 2.2), but with a slightly better estimate: The estimate of Netzer and Thom corresponds in the dual SDP perspective to an iterated triangle inequality showing $|\alpha(\gamma)| \leq 2^n$ for $\gamma \in S^{2^n}$, while we use $|\alpha(\gamma)| \leq n$ for $\gamma \in S^n$. Explicitly, for $\gamma = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \in S^6$, $\gamma_1 \in S^2$, $\gamma_2 \in S^4$, we use multiples of

\[(4.2)\]

\[0 \leq (3 \cdot 1 - 2\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^*(3 \cdot 1 - 2\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \]
instead of \((2 \cdot 1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2)^* (2 \cdot 1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2)\) in the proof of Lemma 2.1. To deal with rounding errors during verification we compute an upper bound for the error, assuming that the hardware complies with the IEEE 754 standard. For the reader wary of floating point hardware we also include a check with integer arithmetic.

**Remark 4.1.** SeDuMi uses a different notation convention for SDPs than [3]:

\begin{equation}
\text{minimize } \langle c, x \rangle \text{ under constraints } Ax = b, \lambda \in K
\end{equation}

The data called \((A, b, c)\) in 4.3 is called \((A, -b, c)\) in our own code, and \((-A, -c, -b)\) in this article. In order to prove Property (T) for SAut\((F_n)\), SeDuMi should find a solution with objective \(< 2|S| - 1\). The difference in sign also effects the verification step: The estimates of Lemma 2.1 and Equation 4.2 must be used on coefficients that are too large rather than too small.

After some experimenting we found for \(n = 4\) a subset \(E \subset S^3 \subset \text{SAut}(F_4)\) – only slightly larger than \(S^2\) – such that the points of \(E\) suffice to prove Property (T).

**Theorem 4.2.** The group \(\text{Aut}(F_4)\) satisfies Property (T). □

**Remark 4.3.** On the author’s laptop the computation takes a total time of around 20 minutes, most of which goes into solving the SDP. We expect similar times if instead of SeDuMi another SDP solver is used that uses the interior-point method. MOSEK [11] appeared to be faster on first sight but returned solutions that severely violate the constraints, indicating numerical problems. If one wants to make use of more powerful hardware, it would be crucial that the SDP solver supports parallelization.

**Remark 4.4.** The same program can also be used to prove Property (T) for all \(\text{Aut}(F_n)\), \(n \geq 4\) in about the same time. To do this for an individual \(n\), one only has to change the objective (called \(b\) in our code) and the target value according to Equation 4.1. To prove Property (T) for all \(n \geq 6\) simultaneously, one takes as objective the difference in Equation 4.1 for \(n = 6\) and \(n = 5\), and uses the estimate \(|\alpha(E_{f_1,f_2}E_{f_3,f_4})|^2 \leq 2\). This strategy was first employed in [8].

Due to the short computing time needed for our version of the SDP, we think it reasonable to collect some empirical data on the SDP Property (T) proofs for \(\text{SAut}(F_n)\), similarly to how we did for \(\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\). For example, since the presentation of \(\text{SAut}(F_n)\) with generating set \(S\) is very similar to \(\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\) (see [7]), we can ask for an analog of Observation 8. The author did not try this, and the attached code in its current form requires that the set of points is invariant under the full symmetry group \(H\).

**Question 4.5.** We ask for a “small” subgroup \(\pi < \text{Aut}(F_4)\) such that Property (T) can be proven for \(\text{Aut}(F_n)\) by solving the simplified Property (T) SDP for a point set \(E\) that is contained in \(\pi\).
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