

# A new computable version of Hall's Harem Theorem

Karol Duda

## Abstract

We prove a new computable version of Hall's Harem theorem. We apply it to non-amenable computable coarse spaces.

## 1 Introduction

The Hall's Harem theorem describes a condition which is equivalent to the existence of a perfect  $(1, k)$ -matching of a bipartite graph, see Theorem H.4.2. in [1]. One of the applications of this theorem belongs to amenability. In [2] we found a computable version of Hall's Harem theorem and presented some applications of it to effective amenability. In this paper, we introduce a modification of the previous construction, allowing us to find a computable matching with some additional properties. We give an application of this new version of the construction to non-amenable coarse spaces. In particular, we obtain computable versions of Schneider's results on the existence of  $d$ -regular forests [3].

To introduce the reader to the subject we recall Hall's Harem theorem. We begin with some necessary definitions from graph theory. We mostly follow the notation of [1]. A symmetric graph  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  is called a *bipartite graph* if the set of vertices  $V$  is partitioned into sets  $A$  and  $B$  in such a way, that the set of edges  $E$  is a subset of  $A \times B$ . We denote such a bipartite graph by  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$ . From now on we concentrate on bipartite graphs. Although our definitions concern this case, they usually have obvious extensions to all ordinary graphs. Let  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$ . We will say that an edge  $(a, b)$  is *adjacent* to vertices  $a$  and  $b$ . In this case we say that  $a$  and  $b$  are adjacent too. When two edges  $(a, b), (a', b') \in E$  have a common adjacent vertex we say that  $(a, b), (a', b')$  are also *adjacent*. A sequence  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  is called a *path* if each pair  $a_i, a_{i+1}$  is adjacent,  $1 \leq i < n$ .

Given a vertex  $x \in A \cup B$  the *neighbourhood* of  $x$  is a set

$$N_\Gamma(x) = \{y \in A \cup B : (x, y) \in E\}.$$

For subsets  $X \subset A$  and  $Y \subset B$ , we define the neighbourhood  $N_\Gamma(X)$  of  $X$  and the neighbourhood  $N_\Gamma(Y)$  of  $Y$  by

$$N_\Gamma(X) = \bigcup_{x \in X} N_\Gamma(x) \text{ and } N_\Gamma(Y) = \bigcup_{y \in Y} N_\Gamma(y).$$

The subscript  $\Gamma$  if it is clear from the context.

Within this paper we always assume that  $\Gamma$  is *locally finite*, i.e. the set  $N(x)$  is finite for all  $x \in A \cup B$ . The subset  $X$  of  $A$  (resp. of  $B$ ) is called *connected* if for all  $x, x' \in X$  there exist a path  $x = p_0, p_1, \dots, p_k = x'$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $p_i \in X \cup N_\Gamma(X)$  for all  $i \leq k$ . For a given vertex  $v$  a *star* of  $v$  is a subgraph  $S = (V', E')$  of  $\Gamma$ , with  $V' = \{v\} \cup N_\Gamma(v)$  and  $E' = (V' \times V') \cap E$ .

**Definition 1.1.** A *perfect*  $(1, k)$ -matching from  $A$  to  $B$  is a set  $M \subset E$  satisfying following conditions:

- (1) for all  $a \in A$  there exists exactly  $k$  vertices  $b_1, \dots, b_k \in B$  such that  $(a, b_1), \dots, (a, b_k) \in M$ ;
- (2) for all  $b \in B$  there is a unique vertex  $a \in A$  such that  $(a, b) \in M$ .

**Theorem 1** (Hall's Harem theorem). *Let  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  be a locally finite graph and let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $k \geq 1$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) For all finite subsets  $X \subset A$ ,  $Y \subset B$  the following inequalities holds:  $|N(X)| \geq k|X|$ ,  $|N(Y)| \geq \frac{1}{k}|Y|$ .
- (ii)  $\Gamma$  has a perfect  $(1, k)$ -matching.

The first condition in this formulation is known as *Hall's  $k$ -harem condition*.

Given a  $(1, k)$ -matching  $M$  and a vertex  $a \in A$  the  $M$ -star of  $a$  is a graph consisting of the set of all vertices and edges adjacent to  $a$  in  $M$ .

**Definition 1.2.** A graph  $\Gamma$  is *computable* if there exists a bijective function  $\nu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V$  such that the set

$$R := \{(i, j) : (\nu(i), \nu(j)) \in E\}$$

is computable. A locally finite graph  $\Gamma$  is called *highly computable* if additionally there is a recursive function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f(n) = |N_\Gamma(\nu(n))|$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 1.3.** A bipartite graph  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  is *computably bipartite* if  $\Gamma$  is computable and the set of  $\nu$ -numbers of  $A$  is computable.

To simplify the matter below we will always identify  $A$  and  $B$  with computable subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$  so that  $\nu$  is the identity map. Thus  $A$  (resp.  $B$ ) will be taken from the left copy of  $\mathbb{N}$  (resp. the right one).

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  be a computably bipartite graph. A perfect  $(1, k)$ -matching  $M$  from  $A$  to  $B$  is called a *computable perfect  $(1, k)$ -matching* if  $M$  is a computable set of pairs.

Observe that computable perfectness exactly means that there is an algorithm which

- for each  $i \in A$ , finds the tuple  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$  such that  $(i, i_j) \in M$ , for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ;
- when  $i \in B$  it finds  $i' \in A$  such that  $(i', i) \in M$ .

In [2] we introduced the following condition, which implies the existence of computable perfect  $(1, k)$ -matchings in highly computable bipartite graphs.

**Definition 1.** A bipartite graph  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  satisfies the *computable expanding Hall's harem condition with respect to  $k$*  (denoted *c.e.H.h.c.( $k$ )*), if and only if there is a total computable function  $h : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that:

- $h(0) = 0$
- for all finite sets  $X \subset A$ , the inequality  $h(n) \leq |X|$  implies  $n \leq |N(X)| - k|X|$
- for all finite sets  $Y \subset B$ , the inequality  $h(n) \leq |Y|$  implies  $n \leq |N(Y)| - \frac{1}{k}|Y|$ .

In [2] we have proven the following computable version of Hall's Harem theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  is a highly computable bipartite graph satisfying the c.e.H.h.c.( $k$ ), then  $\Gamma$  has a computable perfect  $(1, k)$ -matching.*

## 2 A computable version of Hall's harem Theorem

In this section we show that in the case of 'symmetric bipartite graphs' the condition *c.e.H.h.c.( $k$ )* allows us to force some additional properties at the expense of obtaining perfect  $(1, k - 1)$ -matching instead of  $(1, k)$ -matching.

For simplicity, we introduce the following notation. Let  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  be a bipartite graph, such that  $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $B$  is a subset of the right copy of  $A$ . For any vertex  $w \in B$  we denote by  $a_w$  the vertex from  $A$  which is a copy of  $w$ . If  $B$  contains a copy of the vertex  $v \in A$ , then we denote this copy by  $b_v$ . We call  $\Gamma$  *A-reflected* if for every edge  $(v_1, v_2) \in E$  existence of  $b_{v_1}$  implies that the edge  $(a_{v_2}, b_{v_1})$  is in  $E$ . If  $B$  is a copy of  $A$  then *A-reflectedness* means that  $E$  is symmetric.

The following theorem is a variant of Theorem 2. Indeed, according to point (iv) below, the function  $f$  determines a  $((d - 1), 1)$  matching of the graph  $\Gamma$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $\Gamma = (A, B, E)$  be a highly computable bipartite graph satisfying the c.e.H.h.c.( $d$ ), such that both  $A$  and  $B$  are identified with  $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $E$  is symmetric and does not contain edges of the form  $(v, b_v)$ . Then there exist a recursive  $(d - 1)$  to 1 function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that all of the following conditions hold:*

- (i)  $f^2(1) = 1$ ;

(ii) for each  $i$  and each  $n \geq 2$ ,  $f^i(n) = n \implies i \leq n$ ;

(iii) for each  $n \geq 2$ , if for all  $i \leq n$  we have  $f^i(n) \neq n$  then there exist  $k \leq 2n$  and  $l \leq n$  such that  $f^{k+l}(n) = f^k(n)$ ;

(iv) for each  $n$  we have  $(f(n), n) \in E$ .

*Proof.* We will construct a specific effective perfect  $(1, (d-1))$ -matching  $M$  in  $\Gamma$ . Effective perfect  $(1, (d-1))$  matching can be considered as recursive  $(d-1)$  to 1 function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $f$  correspond to matching, condition (iv) will be satisfied. Other required properties of  $f$  will follow from the construction of  $M$ . If for some  $i$  we have  $f^i(a) = a$  then we will say that  $a$  is in a cycle. During description of the construction, we will call satisfying conditions (i)-(iii) collectively as *having control over size of cycles*.

We modify the proof of effective Hall's Harem theorem from [2]. Since this proof is highly technical we start with the list of notation used below.

- $M$  is a perfect matching that we construct, we begin with  $M = \emptyset$ .
- $M_{n-1}$  is a set of edges that are added to  $M$  at the end of the  $n$ -th step. We also use some intermediate sets  $M_{n-1}^j$ , with  $M_{n-1}$  equal to sum of all of these sets.
- $\Gamma^{(n)}$  is a graph obtained from  $\Gamma^{(n-1)}$  by removal of  $M_{n-1}$ . It is constructed in such way that it is  $A^{(n)}$ -reflected.
- At each step,  $M^*$  is a set of edges matched to elements that might spoil *c.e.H.h.c.(d)* for  $\Gamma^{(n)}$ . Edges added at the  $n+1$ -th step there are fan of some element from  $A^{(n)}$ , we denote root of this fan by  $a_n^*$ . Since  $\Gamma^{(0)} = \Gamma$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*, then we begin with  $M^* = \emptyset$ .
- $\Gamma^{(n)*}$  is a graph obtained from  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  by removal of  $M^*$ . At each step  $\Gamma^{(n)*}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. For clarity of proof, we will prove slightly more general fact after description of construction.
- $h$  is a witness of *c.e.H.h.c.(d)* for  $\Gamma$ . At the end of each step we get witness of *c.e.H.h.c.(d)* for  $\Gamma^{(n)*}$ . We abuse notation and label this witness  $h$  as well.
- $\Gamma_{-x_1, \dots, -x_j}^{(n)}$  denotes a graph obtained from  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  by removal of  $M_n^j$ -stars of elements  $x_1, \dots, x_j$ .
- $\widehat{\Gamma}_a^{(n)}$  is an induced subgraph for some  $\Gamma_{-x_1, \dots, -x_j}^{(n)}$  ( $j \geq 0$ ) with set of vertices consisting of all vertices with the distance of at most  $\max\{2h(2d) + 3 + n, 5 + n\}$  from  $a$ . In most cases this distance will be significantly greater than necessary for the proof, for example at the first step we only need  $2h(d-1) + 1$  or 3 if it is bigger. Nevertheless, distance computed as above will be used to simplify notation.
- $M_a$  is a  $(1-d)$ -matching in  $\widehat{\Gamma}_a^{(n)*} := \widehat{\Gamma}_a^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)*}$ . It is obtained in such way, that it satisfy the conditions of perfect  $(1, d)$ -matchings for all vertices that are not at the distance  $\max\{2h(2d) + 3 + n, 5 + n\}$  from  $a$ .

If  $a = a_n$  then elements paired with  $a$  are denoted by  $b_{n,1}^0 \dots b_{n,d}^0$ . If  $a = a_{b_{n,1}^i}$  then elements paired with  $a$  are denoted by  $b_{n,1}^{i+1} \dots b_{n,d}^{i+1}$ . Elements paired with  $a_n^*$  are denoted by  $b_{n,1}^* \dots b_{n,d}^*$ . We assume that they are ordered by their numbers.

At the first step of construction we take  $a_0$ , the first element of the set  $A$  (it is clear that  $a_0 = 1$ ). We construct  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{a_0}$ . Since  $\Gamma = \Gamma^{(0)}$  is symmetric, therefore it is  $A$ -reflected.

We can effectively find  $(1, d)$ -matching  $M_{a_0}$  in  $\Gamma^{(0)}$ , that satisfies the conditions of perfect  $(1, d)$ -matchings for all  $a \in A$ ,  $b \in B \setminus B_S$ , where  $B_S$  denote the set of vertices  $v \in B$  of the distance  $\max\{2h(2d) + 3 + n, 5 + n\}$  from  $a_0$ . Let  $b_{0,1}^0, \dots, b_{0,d}^0$  be elements of  $B$ , ordered by its numbers, such that  $(a_0, b_{0,i}^0) \in M_{a_0} \forall i \leq d$ . We include edges  $(a_0, b_{0,i})$  for  $i \leq d-1$  in  $M_0^0$ .




Figure 1: First part of first step,  $M_{a_0}$  concerning  $a_0$  in red and green,  $M_0^0$  in green.

Clearly graph  $\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  obtained from  $\Gamma$  by removal of  $M_0^0$  star of  $a_0$  is highly computable bipartite graph. We need to show that it satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. Let

$$\widehat{h}(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n = 0, \\ h(n + d - 1), & \text{if } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

We claim that  $\widehat{h}$  works for  $A_{-a_0}^{(0)}$ . Let  $X \subset A_{-a_0}^{(0)}$ . If  $X$  is not connected, then its neighbourhood would be the union of neighbourhoods of its connected subsets. Therefore without the loss of the generality, we can assume that  $X$  is connected.

We start with the case when  $n > 0$ . Since  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma}(X)| - (d - 1)$ , then for  $n \geq 1$  the inequality  $|X| > \widehat{h}(n)$  implies  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| - d|X| \geq |N_{\Gamma}(X)| - d|X| - (d - 1) \geq n$ .

Let us consider the case when  $n = 0$ . Because  $h(0) = \widehat{h}(0) = 0$ , we cannot use methods similar to that from previous case. Since  $M_{a_0}$  was a  $(1, d)$ -matching from  $\widehat{A}_{a_0}$  to  $\widehat{B}_{a_0}$  that was perfect for subsets of  $\widehat{A}_{a_0}$  then for all  $X \subset \widehat{A}_{a_0}$ ,  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| \geq d|X|$ .

Consider the case when  $X$  is not a subset of  $\widehat{A}_{a_0}$ . Let  $b_1, \dots, b_{d-1}$  elements matched to  $a_0$  in  $M_0^0$ . If neither of these is in  $N_{\Gamma}(X)$ , then  $N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X) = N_{\Gamma}(X)$ , so  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| - d|X| \geq 0$ . Now, let us assume that  $a \in X \setminus \widehat{A}_{a_0}$  and for some  $a' \in X$  and some  $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$  there exists  $(a', b_i) \in E_{a_0}$ . Since the distance between  $a$  and  $a'$  is at least  $2h(2d)$  we have  $|X| \geq h(2d) + 1$ . Thus  $|N_{\Gamma}(X)| - d|X| \geq 2d > d - 1$  and it follows that  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| - d|X| \geq 0$ . We conclude that the case of finite subsets of  $A_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  is verified.

We now need to show that  $\widehat{h}$  works for  $B_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  as well. Observe that for each  $X \subset B_{-a_0}^{(0)}$ ,  $|N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma}(X)| - 1$ . Since  $\Gamma$  was  $A$ -reflected, then  $N_{\Gamma}(X) \geq N_{\Gamma}(A_X)$ , where  $A_X := \{a \in A : b_a \in X\}$ . Therefore  $|X| \geq \widehat{h}(n) \implies |N_{\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma}(A_X)| - 1 \geq d|X| + n + (d - 1) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{d}|X| + n$ . Clearly  $\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*.

At the second part of this step we construct induced graph  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}}$  in  $\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  and find  $M_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}}$ . Let  $b_{0,1}^1, \dots, b_{0,d}^1$  be elements of  $B$ , ordered by its numbers, such that  $(a_{b_{0,1}^0}, b_{0,i}^1) \in M_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}} \forall i \leq d$ .

Since  $b_{a_0}$  has the lowest number in  $B$ , therefore we have two cases:

1.  $b_{a_0} = b_{0,1}^1$ . We set  $M_0^1$  to consist of edges  $(a_{b_{0,1}^0}, b_{0,i}^1)$  for  $i \leq d - 1$ .
2.  $b_{a_0} \neq b_{0,1}^1$ . Then there exists  $a_0^* \in \widehat{\Gamma}_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}}$  such that  $(a_0^*, b_{a_0}) \in M_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}}$ . We set  $M_0^1$  to consist of edges  $(a_{b_{0,1}^0}, b_{a_0})$  and  $(a_{b_{0,1}^0}, b_{0,i}^1)$  for  $i \leq d - 2$ .  $M^*$  is updated by edges  $(a_0^*, b_{0,i}^1)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq d$ .




Figure 2: Second case,  $M_{a_{b_{0,1}^0}}$  in red. We want to have control over size of cycles, and in this step we want to construct cycle of length 2 in our matching. Therefore it is necessary for the edge  $(a_{b_{0,1}^0}, b_{a_0})$  to be in  $M$ , but  $b_{a_0}$  is matched with  $a_0^*$  instead. We obtain the situation from the Figure 3.




Figure 3:  $M_0^1$  in green.,  $M^*$  in purple.

Set  $M_0 = M_0^0 \cup M_0^1$ . We include  $M_0$  in  $M$  and obtain  $\Gamma^{(1)}$  by removal of  $M_0$  from  $\Gamma$ . It is highly computable bipartite graph, and since we removed  $a_0, b_{a_0}, b_{0,1}$  and  $a_{b_{0,1}}$ , then it is  $A^{(1)}$ -reflected. In the second case  $\Gamma^{(1)}$  might not satisfy *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. We obtain  $\Gamma^{(1)*}$  from  $\Gamma^{(1)}$  by removal of an  $M^*$ -star of  $a_0^*$  (if  $M^*$  is empty, then  $\Gamma^{(1)*} = \Gamma^{(1)}$ ).

By our construction edges  $(a_0, b_{0,1})$  and  $(b_{a_0}, a_{b_{0,1}})$  are in matching  $M$ . Therefore if we consider corresponding to this matching recursive function  $f$  we have  $f^2(a_0) = f(a_{b_{0,1}}) = f(a_0)$ . Clearly (i) is satisfied.

We now consider the  $n + 1$ -st step. We have the graph  $\Gamma^{(n)}$ , which is  $A^{(n)}$ -reflected. We take  $a_n$ , the first element of the set  $A^{(n)}$ . We assume that  $\Gamma^{(n)*}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)* (as already noted, this fact will be proven after the construction). Our construction can add at most one fan to  $M^*$  per step, so there are at most  $n$  roots  $a_i^*$ . This step is divided into parts, the second part of this step is used only if  $b_{a_n} \in \Gamma^{(n)}$ . If  $b_{a_n} \notin \Gamma^{(n)}$  then  $b_{a_n}$  was already used in construction. Observe that in this case (iii) is already satisfied. Indeed, since  $b_{a_n}$  was used in at most  $n$ -th step, then for some  $k \leq n$  the element  $f^k(a_n)$  is in an already constructed cycle. This cycle may have length of at most  $\max\{2, n\}$  therefore (iii) is satisfied in such case for some  $l \leq n, k \leq n$ .

The first part is divided into two cases:

1. If  $a_n$  is a root of fan in  $M^*$ , then we set  $M_n^0$  to be an  $M^*$ -star of  $a_n$  and remove it from an  $M^*$ .
2. If  $a_n$  is not a root of any fan in  $M^*$ , then we construct induced subgraph  $\widehat{\Gamma_{a_n}^{(n)}}$  and consider graph  $\widehat{\Gamma_{a_n}^{(n)*}} := \widehat{\Gamma_{a_n}^{(n)}} \cap \Gamma^{(n)*}$ . Since  $\Gamma^{(n)*}$  satisfy *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*, we can find matching  $M_{a_n}$  in this graph. We set  $M_n^0$  to consist of edges  $(a_n, b_{n,i}^0)$  for  $i \leq d - 1$ .

The second part. Analogously to the proof that  $\Gamma_{-a_0}^{(0)}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)* we can show that  $\Gamma_{-a_n}^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)*}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. To have control over size of constructed cycles we aim to add edge  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n})$  to our matching. We now construct a subgraph  $\widehat{\Gamma_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}^{(n)}}$  in  $\Gamma_{-a_n}^{(n)}$ . Consider the graph  $\widehat{\Gamma_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}^{(n)*}}$ . We find  $M_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}$  as previously. There are three possible cases:

- A)  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n}) \in M_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}$ , i.e. for some  $1 \leq l \leq d$   $b_{a_n} = b_{n,l}^1$ ;
- B)  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n}) \notin M_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}$  and for some  $a_n^*$ ,  $(a_n^*, b_{a_n}) \in M_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}$ ;
- C)  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n}) \notin M_{a_{b_{n,1}^0}}$  and for some  $j_1 < n$ ,  $(a_{j_1}^*, b_{a_n}) \in M^*$ .

In the case A) we set  $M_n^1$  to consist of edges  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{n,i}^1)$  for  $i \leq d - 1$  if  $l \neq d$  or  $i \geq 2$  if  $l = d$ . We obtain a cycle of length 2.

In the case B) we force edge  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n})$  into  $M_n^1$  as in the second case of the second part of the first step. We obtain a cycle of length 2 and add fan with root  $a_n^*$  to  $M^*$ .

In the case C) we cannot force edge  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{a_n})$  into a matching, since  $a_{j_1}^*$  is in  $M^*$  because there is a possibility that it is an end of only  $d - 1$  edges, and removal of another one would make construction of perfect  $(d - 1)$ -1 matching impossible. Therefore we set  $M_n^1$  to be the  $M^*$ -star of  $a_{j_1}^*$ . Now, if  $b_{a_{j_1}^*} \notin \Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)}$ , then we finished this step either without constructing any new cycle, or we constructed a cycle of length 2. If  $b_{a_{j_1}^*} \in \Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)}$  then to maintain control over size of constructed cycles, we need to add to  $M_n^2$  some edge with  $b_{a_{j_1}^*}$  as one of ends. We choose any  $i$ , such that  $b_{j_1, i}^* \neq b_{a_n}$ , we will aim to add edge  $(a_{b_{j_1, i}^*}, b_{a_{j_1}^*})$  to a matching.

Since  $a_{j_1}^*$  is a root of fan in  $M^*$ , then  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)*} = \Gamma_{-a_n}^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)*}$  which is highly computable bipartite graph that satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. Observe that when we remove  $b_{a_{j_1}^*}$  from  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)}$ , then it will be  $A_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)}$ -reflected.

We consider an induced subgraph  $\widehat{\Gamma_{a_{b_{j_1, i}^*}}^{(n)}}$  in  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*}^{(n)}$  and find  $M_{a_{b_{j_1, i}^*}}$ . There are three possible cases analogous to A), B), C).

Since there are at most  $n$  roots in  $M^*$ , it follows that for some  $l \leq n$ , after  $l$  iterations of this step either  $b_{a_{j_1}^*} \notin \Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*, \dots, a_{j_{l-1}}^*}^{(n)}$  or we are in the case A) or B). If we are in one of these cases then we obtain cycle of length 2. If  $b_{a_{j_1}^*} \in \Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^*, \dots, a_{j_{l-1}}^*}^{(n)}$  then either cycle was not constructed in this step and we are in already constructed part of  $M$  or this last iteration closed a cycle, which clearly cannot be of length greater than  $l + 1$ .

The following pictures show how cycle of the length 3 can be obtained by this procedure.




Figure 4: At the first part of this step we added green edges  $(a_n, b_{n,1}^0), (a_n, b_{n,2}^0)$  to  $M_n^0$ . There is an edge  $(a_n, b_{a_{j_1}^*})$  in  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  and  $b_{a_n} = b_{j_1,2}^*$ . To have control over size of a cycle we now want to add blue edge  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{j_1,2}^*)$  to our matching.




Figure 5: Since  $a_{j_1}^* \in M^*$ , then there is a possibility that  $a_{j_1}^*$  is matched with only 2 elements, therefore we cannot force edge  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{j_1,2}^*)$  into our matching. Instead we add fan with root  $a_{j_1}^*$ . Now, to have control over size of constructed cycle we aim to add orange edge  $(a_{b_{j_1,3}^*}, b_{a_{j_1}^*})$  to matching.




Figure 6: It turns out that  $b_{a_{j_1}^*} = b_{j_2,2}^*$  for  $a_{j_2}^* = a_{b_{n,2}^0}$  and as in previous figure, we cannot force  $(a_{b_{n,1}^0}, b_{j_1,2}^*)$  into our matching. Instead we add fan with root  $a_{j_2}^*$ . Since  $b_{n,2}^0$  was already used in matching we finish construction of  $M_n$ .




Figure 7: Resulting  $M_n$  with obtained cycle of length 3 marked in red.

When this part is finished, we set  $M_n = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n+1} M_n^k$ . We update  $M^*$ , by removing all fans that were used to construct  $M_n$ . We add  $M_n$  to  $M$  and obtain graph  $\Gamma^{(n+1)}$  from  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  by removal of  $M_n$ -stars. It is highly computable bipartite graph, and since for all elements  $a$  from  $A^{(n)} \setminus A^{(n+1)}$  we also removed  $b_a$  then it is  $A^{(n+1)}$ -reflected. We construct additional graph  $\Gamma^{(n+1)*}$  obtained from  $\Gamma^{(n+1)}$  by removal of  $M^*$ -star of all elements of  $A$  having edges in  $M^*$ .

Since we iterate by each element of  $A$  and the corresponding element of  $B$  whenever applicable, then every vertex  $v$  will be added to  $M$  at some step of the algorithm. It follows that  $M$  is a perfect  $(1, d-1)$ -matching of the graph  $\Gamma$ .

By our construction, cycles in this matching can be produced only in the second part of each step. Since at each step we add the first of the remaining elements to  $M$ , then  $n$  is added to  $M$  not later than at the  $n$ -th step. Therefore we will now consider  $n$  to both be a vertex and a number of the step. The length of a cycle created at the  $n$ -th step cannot be greater than  $\max\{2, n\}$  so if  $n$  is in a cycle then  $f^i(n) = n$  for some  $i \leq n$  and (ii) is satisfied. If  $n$  is not in a cycle then we can find  $l, k$  such that  $f^{k+l}(n) = f^k(n)$ . We can bound  $l$  by the size of the biggest cycle that can be constructed before the  $n$ -th step i.e.  $\max\{n-1, 2\}$ . Since  $n-1 < 2$  only for  $n=2$ , we will bound  $l$  by  $n$  for simplicity.

Let us notice that  $k$  is bounded by  $2n-1$ . We begin an estimation of this bound by finding the maximal number of elements of  $A$  that can be added to the matching  $M$  in the  $n$ -th step of the construction without constructing a cycle. It is exactly the maximal number of repetitions of the first and the second part in the  $n$ -th step. Therefore it is equal to the maximal possible number of fans in  $M^*$  at the  $n$ -th step increased by 1 i.e.  $n$ . If there was no cycle constructed in the  $n$ -th step, each repetition of first or second part corresponds to iteration of  $f$  on  $n$ . After the last repetition of the second part, we are in the part of matching  $M$  that was constructed before the  $n$ -th step. Therefore  $f^n(n)$  is in the part of  $M$  that was constructed in at most  $n-1$ -st step. We can now repeat this reasoning for the  $n-1$ -th step and obtain that  $f^{n-1}(f^n(n))$  is in the part of  $M$  that was constructed in at the most  $n-2$ -nd step. Since in the first step of the construction, all elements added to  $M$  are at most one iteration of  $f$  from a cycle, then we obtain an initial estimation of the bound of  $k$  as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (1 + (i-1)),$$

where  $(i - 1)$  in each summand corresponds to the maximal possible number of fans in  $M^\star$  at the  $i$ -th step. But each element of the  $M^\star$  can be used only once in the construction. Therefore we can estimate  $k$  by  $2n - 1$  where  $n$  corresponds to a number of steps and  $n - 1$  is the maximal number of fans that can be in  $M^\star$  in all of these steps. Clearly this construction satisfies conditions (i),(ii),(iii).

To prove that this construction is working it is still necessary to show the following claim:

*Claim 2.2.* Consider the situation after the first part of the  $n + 1$ -st step:  $\Gamma^{(n)}$  is  $A^{(n)}$ -reflected,  $M^\star$  has at most  $n$  elements and both  $\Gamma^{(n)\star}$  and  $\Gamma_{-a_n}^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)\star}$  satisfy *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*.

Then  $\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}$  obtained in this step also satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*.

*Proof.* Depending on iterations done in the  $n + 1$ -st step,  $\Gamma^{(n+1)}$  is equal either to  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^\star, \dots, -a_{j_l}^\star, -a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}$  or  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^\star, \dots, -a_{j_l}^\star}$  for some  $l \geq 0$ . Second case is clear, since, as we noted in  $n + 1$ -st step,  $\Gamma_{-a_n}^{(n)} \cap \Gamma^{(n)\star}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*.

$\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}$  is equal to  $\Gamma_{-a_n, -a_{j_1}^\star, \dots, -a_{j_l}^\star, -a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}$  with updated  $M^\star$ . It is clear that it is obtained from  $\Gamma^{(n)\star}$  by removal of  $M$ -stars of  $a_n, a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}$  and possibly  $M^\star$ -star of  $a_n^\star$  if it exists. We only show case with  $M^\star$ -star of  $a_n^\star$  removed, if it does not then proof is analogous and less complicated.

Let

$$\widehat{h}(m) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n = 0, \\ h(m + 2d), & \text{if } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

We claim that  $\widehat{h}$  works for  $A^{(n+1)\star}$ . Let  $X \subset A^{(n+1)\star}$ . Without loss of generality we can assume that it is connected.

We start with the case when  $m > 0$ . Since  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| - 2d$ , then for  $m \geq 1$  the inequality  $|X| > \widehat{h}(m)$  implies  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| - d|X| \geq |N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| - d|X| - 2d \geq m$ .

Let us consider the case when  $m = 0$ . Since  $M_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}$  was a  $(1, d)$ -matching from  $\widehat{A_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$  to  $\widehat{B_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$  that was perfect for subsets of  $\widehat{A_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$ , then for all  $X \subset \widehat{A_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$ ,  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| \geq d|X|$ ,

Element  $a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}$  is matched to  $b_{a_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star, b_{n, 1}^{l+1}, \dots, b_{n, d-2}^{l+1}$ , and  $a_n^\star$  is matched to  $b_{n, 2}^\star, \dots, b_{n, d}^\star$ . We denote set of all of those elements by  $B^\star$ . If neither of these elements is in  $N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)$ , then  $N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X) = N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)$ , so  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| - d|X| \geq 0$ .

Now, let us assume that  $a \in X \setminus \widehat{A_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$  and for some  $a' \in X$  there exists  $b \in B^\star$  such that  $(a', b) \in E^{(n)\star}$ . Since  $a$  is not in  $\widehat{A_{a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}}$  and  $a'$  is in distance at most 4 from  $a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}$ , then distance between  $a'$  and  $a$  is at least  $2h(2d) + n$ . Therefore we have  $|X| \geq h(2d) + 1$ . Thus  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| - d|X| \geq 2d$  and it follows that  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| - d|X| \geq 0$ . We conclude that the case of finite subsets of  $A^{(n+1)\star}$  is verified.

Observe that for each  $X \subset B^{(n+1)\star}$ ,  $|N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| - 2$ . Observe that the only element that spoiled  $A_{a_n, a_{j_1}^\star, \dots, a_{j_l}^\star, a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}$ -reflectedness of  $\Gamma_{a_n, a_{j_1}^\star, \dots, a_{j_l}^\star, a_{b_{j_l, i}^\star}^\star}^{(n)}$  was  $b_{a_{j_l, i}^\star}$ . Since it is not in  $\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}$  therefore it cannot be in  $X$ . It follows that  $N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X) \geq N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(A_X)$ , where  $A_X := \{a \in A^{(n+1)\star} : b_a \in X\}$ . Therefore  $|X| \geq \widehat{h}(n) \implies |N_{\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}}(X)| \geq |N_{\Gamma^{(n)\star}}(X)| - 2 \geq d|X| + n + 2d - 2 \geq \frac{1}{d}|X| + n$ . Clearly  $\Gamma^{(n+1)\star}$  satisfies *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*.  $\square$

$\square$

### 3 Coarse spaces

We recall some terminology from coarse geometry. For relation  $E \subseteq X \times X$  on a set  $X$  and  $x \in X, A \subseteq X$ , let

$$E[x] := \{y \in X \mid (x, y) \in E\},$$

and

$$E[A] := \bigcup \{E[x] \mid x \in A\}.$$

Moreover by  $\Gamma(E)$  we will denote graph associated with relation  $E$ , i.e.  $\Gamma(E) := (X, E)$ .



**Definition 3.1.** A *coarse space* is a pair  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  consisting of a set  $X$ , and a collection of subsets of  $X \times X$  (called *entourages*) such that:

- $\Delta_x \in \mathcal{E}$ ;
- if  $F \subseteq E \in \mathcal{E}$ , then also  $F \in \mathcal{E}$ ;
- if  $E, F \in \mathcal{E}$  then  $E \cup F, E^{-1}, E \circ F \in \mathcal{E}$ .

**Definition 3.2.** A coarse space  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is said to have *bounded geometry* if

$$\forall E \in \mathcal{E}, \forall x \in X : E[x] \text{ is finite.}$$

**Definition 3.3.** A coarse space  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  of bounded geometry is called *amenable* if

$$\forall \theta > 1, \forall E \in \mathcal{E} \exists F \subseteq X \text{ finite, } F \neq \emptyset : |E[F]| \leq \theta |F|.$$

In [3] in Theorem 2.2 F.M. Schneider has proved that a coarse space of bounded geometry is not amenable if and only if there is  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\Gamma(E)$  is a  $d$ -regular forest. To see that the following theorem is a computable version of Schneider's result we remind the reader that when  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  is not amenable, then for every finite  $d$  there is a symmetric entourage such that  $|E(F)| \geq d|F|$  for every finite  $F \subseteq X$  (see discussion before Proposition 2.1 in [3]).

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $d \geq 3$ . Let a coarse space  $(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{E})$  of bounded geometry be non-amenable. Furthermore, assume that there exists a computable symmetric  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  such that for any finite  $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  we have  $|E[F]| \geq (d+2)|F|$ . Then there exists a computable  $E' \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\Gamma(E')$  is a  $d$ -regular forest. Moreover there exist an algorithm which for any  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  recognizes if  $m$  and  $n$  are in the same connected component of  $\Gamma(E')$ .*

*Proof.* We adapt the proof of Theorem 2.2 of [3].

Consider the symmetric relation  $R := E \setminus \Delta_{\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $E$  is computable,  $R$  is computable as well. Then the following inequality holds for  $R$ :

$$|R[F]| \geq |E[F] \setminus F| \geq |E[F]| - |F| \geq (d+1)|F|.$$

Since the identity map on  $\mathbb{N}$  is recursive, and  $R$  is symmetric, then for all finite sets  $X \subset \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $|N(X)| - d|X| = (d+1)|X| - d|X| = |X|$ . Therefore  $n \leq |X|$  implies that  $n \leq |N(X)| - d|X|$ . Clearly graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}, R)$  is highly computable bipartite graph satisfying *c.e.H.h.c.(d)*. Thus we can use Theorem 2.1 to obtain recursive  $(d-1)$  to 1 function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that, with respect to the natural enumeration of  $\mathbb{N}$ , all of the following conditions hold:

- (i)  $f^2(1) = 1$ ;
- (ii) for each  $i$  and each  $n \geq 2$ ,  $f^i(n) = n \implies i \leq n$ ;
- (iii) for each  $n \geq 2$ , if for all  $i \leq n$   $f^i(n) \neq n$  then there exist  $i \leq 2n$  and  $j \leq n$  such that  $f^{i+j}(n) = f^i(n)$ ;
- (iv) for each  $n$  we have  $(f(n), n) \in R$ .

Since  $R = E \setminus \Delta_x$  we know that  $f$  does not have any fixed points. Moreover for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we can effectively check whether  $n \in P(f) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} | \exists m \geq 1 : f^m(n) = n\}$ . Let  $P_0$  be a set defined in the following way:

$$\{n \in P(f) | \forall m \geq 1 : f^m(n) \geq n\}.$$

Since for  $n \geq 2$  we have  $(f^i(n) = n \implies i \leq n)$  we can check whether  $n \in P_0$  in at most  $n$  iterations of function  $f$ , so  $P_0$  is computable. Moreover, if  $n \neq m$  are in  $P_0$  then  $n$  and  $m$  are in different connected components of graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$ . Clearly  $P(f) = \sqcup_{n \in P_0} \{f^m(n) | m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . If  $n \notin P(f)$  then we can find  $i \leq 2n$  such that  $f^i(n) \in P(f)$ . Moreover we can find  $j \leq n$  such that  $f^{i+j}(n) \in P_0$ .

The graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  is computable and  $d$ -regular. Based on this we want to construct a new recursive function  $f_*$  such that graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  is computable and  $d$ -regular forest. To do that, we choose auxiliary functions  $g, h : P_0 \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that, for all  $n \in P_0$  and  $m \geq 1$  we have

- $g(n, 0) = n$  and  $h(n, 0) = f(n)$ ;
- $\{g(n, m), h(n, m)\} \cap P(f) = \emptyset$ ;

- $f(g(n, m)) = g(n, m - 1)$ , and  $f(h(n, m)) = h(n, m - 1)$ .

We want to show that  $g, h$  are recursive functions. Since the graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  is computable and  $d$ -regular and sets  $P_0$  and  $P(f)$  are computable, then for each  $n \in P_0, m \geq 1$  we can effectively find  $x, y$  such that  $x, y \notin P(f)$  and  $f(x) = g(n, m - 1), f(y) = h(n, m - 1)$ . Then  $x = g(n, m)$  and  $y = h(n, m)$ . Clearly  $g, h$  are recursive functions. Moreover they are injective and have disjoint ranges.

Now we define  $f_* : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  for  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  in the following way:

$$f_*(x) = \begin{cases} g(y, m + 2) & \text{if } x = g(y, m) \text{ for } y \in P_0 \text{ and even } m \geq 0, \\ g(y, m - 2) & \text{if } x = g(y, m) \text{ for } y \in P_0 \text{ and odd } m \geq 3, \\ f^2(x) & \text{if } x = h(y, m) \text{ for } y \in P_0 \text{ and } m \geq 2, \\ f(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As it was mentioned already, for each  $n$  we can find  $i$  and  $j$  such that  $i + j \leq 3n$  and  $f^{i+j}(n)$  is in  $P_0$ . Moreover  $x \neq g(y, m')$  nor  $x \neq h(y, m')$  for any  $m' > 3x$ . It follows that  $f_*$  is a recursive function. In the proof of Theorem 2.2. in [3] Schneider has shown that  $\{(n, f_*(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $|f_*^{-1}(x)| = |d - 1|$  for each  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore the graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f_*(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  is a computable  $d$ -regular forest. There is 1-1 correspondence between connected components of  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  and trees in  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f_*(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$ . More precisely if  $C \subset \mathbb{N}$  is the set of vertices of a connected component of the graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f_*(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$  then it is also the set of vertices of a connected component of the graph  $(\mathbb{N}, \{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\})$ . Since for each  $n$  we can compute  $n' \in P_0$  such that  $n$  and  $n'$  are in same connected component of  $\{(n, f(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , then for any  $n, m$  we can check whether  $n$  and  $m$  are in the same tree in  $\{(n, f_*(n)) | n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .  $\square$

We now translate this Theorem into a statement about wobbling groups. Given a coarse space  $(X, \mathcal{E})$  we define its *wobbling group* as

$$\mathcal{W}(X, \mathcal{E}) := \{\alpha \in \text{Sym}(X) | \{(x, \alpha(x)) | x \in X\} \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Let us recall that a subgroup  $G \leq \text{Sym}(X)$  is said to be *semi-regular* if no non-identity element of  $G$  has a fixed point in  $X$ . The following statement is a computable version of Corollary 2.3 [3].

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let coarse space  $(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{E})$  of bounded geometry be non-amenable. Furthermore, assume that there exists a computable symmetric  $E \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\forall F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  if  $F$  is finite then  $|E[F]| \geq 6|F|$ . Then there are two computable permutations  $\sigma, \pi \in \text{Sym}(\mathbb{N})$  such that  $\langle \sigma, \pi \rangle$  is a free semi-regular subgroup of  $\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{E})$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.4 there is  $E' \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\Gamma(E')$  is a computable 4-regular forest. Moreover for each  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  we can recognize if  $n$  and  $m$  are in the same connected component of  $\Gamma(E')$ . For each  $n$  we can find  $n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4$  such that either  $(n, n_i) \in E'$  or  $(n_i, n) \in E'$ . We index them by order, i.e.  $n_1 < n_2 < n_3 < n_4$ . Since graph  $\Gamma(E')$  is a computable 4-regular forest, then for each  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can compute  $B_m(n) \subset \mathbb{N}$ , an  $m$ -ball of  $n$ .

The standard Cayley graph of the free group on two generators is isomorphic to the 4-regular tree so it is clear that such permutations  $\sigma, \pi$  exist. We will show that there exist computable ones. We will say that a partial permutation  $\sigma$  is *loxodromic* on a finite, connected set  $D$ , if:

- it preserves distance i.e. for all  $n, m \in D$  we have  $d(n, m) = d(\sigma(n), \sigma(m))$ ;
- there is a maximal line in the set  $D \cup \sigma(D)$  i.e. there exists  $d_0, \dots, d_k \in D \cup \sigma(D)$  for  $k = \max\{d(a, b) | a, b \in D\} + 1$ , such that  $\sigma(d_0) = d_1, \dots, \sigma(d_{k-1}) = d_k$  where  $d_0 \in D \setminus \sigma(D)$  and  $d_k \in \sigma(D) \setminus D$ .

At the first step of the construction of  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  we find  $1_1, 1_2, 1_3, 1_4$  and set  $\sigma_1(1) = 1_1, \sigma_1(1_2) = 1, \pi_1(1) = 1_3, \pi_1(1_4) = 1$ . Let  $D_1 = B_1(1) = \{1, 1_1, 1_2, 1_3, 1_4\}$ . We extend  $\sigma_1$  and  $\pi_1$  to loxodromic maps on  $D_1$  such that  $\sigma_1(D_1) = B_1(\sigma_1(1))$  and  $\pi_1(D_1) = B_1(\pi_1(1))$ .

In the  $n$ -th step let  $(D_{n-1}, \sigma_{n-1}, \pi_{n-1})$  be a finite partial permutations defined before the  $n$ -th step, which are loxodromic maps on  $D_{n-1}$ . For all  $a \in D_{n-1}$  we set  $\sigma_n(a) = \sigma_{n-1}(a)$  and  $\pi_n(a) = \pi_{n-1}(a)$ . Let  $a_n$  be the first number in  $\mathbb{N} \setminus D_{n-1}$ . Let  $X$  be the connected component of  $\Gamma(E')$  containing  $a_n$ . If it does not meet  $D_{n-1}$  then we find  $(a_n)_1, (a_n)_2, (a_n)_3, (a_n)_4$ , and repeat the first step. We set  $D_n = D_{n-1} \cup B_1(a_n)$ . Otherwise there is a minimal  $i < n$  such that  $a_i \in X$ . We find the first  $m$  such that  $a_n \in B_m(a_i)$ . Then we extend  $\sigma_n$  and  $\pi_n$  to a loxodromic partial permutations on  $D_n = D_{n-1} \cup B_m(a_i)$  in such way that there is no  $a \in D_n$  such that for some  $i, j \in \{-1, 1\}$  we have  $\sigma_n^i(a) \neq \pi_n^j(a)$ .

Let  $\sigma = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_n$ , and  $\pi = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_n$ . These permutations act on each connected component of  $\Gamma(E')$  by translations along some line, with lines corresponding to  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  having one common vertex which is the first  $n$  that belongs to component. Clearly there are no points which are fixed by non-identity of  $\langle \sigma, \pi \rangle$  and this group is a free semi-regular subgroup of  $W(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{E})$ . Permutations  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  are computable since for all  $n$  both  $\sigma_n$  and  $\pi_n$  are computable permutations and for each  $n$  we have  $\sigma(n) = \sigma_n(n)$  and  $\pi(n) = \pi_n(n)$ .

□

## References

- [1] Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein and Michel Coornaert. The hall harem theorem. In *Cellular automata and Groups*, *Encycl. Complex. Syst. Sci.*, pages 221–238. Springer, New York, 2018.
- [2] Karol Duda. Amenability and computability, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.02640>.
- [3] Schneider Friedrich Martin. About von neumann’s problem for locally compact groups. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 12:1531–1549, 2018.