

ON THE PROFINITE RIGIDITY OF FREE AND SURFACE GROUPS

ISMAEL MORALES

ABSTRACT. Let S be a free or surface group. We establish a Tits alternative for groups in the finite, soluble and p -genus of S . This generalises (and gives a new proof of) the analogous result of Baumslag for parafree groups. Then we study applications to profinite rigidity. A well-known question of Remeslennikov asks whether a finitely generated residually finite G with profinite completion $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{S}$ is necessarily $G \cong S$. We give a positive answer when G belongs to a class of groups $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ that has a finite abelian hierarchy starting with finitely generated residually free groups. This strengthens previous results of Bridson, Corner, Reid and Wilton. Then we show that one-relator groups in the genus of S are hyperbolic and virtually special. Lastly, we prove that $S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ is profinitely rigid within finitely generated residually free groups.

1. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental idea in the study of infinite groups consists of understanding how much algebraic structure of a group G can be detected in its collection of finite quotients, or if, in fact, the isomorphism type of G can be determined out of these quotients. This sort of question broadly belongs to the area of profinite rigidity.

To expand on the above, we briefly review a few definitions. A non-empty class of finite groups \mathcal{C} is a *formation* if it is closed under taking homomorphic images and subdirect products. Given a finitely generated group Λ , we say that it is *residually- \mathcal{C}* if, for all $1 \neq \lambda \in \Lambda$, there exists $N \trianglelefteq \Lambda$ such that $\lambda \notin N$ and $\Lambda/N \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case, following the terminology of [GZ11], we define the *\mathcal{C} -genus* of Λ as the collection of finitely generated residually- \mathcal{C} groups Γ with isomorphic pro- \mathcal{C} completion $\Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \cong \Lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$. Equivalently, the latter happens if Γ and Λ have the same collection of isomorphism types of finite quotients belonging to \mathcal{C} (see Section 2 for more details). We will mostly think of \mathcal{C} as being the formations of all finite groups, all finite soluble groups, all finite nilpotent groups or all finite p -groups (for some prime p). In these cases, we refer to the \mathcal{C} -genus as the finite, soluble, nilpotent and p -genus, respectively. Lastly, we say that a finitely generated residually finite Λ is *profinutely rigid* if the only Γ in its finite genus is $\Gamma \cong \Lambda$.

It is easy to see that finitely generated abelian groups are profinitely rigid. However, for groups satisfying more complicated group laws, the picture is not as clear. In fact, there are examples of finitely generated nilpotent groups [Pic71] and virtually cyclic groups [Bau74] that are not profinitely rigid. Outside the world of groups satisfying group laws, harder problems arise, such as finding profinitely rigid groups that contain non-abelian free subgroups. The only known examples

are due to Bridson–McReynolds–Reid–Spitler [BMRS20, BMRS21] and Cheetham–West [CW22], which are certain arithmetic lattices in $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

On the other hand, there are other classical families of groups that are expected to be profinitely rigid, such as free groups, as conjectured by Remeslennikov (see, for example, [KM14, Question 5.48] and [NRR79, Question 12]).

Conjecture 1.1. Let Γ be a finitely generated residually finite group with the same profinite completion as a free group F . Then $\Gamma \cong F$.

It is also natural to pose this conjecture for surface groups. By a *surface group* we will always mean the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface Σ of non-positive Euler characteristic. If $g \geq 1$ is the genus of Σ , then $\pi_1\Sigma$ is isomorphic to the one-relator group $\langle a_1, b_1, \dots, a_g, b_g \mid [a_1, b_1] \cdots [a_g, b_g] \rangle$.

Conjecture 1.2. Let Γ be a finitely generated residually finite group with the same profinite completion as a surface group $\pi_1\Sigma$. Then $\Gamma \cong \pi_1\Sigma$.

We refer the reader to [JZ21a] for related conjectures regarding other genera. The main result of this paper is Theorem A, which solves Conjectures 1.1 and 1.2 when Γ belongs to the family of groups $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ (see Definition 1.3 below). This family has a finite abelian hierarchy starting at finitely generated residually free groups. Before stating Theorem A, we will spend some time discussing previous progress made on these conjectures.

Puder–Parzanchevski [PP15, Theorem 1.1] showed that a finitely generated subgroup H of a free group F is measure-preserving if and only if H is a free factor of F . Suppose that the ranks of F and H are n and d , respectively. A short counting argument of Jaikin-Zapirain [JZ21a, Theorem 1.5(a)] proves that if the double $\Gamma = F_{H=\overline{H}}\overline{F}$ has a free profinite completion of rank $2n - d$, then H is measure-preserving (and hence Γ is free by [PP15, Theorem 1.1]). This, in particular, proves Conjecture 1.1 when Γ is the double $F_{*_{u=\overline{u}}}\overline{F}$ of a free group F along a word $u \in F$. Another argument that solves Conjecture 1.1 for $\Gamma = F_{*_{u=\overline{u}}}\overline{F}$ is given by Wilton [Wil21] (in fact, Wilton [Wil21] also solves Conjecture 1.2 for such Γ).

The above result of Puder-Parzanchevski has the following consequence [PP15, Corollary 1.5]: if F is a free group and $H \leq F$ is a subgroup, then its closure \overline{H} in \widehat{F} is a free factor of \widehat{F} if and only if H was already a free factor of F . An alternative proof of the latter fact was given by Wilton [JZ18] and it was recently generalised by Garrido and Jaikin-Zapirain [GJZ22] to virtually free groups F .

Before giving more instances in which these conjectures have been solved, we review the class of limit groups, which has attracted much attention in geometric group theory and profinite rigidity. A *limit group* G is a finitely generated fully residually free group. This means that, for all finite subsets $X \subseteq G$, there exists a group homomorphism $\psi: G \rightarrow F$ to a free group F such that the restriction of ψ to X is injective. This class includes free and surface groups. Remeslennikov [Rem89] showed that limit groups are exactly the finitely generated groups with the same existential theory as a free group. Importantly, Sela [Sel01, Theorem 4.1] proved that limit groups admit a finite abelian hierarchy that starts in free abelian groups. A bigger class of groups is the class of finitely generated residually free groups. For example, $\mathbb{Z} \times F_2$ is residually free but it is not limit.

Coming back to Conjecture 1.1, Wilton [Wil18c] solved it when Γ is a limit group by showing that these groups are either free or contain surface subgroups. Bridson–Corner–Reid [BCR14] had already pointed out how the latter can be used to establish Conjecture 1.1 when Γ is residually free. Lastly, Wilton also proved Conjecture 1.2 when Γ is a limit group [Wil21]. There is a second proof of this fact by Fruchter and the author [Fru22]. We now introduce the family $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ and state the main theorem.

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ denote the smallest class of groups such that

- (1) $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ contains all finitely generated residually free groups.
- (2) If A, B are in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ and C is a virtually abelian subgroup of A and B , then the amalgamated product $A *_C B$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$.
- (3) If A is in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ and $\theta: C \rightarrow C'$ is an isomorphism between virtually abelian subgroups of A , then the HNN extension $A *_C \theta$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$.
- (4) If A is in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ and A embeds as a finite-index subgroup in B , then B belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$.
- (5) If A and B are in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$, then $A \times B$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$.

The following is proven in Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 10.2.

Theorem A. Let Γ be a group belonging to the class $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$. Then Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2 hold for Γ .

We remark that the methods of Wilton in [Wil18c] and [Wil21] cover Theorem A when Γ is a limit group or when Γ is a hyperbolic fundamental group of a graph of groups with free vertices and cyclic edges. Therefore, one novelty of Theorem A is including similar fundamental groups and getting rid of the hyperbolicity assumption. Many groups in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ are virtually compact special but not residually free, such as the relatively hyperbolic group $(F_2 \times F_2) * F_3$ and the hyperbolic one-relator groups $\langle a, b, c \mid a^p b^q c^r \rangle$ (see [LS62]).

There are several reasons why it is natural to study $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$, other than being a family that naturally incorporates other groups for which Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2 were solved. The consideration of hierarchies with abelian edges has provided a setting in which combination theorems for relevant classes of groups have been established: for coherent groups [Wis20, Corollary 5.4], for hyperbolic groups [BF92], for free groups [She55, Swa86, Sta91] and for parafree groups [JZM21].

We say that a finitely generated group Γ is *parafree* (resp. *parasurface*) if it belongs to the nilpotent genus of some free group (resp. surface group). Parafree groups were introduced by Baumslag in [Bau67b] and these are groups that resemble free groups in terms of their residual properties. In fact, all Γ of Conjecture 1.1 (resp. Conjecture 1.2) are parafree (resp. parasurface) by [JZ21a, Theorem 1.1]. It is not hard to see that $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ contains all the parafree groups constructed in [Bau67b, Bau69, Bau94, Bau05, BC06, JZM21] and all the parasurface groups of [BR10].

We pose a question that already contains many of the difficulties that appear when approaching Conjecture 1.1 for more complicated hierarchies.

Question 1.4. Let F be a finitely generated free group and let H be a finitely generated malnormal subgroup. Consider the double $\Gamma = F *_H \overline{F}$ of the group F along its subgroup H . In particular, Γ is hyperbolic and virtually compact

special by [Git97, Corollary 5.3] and [HW15, Corollary B]. Are Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2 true for Γ ?

Our proof of Theorem A mimics the general outline of the previous results of Bridson, Corner, Reid and Wilton for finitely generated residually free groups. In particular, it relies on the existence of surface subgroups for one-ended hyperbolic amalgamated products $F *_Z F'$ and HNN extensions $F *_Z$ of free groups along cyclic subgroups [Wil18c, Theorem 6.1]. However, in order to apply these methods, one first needs to show that the group Γ is hyperbolic and has strong separability properties (virtual retractions). We show that Γ is hyperbolic using the Bestvina–Feighn combination theorem [BF92] and virtually compact special using Wise’s classification of hyperbolic groups with a malnormal quasi-convex hierarchy ([Wis21, Theorem 11.2]), which ensures separability of quasi-convex subgroups. To apply the Bestvina–Feighn combination theorem in the first place, we need to ensure that such $\Gamma \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{ab}}$ do not contain Baumslag–Solitar groups. We ensure this by Theorem B, a result that also encompasses a strong Tits alternative.

We say that a group G satisfies a *Tits alternative* if for every subgroup $H \leq G$, the following dichotomy holds:

- (a) Either the group H is virtually soluble; or
- (b) the group H contains a non-abelian free subgroup.

This principle was originally established by Tits [Tit72] for finitely generated linear groups. This implies that linear groups satisfy the von Neumann conjecture (i.e. non-amenable linear groups contain non-abelian free subgroups) and it also plays a crucial role in several proofs of Gromov’s theorem on groups of polynomial growth [Gro81, vdDW84, Kle10, ST10]. This surprising dichotomy has been established for many other groups. For example, for Mapping Class groups by McCarthy [McC85] and for $\text{Out}(F_n)$ by Bestvina–Feighn–Handel [BFH00, BFH05]. There are also versions of the Tits alternative in more topological settings, as given by Breuillard–Gelder [BG07], and in profinite or pro- p settings, as studied by Kochloukova–Zalesskii [KZ11] and Wilton–Zalesskii [WZ17] (see also [Zal22]).

By a standard ping-pong argument, it is known that hyperbolic groups also satisfy a Tits alternative. In fact, the Tits alternative is improved because soluble subgroups are virtually cyclic (and the same occurs for some of the previously listed examples). We show this strengthened version of the Tits alternative for groups in the genera of free or surface groups as a consequence of the following result.

Theorem B. Let p be a prime and let G be a group in the p -genus of a free or hyperbolic surface group. Let H be a subgroup of G . The following holds:

- (i) If H is amenable, then it is cyclic.
- (ii) If H is two-generated, then it is free.
- (iii) If H is finitely presented and non-cyclic, then it is large.

We prove this result in Theorem 8.1. Recall a group is *large* if it contains a finite-index subgroup that surjects onto a non-abelian free group. As a particular consequence of Theorem B, such groups G do not contain Baumslag–Solitar subgroups and have the property that any subgroup $H \leq G$ is either cyclic or contains a non-abelian free subgroup. In fact, continuing the previous discussion, we note

that Theorem B covers stronger forms of the Tits alternative in the literature, such as the one proven by Button [But04] for the fundamental groups of certain compact three-manifolds in terms of largeness or SQ -universality. We refer the reader to [AM15] for more references and more variations of this classical dichotomy.

As aforementioned, Theorem B can be applied to groups in the finite, soluble or nilpotent genus of a free or surface group. The reason is that, by [JZ21a, Theorem 1.1], these genera are contained in the p -genus of the corresponding free or surface group, so all such groups lie under the assumptions of Theorem B.

There has been much research on relating subgroup structure and profinite completions, specially in the context of three-manifolds. For example, Kochloukova–Zaleskii [KZ07] show a Tits alternative for groups in the p -genus of an irreducible, orientable, closed three-manifold. The topic of connecting three-manifold topology with the profinite completion of its fundamental group has experienced much exciting progress over the last few years [BRW17, Wil17a, JZ18, Wil18a, Wil18b, Wil19, WZ19, BR20, MW22, Liu22, HK22]. A remarkable result is the profinite recognition of the topology of geometric three-manifolds by Wilton–Zaleskii [WZ17], where they show that a compact orientable aspherical three-manifold M^3 is hyperbolic if and only if $\widehat{\pi_1 M^3}$ contains no \mathbb{Z}_p^2 . More recently, this was generalised by Zaleskii [Zal22, Theorem 1.1], showing that a relatively hyperbolic virtually compact special group G is hyperbolic if and only if its profinite completion \widehat{G} contains no \mathbb{Z}_p^2 .

One of the difficulties of Theorem B is relating subgroup obstructions of an abstract group to subgroup obstructions of its pro- p completion in the flavour of the previous results but in the generality of finitely generated residually- p groups, where there is a priori no hierarchy at our disposal.

Using ideas from the world of L^2 -invariants, more progress has been made in the previous direction, although with the apparent caveat of leading to conclusions of more global nature. For example, Lackenby [Lac09, Lac10] proved that largeness is a profinite invariant among finitely presented groups, and that it relates to the property of having positive first L^2 -Betti number, denoted by $b_1^{(2)}$. In a different flavour, Peterson–Thom [PT11] established a Freiheitssatz for countable abstract groups Λ that satisfy the Atiyah conjecture and have $b_1^{(2)}(\Lambda) > 0$. Bridson–Reid [BR14, Corollary 8.3] used this to prove a Freiheitssatz for a class of groups G that includes parafree groups and those of Theorem B. We incorporate these ideas to the proofs of Theorem B and Theorem E. It can be enlightening to discuss the limitations of different approaches, including ours, when it comes to tackle problems as the following.

Question 1.5. Let S be a free or hyperbolic surface group and let G be finitely generated residually finite group with $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{S}$. Are three-generated subgroups of G necessarily free?

The one-relator group $\langle a, b, c \mid a^2 b^2 c^3 \rangle$ is a three-generated non-free group in the p -genus of F_2 for all primes p . So part (ii) of Theorem B would not hold for three-generated H . This shows that the approach we take in this paper, consisting on just studying the p -genus of S , cannot answer Question 1.5. Another weaker fact that does not suffice to consider in order to solve Question 1.5 (resp. Theorem B) is the mere observation that G is a subgroup of \widehat{S} (resp. $S_{\widehat{p}}$) because, as opposed to

S , the groups \widehat{S} and $S_{\widehat{p}}$ contain all finitely generated free abelian groups as abstract subgroups. Furthermore, Jaikin-Zapirain [JZ20] showed that these contain all limit groups.

We note that Theorem B is not immediate even for residually free groups. An elementary property of residually free groups is that non-abelian two-generated subgroups are free (see [Bau62, Section 4]). However, these can clearly contain the group \mathbb{Z}^2 and, even in this context, one needs an additional argument to rule it out. One may expect the analogous result of Theorem B to hold for limit groups. We observe in Remark 8.4 that our methods establish parts (i)–(ii) of Theorem B for the p -genus of more hyperbolic limit groups, other than free and surface groups. However, we cannot solve the general case.

Question 1.6. Let p be a prime and let G be a group in the p -genus of a hyperbolic limit group L . Are two-generated subgroups of G free?

An important property of our argument is that, when S is a free or surface group, $S_{\widehat{p}}$ is residually-(torsion-free nilpotent), proven in Propositions 2.15 and 2.16. For a general limit group L , this feature about $L_{\widehat{p}}$ is not known. Kochloukova–Zaleskii study in [KZ11, Theorem 4.2] the residual properties of a class of pro- p analogues of limit groups (which includes, for example, pro- p completions of ICE groups). However, it is an open problem to determine whether their class contains the pro- p completions of all limit groups (we refer to [KZ11, Section 9] for related open questions).

The following is another consequence of Theorem B, as an application of the advances of Louder–Wilton [LW22a, LW22b] and Linton [Lin22] on one-relator groups.

Corollary C. Let p be a prime and let G be a one-relator group in p -genus of a free or hyperbolic surface group. Then G is hyperbolic and virtually special.

This is proven in Corollary 9.5. The conclusion of this result was already ensured for one-relator parafree groups in [Lin22, Corollary 8.4]. However, we should stress that Corollary C extends to other genera by [JZ21a, Theorem 1.1].

We recall to the reader that the work of Puder–Parzanchevski [PP15] and Wilton [Wil18c] establish Conjecture 1.1 when $\Gamma = F *_u \overline{F}$ is the double of a free group F along a word $u \in F$. By Theorem A, we can cover other examples of one-relator groups, namely amalgamated products of free groups (or a HNN extension of a free group) along cyclic subgroups. Nevertheless, Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2 are open for general one-relator groups. That is, we do not know whether one-relator groups Γ in the finite genus of a free or surface group S necessarily satisfy $\Gamma \cong S$. Opportunely, Corollary C at least ensures that such Γ are hyperbolic and virtually special.

We also remark that Theorem B gives a new proof of the analogous result of Baumslag [Bau69, Theorem 4.2]) for parafree groups G and generalises it to parasurfaces and other genera. The proof of Baumslag relies on the fact that a parafree group can be embedded into the unit group of a ring of power series $\mathbb{Z}[[X]]$. Our proof of Theorem B relies on different cohomological tools and the following elementary fact about the pro- p topology of finitely generated nilpotent groups.

Theorem D. Let G be a virtually polycyclic group. Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- The group G is nilpotent.
- For all subgroups $H \leq G$ and all primes p , the pro- p topology of G induces on H its full pro- p topology.

The first implication is proven in Theorem 7.2 and the second in Theorem 7.7. To the best of the author's knowledge, this result has not appeared explicitly in the literature before. We also think it may be of independent interest, as it provides another viewpoint from which we see how generic polycyclic groups differ from nilpotent groups. In this sense, Theorem D is comparable with a result of Hirsch [Seg83, Theorem 2, Chapter 1] that states that a virtually polycyclic group has the property that all its finite quotients are nilpotent if and only if it is nilpotent itself.

Virtually polycyclic groups are known to be LERF (see Section 7 for references). In particular, in these groups, the induced profinite topology on subgroups is the full profinite topology. However, when it comes to the pro- p topology, Theorem D shows that this phenomenon is very restrictive among virtually polycyclic groups. In fact, it is natural to ask whether this property can be found in groups that satisfy no group law (see Section 7.3 for more discussion).

Question 1.7. Let p be a prime. Are there finitely generated residually finite groups G that contain non-abelian free subgroups and have the property that, for all finitely generated $H \leq G$, the pro- p topology of G induces on H its full pro- p topology?

In our last result, we provide infinitely many examples of groups that are determined within the class of residually free groups by their finite quotients.

Theorem E. Let G be a finitely generated residually free group and let S be a free or surface group. Suppose that $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{S} \times \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n}$. Then $G \cong S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$.

We prove this theorem in Section 11. The first step consists on showing that G and $S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$ have isomorphic centre. We remark that this does not happen in general since Lubotzky proved in [Lub14, Proposition 1.5] that having non-trivial centre is not a profinite property.

1.1. Acknowledgements. The author is funded by the Oxford–Cocker Graduate Scholarship. This work has also received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 850930). I am grateful to Andrei Jaikin-Zapirain for introducing me to these ideas and questions on profinite rigidity and for suggesting Theorem D. I would like to thank Jonathan Fruchter for conversations on the one-endedness of cyclic splittings, and also Sam Hughes and Gareth Wilkes for many useful suggestions and corrections. Lastly, special thanks are due to my supervisors Dawid Kielak and Ric Wade for their stimulating guidance and for carefully reading this paper, which made a very significant improvement.

1.2. Organisation of the paper. In Section 2, we revisit the theory of profinite and pro- p groups and, in Section 3, we review when the first L^2 -Betti numbers of a residually finite abstract group can be detected from its profinite completion. In Section 4, we briefly introduce the cohomology theory of profinite groups, with emphasis on the analogous finiteness properties and on notions such as cohomological

dimension and Poincaré duality. The main result of Section 4 is Proposition 4.14, which restates a criterion of Wilton that recognises surfaces among abstract groups from the profinite completion. Other crucial ingredients are the surface subgroups and the separability properties of limit and special groups that we recall in Section 5 and Section 6. The Tits alternative of Theorem B is proven in Theorem 8.1 as an application of p -separability principles studied in Section 7, where we establish Theorem D. We show Corollary C in Section 9. The proof of Theorem A is split into Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 10.2. Finally, we prove Theorem E in Section 11.

2. PRO- \mathcal{C} GROUPS, TOPOLOGIES AND COMPLETIONS

This section continues the discussion at the beginning of the introduction, where we defined formations \mathcal{C} of finite groups and the \mathcal{C} -genus of an abstract group.

Notation 2.1. Given an abstract group Γ , we denote its profinite completion (resp. pro- p completion) by $\widehat{\Gamma}$ (resp. $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$). Bold letters $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{U}$ will denote profinite groups. In addition, we write $\mathbf{H} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$ or $\mathbf{H} \leq_o \mathbf{G}$ (resp. $\mathbf{H} \trianglelefteq_c \mathbf{G}$ or $\mathbf{H} \trianglelefteq_o \mathbf{G}$) to indicate that the subgroup $\mathbf{H} \leq \mathbf{G}$ (resp. normal subgroup $\mathbf{H} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{G}$) is closed or open.

We are interested in studying the finite genus of free and surface groups S . These groups were fairly mysterious until the following theorem, which is important to keep in mind during the rest of the exposition.

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 1.1, [JZ21a]). *Let S be a finitely generated free or surface group. Suppose that G belongs to the finite, soluble or nilpotent genus of S . Then G belongs to the p -genus of S for all primes p .*

We remark again that these inclusions between genera are not true in general, since Lubotzky [Lub14] showed that the properties of being residually soluble or residually- p are not profinite invariants.

2.1. Pro- \mathcal{C} completions. We now fix a formation \mathcal{C} of finite groups. A pro- \mathcal{C} group can be defined as a profinite group \mathbf{G} such that for all its open normal subgroups $\mathbf{U} \trianglelefteq_o \mathbf{G}$, one has that $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{C}$. Alternatively, a pro- \mathcal{C} group is just an inverse limit of groups belonging to \mathcal{C} that is endowed with the profinite topology.

In order to relate residual properties of abstract groups and profinite invariants, we recall the pro- \mathcal{C} completion functor. Given an abstract group G , its collection of quotients belonging to \mathcal{C} is encoded in its pro- \mathcal{C} completion $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$. As an abstract group, it is defined to be the inverse limit of finite groups

$$G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} = \varprojlim_U G/U$$

where U ranges over finite-index normal subgroups of G such that $G/U \in \mathcal{C}$. We always consider $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ endowed with the profinite topology, which turns it into a pro- \mathcal{C} group. There is a natural and canonical group homomorphism $\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}: G \rightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ and, in these terms, a group G is residually- \mathcal{C} if and only if $\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ is injective. This map $\iota_{\mathcal{C}}$ enjoys the following universal property (which, in fact, provides a more functorial definition of $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$).

Proposition 2.3. Let Γ be an abstract group. Let $\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ be the canonical map. The data $(\Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}, \iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}})$ is characterised by the following properties.

- (1) $\Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ is a pro- \mathcal{C} group.
- (2) The map $\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ has dense image.
- (3) For any pro- \mathcal{C} group \mathbf{K} and every group homomorphism $f: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ with dense image, there exists a continuous homomorphism $f_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}: \Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow \mathbf{K}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Gamma & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}} & \Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \\ & \searrow f & \downarrow f_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \\ & & \mathbf{K} \end{array}$$

is commutative.

When we say that the pair $(\Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}, \iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}})$ is unique, we mean the following: if \mathbf{H} is a pro- \mathcal{C} group and $\iota: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ is a group homomorphism such that the pair (\mathbf{H}, ι) verifies the three properties above, then there exists an isomorphism of pro- \mathcal{C} groups $\alpha: \Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ such that $\alpha \circ \iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} = \iota$.

We stress the fact that the previous discussion does not rely on whether $\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ is injective (equivalently G is residually- \mathcal{C}) or not. A priori the pro- \mathcal{C} completion only captures information about finite quotients of G in \mathcal{C} and not about how we can distinguish elements of G in these quotients. There are, for example, finitely generated residually finite groups with free pro- p completion for all primes p that are not residually- p for any prime p , such as the trefoil knot group $\langle a, b | a^2 b^3 \rangle$.

The philosophy that finite quotients of a group are encoded in their profinite completion is precised in the following folkloric theorem.

Theorem 2.4 (Dixon–Formanek–Poland–Ribes [DFPR82]). *Let \mathcal{C} be a formation of finite groups. Two abstract groups Γ and Λ have the same class of isomorphism types of quotients belonging to \mathcal{C} if and only if $\Gamma_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \cong \Lambda_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$.*

So we can completely reformulate in terms of the pro- \mathcal{C} completions what it means for a group to be in the \mathcal{C} -genus of another one. This is important because now we have turned a bare collection of finite groups into a group and now we can do, say, group cohomology with this information. Crucially, this functor “pro- \mathcal{C} completion” is right-exact.

Proposition 2.5 ([RZ00], Proposition 3.2.5). Let \mathcal{C} be a formation that is closed under taking normal subgroups. Given an exact sequence of abstract groups of the form $N \rightarrow G \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 1$, the induced sequence of maps $N_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow Q_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow 1$ is exact.

Given an injective map $N \rightarrow G$, the question of whether the induced map $N_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$ is also injective will be a crucial topic of discussion later in this section and during Section 7, especially with the aim of proving the Tits alternative of Theorem 8.1. On the other hand, Proposition 2.5 also tells us that pro- \mathcal{C} completions are better understood when studying quotients than when studying subgroups, as the following direct consequence exhibits.

Proposition 2.6 (*Pro- \mathcal{C} completion of a quotient*). Let G be an abstract group and let $N \trianglelefteq G$ be a normal subgroup. Suppose that \mathcal{C} is a formation as in Proposition 2.5. Denote by $\iota: N \rightarrow G$ the inclusion. Then the canonical and natural map

$$(G/N)_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \longrightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}/\overline{\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}(N)}$$

is an isomorphism.

2.2. The notion of index in profinite groups. Given a profinite group \mathbf{G} and a subgroup \mathbf{H} , we will not need for our purposes to define the formal meaning of $|\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{H}|$ as a *supernatural number* (as in, for example, [RZ00, Section 2.3]).

However, recall we say that p^∞ divides the index $|\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{H}|$ if and only if for all n there exists a normal open $\mathbf{U} \trianglelefteq_o \mathbf{G}$ such that p^n divides the index of $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{U}/\mathbf{U}$ in the finite group \mathbf{G}/\mathbf{U} . Observe that, if \mathbf{G} is a pro- p group, then $\mathbf{H} \leq_c \mathbf{G}$ has infinite index if and only if p^∞ divides the index $|\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{H}|$. However, for general profinite groups, the latter is much stronger, as the following example shows.

Example 2.7. The profinite group $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ is canonically isomorphic to $\prod_p \mathbb{Z}_p$, where \mathbb{Z}_p denotes the additive part of the ring of p -adic integers (isomorphic to the pro- p completion of \mathbb{Z}). So $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ surjects in a natural way onto the profinite group $\prod_p \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, where the kernel \mathbf{K} is isomorphic to $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ and will have an index in $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ equal to the supernatural number $\prod_p p$. In particular, no prime p will satisfy that p^2 divides the index $|\widehat{\mathbb{Z}} : \mathbf{K}|$.

2.3. Lower central series. The terms of the *lower central series* of a group G are defined recursively as $\gamma_1 G = G$ and $\gamma_{n+1} G = [\gamma_n G, G]$ if $n \geq 1$. Similarly, the terms of the *p -lower central series* of G are defined as $\gamma_{1,p} G = G$ and $\gamma_{n+1,p} G = [\gamma_{n,p} G, G] \gamma_{n,p} G^p$ if $n \geq 1$. The expression $\gamma_n \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ may be ambiguous. We clarify that it means $\gamma_n G$ with $G = \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$, defined as a subgroup of $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ (so we do not mean to denote the pro- p completion of $\gamma_n \Gamma$).

Proposition 2.8 ([DSMS99], Proposition 1.19 and Exercise 17). Let \mathbf{G} be a finitely generated pro- p group. Then $\gamma_k \mathbf{G}$ is a closed subgroup of \mathbf{G} .

In fact, the previous is true for finitely generated profinite groups, although this is a much deeper result due to Nikolov and Segal [NS07, Theorem 1.4].

Lemma 2.9. Let Γ be a finitely generated group and let $k \geq 0$ be an integer. Then the canonical map $\Gamma/\gamma_k \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_k \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ is a pro- p completion map.

Proof. The group $\gamma_k \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ are closed subgroups of $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ by Proposition 2.8 and contain $\gamma_k \Gamma$ as a dense subgroup, so $\gamma_k \Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ is the closure of $\gamma_k \Gamma$. By Proposition 2.6, the conclusion follows. \square

2.4. Induced profinite topologies. Given a formation \mathcal{C} and a group G the *full pro- \mathcal{C} topology* of G is defined to be the initial topology of the map $G \rightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$. In other words, it is the smallest topology that contains among its open subsets all the cosets of $U \trianglelefteq G$ such that $G/U \in \mathcal{C}$. When \mathcal{C} is the formation of all finite groups (resp. finite p -groups), we call it the *profinite* (resp. *pro- p) topology*.

Notation 2.10. When the formation \mathcal{C} is understood from the context, we write $H \leq_c G$ or $H \leq_o G$ (resp. $H \trianglelefteq_c G$ or $H \trianglelefteq_o G$) to denote that the subgroup $H \leq G$ (resp. normal subgroup $H \trianglelefteq G$) is closed or open in the pro- \mathcal{C} topology.

A useful result that relates the open subgroups of a group G with the open subgroups of \widehat{G} in a explicit way is the following correspondence.

Proposition 2.11 ([RZ00], Proposition 3.2.2). Let G be a residually- \mathcal{C} group and identify G with its image in $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$.

(a) Let

$$\Theta : \{H \mid H \leq_o G\} \longrightarrow \{\mathbf{H} \leq_o G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}\}$$

be the map that assigns to each open subgroup $H \leq_o G$ its closure \overline{H} in $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$.

Then Θ is a bijective correspondence with inverse given by $\Theta^{-1}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathbf{H} \cap G$.

(b) Given $H \leq_o G$, H is normal in G if and only if $\Theta(H)$ is normal in $G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$.

(c) Given $H \leq_o G$, the index $|G : H|$ is equal to the index $|G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} : \Theta(H)|$.

(d) The map $H \longrightarrow \Theta(H)$ is a pro- \mathcal{C} completion map.

Definition 2.12. Let \mathcal{C} be a formation of finite groups. Assume that $H \leq G$. Denote by $\iota : H \longrightarrow G$ the injection. We say that H is *pro- \mathcal{C} embeddable into G* if the induced map

$$\iota_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} : H_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \longrightarrow G_{\widehat{\mathcal{C}}}$$

is an injection.

Observe that this is a transitive relation in the sense that whenever $A \leq B \leq C$, with A being pro- \mathcal{C} embeddable into B and B being pro- \mathcal{C} embeddable into C , then A is pro- \mathcal{C} embeddable into C . Other than stating Proposition 2.11, we introduced the pro- \mathcal{C} topology on abstract groups because it allows us to reformulate pro- \mathcal{C} embeddability intrinsically in G as follows.

Lemma 2.13 (See [RZ00], Lemma 3.2.6). Let $H \leq G$ be two groups. Then H is pro- \mathcal{C} embeddable into G if and only if the pro- \mathcal{C} topology of G induces on H its full pro- \mathcal{C} topology.

Observation 2.14. If H is finitely generated, in order to prove that the pro- \mathcal{C} -topology of G induces the full pro- \mathcal{C} topology of H , it suffices to check the following: For any characteristic subgroup $\Lambda \trianglelefteq H$ with $H/\Lambda \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists $\Gamma \trianglelefteq G$ with $G/\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\Gamma \cap H \subseteq \Lambda$.

We will show in Theorem 7.2 that subgroups of finitely generated nilpotent groups are pro- p embeddable. We finish this section by analysing some of its consequences (for instance, the fact that Hirsch lengths will be pro- p invariants of finitely generated nilpotent groups).

Proposition 2.15. Let G be a finitely generated group such that the central quotients $G/\gamma_k G$ are torsion-free for all k . Then, for all primes p , $G_{\widehat{p}}$ is residually- (torsion-free nilpotent). In fact, the quotients $G_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_n G_{\widehat{p}}$ are torsion-free for all n .

Proof. Since $G_{\widehat{p}}$ is residually- p , $\bigcap_k \gamma_{k,p} G_{\widehat{p}} = \{1\}$ and, in particular, $\bigcap_k \gamma_k G_{\widehat{p}} = 1$. It remains to prove that $G_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_k G_{\widehat{p}}$ is torsion-free. We know that $\Gamma = G/\gamma_{c+1} G$ is a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group. We are going to prove that this is enough to conclude that its pro- p completion $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ is torsion-free. The proof of the

proposition would then be complete because the canonical map $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_k G_{\widehat{p}}$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 2.6.

Now let Γ be a finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group. Then $\Gamma/Z(\Gamma)$ is also torsion-free (see [CMZ17, Corollary 2.22]). Then, iterating the previous observation, we deduce that the lower central series

$$1 = \gamma_{c+1}\Gamma \trianglelefteq \gamma_c\Gamma \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq \gamma_2\Gamma \trianglelefteq \gamma_1\Gamma = \Gamma$$

of Γ will be such that $\gamma_k\Gamma/\gamma_{k+1}\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}^{n_k}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq c$ and some non-negative integers n_1, \dots, n_c .

Notice that the canonical maps $(\gamma_k\Gamma)_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow \gamma_k\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ are isomorphisms (for example, by Theorem 7.2). From this and Proposition 2.6, we derive that $(\gamma_{k+1}\Gamma/\gamma_k\Gamma)_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow \gamma_{k+1}\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_k\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ are isomorphisms of pro- p groups for all $1 \leq k \leq c$ (recall that these groups are, by Lemma 2.9, the pro- p completions of $\gamma_{k+1}\Gamma/\gamma_k\Gamma$). So there is a lower central series of $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ by closed subgroups

$$1 = \gamma_{c+1}\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} \trianglelefteq \gamma_c\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} \trianglelefteq \cdots \trianglelefteq \gamma_2\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} \trianglelefteq \gamma_1\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} = \Gamma_{\widehat{p}},$$

for which each quotient $\gamma_{k+1}\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_k\Gamma_{\widehat{p}} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^{n_k}$ is torsion-free. So $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ is torsion-free, as we claimed before. \square

It is not hard to see that the class of groups satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 2.15 is closed under taking free products. However, the following proposition ensures many one-ended examples as well.

Proposition 2.16. Let G be isomorphic to a RAAG or to a one-relator group $F/\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle$ such that if k is the biggest non-negative integer such that $r \in \gamma_k F$, then $r \cdot \gamma_{k+1}F$ is not a proper power in $\gamma_k F/\gamma_{k+1}F$. In these cases, G satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.15. In particular, this is true if G is a surface group.

Proof. When G is a RAAG, this is [Wad15, Theorem 6.4]. When $G = F/\langle\langle r \rangle\rangle$, this proposition is a direct consequence of [Lab70, Section 1]. The reason is the following. The main theorem of [Lab70] states that, under our assumptions on the relator r , the graded algebra $\bigoplus_n \gamma_n G/\gamma_{n+1}G$ is a free \mathbb{Z} -Lie algebra. In particular, the subsequent quotients $\gamma_n G/\gamma_{n+1}G$ are free abelian (the author also computes their rank). Since surface groups are defined by a single relator that satisfies the assumptions of r in Proposition 2.16, the last conclusion follows. \square

We observe that the class of one-relator groups of Proposition 2.16 includes many limit groups. For example, those arising as doubles $F *_{u=\bar{u}} \overline{F}$ of a free group F along a relator $u \in F$ that satisfies the assumptions of r in Proposition 2.16. We remark in Remark 8.4 how this can be used to establish Theorem B for the p -genus of many hyperbolic limit groups, other than free and non-abelian surface groups.

3. THE FIRST L^2 -BETTI NUMBER AS A PRO- \mathcal{C} INVARIANT

We will describe some scenarios in which the first L^2 -Betti number of a group G , denoted by $b_1^{(2)}(G)$, is a profinite invariant. This is an important principle in the proofs of Theorem B and Theorem E. A standard reference about L^2 -invariants is the book of Lück [Lüc02] and, in alignment with the approach taken in this section, the survey paper of Jaikin-Zapirain [JZ19].

For torsion-free groups G satisfying the Strong Atiyah conjecture, Linnell [Lin93] shows that one can define $b_1^{(2)}(G)$ as follows. Suppose that the group ring $\mathbb{Q}G$ of G with rational coefficients has a universal division ring of fractions $\mathbb{Q}G \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}$. This provides a notion of dimension for all $\mathbb{Q}G$ -modules as follows: given a left $\mathbb{Q}G$ -module M , we extend scalars $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}G} M$ and take its linear-algebraic dimension as a left $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}$ -module. We can define the first L^2 -Betti number for these groups G as

$$b_1^{(2)}(G) = \dim_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}} H_1(G; \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}).$$

Since locally indicable groups satisfy the Strong Atiyah conjecture by a result of Jaikin-Zapirain and López-Álvarez [JZLÁ19], the previous is a definition of $b_1^{(2)}$ for these groups.

A general philosophy that explains why we work with first L^2 -Betti numbers instead of usual Betti numbers is that the former behave in a better way while containing similar information. For example, they are multiplicative in the following sense.

Proposition 3.1 (Theorem 1.35(9), [Lüc02]). *Let G be a finitely generated group and let H be a finite-index subgroup. Then $b_1^{(2)}(H) = b_1^{(2)}(G) |G : H|$.*

3.1. Computations using Lück approximation. When it comes to relate the first L^2 -Betti number $b_1^{(2)}(G)$ of a group G to its profinite completion \widehat{G} , it is particularly helpful the characterisation of $b_1^{(2)}(G)$ as a limit of (normalised) usual Betti numbers over a filtration of G by normal finite-index subgroups. A pioneering result in this direction is due to Lück [Lüc94].

Theorem 3.2 (Lück's approximation theorem). *Let G be a group of type FP_2 and let $G = N_1 > N_2 > \dots > N_m > \dots$ be a sequence of finite-index normal subgroups with $\bigcap_m N_m = 1$. Then*

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} = b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

For residually-finite groups that are not FP_2 , we still have a one-sided estimate of the same type.

Theorem 3.3 ([LO11]). *Let G be finitely generated and let $G = N_1 > N_2 > \dots > N_m > \dots$ be a sequence of finite-index normal subgroups with $\bigcap_m N_m = 1$. Then*

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} \leq b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

We move on to the observation that groups G satisfying the following inequality also have a Lück approximation theorem:

$$(1) \quad b_1(G_0) \geq b_1^{(2)}(G_0) + 1 \text{ for every finite-index } G_0 \leq G.$$

Examples of groups G with this property are limits of left-orderable amenable groups in the space of marked group presentations (by a result of Osin [OT11, Theorem 1.4]). Interestingly, the property of (1) can be proven in greater generality.

Proposition 3.4 (Jaikin-Zapirain [JZ21b]). *Let G be a finitely generated residually- (locally indicable and amenable) group. Then $b_1^{(2)}(G) \leq b_1(G) - 1$.*

Proof. Since H is residually-(locally indicable amenable), then there exists a universal division ring of fractions $\mathbb{Q}G \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}$ by [JZ21b, Theorem 1.1]. From previous comments, then we can compute the first L^2 -Betti number of G as $b_1^{(2)}(G) = \dim_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}} H_1(G; \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}) = \dim_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}} \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}G} I_G \right) - 1$. On the other hand, the universality of the epic $\mathbb{Q}G$ -ring $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}$ implies that its associated rank function is maximal (see [JZ21b, Corollary 1.4]). Hence, we have the inequality $\dim_{\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G}} \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{Q}G} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}G} I_G \right) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}G} I_G \right) = b_1(G)$. The conclusion follows. \square

This proposition is used in [JZ21a, Theorem 3.3] to show that groups in the soluble genus of a free group are parafree (similarly, these ideas are replicated in [Fru22]). For our purposes, the interest behind Proposition 3.4 is extending the Lück approximation Theorem 3.2 of $b_1^{(2)}$ to other classes of groups.

Corollary 3.5. Let G be a finitely generated residually-(amenable and locally indicable) group. Let $G = N_1 > N_2 > \dots > N_m > \dots$ be a sequence of finite-index normal subgroups with $\bigcap_m N_m = 1$. Then

$$(2) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} = b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

Proof. We know from Theorem 3.3 that

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} \leq b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

On the other hand, $b_1(N_m) \geq b_1^{(2)}(N_m) + 1 = b_1^{(2)}(G)|G : N_m| + 1$ for all m by Proposition 3.4 and the multiplicativity of $b_1^{(2)}$ (Proposition 3.1). So

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} \geq b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

Hence the limit of (2) exists and equals $b_1^{(2)}(G)$. \square

Definition 3.6. We say that a finitely generated residually finite group G is Lücky if for every descending sequence $G = N_1 > N_2 > \dots > N_m > \dots$ of finite-index normal subgroups N_m with $\bigcap_m N_m = 1$, it satisfies that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(N_m)}{|G : N_m|} = b_1^{(2)}(G).$$

We review this subsection by saying that both FP_2 groups and finitely generated residually-(amenable and locally indicable) are Lücky by Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.5.

3.2. An invariant of the genus. We are going to denote by \mathcal{C} a formation of finite groups. In particular, we will denote by \mathcal{C}_p the formation of finite p -groups.

Proposition 3.7. Let \mathcal{C} be a formation of finite groups containing \mathcal{C}_p for some prime p . Suppose that G and H are finitely generated groups with the same pro- \mathcal{C} completion. Then $b_1(G) = b_1(H)$.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the fact that $b_1(G)$ is exactly the greatest positive integer m such that G maps surjectively to $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})^m$ for all n , and this is a property detected by the pro- \mathcal{C} completion because \mathcal{C} contains \mathcal{C}_p . \square

The following is a re-statement of [BR14, Proposition 7.5] and we reproduce the same proof.

Corollary 3.8. Let \mathcal{C} be a formation of finite groups that includes \mathcal{C}_p for some p . Let H be a Lücky and residually- \mathcal{C} group. If G admits a dense embedding into $\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{C}}$ then $b_1^{(2)}(G) \geq b_1^{(2)}(H)$.

Proof. Let H_m be the intersection of all the normal finite-index subgroups $H_0 \leq H$ such that $H/H_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $|H : H_0| \leq m$. It is clear that H_m is normal with $H/H_m \in \mathcal{C}$ and that the intersection of the sequence of open subgroups $\overline{H_m} \subseteq H_{\mathcal{C}}$ is trivial. Consider $G_m = G \cap \overline{H_m}$. Then $\bigcap_m G_m = 1$ are normal subgroups of finite-index. Notice that, by Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 3.7, we have $b_1(G_m) \geq b_1(\overline{G_m}) = b_1(\overline{H_m}) = b_1(H_m)$ for all m . Then, since H is Lücky, we can combine the estimation of Theorem 3.3 with the previous observation to derive that

$$b_1^{(2)}(G) \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(G_m)}{|G : G_m|} \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_1(H_m)}{|H : H_m|} = b_1^{(2)}(H). \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.9. Let G and H be two Lücky groups. Let \mathcal{C} be a formation of finite groups that contains \mathcal{C}_p for some prime p . If G and H belong to the same \mathcal{C} -genus, then $b_1^{(2)}(G) = b_1^{(2)}(H)$.

Proof. Immediate from Corollary 3.8. \square

4. COHOMOLOGICAL DIMENSION AND POINCARÉ DUALITY

Here we recall the finiteness properties of groups that we shall use. We denote by R a unital and associative ring (not necessarily commutative).

Definition 4.1. We say that an R -module M is of type $\text{FP}_n(R)$ if there exists a projective resolution

$$\longrightarrow P_{n+1} \longrightarrow P_n \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

with P_i finitely generated for $0 \leq i \leq n$. Moreover, we say that an R -module M is of type $\text{FP}_\infty(R)$ if it is of type $\text{FP}_n(R)$ for all n . Analogously, we say that a group G is of type $\text{FP}_n(R)$ (resp. of type $\text{FP}_\infty(R)$) if the trivial RG -module R is of type $\text{FP}_n(R)$ (resp. of type $\text{FP}_\infty(R)$ for all n).

4.1. Profinite groups. Now we quickly review the cohomology theory of profinite groups, including their adequate notion of group ring that is used to define their (co-)homology groups and their finiteness properties in the sense of Definition 4.1.

Given a profinite group \mathbf{G} and a profinite ring \mathbf{R} given as an inverse limit $\mathbf{R} = \varprojlim_{i \geq 1} R_i$ of finite rings R_i , the *completed group algebra of \mathbf{G} over \mathbf{R}* is defined as the inverse limit of usual group rings $R_i[\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{U}]$ in the following way

$$[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{G}] = \varprojlim_{i \geq 1, \mathbf{U} \leq_o \mathbf{G}} R_i[\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{U}],$$

where $i \geq 1$ and \mathbf{U} ranges over open normal subgroup of \mathbf{G} . Since $[[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{G}]]$ is an inverse limit of finite sets, we can endow it with the profinite topology. The only three profinite rings \mathbf{R} that we consider are \mathbb{F}_p , $\mathbb{Z}_p \cong \varprojlim_n \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \cong \varprojlim_n \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

A group is said to be *cohomologically good* (or *good* in the sense of Serre [Ser97, Section I. 2. 6]) if for every finite $\widehat{\mathbf{G}}$ -module A , the natural homomorphism

$$H^k(\widehat{\mathbf{G}}; A) \longrightarrow H^k(G; A),$$

induced by $G \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{G}}$, is an isomorphism. A group G is said to be *subgroup separable* or *LERF* (standing for *locally extended residually finite*) if every finitely generated subgroup $H \leq G$ is closed in the profinite topology. This implies that the topology induced on H from the profinite topology of G is the full profinite topology of H . Equivalently, by Lemma 2.13, the natural map $\widehat{H} \longrightarrow \overline{H} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbf{G}}$ is an isomorphism of profinite groups.

We say that a profinite group \mathbf{G} is of type \mathbf{FP}_n (resp. of type $p\text{-FP}_n$) if the $[[\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{G}]]$ -module $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. the $[[\mathbb{Z}_p\mathbf{G}]]$ -module \mathbb{Z}_p) is of type \mathbf{FP}_n .

Proposition 4.2 ([JZ18], Proposition 3.1). If Γ is an abstract \mathbf{FP}_∞ and good group then its profinite completion $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is of type $p\text{-FP}_\infty$ for every prime p .

Recall we say a module M is *simple* if and only if it has exactly two submodules.

Definition 4.3. We say that a profinite group \mathbf{G} has p -cohomological dimension $n = \text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G})$ if n is the largest non-negative integer m such that $H^{m+1}(\mathbf{G}, A) = 0$ for all simple discrete $[[\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{G}]]$ -modules that are annihilated by p .

We review alternative definitions of cd_p that relate finiteness properties of the trivial \mathbf{G} -module \mathbb{F}_p and the cohomology of its p -Sylows.

Proposition 4.4. Let \mathbf{G} be a profinite group. Then the following are equivalent

- (1) $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}) \leq n$.
- (2) $H^k(\mathbf{G}, A) = 0$ for all $k \geq n + 1$ and all discrete $[[\widehat{\mathbf{Z}}\mathbf{G}]]$ -modules that are annihilated by p .
- (3) There exists a resolution of the trivial $[[\mathbb{F}_p\mathbf{G}]]$ -module \mathbb{F}_p

$$0 \longrightarrow P_n \longrightarrow P_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_p \longrightarrow 0$$

by projective profinite $[[\mathbb{F}_p\mathbf{G}]]$ -modules P_i .

- (4) If \mathbf{G}_p is a Sylow p -subgroup of \mathbf{G} , then $H^{n+1}(\mathbf{G}_p, \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$.

Proof. The equivalence between (1), (2) and (3) is [RZ00, Proposition 7.1.4]. The equivalence between (1) and (4) follows from [Ser97, Corollary 1 of Chapter 3, and Proposition 21]. \square

Good groups G enjoy the convenient property that

$$\text{cd}_p(\widehat{G}) = \text{cd}_p(G) \text{ for all primes } p.$$

In particular, a free profinite group has $\text{cd}_p = 1$ and profinite surfaces have $\text{cd}_p = 2$. Beyond the ease of computations, we should remark that focusing on p -primary modules in the Definition 4.3 of the ‘‘cohomological dimension function’’ cd_p also has the purpose of recovering intuitive features that are true for abstract groups

such as assigning the value 1 to free objects. If we had looked, more generally, at discrete modules and not only finite modules, one would have not avoided the pathology of $H^2(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}; \mathbb{Z})$ being non-zero (as this is isomorphic to $H^1(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, see [Ser97, Chapter 1, Section 3.2]). Furthermore, the dimension function cd_p enjoys nice “geometric” properties.

Proposition 4.5. Let \mathbf{G} be a profinite group, \mathbf{H} a closed subgroup of \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{N} a normal closed subgroup of \mathbf{G} . Then

- (1) $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{H}) \leq \text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G})$, and
- (2) $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}) \leq \text{cd}_p(\mathbf{N}) + \text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{N})$.

The first point of the proposition is proven in [RZ00, Theorem 7.3.1] and follows from Shapiro’s lemma. The second one is more technical, as it requires the use of spectral sequences (see [RZ00, Proposition 7.4.2]). Consequently, $\text{cd}_p(\widehat{F} \rtimes \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \leq 2$ and $\text{cd}_p(\widehat{\pi_1(\Sigma)} \rtimes \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}) \leq 3$. In fact, the previous are equalities in these cases, because, under certain finiteness assumptions, cd_p can be proven to be (virtually) additive with respect to short exact sequences (as shown in [WZ04, Theorem 1.1]).

It is instructive to compare the properties that we are treating about cd_p with the ones corresponding to the projective dimension in the abstract setting (as in, for example, the book of Brown [Bro82, Chapter VIII, Section 2]).

A classical characteristic feature of groups of finite cohomological dimension, both in the abstract and profinite setting, is that these are torsion-free.

Lemma 4.6. Let \mathbf{G} be a profinite group with $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}) < \infty$ for all primes p . Then \mathbf{G} is torsion-free.

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, we know that, for all closed subgroups $\mathbf{H} \leq \mathbf{G}$ and all primes p , we have $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{H}) \leq \text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G})$. In particular, since $\text{cd}_p(\mathbb{Z}/p) = \infty$, there is no embedding $\mathbb{Z}/p \hookrightarrow \mathbf{G}$. Thus \mathbf{G} is torsion-free. \square

The previous lemma allows to prove that the property of being torsion-free is a property of the finite genus of good groups with finite cohomological dimension. However, Lubotzky shows that being torsion-free is not a profinite property ([Lub14, Proposition 1.5]).

A crucial principle about the category of pro- p groups is that, as opposed to the category of profinite groups, there is an analogous theorem to Stallings’ [Sta68] and Swan’s [Swa69] characterising free groups by their cohomological dimension.

Theorem 4.7 (Theorem 7.7.4, [RZ00]). *Let \mathbf{G} be a pro- p group of p -cohomological dimension at most one. Then \mathbf{G} is free pro- p .*

4.2. Poincaré Duality and the recognition of surfaces. A hard theorem of Eckman and Müller [EM80] gives a cohomological characterisation of surface groups among abstract groups as being exactly the Poincaré duality groups of dimension two (an alternative proof can be found in [KK21]). There is a similar principle for pro- p groups but it is poorly understood what happens for general profinite groups. In a similar fashion, it is not known whether a finitely generated residually finite group whose profinite completion is PD_2 at all primes p is itself PD_2 . However, we combine a geometric result of Kerckhoff (Corollary 4.8) with an observation of Serre

on profinite groups (Lemma 4.11) to restate in Proposition 4.14 a criterion of Wilton [Wil21] for detecting surface groups among abstract groups by looking at their profinite completion. Before this, we introduce separately these two topological and profinite ingredients.

A classical question in the theory of surfaces is the *Nielsen realisation* problem, which, in its strongest formulation, asks whether any finite subgroup of the mapping class group of a surface Σ can be realised as a group of isometries of (Σ, g) for some choice of a Riemannian metric g with constant sectional curvature. Fenchel and Nielsen solved the case of cyclic groups and the general case was solved by Kerckhoff [Ker83]. This result has the following particular consequence, which answers a question of A. Karrass and D. Solitar raised at the American Mathematical Society meeting in 1970.

Corollary 4.8 (Kerckhoff’s Nielsen realisation). A torsion-free group that is virtually a surface group is itself a surface group.

The previous result was used by Gardam, Kielak and Logan [GKL22] to partially confirm some conjectural descriptions of surface groups among one-relator groups.

In order to state the aforementioned remark of Serre in Lemma 4.11, we review the notion of Poincaré duality in profinite groups.

Definition 4.9. Let \mathbf{G} be a profinite group of type $p\text{-FP}_\infty$. We say that \mathbf{G} is a *Poincaré duality group at p* of dimension n (written as PD^n at p) if $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}) = n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H^i(\mathbf{G}, \llbracket \mathbb{Z}_p \mathbf{G} \rrbracket) &= 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq n, \\ H^i(\mathbf{G}, \llbracket \mathbb{Z}_p \mathbf{G} \rrbracket) &\cong \mathbb{Z}_p \quad (\text{as abelian groups}). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.10. A group \mathbf{G} with $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{G}) < \infty$ is PD_n at p if and only if some (equivalently all) open subgroup $\mathbf{U} \leq_o \mathbf{G}$ is PD_n at p (see [SW00, Remark 4.2.9]).

As opposed to the abstract case, there is no classification of PD_2 profinite groups. However, these are classified for pro- p groups. A pro- p group \mathbf{G} is PD_1 if and only if $\mathbf{G} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$ (see [SW00, Example 4.4.4]). Poincaré duality pro- p groups of dimension 2 are known to coincide with the class of *Demushkin* groups (see [Ser97, Section I.4.5, Example 2]), which is a class of one-relator pro- p groups that was classified by Demushkin, Serre and Labute [Dem61, Dem63, Ser62, Lab67].

The following is a profinite variant of Strebel’s theorem [Str77] on infinite-index subgroups of PD_n abstract groups, and it appears in [Ser97, Page 44, exercise 5(b)] and [NSW08, Chapter 3, Section 7, Exercise 3].

Lemma 4.11 (Serre). Let \mathbf{G} be a profinite PD_n group at a prime p and let \mathbf{H} be a closed subgroup such that p^∞ divides the index $|\mathbf{G} : \mathbf{H}|$. Then $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{H}) < n$.

The previous lemma was of fundamental importance in the work of Wilton–Zaleskii [WZ19] on the profinite detection of prime and JSJ decompositions of three-manifolds.

Remark 4.12. When \mathbf{G} is a pro- p group, Lemma 4.11 only requires \mathbf{H} to have infinite index. Nevertheless, for general profinite groups \mathbf{G} , the conclusion of the theorem would not be true by only requiring infinite index. In fact, from Example 2.7, we know that $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ contains closed subgroups isomorphic to $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$ of index $\prod_p p$.

The most natural source of examples of profinite Poincaré duality groups consists of profinite completions of abstract Poincaré duality groups, as the following result from [KZ08, Theorem 4.1] ensures.

Theorem 4.13. *Let Γ be an abstract cohomologically good PD_n group. Then $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is a profinite PD_n group at every prime and $\Gamma_{\widehat{p}}$ is PD_n at p .*

Finally, we are ready to give a more refined criterion to detect surfaces, used by Wilton [Wil21] to establish Conjecture 1.2 when G is a limit group.

Proposition 4.14. *Let p be a prime and let G be a torsion-free residually finite group with separable cyclic subgroups such that its profinite completion \widehat{G} is PD_2 at p . Suppose that G contains a surface subgroup as a virtual retract. Then G is a surface group.*

Proof. By assumption, there exists a finite-index subgroup L of G containing a surface group $\pi_1\Sigma$ as a retract. Let K be the kernel of the retraction $L \rightarrow \pi_1\Sigma$. Our aim is to prove that $K = 1$. This way, we would have that $L \cong \pi_1\Sigma$ and that the torsion-free group G would be virtually a surface group. So the conclusion would follow from Corollary 4.8.

Hence, it remains to show that $K = 1$. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose that $K \neq 1$. The retraction $\pi_1\Sigma \hookrightarrow L \rightarrow \pi_1\Sigma$ induces a retraction $\widehat{\pi_1\Sigma} \hookrightarrow \widehat{L} \rightarrow \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}$ at the level of the profinite completions. Take $1 \neq k \in K$. Since G is torsion-free and cyclic subgroups are separable, then $\langle k \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}$ and the supernatural number p^∞ divides the order of $\overline{\langle k \rangle} \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}$. Since k is contained in the kernel \mathbf{K} of the retraction $\widehat{L} \rightarrow \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}$, then $|\mathbf{K}| = |\overline{\langle k \rangle}| |\mathbf{K} : \overline{\langle k \rangle}|$ is also divisible by p^∞ . We now claim that p^∞ also divides the index $|\widehat{L} : \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}|$. This way, it would also divide the index $|\widehat{G} : \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}|$ and, by Lemma 4.11, the p -cohomological dimension of $\widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}$ should be at most $\text{cd}_p(\widehat{G}) - 1 = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Thus, it simply remains to prove that p^∞ divides $|\widehat{L} : \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}|$. From the comments above, we know that, for every $n \geq 1$, there exists a characteristic open subgroup $\mathbf{U} \trianglelefteq_o \mathbf{K}$ such that p^n divides $|\mathbf{K} : \mathbf{U}|$. We observe that $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}$ is an open subgroup of \widehat{L} . After taking a normal open subgroup $\mathbf{H}_0 \trianglelefteq_o \widehat{L}$ contained in \mathbf{H} (for example, its core), we are going to check that p^n divides $|\widehat{L} : \mathbf{H}_0 \cdot \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}|$. For this, it suffices to notice that the previous index is divisible by

$$|\widehat{L} : \mathbf{H} \cdot \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}| = |\mathbf{K} \cdot \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma} : \mathbf{U} \cdot \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}| = |\mathbf{K} : \mathbf{U}|,$$

since $\mathbf{U} \trianglelefteq_o \mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{K} \cap \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma} = \{1\}$. We chose \mathbf{U} so p^n divides $|\mathbf{K} : \mathbf{U}|$, so this proves that p^∞ divides $|\widehat{L} : \widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}|$, as we wanted. \square

For the purpose of proving Theorem A using Proposition 4.14, we remark that the profinite completion of a surface $\widehat{\pi_1\Sigma}$ is PD_2 at p for all primes p .

5. RESIDUALLY FREE AND LIMIT GROUPS

The purpose of this section is reviewing separability and structural properties of residually free groups and a criteria to detect hyperbolic and limit groups among them. In Section 6, we will see to what extent some of these strong features are

still true in some of the groups of the class \mathcal{H}_{ab} . It is straightforward to see that residually free groups satisfy a Tits alternative.

Proposition 5.1 (Section 4, [Bau62]). Let G be a residually free group and let $H \leq G$ be a two-generated subgroup. Then H is isomorphic to one of the groups $\{1, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}^2, F_2\}$.

The following result allows us to relate the structure of finitely generated residually free groups to the structure of limit groups.

Proposition 5.2 ([BMR99], Corollary 19; and [Sel01], Claim 7.5). Let G be a finitely generated residually free group. Then G is a subdirect product of finitely many limit groups.

A classical question attributed to Gromov asks whether one-ended hyperbolic groups must contain surface subgroups, and Wilton answers this question positively for many cyclic splittings in the following way.

Theorem 5.3 ([Wil18c], Theorem 6.1). *Let G be the fundamental group of a graph of virtually free groups and virtually cyclic edge subgroups. Suppose that G is hyperbolic and one-ended. Then G contains a surface subgroup.*

As proven in [Wil18c, Corollary C], the theorem above can be applied, in combination with Sela's hierarchy on limit groups [Sel01], to find surface subgroups in non-free limit groups.

5.1. Criterion for the hyperbolicity of residually free groups. We state a criterion that helps to recognise a hyperbolic group given a cyclic splitting. It is a consequence of the combination theorem for negatively curved groups of Bestvina–Feighn [BF92].

Theorem 5.4. *Let (G, Y) be a finite graph of groups with hyperbolic vertex groups and virtually cyclic edge subgroups. Then its fundamental group π is hyperbolic if and only if it contains no Baumslag–Solitar subgroups.*

This combination theorem was used by Sela [Sel01, Corollary 4.4. (iii)] to characterise hyperbolic limit groups as follows.

Proposition 5.5. A limit group G is hyperbolic if and only if it contains no \mathbb{Z}^2 .

We remark that currently we know much more than this. For example, Alibegovic [Ali05, Corollary 3.4] and Dahmani [Dah03, Theorem 0.3] independently proved that limit groups are hyperbolic relative to their maximal abelian subgroups. Furthermore, in the case a limit group contains no \mathbb{Z}^2 , one can also conclude (as we later do in Proposition 6.2 for a subclass of \mathcal{H}_{ab}) that it is virtually compact special as a consequence of the Haglund–Wise's classification of hyperbolic groups with a quasi-convex hierarchy. The previous Proposition 5.5 can be extended to residually free groups.

Proposition 5.6 ([BCR14], Lemma 4.15). Let G be a finitely generated residually free group. Then G is a hyperbolic limit group if and only if it contains no \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Proof. One direction is clear. For the other, it suffices to prove, by Proposition 5.5, that G is limit if it contains no \mathbb{Z}^2 . By Proposition 5.2, G must be a subgroup of a direct product $G_1 \times \cdots \times G_n$ of limit groups G_1, \dots, G_n . We can assume that each G_i intersects G non-trivially. Otherwise, if some G_i satisfies that $G \cap G_i = \{1\}$, then the composition $G \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_j G_j \twoheadrightarrow \bigoplus_{j \neq i} G_j$ is still injective. If G intersected at least two of the factors, then G would contain a \mathbb{Z}^2 (since limit groups are torsion-free). So this implies that $G \hookrightarrow G_1$ must be a finitely generated subgroup of a limit group, and so it is also limit. \square

5.2. Separability properties. Wilton [Wil08a] proved that finitely generated subgroups of limit groups are quasiconvex and separable by establishing the following stronger property.

Definition 5.7. Let A be a subgroup of B . We say that A is a *virtual retract* of B if there exists a finite-index subgroup B_1 of B containing A and a group homomorphism $r : B_1 \rightarrow A$ such that r restricts to the identity function on A .

Theorem 5.8 ([Wil08a]). *Let G be a limit group and let H be a finitely generated subgroup. Then H is a virtual retract of G .*

This principle was later extended to subgroups of type FP of finitely generated residually free groups by Bridson–Wilton [BW08, Theorem B]. In the following section we treat other classes of groups with similar retraction properties (see Theorem 6.3).

6. HYPERBOLIC AND SPECIAL GROUPS

The study of special cube complexes was initiated by Haglund–Wise in their seminal paper [HW08] and plays a fundamental role in the solution of important results about three-manifolds, such as Agol’s proof of the virtual Haken conjecture [Ago13]. We refer the reader to the book of Aschenbrenner–Friedl–Wilton [AFW15] for more examples and discussion. A group is said to be *special* (resp. *compact special*) if it is the fundamental group of a non-positively curved (resp. compact) cube complex that satisfies Haglund–Wise a special condition on its hyperplanes. We will not delve into this definition because we are only interested in the retraction properties of these groups (as reflected by Theorem 6.3) and their consequences in the proof of Theorem A. Nevertheless, in order to offer a more precise idea of what these groups look like, we recall the following alternative description.

Theorem 6.1 ([HW08], Theorem 4.2). *A group G is special (resp. compact special) if and only if it is a subgroup (resp. a quasiconvex subgroup) of a right-angled Artin group.*

As anticipated in the introduction, many groups from \mathcal{H}_{ab} will be hyperbolic and virtually compact special.

Proposition 6.2. Let G be a group belonging to \mathcal{H}_{ab} with the following properties:

- (1) It is torsion-free.
- (2) It contains no Baumslag–Solitar subgroups.
- (3) Its abelian subgroups are cyclic.

Then G is hyperbolic and virtually compact special.

Before moving on to the proof, it is important to keep in mind that the assumptions 1–3 of Proposition 6.2 pass to subgroups.

Proof. On the first place, we show that G is hyperbolic by an inductive argument on the level of the hierarchy of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$. In the base of the induction, that is, at the level 0 of the hierarchy, G is a finitely generated residually free group. So G is hyperbolic by Proposition 5.6. For the induction step, we distinguish three cases:

- If $G = A *_C B$ or $G = A_{C,\theta}$ for some injection $\theta : C \rightarrow A$, where A and B are hyperbolic in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$, and C is virtually abelian, then C is cyclic and hence G is hyperbolic by Theorem 5.4.
- If $H \leq G$ is a finite-index subgroup in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ for which the statement is already true, then G is clearly hyperbolic.
- If $G = A \times B$, where the statement is true for each factor and each factor is in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$, we notice that at least one factor is trivial (since G is torsion-free and has no \mathbb{Z}^2), so it holds for G , too.

The induction is complete and this proves that such G are hyperbolic. Secondly, we prove, again inductively, that G is virtually compact special. Let us start with the base case. When G is finitely generated residually free, it follows from Proposition 5.6 that G is a hyperbolic limit group. By [Sel01], hyperbolic limit groups have a finite cyclic hierarchy terminating in free groups, so G is virtually compact special by [Wis21, Theorem 11.2]. Moreover, from this, we notice that any hyperbolic $G \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ that is torsion-free and has no non-cyclic abelian subgroup obviously admits a finite cyclic hierarchy terminating in free groups. So, again by [Wis21, Theorem 11.2], this proves that G is virtually compact special. \square

From the proof of [HW08, Theorem 7.3], we know that quasi-convex subgroups of hyperbolic compact special groups are virtual retracts (recall Definition 5.7).

Theorem 6.3. *Let G be a hyperbolic virtually compact special group and let $H \leq G$ be a quasi-convex subgroup. Then there exists a finite-index subgroup H' of H such that H' is a virtual retract of G .*

We can use Wilton's partial solution to Gromov's surface conjecture (Theorem 5.3) to find surface subgroups in certain groups of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ that will be relevant for the proof of Theorem A.

Proposition 6.4. Let G be as in Proposition 6.2. Suppose that G is not free. Then G contains a surface subgroup as a virtual retract.

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 6.2, we will proceed by induction on the level of the hierarchy. Before establishing the inductive step, we make a relevant note. By Proposition 6.2, G is hyperbolic and virtually compact special. So, by Theorem 6.3, in order to conclude that G contains a hyperbolic surface subgroup as a virtual retract, it is enough to ensure that G contains a quasi-convex surface subgroup. Furthermore, we know that for finitely generated subgroups of a hyperbolic group, being quasi-convex and quasi-isometrically embedded is equivalent.

Hence, it suffices to ensure that there exists a quasi-isometrically embedded surface subgroup in G to prove Proposition 6.4.

Let us start with the level 0, that is, when G is a finitely generated residually free group. Since G contains no \mathbb{Z}^2 , then G is limit by Proposition 5.6 and the statement follows directly from Theorem 5.3.

Now we establish the inductive step by distinguishing two cases.

- Suppose that $G = A *_C B$ (resp. $G = A_{C,\theta}$ for some injection $\theta : C \rightarrow A$), where A and B (resp. A) are groups in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ for which the statement holds and C is cyclic. Since both A and B are quasi-isometrically embedded in G (for example, by [Kap01, Theorem 1.2]), then G will contain a quasi-isometrically embedded surface if at least one of A or B does. So it remains to ensure the conclusion in the case when A and B (resp. A) are free. Viewing G as the fundamental group of a graph of two free groups (resp. one free group) with infinite cyclic edge groups, we apply a variant of Shenzitser's theorem [Wil12, Theorem 18] to deduce that, if G is not one-ended, then some vertex will split freely relative to its incident edge groups. In particular, applying this result a finite number of times (and taking out an infinite cyclic free factor of G each time), we deduce that G is isomorphic to the free product $F * G'$ for a free group F and a one-ended group $G' = A' *_C B'$ (resp. $G = A'_{C,\theta}$ for the injection $\theta : C \rightarrow A'$), where A' and B' are free factors of A and B (resp. A' is a free factor of A). Since G was hyperbolic, and G' is a quasi-convex subgroup, then G' is also hyperbolic. So G' is a hyperbolic one-ended fundamental group of a graph of free groups with cyclic edges. By Theorem 5.3, the group G' (and hence also G) contains a quasi-convex surface subgroup.
- Suppose that G has a finite-index subgroup $H \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ for which the statement is already true. Since G is torsion-free and not free, then H is not free by [Sta68, Theorem 2]. So H (and hence also G) must contain a surface subgroup that is a virtual retract. \square

7. PROFINITE AND PRO- p TOPOLOGIES ON POLYCYCLIC GROUPS

It was proven by Hirsch [Hir46, Theorem 3.25] that polycyclic groups are residually finite, and Malcev later in 1948 proved that they are, in fact, LERF (see [Seg83, Exercise 11, Chapter 1] for a proof). The former result of Hirsch has a pro- p variant for nilpotent groups, given by Gruenberg (Theorem 7.1), while Malcev's result does not. However, we recall that it follows from Malcev's theorem the weaker property that the induced topology on subgroups of polycyclic groups is the full profinite topology. We study in Theorem 7.2 a pro- p version of this statement. Before stating it, we first introduce Gruenberg's result and review some definitions.

Given a set of primes P and a non-negative integer n , we say that n is a P -number if all the primes dividing n are contained in P . We say that a group G is *residually- P* if, for all $1 \neq g \in G$, there exists a prime $p \in P$ and a finite-index normal subgroup $U \trianglelefteq G$, where $|G : U|$ is a power of p , such that $g \notin U$.

Notice that, by Cauchy's theorem, the set of primes P appearing as the orders of elements of a group G is exactly the smallest set of primes P such that every element with finite order in G has a P -number order.

Theorem 7.1 ([Gru57], Theorem 2.1). *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group.*

- (a) *If G is torsion-free, then G is residually- p for all primes p .*
- (b) *Otherwise, let P be the (non-empty) collection of primes p that appear as orders of elements in G . Then G is residually- P .*

7.1. Induced pro- p topology on nilpotent groups. Continuing the discussion at the beginning of the section, one may also try to extend the result of Malcev to the pro- p setting by, in the first place, figuring out a definition of p -LERF groups. A tentative definition is to say that a group G is p -LERF if all its finitely generated subgroups are closed in the pro- p topology. However, this may not be an interesting notion for infinite groups, since a virtually polycyclic group is p -LERF if and only if it is a finite p -group (see Remark 7.13). In any case, many infinite groups have the weaker property that the induced pro- p topology on subgroups is their full pro- p topology. We confirm this in the next theorem.

Theorem 7.2. *Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group and let H be any subgroup. Then the pro- p topology of G induces on H its full pro- p topology.*

By Lemma 2.13, the previous condition on each $H \leq G$ is equivalent to the injectivity of the induced map $H_{\hat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\hat{p}}$. Recall in this case we say that H is pro- p embeddable into G (Definition 2.12). Theorem 7.2 says that the functor “pro- p completion” is exact in the category of finitely generated nilpotent groups (since it is always right-exact by Proposition 2.5). Before the proof of Theorem 7.2, we will review how one can extract roots of subgroups in nilpotent groups in Proposition 7.4.

Definition 7.3. Let G be a group, let P be a collection of primes and assume $H \leq G$. We define the P -radical of H in G as the set

$$R_P(H) = \{g \in G \mid \text{there exists a } P\text{-number } n \text{ with } g^n \in H\}.$$

Proposition 7.4. Let G be a finitely generated nilpotent group and let $H \leq G$. Then $R_P(H)$ is a subgroup of G and the finite index $|R_P(H) : H|$ is a P -number.

Proof. Let K be the subgroup generated by $R_P(H)$. Since G is noetherian, then K is finitely generated. So K is generated by a finite subset of $R_P(H)$. Then, by [CMZ17, Theorem 2.24], it follows that $K = R_P(H)$ and that H has a finite index in $R_P(H)$ which is a P -number. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. We divide the proof in two steps. First, we prove in Claim 7.5 that the conclusion follows if we additionally suppose that H is normal, and then we prove the general case when H is any subgroup.

Claim 7.5. The conclusion follows if H is normal in G .

Proof of Claim 7.5. We follow the strategy depicted in Observation 2.14. Let $\Lambda \trianglelefteq H$ be a characteristic subgroup of H whose index $|H : \Lambda|$ is finite and a p -power. In

particular, Λ is normal in G . Let P be the collection of primes different from p . The subgroup $N = R_P(\Lambda)$ is normal in G and it contains Λ with finite-index. It is immediate to see that $N \cap H = \Lambda$ and that the finite group G/N does not contain elements of order coprime with p . The latter implies, by Theorem 7.1, that the nilpotent group G/N is residually- p . We have an injection $HN/N \hookrightarrow G/N$, where HN/N is a finite subgroup. There exists a finite p -power index normal subgroup $K \trianglelefteq G$ containing N such that K/N intersects HN/N trivially (or, equivalently, $K \cap HN = N$). Lastly, we check that $K \cap H = \Lambda$, which would complete the proof of the claim. For this, observe that $K \cap H = (K \cap HN) \cap H = N \cap H = \Lambda$. \square

We now finish the proof of the theorem. Consider any subgroup $H \leq G$. Let c denote the nilpotency class of G . By [Hal76, Theorem 10.3.3], there is an ascending chain $H = H_0 \trianglelefteq H_1 \trianglelefteq \dots \trianglelefteq H_c = G$. By Claim 7.5, each H_i is pro- p embeddable into H_{i+1} . Finally, by transitivity, H is pro- p embeddable into G . \square

Remark 7.6. Gareth Wilkes pointed out to the author another proof of one of the directions of Theorem 7.2, that is, that if G is finitely generated nilpotent and $H \leq G$ is a subgroup, then H is pro- p embeddable into G . The argument can be sketched as follows. Since pro-nilpotent groups are direct products of their p -Sylows (see [RZ00, Proposition 2.3.8]), then there is a commutative diagram

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H & \xrightarrow{\iota} & G \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_{\widehat{p}} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\widehat{p}}} & G_{\widehat{p}} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \widehat{H} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{\iota}} & \widehat{G} \end{array}$$

where we denoted by $\iota: H \rightarrow G$ the injection map and by $\iota_{\widehat{p}}$ and $\widehat{\iota}$ the natural induced maps between profinite and pro- p completions, respectively. Since G is LERF, the map $\widehat{\iota}$ is injective and, consequently, $\iota_{\widehat{p}}$ is also injective, as we wanted to prove.

7.2. Induced pro- p topology on polycyclic groups. As we anticipated, although the profinite version of Theorem 7.2 holds for virtually polycyclic groups, we also prove a converse to Theorem 7.2 that shows the limitations of this phenomenon outside of the world of nilpotent groups.

Theorem 7.7. *Let G be a virtually polycyclic group. Suppose that for every prime p and every subgroup $H \leq G$, the pro- p topology of G induces on H its full pro- p topology. Then G is nilpotent.*

We remark that this theorem in conjunction with Theorem 7.2 constitute Theorem D from the introduction.

We now move on to the proof of Theorem 7.7. For expository reasons, we start by proving a chain of preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 7.8. Let P be a finite p -group and let Q be a finite q -group, with p and q being different primes. Let $\theta: Q \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P)$ be a group homomorphism and let $G = P \rtimes_{\theta} Q$ be the corresponding semi-direct product. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) The map θ is trivial.
- (2) G is isomorphic to $P \times Q$.
- (3) G is nilpotent.
- (4) The subgroup P is pro- p embeddable into G .

Proof. The equivalence between (1) and (2) is well-known and follows from the definition of semi-direct product (since Q is normal if and only if it is central). By [Hal76, Theorem 10.3.4], a finite group is nilpotent if and only if it is a direct product of finite t -groups with t ranging over prime numbers. So the equivalence between (2) and (3) is also clear. We notice that if (1) is given, then (4) is obviously ensured. So it suffices to prove that (4) implies (1). We consider the trivial subgroup $\{1\}$, which has p -power index in P and it is normal. By assumption, there must exist a normal subgroup $N \trianglelefteq G$ of p -power index such that $N \cap P \subseteq \{1\}$, so $N \cap P = \{1\}$. Since the index is coprime to q , then N is a q -Sylow subgroup of G , as well as Q . So N and Q are conjugated to each other by the second Sylow's theorem, which shows that Q is also normal and (1) follows. \square

Lemma 7.9. Let p be a prime. Suppose that $N \trianglelefteq G$ and $N \leq H \leq G$ have the property that the induced maps $N_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow H_{\widehat{p}}$ and $N_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{p}}$ are injective. Then, the induced map $H_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{p}}$ is injective if and only if the induced map $(H/N)_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow (G/N)_{\widehat{p}}$ is injective.

Proof. If the induced maps $N_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow H_{\widehat{p}}$ and $N_{\widehat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\widehat{p}}$ are injective, we have, by Proposition 2.5, a commutative diagram of the form

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & N_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & H_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & (H/N)_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & N_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & G_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & (G/N)_{\widehat{p}} & \longrightarrow & 1, \end{array}$$

where all the arrows are the natural ones and the rows are exact. A simple diagram chase gives the desired conclusion. \square

Lemma 7.10. Let P be a direct product $P_1 \times \cdots \times P_m$, where each P_i is a finite p_i -group and $p_i \neq p_j$ if $i \neq j$. Suppose that q is a prime not belonging to the set $\{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ and let Q be a finite q -group. Let $\theta: Q \rightarrow \text{Aut}(P)$ be a group homomorphism and let $G = P \rtimes Q$ be the corresponding semi-direct product. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) The map θ is trivial.
- (2) G is isomorphic to $P \times Q$.
- (3) G is nilpotent.
- (4) The subgroup P is pro- p_i embeddable into G for all i .

Proof. The equivalence between the first three items is established in the exact same way as in Lemma 7.8. Again, it is clear that (2) implies (4). We suppose now that (4) holds. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$, we consider $N_i = \prod_{j \neq i} P_j$, which is a characteristic subgroup of G that is pro- t embeddable into P for all primes t . So N_i is normal in G and, by Lemma 7.9, $P/N_i \cong P_i$ is pro- p_i embeddable into

$G/N_i \cong P_i \rtimes Q$. By Lemma 7.8, the action of Q on P_i is trivial. We have proven this for all i , so the action of Q on P is trivial and hence we have (2). \square

Lemma 7.11. Let G be a finite group such that for every subgroup $H \leq G$ and all primes p , the induced map $H_{\hat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\hat{p}}$ is injective. Then G is nilpotent.

Proof. We can prove this by induction on the order of G . When $|G| = 1$ or, in fact, when it is a finite p -group for some p , the statement is trivial. Suppose then that $|G|$ is divisible by at least two primes p and q . We consider a p -Sylow $P \leq G$ (which exists by the first Sylow theorem). Since $\{1\}$ is open in P , there must exist a normal subgroup $N \trianglelefteq G$ of p -power index such that $N \cap P = \{1\}$. Since p -subgroups of G can be conjugated into P (by the second Sylow theorem), then the order of N is coprime with p . Consequently, $|P| = |G : N|$ and then $G = \langle N, P \rangle$ is isomorphic to a semi-direct product $N \rtimes P$. We know that $|N| < |G|$ and then by the induction hypothesis, N is nilpotent and so a direct product of its Sylow subgroups. By Lemma 7.10, we conclude that G is nilpotent. \square

We have gathered all the ingredients to show Theorem 7.7.

Proof of Theorem 7.7. By Lemma 7.9, any finite quotient Q of G will still have the property that for every subgroup $H \leq Q$, the induced map $H_{\hat{p}} \rightarrow Q_{\hat{p}}$ is injective. So, by Lemma 7.11, every finite quotient of G is nilpotent. Finally, by a result of Hirsch (see [Seg83, Theorem 2, Chapter 1]), a virtually polycyclic group has the property that all its finite quotients are nilpotent if and only if it is nilpotent itself. So G is nilpotent. \square

7.3. Induced pro- p topology on infinite groups. Here we continue the discussion that preceded Question 1.7 from the introduction (see Question 7.12 below), to motivate the study of pro- p separability properties and its applications during this and previous works.

There are geometric ways to produce families of LERF groups. Three big classes are limit groups [Wil08a], locally quasi-convex hyperbolic virtually compact special groups (which includes hyperbolic fundamental groups of graphs of free groups with cyclic edge subgroups [Wis00]), Seifert fibered spaces (either with boundary [Hal49, Theorem 5.1] or closed [Sco78, Theorem 4.1] [Sco85]) and hyperbolic three manifolds (by works of Kahn–Markovic, Sageev, Haglund–Wise, Bergeron–Wise, Agol, Calegari–Gabai; see [AFW15, Chapters 4–5] for complete referencing).

Nevertheless, it seems very hard to use geometric methods to construct groups with good pro- p embeddability or separability properties on its subgroups (as, for example, finitely generated nilpotent groups enjoy by Theorem 7.2). These difficulties appear when constructing profree groups (for which, so far, we only have cyclic hierarchies [JZM21]), when classifying residually nilpotent 3-manifolds (see [Wil08b, Question 2.12]) or when it comes to find the right pro- p analogue of limit groups [KZ11]. On the other hand, there is research made on related principles, such as the virtual p -efficiency of JSJ-decompositions of graph manifolds [AF13] and also of fibred 3-manifolds [Wil17b, Theorem A].

These principles have a number of applications, for instance, on the residual properties and subgroup structure theory of pro- p completions of ICE groups [KZ11],

on the conjugacy p -separability of certain classes of three-manifold groups [Wil17b, Theorems B and C] and on the profinite detection of JSJ decompositions of graph manifolds [Wil18b, Theorem A]. Lastly, we note that in the proof of Theorem 8.1 we offer a technique to establish the pro- p embeddability of abelian subgroups. These properties are useful and singular, and we consider that one should try to understand the following problem (Question 1.7).

Question 7.12. Let p be a prime. Are there finitely generated residually finite groups G that contain non-abelian free subgroups and have the property of Theorem 7.2, i.e. that, for all finitely generated $H \leq G$, the pro- p topology of G induces on H its full pro- p topology?

Remark 7.13. Recall that a group is p -LERF if all its finitely generated subgroups are closed in the pro- p topology. As we mentioned above, this property is too strong in the universe of infinite groups, since it does not even hold in \mathbb{Z} (because $p\mathbb{Z}$ is not a closed subgroup in the pro- q topology for any prime $q \neq p$). In fact, for similar reasons, a virtually polycyclic group is p -LERF if and only if it is a finite p -group. For a more general infinite group G that is p -LERF, we can prove that all its finite quotients are p -groups (as in the proof of Theorem 7.7). Equivalently, this means that its profinite completion is a pro- p group. Interestingly, Garrido and Uria-Albizuri [GUA19] found Grigorchuk–Gupta–Sidki groups that are examples of finitely generated, residually finite and torsion-free groups G with the latter property. Nevertheless, it is not clear to the author whether these groups are p -LERF.

8. A TITS ALTERNATIVE FOR THE p -GENUS OF FREE OR SURFACE GROUPS

In this section we prove Theorem B from the introduction.

Theorem 8.1. *Let p be a prime and let S be a free or hyperbolic surface group. Suppose that G is a finitely generated residually- p group with $G_{\widehat{p}} \cong S_{\widehat{p}}$. Assume that $H \leq G$. The following holds.*

- (i) *If H is amenable, then it is cyclic.*
- (ii) *If H is two-generated, then it is free.*
- (iii) *If H is finitely presented and non-cyclic, then it is large.*

The property (i) of this theorem will follow from (ii) by the following lemma.

Lemma 8.2. Let G be a finitely generated residually-(torsion-free polycyclic) group and let $H \leq G$ be locally-cyclic. Then H is either trivial or infinite cyclic.

Proof. If H is finitely generated, then the conclusion follows immediately. We proceed by contradiction. Suppose, otherwise, that H is not finitely generated. Take $1 \neq h_1 \in H$. Since H is locally cyclic but not cyclic, there exists $a_2 \notin \langle h_1 \rangle$ and also $h_2 \in H$ such that $\langle h_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, a_2 \rangle$. So there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $h_2^{n_1} = h_1$ and, due to the fact that $a_2 \notin \langle h_1 \rangle$, we derive that $|n_1| > 1$. Iterating this process, we show that then there must exist a sequence $(h_i)_{i \geq 1}$ in H of non-trivial elements and a sequence of integers $(n_i)_{i \geq 1}$ with $|n_i| > 1$ such that $h_{i+1}^{n_i} = h_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. Let $\phi: G \rightarrow Q$ be a surjective map to a torsion-free polycyclic group Q such that

$\phi(h_1) \neq 1$ (and hence $\phi(h_i) \neq 1$ for all i). Now consider the ascending chain of subgroups

$$\langle \phi(h_1) \rangle \subseteq \langle \phi(h_2) \rangle \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \langle \phi(h_n) \rangle \subseteq \cdots$$

of Q . Since Q is noetherian, this sequence must stabilise. So there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $\phi(h_{k+1}) \in \langle \phi(h_k) \rangle = \langle \phi(h_{k+1})^{n_k} \rangle$. Since $|n_k| > 1$, this implies that $\phi(h_{k+1})$ has finite order in Q , and so $\phi(h_{k+1}) = 1$, which is a contradiction. \square

Before proving Theorem 8.1, we state the following well-known principle.

Lemma 8.3. Let S be a non-abelian free or surface group. Suppose that \mathbf{H} is a topologically two-generated closed subgroup of $S_{\hat{p}}$. Then \mathbf{H} is a free pro- p group.

Proof. If S is free, this follows from Theorem 4.7. If S is a hyperbolic surface group of genus g , then the abelianisation of S has rank $2g \geq 4$. This implies that the image of \mathbf{H} in the abelianisation of $S_{\hat{p}}$ has infinite index and, in particular, \mathbf{H} already had infinite index in $S_{\hat{p}}$. By Lemma 4.11, $\text{cd}_p(\mathbf{H}) \leq 1$. Lastly, again by Theorem 4.7, \mathbf{H} is a free pro- p group. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.1. We first explain how the property (i) follows from (ii). Remark that amenable groups cannot contain non-abelian free subgroups. So, if H is amenable, then, by property (ii), H is locally cyclic. In addition, G is a subgroup of $G_{\hat{p}}$, which is residually-(torsion-free nilpotent) by Proposition 2.16. Finally, by Lemma 8.2, H is cyclic.

Now we move on to prove (ii). Let S be a free or surface group and suppose that G belongs to the p -genus of S . The statement is clear when $S \cong \mathbb{Z}$ because, in this case, $G \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Let us suppose that S is a non-abelian free group or a hyperbolic surface group. Let $H \leq G$ be a two-generated subgroup. We separately analyse two cases, depending on whether H is abelian or not.

- (a) Firstly, consider the case when H is non-abelian. We consider $\overline{H} \subseteq G_{\hat{p}}$. By Lemma 8.3, \overline{H} is a two-generated free pro- p group. Notice that $H \leq \overline{H}$ is not abelian, so the rank of \overline{H} has to be exactly equal to two and then \overline{H} is the free pro- p group of rank 2. Let x and y be two elements that generate H , then x and y are topological generators of \overline{H} and hence, by the Hopfian property, they are also free topological generators of \overline{H} . In particular, the group H generated by x and y is free of rank two, as we wanted.
- (b) Lastly, suppose that H is abelian. It has to be torsion-free (in fact, we already know that H is residually-(torsion-free nilpotent)). Since H is two-generated, it suffices to show that $H \not\cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ in order to conclude that it is cyclic. We proceed by contradiction. Assume that $H \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$ and let a and b be free-abelian generators of H . By Lemma 8.3, $\overline{H} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$, where this group is topologically generated by some $c \in G_{\hat{p}}$, so there exist non-trivial $m_a, m_b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $a = c^{m_a}$ and $b = c^{m_b}$. Let $n \geq 1$ be such that $c \notin \gamma_n G_{\hat{p}}$. We consider the canonical projection $p: G_{\hat{p}} \rightarrow G_{\hat{p}}/\gamma_n G_{\hat{p}}$. The pro- p group $G_{\hat{p}}/\gamma_n G_{\hat{p}}$ is torsion-free by Proposition 2.15. In particular, since $p(c) \neq 1$, it follows that the restriction of $p_{\hat{p}}$ to \overline{H} is injective. If we denote by $\iota: H \rightarrow G$ the inclusion, we have a commutative diagram of the

form

$$(5) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H & \longrightarrow & H_{\widehat{p}} \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \iota_{\widehat{p}} \\ G & \longrightarrow & G_{\widehat{p}} \\ \downarrow p & & \downarrow p_{\widehat{p}} \\ G/\gamma_n G & \longrightarrow & G_{\widehat{p}}/\gamma_n G_{\widehat{p}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright f \\ \curvearrowleft f_{\widehat{p}} \end{array}$$

The horizontal arrows are the canonical pro- p completion maps (the fact that the lowest arrow represents a pro- p completion map follows from Lemma 2.9). The map $f = p \circ \iota: H \rightarrow G/\gamma_n G$ is injective by the previous paragraph. Since $G/\gamma_n G$ is finitely generated and nilpotent, it follows by Theorem 7.2 that the induced $f_{\widehat{p}}$ is injective, too. In particular, $\iota_{\widehat{p}}$ must be injective. But this is absurd, because we derived that $H_{\widehat{p}} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ and $\iota_{\widehat{p}}(H_{\widehat{p}}) = \overline{H} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. This establishes (ii).

The previous shows (ii). Finally, we explain how (iii) follows. Let H be a non-cyclic finitely presented subgroup. By (i), H is not abelian, so $\overline{H} \leq S_{\widehat{p}}$ is not abelian either. The pro- p group \overline{H} must either be a non-abelian free pro- p group or an open subgroup of $S_{\widehat{p}}$. In any case, \overline{H} is isomorphic to the pro- p completion of a non-abelian free or surface group S' . By Corollary 3.8, $b_1^{(2)}(H) \geq b_1^{(2)}(S') > 0$. Thus H is a finitely presented residually- p group with $b_1^{(2)}(H) > 0$ and, by [Lac10, Theorem 1.6], it is large. \square

Remark 8.4. We should note that our methods can also establish parts (i) and (ii) of Theorem 8.1 for other hyperbolic limit groups S . For example, one can take S to be the free product $S = S_1 * \cdots * S_n$, with each $S_i \cong F_i *_{u_i = \overline{u_i}} \overline{F_i}$ is the double of a free group F_i along a relator $u_i \in F_i$ that satisfies the same assumptions as r in Proposition 2.16. The pro- p completion $S_{\widehat{p}}$ will be residually-(torsion-free nilpotent) by Proposition 2.15 and, by the proof of [KZ11, Theorem 7.3], the 2-generated subgroups of $S_{\widehat{p}}$ are cyclic or free pro- p . So our proof of Theorem 8.1 applies to such S to show parts (i) and (ii).

9. PRO- p DETECTION OF ALGEBRAIC AND TOPOLOGICAL PROPERTIES

We recall that by Theorem 2.2, groups in the finite, soluble or nilpotent genus of a free or surface group S , do belong to the p -genus of S for all primes p . So all the results here about any p -genus of S include all these genera.

9.1. Lück groups. It is generally not well understood if being Lück (Definition 3.6) is a profinite invariant (see Question 9.2 below). However, Jaikin-Zapirain [JZ21a] can answer affirmatively to this question for the genera of free and surface groups as a consequence of the following.

Proposition 9.1. Let S be a free or surface group and let G be an abstract subgroup of $S_{\widehat{p}}$. Then G is Lücky.

Proof. By Proposition 2.15 and Proposition 2.16, G is residually-(torsion-free nilpotent). By Corollary 3.5, G is Lücky. \square

It is not difficult to see that the previous G have to be RFRS (there is, in fact, a stronger statement in [JZ21a, Proposition 4.1]). As a consequence, if G is a group in the finite genus of a free or surface group S , then $b_1^{(2)}(G) = b_1^{(2)}(S)$.

Question 9.2. Let Γ and Λ be finitely generated residually finite groups with $\widehat{\Gamma} \cong \widehat{\Lambda}$. If Γ is Lücky, does it follow that Λ is Lücky?

This is related to the question of whether being RFRS is a profinite property.

Question 9.3. Let Γ and Λ be finitely generated residually finite groups with $\widehat{\Gamma} \cong \widehat{\Lambda}$. If Γ is RFRS, does it follow that Λ is RFRS?

9.2. Hyperbolic and special groups. Here we see how Theorem 8.1 allows us to study when groups from \mathcal{H}_{ab} (Definition 1.3) or one-relator groups can be proven to be hyperbolic and virtually special by looking at their pro- p completion.

Corollary 9.4. Let p be a prime and let G be a group in the class \mathcal{H}_{ab} that belongs to the p -genus of a free or hyperbolic surface group. Then G is hyperbolic and virtually compact special.

Proof. By the Tits alternative of Theorem 8.1, G is torsion-free, contains no Baumslag–Solitar groups and contains no non-cyclic abelian subgroups. Hence, by Proposition 6.2, G is hyperbolic virtually compact special. \square

Recently, Linton [Lin22] established that all one-relator groups with no negative immersions are hyperbolic and virtually special, and uses this result to prove that one-relator parafree groups are hyperbolic. We will use the Tits alternative of Theorem 8.1 to extend this argument to parasurfaces and to other genera.

Corollary 9.5. Let G be a one-relator group that belongs to the p -genus of a free group or a hyperbolic surface group. Then G is hyperbolic and virtually special.

Proof. Let $G = \langle S | \omega \rangle$ be presented by a finite set of generators S and a relator $\omega \in F(S)$. By Theorem 8.1, all 2-generated subgroups are free and hence there are no freely indecomposable one-relator subgroups of rank 2 in G . Hence, by [LW22a, Theorem 1.3], the primitivity rank $\pi(\omega)$ is at least 3; and then, by [LW22a, Theorem 1.3], $G = \langle S | \omega \rangle$ has a presentation complex with no negative immersions. Finally, the conclusion follows immediately from [Lin22, Theorem 8.2]. \square

10. ON THE PROFINITE RIGIDITY OF FREE AND SURFACE GROUPS

We are now ready to establish the profinite rigidity of free and surface groups within the family \mathcal{H}_{ab} . The proof of Theorem A is divided in Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 10.2. We recall that the abelianisation of a finitely generated group is a profinite invariant and that, from this, it follows easily that free groups and surface groups are distinguished from each other by their profinite completions.

Theorem 10.1. *Let G be a group belonging to the class \mathcal{H}_{ab} and let F be a finitely generated free group. If G is residually finite and $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{F}$, then $G \cong F$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that G is free. Let G be a group in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ that belongs to the finite genus of a free group F . By [JZ21a, Theorem 1.1], G also belongs to the p -genus of F . Consequently, by Corollary 9.4, G is hyperbolic virtually compact special. To prove that G is free, we proceed by contradiction. Suppose that G is not free. Then, by Proposition 6.4, there exists a surface subgroup $\pi_1 S$ that it is a virtual retract of G . In particular, $\widehat{\pi_1 S} \hookrightarrow \widehat{G} \cong \widehat{F}$. This would imply by the goodness of the surface $\pi_1 S$ and the monotonicity of cd_p (Proposition 4.5), the following contradiction:

$$2 = \text{cd}_p(\pi_1 S) = \text{cd}_p(\widehat{\pi_1 S}) \leq \text{cd}_p(\widehat{F}) = 1. \quad \square$$

Theorem 10.2. *Let G be a group belonging to the class $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ and let $\pi_1 \Sigma$ be the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface. If G is residually finite and $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{\pi_1 \Sigma}$, then $G \cong \pi_1 \Sigma$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that G is a surface group. Let G be a group in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{ab}}$ that belongs to the finite genus of a free group $\pi_1 \Sigma$. By [JZ21a, Theorem 1.1], G also belongs to the p -genus of $\pi_1 \Sigma$. Consequently, by Corollary 9.4, G is hyperbolic virtually compact special. Since G cannot be free, it follows from Proposition 6.4 that there exists a surface subgroup $\pi_1 S$ that it is a virtual retract of G . Lastly, by Proposition 4.14, G will be isomorphic to a surface group. \square

11. PROOF OF THEOREM E

In this final section we prove Theorem E. Let us review the statement.

Theorem 11.1 (Theorem E). *Let G be a finitely generated residually free group and let S be a free or surface group. Suppose that $\widehat{G} \cong \widehat{S} \times \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n}$. Then $G \cong S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$.*

We will state two lemmas that we will use during the proof of Theorem E. The first allows us to prove that the centre of a residually free group is a profinite invariant.

Lemma 11.2 ([Bau67a], Lemma 4). *Let G be a residually free group. Then $G/Z(G)$ is a residually free group with trivial centre.*

The second lemma is a profinite criterion that detects when short exact sequences split. It was used by Wilton–Zalesskii [WZ17] to distinguish circle bundles over the surface by looking at finite quotients of their fundamental group (later on used in dimension 4 by Jiming–Zixi [MW22, Proposition 25]).

Lemma 11.3 ([WZ17], Lemma 8.3). *Let $n \geq 0$ be an integer and let S be a surface group. Let*

$$(6) \quad 1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 1$$

be a central extension of S by the group \mathbb{Z}^n . Suppose that the induced short sequence in profinite completions

$$(7) \quad 1 \longrightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n} \longrightarrow \widehat{G} \longrightarrow \widehat{S} \longrightarrow 1$$

is also exact and that it splits. Then the sequence (6) splits, too.

We remark that the exactness of (7) is always ensured if (6) is exact, by the goodness of S (as observed by Serre [Ser97, Chapter 1, Section 2, Exercise 2(b)]). However, we stated this as an assumption for clearness, as it is also enough for our application. Regarding this lemma of Serre, we also refer the reader to [Lor08, Proposition 2.4] for a precise proof and a converse.

Proof of Theorem E. Let S be a free or surface group and let G be a finitely generated residually free group in the finite genus of $S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$. If S is abelian, then it is clear that $G \cong S \times \mathbb{Z}^n$. So we can suppose that S is hyperbolic and non-abelian. In particular, $b_1^{(2)}(S) > 0$ and \widehat{S} has trivial centre. We denote by $\iota: Z(G) \hookrightarrow G$ the canonical injection.

Claim 11.4. The centre $Z(G)$ is a finitely generated subgroup of G and the induced map $\widehat{\iota}: \widehat{Z(G)} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is injective.

To prove the claim, first recall that $Z(\widehat{G}) = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n}$ is a retract of \widehat{G} . Denoting this retraction by $r: \widehat{G} \rightarrow Z(\widehat{G})$, we have the following natural commutative diagram:

$$(8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z(G) & \hookrightarrow & Z(\widehat{G}) \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \\ G & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{G} \\ \downarrow p & & \downarrow r \\ G/[G, G] & \xrightarrow{g} & Z(\widehat{G}), \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right\} f \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right\} \text{id} \end{array}$$

for some naturally defined f and g from the canonical maps ι, p and r . We can read off from the diagram that $g \circ f$ is injective, so f is injective, too. This implies that $Z(G)$ is a subgroup of the finitely generated abelian group $G/[G, G]$, so it is finitely generated, too. Now we consider a second natural commutative diagram:

$$(9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} Z(G) & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{Z(G)} \\ \downarrow \iota & & \downarrow \widehat{\iota} \\ G & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{G} \\ \downarrow p & & \downarrow \widehat{p} \\ G/[G, G] & \hookrightarrow & \widehat{G/[G, G]}. \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right\} f \\ \left. \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array} \right\} \widehat{f} \end{array}$$

We know that f is injective, so \widehat{f} is also injective (since finitely generated abelian groups are LERF). Thus $\widehat{\iota}$ is injective and Claim 11.4 is proven.

Claim 11.5. The profinite group $Z(\widehat{G})/\widehat{Z(G)}$ is the profinite completion of a finitely generated abelian group A .

The image of $\widehat{\iota}$ can be alternatively described as the closure of $Z(G) \hookrightarrow \widehat{G}$ and it is easy to see that it is a normal subgroup of \widehat{G} that is contained in $Z(\widehat{G}) = \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n}$. We consider the group $H = G/Z(G)$, which is a finitely generated residually free group with trivial centre by Lemma 11.2. By Proposition 2.6, \widehat{H} is naturally isomorphic

to $\widehat{G}/\overline{Z(G)} \cong \widehat{S} \times \left(Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} \right)$. So $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)}$ appears as a direct factor of $\widehat{H}/[\widehat{H}, \widehat{H}] \cong \left(\widehat{S}/[\widehat{S}, \widehat{S}] \right) \times \left(Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} \right)$, where $\widehat{H}/[\widehat{H}, \widehat{H}]$ and $\widehat{S}/[\widehat{S}, \widehat{S}]$ are the profinite completions of $H/[H, H]$ and $S/[S, S]$, respectively. This shows Claim 11.5.

Claim 11.6. The image of the map $\widehat{\iota}: \widehat{Z(G)} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is $Z(\widehat{G})$.

Let us denote by p_1 and p_2 the projections of \widehat{H} onto its first and second direct factor according to the decomposition $\widehat{H} \cong \widehat{S} \times Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)}$. Claim 11.6 follows if the second factor is trivial. Let us suppose that it is not trivial to reach a contradiction. We study two separate cases.

- (i) Suppose that $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)}$ is infinite. By Claim 11.5, there exists an infinite finitely generated abelian group A such that $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} \cong \widehat{A}$. Hence H and $K = S \times A$ have the same profinite completion. Observe that K is Lücky and that $b_1^{(2)}(K) = 0$. Since H is residually free, it is also Lücky by Corollary 3.5, so it follows from Corollary 3.9 that $b_1^{(2)}(H) = b_1^{(2)}(K) = 0$. This implies that the restriction of p_1 to H cannot be injective (otherwise, we would see H as a dense subgroup of \widehat{S} and it would follow from Corollary 3.8 that $b_1^{(2)}(H) \geq b_1^{(2)}(S) > 0$, contradicting the fact that $b_1^{(2)}(H) = 0$). So H intersects $\ker p_1 = Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} = Z(\widehat{H})$ non-trivially and then $Z(H) \neq 1$, which contradicts Lemma 11.2.
- (ii) Suppose that $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)}$ is finite. Then we can still prove that H intersects non-trivially the direct factor $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)}$, leading to the same contradiction as before. To verify this, let us denote $H_1 = H \cap \widehat{S}$. This is a finite-index subgroup of H with $\widehat{H}_1 \cong \widehat{S}$ by Proposition 2.11. So H_1 is also Lücky and $b_1^{(2)}(H_1) = b_1^{(2)}(S)$ by Corollary 3.9. Observe that $p_1(H_1)$ is isomorphic to H_1 , that this is finite-index in $p_1(H)$, and that both $p_1(H_1)$ and $p_1(H)$ are dense in \widehat{S} . Let us denote the index $k = |p_1(H) : p_1(H_1)|$. Using the multiplicativity of $b_1^{(2)}$ (Proposition 3.1) and the estimation of Corollary 3.8, it follows that

$$b_1^{(2)}(p_1(H)) \geq b_1^{(2)}(S) = b_1^{(2)}(H_1) = b_1^{(2)}(p_1(H_1)) = k \cdot b_1^{(2)}(p_1(H)).$$

Since $b_1^{(2)}(S)$ is positive, we derive from the previous inequalities that $k = 1$ and hence $p_1(H) = p_1(H_1)$. From this, it is immediate to see that $Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} = p_2(H) = p_2(H \cap Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)})$, and then $H \cap Z(\widehat{G})/\overline{Z(G)} \neq 1$, as we wanted.

This proves Claim 11.6. Since $H = G/Z(G)$ is a finitely generated residually free group and $\widehat{H} \cong \widehat{S}$ by Claim 11.6, it follows from Theorems 10.1 and 10.2 that $H \cong S$.

Claim 11.7. The short exact sequence

$$(10) \quad 1 \longrightarrow Z(G) \longrightarrow G \longrightarrow G/Z(G) \longrightarrow 1$$

splits. In particular, $G \cong Z(G) \times G/Z(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \times S$.

The proof of the claim would complete the proof of Theorem E. This claim is obvious when S is free and, when S is a surface group, it is a direct consequence of Lemma 11.3. \square

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, RADCLIFFE OBSERVATORY, ANDREW WILES BUILDING, WOODSTOCK RD, OXFORD OX2 6GG
E-mail address: morales@maths.ox.ac.uk

REFERENCES

- [AF13] M. Aschenbrenner and S. Friedl, *3-Manifold Groups are virtually residually- p* , Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, American Mathematical Society, 2013.
- [AFW15] M. Aschenbrenner, S. Friedl, and H. Wilton, *3-Manifold Groups*, EMS Series of Lectures Notes in Mathematics, EMS, 2015.
- [Ago13] I. Agol, *The Virtual Haken Conjecture (with an appendix by Ian Agol, Daniel Groves and Jason Manning)*, Doc. Math. **18** (2013), 1045–1087.
- [Ali05] E. Alibegović, *A combination theorem for relatively hyperbolic groups*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **37** (2005), no. 3, 459–466.
- [AM15] Y. Antolín and A. Minasyan, *Tits alternatives for graph products*, Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik. [Crelle’s Journal] **704** (2015), 55–83.
- [Bau05] G. Baumslag, *Parafree groups*, Infinite groups: geometric, combinatorial and dynamical aspects, 2005, pp. 1–14.
- [Bau62] G. Baumslag, *On generalised free products*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **78** (1962), 423–438.
- [Bau67a] G. Baumslag, *Residually free groups*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **s3-17** (1967), no. 3, 402–418.
- [Bau67b] G. Baumslag, *Groups with the same lower Central Sequence as a Relatively Free Group. I. The Groups*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **129** (1967), no. 2, 308–321.
- [Bau69] ———, *Groups with the same lower Central Sequence as a Relatively Free Group. II. The Properties*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **142** (1969), 507–538.
- [Bau74] ———, *Residually finite groups with the same finite images*, Compositio Mathematica **29** (1974), no. 3, 249–252.
- [Bau94] ———, *Musings on Magnus*, The mathematical legacy of Wilhelm Magnus: groups, geometry and special functions (Brooklyn, NY, 1992), 1994, pp. 99–106.
- [BC06] G. Baumslag and S. Cleary, *Parafree one-relator groups*, Journal of Group Theory **9** (2006), no. 2, 191–201.
- [BCR14] M. R. Bridson, M. Conder, and A. Reid, *Determining fuchsian groups by their finite quotients*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **214** (2014), 271–303.
- [BF92] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *A combination theorem for negatively curved groups*, Journal of Differential Geometry **35** (1992), 85–101.
- [BFH00] M. Bestvina, M. Feighn, and M. Handel, *The Tits alternative for $\text{Out}(F_n)$. I. Dynamics of exponentially-growing automorphisms*, Annals of Mathematics. Second Series **151** (2000), no. 2, 517–623.
- [BFH05] ———, *The Tits alternative for $\text{Out}(F_n)$. II. A Kolchin type theorem*, Annals of Mathematics. Second Series **161** (2005), no. 1, 1–59.
- [BG07] E. Breuillard and T. Gelander, *A topological Tits alternative*, Annals of Mathematics. Second Series **166** (2007), no. 2, 427–474.
- [BMR99] G. Baumslag, A. Myasnikov, and V. Remeslennikov, *Algebraic geometry over groups*, Journal of algebra **219** (1999), 16–79.
- [BMRS20] M. R. Bridson, D. B. McReynolds, A. W. Reid, and R. Spitler, *Absolute profinite rigidity and hyperbolic geometry*, Annals of Mathematics **192** (2020), 679–719.
- [BMRS21] M. R. Bridson, D. B. McReynolds, A. W. Reid, and R. Spitler, *On the profinite rigidity of triangle groups*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **53** (2021), no. 6, 1849–1862.

- [BR10] K. Bou-Rabee, *Parasurface groups*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **248** (2010), no. 1, 23–30.
- [BR14] M. R. Bridson and A. W. Reid, *Nilpotent completions of groups, Grothendieck pairs, and four problems of Baumslag*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2015** (2014), no. 8, 2111—2140.
- [BR20] ———, *Profinite rigidity, fibering, and the figure-eight knot*, What’s next?—the mathematical legacy of William P. Thurston, 2020, pp. 45–64.
- [Bro82] K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, NY, 1982.
- [BRW17] M. R. Bridson, A. W. Reid, and H. Wilton, *Profinite rigidity and surface bundles over the circle*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **49** (2017), no. 5, 831–841.
- [But04] J. O. Button, *Strong Tits alternatives for compact 3-manifolds with boundary*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **191** (2004), no. 1-2, 89–98.
- [BW08] M. R. Bridson and H. Wilton, *Subgroup separability in residually free groups*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **260** (2008), 25–30.
- [CMZ17] A. E. Clement, S. Majewicz, and M. Zyman, *The theory of nilpotent groups*, Birkhäuser Basel, 2017.
- [CW22] T. Cheetham-West, *Absolute profinite rigidity of some closed fibered hyperbolic 3-manifolds*, Preprint (2022).
- [Dah03] F. Dahmani, *Combination of convergence groups.*, Geometry & Topology **7** (2003), 933–963.
- [Dem61] S. P. Demuškin, *The group of a maximal p -extension of a local field*, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR. Seriya Matematicheskaya **25** (1961), 329–346.
- [Dem63] ———, *On 2-extensions of a local field*, Akademija Nauk SSSR. Sibirskoe Otdelenie. Sibirskii Matematičeskii Žurnal **4** (1963), 951–955.
- [DFPR82] J. D. Dixon, E. W. Formanek, J. C. Poland, and L. Ribes, *Profinite completions and isomorphic finite quotients*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **23** (1982), no. 3, 227–231.
- [DSMS99] J. D. Dixon, D. Sautoy, A. Mann, and D. Segal, *Analytic pro- p groups*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [EM80] B. Eckmann and H. Müller, *Poincaré duality groups of dimension two*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **55** (1980), no. 1, 1420–8946.
- [Fru22] J. Fruchter, *Characterising surface groups by their virtual second Betti number (with an appendix by Ismael Morales)*, Preprint (2022).
- [Git97] R. Gitik, *On the combination theorem for negatively curved groups*, International Journal of Algebra and Computation **7** (1997), 267–276.
- [GJZ22] A. Garrido and A. Jaikin-Zapirain, *Free factors and profinite completions*, 2022. arXiv:2207.00912.
- [GKL22] G. Gardam, D. Kielak, and A. D. Logan, *The surface group conjectures for groups with two generators*, 2022. arXiv:2202.11093.
- [Gro81] M. Gromov, *Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps*, Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Publications Mathématiques **53** (1981), 53–73.
- [Gru57] K. W. Gruenberg, *Residual properties of infinite soluble groups*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society (**3**) **7** (1957), 29–62.
- [GUA19] A. Garrido and J. Uria-Albizuri, *Pro- \mathcal{C} congruence properties for groups of rooted tree automorphisms*, Archiv der Mathematik **112** (2019), 123—137.
- [GZ11] F. Grunewald and P. Zalesskii, *Genus for groups*, Journal of Algebra **321** (2011), 330–368.
- [Hal49] M. Hall, *Coset representations in free groups*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **67** (1949), no. 2, 421–432.
- [Hal76] M. Hall, *The theory of groups*, Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, 1976. Second edition.
- [Hir46] K. A. Hirsch, *On infinite soluble groups (iii)*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **s2-49** (1946), 184–194.
- [HK22] S. Hughes and D. Kielak, *Profinite rigidity of fibering*, 2022. arXiv:2206.11347.
- [HW08] F. Haglund and D. Wise, *Special cube complexes*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **17** (2008), no. 5, 1551—1620.

- [HW15] T. Hsu and D. T. Wise, *Cubulating malnormal amalgams*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **199** (2015), 293–331.
- [JZ18] A. Jaikin-Zapirain, *Recognition of being fibered for compact 3-manifolds*, *Geometry & Topology* **24** (2018), 409–420.
- [JZ19] ———, *L^2 -Betti numbers and their analogues in positive characteristic*, *Groups St Andrews 2017 in Birmingham*, 2019, pp. 346–405.
- [JZ20] ———, *Free \mathbb{Q} -groups are residually torsion-free nilpotent*, 2020. <http://matematicas.uam.es/~andrei.jaikin/preprints/baumslag.pdf>.
- [JZ21a] ———, *The finite and soluble genus of finitely generated free and surface groups*, Preprint (2021).
- [JZ21b] ———, *The universality of Hughes-free division rings*, *Selecta Mathematica* **27** (2021), no. 74.
- [JZLÁ19] A. Jaikin-Zapirain and D. López-Álvarez, *The Strong Atiyah and Lück Approximation conjectures for one-relator groups.*, *Mathematische Annalen* **376** (2019), 1741–1793.
- [JZM21] A. Jaikin-Zapirain and I. Morales, *Parafree fundamental groups of graph of groups with cyclic edge subgroups*, Preprint (2021).
- [Kap01] I. Kapovich, *The combination theorem and quasi-convexity*, *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* **11** (2001), no. 2, 185–216.
- [Ker83] S. P. Kerckhoff, *The Nielsen realization problem*, *Annals of Mathematics* **117** (1983), no. 2, 235–265.
- [KK21] D. Kielak and P. Kropholler, *Isoperimetric inequalities for Poincaré duality groups*, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **149** (2021), no. 11, 4685–4698.
- [Kle10] B. Kleiner, *A new proof of Gromov’s theorem on groups of polynomial growth*, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **23** (2010), no. 3, 815–829.
- [KM14] E. I. Khukhro and V. D. Mazurov, *Unsolved Problems in Group Theory. The Kourovka Notebook*, Russian Academy of Sciences, Siberian Division, Institute of Mathematics, 2014.
- [KZ07] D. H. Kochloukova and P. A. Zalesskii, *Tits alternative for 3-manifold groups*, *Archiv der Mathematik* **88** (2007).
- [KZ08] ———, *Profinite and pro- p completions of poincaré duality groups of dimension 3*, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **360** (2008), no. 4, 1927–1949.
- [KZ11] D. H. Kochloukova and P. A. Zalesskii, *On pro- p analogues of limit groups via extensions of centralizers*, *Mathematische Zeitschrift* (2011), 109–128.
- [Lüc02] W. Lück, *L^2 -Invariants: Theory and Applications to Geometry and K-theory*, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge / A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002.
- [Lüc94] W. Lück, *Approximating L^2 -invariants by their finite-dimensional analogues*, *Geometric and Functional Analysis* (1994), 455–481.
- [Lab67] J. P. Labute, *Classification of Demushkin groups*, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics. Journal Canadien de Mathématiques* **19** (1967), 106–132.
- [Lab70] ———, *On the descending central series of groups with a single defining relation*, *Journal of Algebra* **14** (1970), 16–23.
- [Lac09] M. Lackenby, *Large groups, property (τ) and the homology growth of subgroups*, *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **146** (2009), no. 3, 625–648.
- [Lac10] ———, *Detecting large groups*, *Journal of Algebra* **324** (2010), no. 10, 2636–2657.
- [Lin22] M. Linton, *One-relator hierarchies*, 2022. [arXiv:2202.11324](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.11324).
- [Lin93] P. A. Linnell, *Division Rings and Group von Neumann Algebras.*, *Forum mathematicum* **5** (1993), no. 6, 561–576.
- [Liu22] Y. Liu, *Finite-volume hyperbolic 3-manifolds are almost determined by their finite quotient groups*, *Inventiones mathematicae* (2022).
- [LO11] W. Lück and D. Osin, *Approximating the first L^2 -Betti number of residually finite groups*, *Journal of Topology and Analysis* **3** (2011), no. 2, 153–160.
- [Lor08] K. Lorenzen, *Groups with the same cohomology as their profinite completions*, *Journal of Algebra* **320** (2008), no. 4, 1704–1722.
- [LS62] R. C. Lyndon and M. P. Schützenberger, *The equation $a^m = b^n c^p$ in a free group.*, *Michigan Mathematical Journal* **9** (1962), no. 4, 289–298.

- [Lub14] A. Lubotzky, *Finiteness properties and profinite completions*, Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society **46** (2014), no. 1, 103–110.
- [LW22a] L. Louder and H. Wilton, *Negative immersions for one-relator groups*, Duke Mathematical Journal **171** (2022), no. 3, 547–594.
- [LW22b] ———, *Uniform negative immersions and the coherence of one-relator groups*, 2022. arXiv:2107.08911.
- [McC85] J. McCarthy, *A “Tits-alternative” for subgroups of surface mapping class groups*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **291** (1985), no. 2, 583–612.
- [MW22] J. Ma and Z. Wang, *Distinguishing 4-dimensional geometries via profinite completions*, Geometriae Dedicata **216** (2022), no. 52.
- [NRR79] G. A. Noskov, V. N. Remeslennikov, and V. A. Roman’kov, *Infinite groups*, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Informatsii, Moscow, 1979.
- [NS07] N. Nikolov and D. Segal, *On finitely generated profinite groups. I. Strong completeness and uniform bounds*, Annals of Mathematics **165** (2007), no. 1, 171–238.
- [NSW08] J. Neukirch, A. Schmidt, and K. Wingberg, *Cohomology of number fields*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.
- [OT11] D. V. Osin and A. B. Thom, *Normal generation and ℓ^2 -Betti numbers of groups*, Mathematische Annalen **355** (2011), 1331–1347.
- [Pic71] P. F. Pickel, *Finitely generated nilpotent groups with isomorphic finite quotients*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **77** (1971), 216–219.
- [PP15] D. Puder and O. Parzanchevski, *Measure preserving words are primitive*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **28** (2015), no. 1, 63–97.
- [PT11] J. Peterson and A. Thom, *Group cocycles and the ring of affiliated operators*, Inventiones Mathematicae **185** (2011), no. 3, 561–592.
- [Rem89] V. N. Remeslennikov, *\exists -free groups*, Sibirskii Matematicheskii Zhurnal **30:6** (1989), 193–197.
- [RZ00] L. Ribes and P. Zalesskii, *Profinite groups*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2000.
- [Sco78] P. Scott, *Subgroups of surface groups are almost geometric*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **17** (1978), no. 3, 555–565.
- [Sco85] ———, *Correction to ‘Subgroups of Surface Groups are almost Geometric’*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **32** (1985), no. 2, 217–220.
- [Seg83] D. Segal, *Polycyclic groups*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [Sel01] Z. Sela, *Diophantine geometry over groups I : Makanin-razborov diagrams*, Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS **93** (2001), 31–105.
- [Ser62] J.-P. Serre, *Structure de certains pro- p -groupes (d’après Demuškin)*, Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 8, 1962, pp. Exp. No. 252, 145–155.
- [Ser97] ———, *Galois cohomology*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997.
- [She55] A. Shenitzer, *Decomposition of a group with a single defining relation into a free product*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **6** (1955), 273–279.
- [ST10] Y. Shalom and T. Tao, *A finitary version of Gromov’s polynomial growth theorem*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **20** (2010), no. 6, 1502–1547.
- [Sta68] J. R. Stallings, *On torsion-free groups with infinitely many ends*, Annals of Mathematics. Second Series **88** (1968), 312–334.
- [Sta91] ———, *Foldings of G -trees*, Arboreal group theory (Berkeley, CA, 1988), 1991, pp. 355–368.
- [Str77] R. Strebel, *A remark on subgroups of infinite index in Poincaré duality groups*, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **52** (1977), no. 3, 317–324.
- [SW00] P. Symonds and T. Weigel, *Cohomology of p -adic analytic groups*, In *New horizons in pro- p group* **192** (2000), 349–410.
- [Swa69] R. G. Swan, *Groups of cohomological dimension one*, Journal of Algebra **12** (1969), 585–610.
- [Swa86] G. A. Swarup, *Decompositions of free groups*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **40** (1986), no. 1, 99–102.
- [Tit72] J. Tits, *Free subgroups in linear groups*, Journal of Algebra **20** (1972), 250–270.
- [vdDW84] L. van den Dries and A. J. Wilkie, *Gromov’s theorem on groups of polynomial growth and elementary logic*, Journal of Algebra **89** (1984), no. 2, 349–374.

- [Wad15] R. D. Wade, *The lower central series of a right-angled Artin group*, L'Enseignement Mathématique **61** (2015), no. 3, 343–371.
- [Wil08a] H. Wilton, *Hall's theorem for limit groups*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **18** (2008), 271–303.
- [Wil08b] ———, *Residually free 3-manifolds*, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **8** (2008), 2031–2047.
- [Wil12] ———, *One-ended subgroups of graphs of free groups with cyclic edge groups*, Geometry & Topology **16** (2012), no. 2, 665–683.
- [Wil17a] G. Wilkes, *Profinite rigidity for seifert fibre spaces*, Geometriae Dedicata **188** (2017), 141–163.
- [Wil17b] ———, *Virtual pro- p properties of 3-manifold groups*, Journal of Group Theory **20** (2017), no. 5, 999–1023.
- [Wil18a] ———, *Profinite completions, cohomology and JSJ decompositions of compact 3-manifolds*, New Zealand Journal of Mathematics **48** (2018), 101–113.
- [Wil18b] ———, *Profinite rigidity of graph manifolds and JSJ decompositions of 3-manifolds*, Journal of Algebra **502** (2018), 538–587.
- [Wil18c] H. Wilton, *Essential surfaces in graph pairs*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **31** (2018), 893–919.
- [Wil19] G. Wilkes, *Profinite rigidity of graph manifolds, II: Knots and mapping classes*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **233** (2019), no. 1, 351–378.
- [Wil21] H. Wilton, *On the profinite rigidity of surface groups and surface words*, Comptes Rendus. Mathématique **359** (2021), no. 2, 119–122.
- [Wis00] D. T. Wise, *Subgroup separability of graphs of free groups with cyclic edge groups*, The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics **50** (2000), no. 1, 107–129.
- [Wis20] ———, *An invitation to coherent groups*, What's next?—the mathematical legacy of William P. Thurston, 2020, pp. 326–414.
- [Wis21] ———, *The structure of groups with a quasiconvex hierarchy: (ams-209)*, Vol. 366, Princeton University Press, 2021.
- [WZ04] T. S. Weigel and P. Zalesskii, *Profinite groups of finite cohomological dimension*, Comptes Rendus Mathématique **338** (2004), 353–358.
- [WZ17] H. Wilton and P. Zalesskii, *Distinguishing geometries using finite quotients*, Geometry & Topology **21** (2017), 345–384.
- [WZ19] ———, *Profinite detection of 3-manifold decompositions*, Compositio Mathematica **155** (2019), no. 2, 246–259.
- [Zal22] P. Zalesskii, *The profinite completion of relatively hyperbolic virtually special groups*, Preprint (2022).