

2-step Growth, Covering and Applications

Aner Shalev

Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

60th Birthday Conference of Udi Hrushovski
Fields Institute

December 15, 2021

Joint work with Michael Larsen and Pham Tiep

Growth and approximate subgroups

G a group, $A, B \subseteq G$, $AB := \{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}$.

Similarly for longer products ABC, A^3 , etc.

Goal: Study the product size and growth phenomena.

Helfgott (2006-2008): There is $\epsilon > 0$ s.t., for any prime $p > 3$ and $G = SL_2(p)$, if $A \subseteq G$ generates G , then either $A^3 = G$, or $|A^3| \geq |A|^{1+\epsilon}$.

Tao defined k -approximate subgroups A of arbitrary groups G : $A = A^{-1}$ is a finite subset of G s.t. $|A^3| \leq k|A|$ (or moreover, A^3 is contained in the union of k right cosets of A).

Hrushovski (2009-2012): Stable group theory and approximate subgroups. Applies model theory to study k -approximate subgroups of infinite groups.

Growth and approximate subgroups

G a group, $A, B \subseteq G$, $AB := \{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}$.

Similarly for longer products ABC, A^3 , etc.

Goal: Study the product size and growth phenomena.

Helfgott (2006-2008): There is $\epsilon > 0$ s.t., for any prime $p > 3$ and $G = SL_2(p)$, if $A \subseteq G$ generates G , then either $A^3 = G$, or $|A^3| \geq |A|^{1+\epsilon}$.

Tao defined k -approximate subgroups A of arbitrary groups G : $A = A^{-1}$ is a finite subset of G s.t. $|A^3| \leq k|A|$ (or moreover, A^3 is contained in the union of k right cosets of A).

Hrushovski (2009-2012): Stable group theory and approximate subgroups. Applies model theory to study k -approximate subgroups of infinite groups.

The Product Theorem: Pyber-Szabó (2010-2016), Breuillard-Green-Tao (2010-2011) using Hrushovski: Let G be a finite simple group of Lie type of rank r . There exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(r) > 0$ s.t. if $A \subseteq G$ generates G , then either $A^3 = G$, or $|A^3| \geq |A|^{1+\epsilon}$.

Covering and Quasi-random groups

G any finite group.

$m(G) :=$ the minimal degree of a non-trivial irreducible complex character $\chi \in \text{Irr}G$.

A family F of finite groups is called **quasi-random** if, for $G \in F$,

$$m(G) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } |G| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Example: $F =$ all (nonabelian) FSG.

Covering and Quasi-random groups

G any finite group.

$m(G) :=$ the minimal degree of a non-trivial irreducible complex character $\chi \in \text{Irr}G$.

A family F of finite groups is called **quasi-random** if, for $G \in F$,

$$m(G) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } |G| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Example: $F =$ all (nonabelian) FSG.

Gowers trick (Gowers 2008, Nikolov-Pyber 2011): If $A, B, C \subseteq G$ and $|A||B||C| \geq |G|^3/m(G)$, then

$$ABC = G.$$

Consequences:

(i) If $A \subseteq G$ and $|A| \geq m(G)^{-1/3}|G|$ then $A^3 = G$.

(ii) If F is quasi-random, $\epsilon > 0$, $G \in F$, and $A, B, C \subseteq G$ satisfy $|A|, |B|, |C| \geq \epsilon|G|$, then $ABC = G$ provided $|G| \gg 0$.

(iii) This applies for FSG.

The trouble with length two products

Can we extend results on products of length **three** to products of length **two**?

Usually not: no growth, no covering.

A rare yes: $A, B \subseteq G$, $|A|, |B| > |G|/2$ imply $AB = G$ (trivial).

Reason: A intersects gB^{-1} for all $g \in G$.

What if we deal with **normal subsets** $R, S \subseteq G$?

The trouble with length two products

Can we extend results on products of length **three** to products of length **two**?

Usually not: no growth, no covering.

A rare yes: $A, B \subseteq G$, $|A|, |B| > |G|/2$ imply $AB = G$ (trivial).

Reason: A intersects gB^{-1} for all $g \in G$.

What if we deal with **normal subsets** $R, S \subseteq G$?

Liebeck-Schul-Sh (2016): For every $\epsilon > 0$ there is $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ s.t., if G is a FSG, $R, S \subseteq G$ are normal subsets of size $\leq |G|^\delta$, then $|RS| \geq (|R||S|)^{1-\epsilon}$. Hence for $\delta = \delta(\epsilon/2) > 0$ and $|R| \leq |G|^\delta$ we have

$$|R^2| \geq |R|^{2-\epsilon}.$$

This holds for **all** FSG, and exhibits **2-step growth instead of the 3-step growth in the Product Theorem.**

Yet, this says nothing about the 2-step growth or covering of large normal subsets.

Thompson Conjecture

Some 2-step covering problems by normal subsets are notoriously difficult and very much open:

Thompson Conjecture: Every FSG G has a conjugacy class C such that $C^2 = G$.

This implies **Ore Conjecture** (every element of a FSG is a commutator) proved in 2010 (Liebeck-O'Brien-Sh-Tiep); it's still open for some FSG of Lie type over fields with ≤ 8 elements.

Thompson Conjecture

Some 2-step covering problems by normal subsets are notoriously difficult and very much open:

Thompson Conjecture: Every FSG G has a conjugacy class C such that $C^2 = G$.

This implies **Ore Conjecture** (every element of a FSG is a commutator) proved in 2010 (Liebeck-O'Brien-Sh-Tiep); it's still open for some FSG of Lie type over fields with ≤ 8 elements.

Approximations of Thompson Conjecture:

2008 Sh: G a FSG, $x \in G$ random, $C := x^G$. Then, as $|G| \rightarrow \infty$, the random walk on G w.r.t. C has mixing time two. Consequently, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, $|C^2| \geq (1 - \epsilon)|G|$ almost surely.

2011 Larsen-Sh-Tiep: Every FSG G of size $> 2^{630}$ has conjugacy classes C_1, C_2 satisfying $C_1 C_2 \supseteq G \setminus \{e\}$.

2012 Guralnick-Malle: The above holds for **all** FSG.

Word maps

Let $w = w(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ be a word, namely $1 \neq w \in F_d$, the free group on x_1, \dots, x_d . Let G be a group. The word map $w : G^d \rightarrow G$ is defined by substituting group elements g_1, \dots, g_d in x_1, \dots, x_d respectively. Let $w(G)$ denote the image of this map.

$w(G)$ is a normal subset of G .

Borel (1983): Word maps on simple algebraic groups are dominant.

Active project in the past 2-3 decades: Study word maps on FSG G .

Larsen (2004): They have large image.

Let $w = w(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ be a word, namely $1 \neq w \in F_d$, the free group on x_1, \dots, x_d . Let G be a group. The word map $w : G^d \rightarrow G$ is defined by substituting group elements g_1, \dots, g_d in x_1, \dots, x_d respectively. Let $w(G)$ denote the image of this map.

$w(G)$ is a normal subset of G .

Borel (1983): Word maps on simple algebraic groups are dominant.
Active project in the past 2-3 decades: Study word maps on FSG G .
Larsen (2004): They have large image.

- Word Width:**
1. Liebeck-Sh (2001): $w(G)^{c(w)} = G$ if $|G| \geq N(w)$.
 2. Nikolov-Segal (2007): Use word width to solve Serre's problem: finite index subgroups of f.g. profinite groups are open.
 3. Sh (2009): $w_1(G)w_2(G)w_3(G) = G$ if $|G| \geq N(w_1, w_2, w_3)$.
 4. Larsen-Sh-Tiep (2011): $w_1(G)w_2(G) = G$ if $|G| \geq N(w_1, w_2)$.
 5. Larsen-Sh-Tiep (2019): If w_1, w_2 are disjoint words, then $w_1 w_2$ induces an almost uniform distribution on FSGs w.r.t. the L_1 -norm.

Main Questions

Can we extend this to all large normal subsets?

Let S, T be normal subsets of a FSG G s.t. $|S|, |T| \geq \epsilon|G|$ ($\epsilon > 0$).

Question 1: Does ST contain $G \setminus \{e\}$ if $|G|$ is sufficiently large?

Question 2: For $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$, is the number of solutions to $g = st$, $s \in S, t \in T$, $(1 + o_{|G|}(1))|S||T|/|G|$?

Question 3: What happens in the special case $S = T$?

Question 4: Applications?

Main Questions

Can we extend this to all large normal subsets?

Let S, T be normal subsets of a FSG G s.t. $|S|, |T| \geq \epsilon|G|$ ($\epsilon > 0$).

Question 1: Does ST contain $G \setminus \{e\}$ if $|G|$ is sufficiently large?

Question 2: For $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$, is the number of solutions to $g = st$, $s \in S, t \in T$, $(1 + o_{|G|}(1))|S||T|/|G|$?

Question 3: What happens in the special case $S = T$?

Question 4: Applications?

Comments:

1. Excluding e in Questions 1 and 2 is necessary:

Every conjugacy class in $G \neq \{e\}$ has size $|G|/n$ for some $n \geq 2$, hence G has a normal subset S with $|G|/3 \leq |S| \leq 2|G|/3$. Setting $T = G \setminus S^{-1}$, we have $|T| \geq |G|/3$, and $e \notin ST$.

2. Assuming S, T are normal subsets in Questions 1 and 2 is necessary: If $G \neq \{e\}$, there are $S, T \subseteq G$ of size $\geq \lfloor |G|/2 \rfloor$ s.t. $ST \not\supseteq G \setminus \{e\}$; indeed, fix $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$, choose S of size $\lfloor |G|/2 \rfloor$, and let $T = G \setminus S^{-1}g$. Then $g \notin ST$.

3. A positive answer to Question 2 implies a positive answer to Question 1 (similarly when $S = T$).

We hoped to provide **positive answers** to Question 1 for all FSG.
Drawback: it's harder to prove wrong results.

Theorem (Larsen-Sh-Tiep)

- (i) Questions 1 and 2 have **negative** answers for FSGs G , e.g. for alternating groups, or for projective special linear groups.
- (ii) In the $S = T$ case, Question 2 still has a **negative** answer for alternating groups.
- (iii) In the $S = T$ case, Question 1 has a **positive** answer for alternating groups.
- (iv) If G is a group of Lie type of bounded rank, the answers to Questions 1 and 2 are **both positive**.

E.g. for normal subsets $S, T \subset A_n$, $|S|, |T| \geq (1/2 - o(1))|A_n|$ doesn't imply $ST \supseteq A_n \setminus \{e\}$. ST need not contain a 3-cycle

What if $S = T$?

Good news: a covering result even when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ rather fast:

Theorem

For every $0 < \alpha < 1/4$ there exists $N > 0$ such that, if $n \geq N$ and $T \subseteq A_n$ is a normal subset satisfying $|T| \geq \exp(-n^\alpha) \cdot |A_n|$, then $T^2 = A_n$.

What if $S = T$?

Good news: a covering result even when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ rather fast:

Theorem

For every $0 < \alpha < 1/4$ there exists $N > 0$ such that, if $n \geq N$ and $T \subseteq A_n$ is a normal subset satisfying $|T| \geq \exp(-n^\alpha) \cdot |A_n|$, then $T^2 = A_n$.

The proof applies [exponential character bounds](#) for S_n .

1. Larsen-Sh 2008: for each $\sigma \in S_n$ there is a well-defined $E(\sigma) \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $|\chi(\sigma)| \leq \chi(1)^{E(\sigma)+o(1)}$ for all $\chi \in \text{Irr} S_n$.
2. A random $\sigma \in T$ satisfies $E(\sigma) < 1/4$ almost surely.
3. $E(\sigma) < 1/4$ implies $(\sigma^{S_n})^2 = A_n$ for all $n \gg 0$.
4. Replacing σ^{S_n} with σ^{A_n} using [Erdős-Turán's Statistical Group Theory](#), we conclude that $T^2 = A_n$ for $n \gg 0$.

Classical groups

Bad groups: e.g. $G = PSL_n(q)$ for q fixed and n unbounded and coprime to $q - 1$. Here Question 1 has a negative answer: there are $S, T \subset G$ normal of size $\geq \epsilon|G|$ s.t. no transvection lies in ST . Question 1 for 3 subsets has a positive answer with $\epsilon = |G|^{-\delta}$:

Theorem

There exists a fixed $\delta > 0$ s.t., if G is a finite simple classical group, and $R, S, T \subseteq G$ are normal subsets of size $\geq |G|^{1-\delta}$, then $RST = G$.

Classical groups

Bad groups: e.g. $G = PSL_n(q)$ for q fixed and n unbounded and coprime to $q - 1$. Here Question 1 has a negative answer: there are $S, T \subset G$ normal of size $\geq \epsilon|G|$ s.t. no transvection lies in ST . Question 1 for 3 subsets has a positive answer with $\epsilon = |G|^{-\delta}$:

Theorem

There exists a fixed $\delta > 0$ s.t., if G is a finite simple classical group, and $R, S, T \subseteq G$ are normal subsets of size $\geq |G|^{1-\delta}$, then $RST = G$.

This doesn't follow from Gowers trick: for G of rank $r \gg 0$, $|G|^{-\delta} \sim q^{-ar^2}$ is much smaller than $m(G)^{-1/3} \sim q^{-br}$.

Main tools in the proof: **Level theory of characters.**

Guralnick-Larsen-Tiep 2019: There is $\gamma > 0$ such that, if $|C_G(g)| \leq |G|^\gamma$, then $|\chi(g)| \leq \chi(1)^{1/4}$ for all $\chi \in Irr(G)$.

Witten zeta function $\zeta^G(s) = \sum_{\chi \in Irr G} \chi(1)^{-s}$ and its abscissa of convergence (Liebeck-Sh 2006).

The bounded rank theorem

Good groups: Lie type groups of bounded rank.

For normal subsets R_1, \dots, R_k of G and $g \in G$, let $P_{R_1, \dots, R_k}(g)$ denote the probability that $x_1 \cdots x_k = g$, where $x_i \in R_i$ are randomly chosen.

Theorem

Let $G = X_r(q)$, a finite simple group of Lie type of rank r over F_q . Suppose r is bounded and $q \rightarrow \infty$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $S, T \subseteq G$ be normal subsets of size $\geq \epsilon|G|$. Then, for every $g \in G \setminus \{e\}$ we have

$$P_{S,T}(g) = (1 + o_{|G|}(1))|G|^{-1}.$$

Thus Question 2, and hence Questions 1-3, have affirmative answers for G .

The character connection:

Frobenius: $C_1, \dots, C_k \subset G$ conjugacy classes, $g \in G$. Then

$$P_{C_1, \dots, C_k}(g) = |G|^{-1} \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(C_1) \cdots \chi(C_k) \bar{\chi}(g)}{\chi(1)^{k-1}}.$$

Use the theory of **exponential character bounds**: $|\chi(g)| \leq \chi(1)^{\alpha(g)}$.

For S_n : Fomin-Lulov (1996), Liebeck-Sh (2004), Muller-Puchta (2007), Larsen-Sh (2008).

For Lie type groups: Bezrukavnikov-Liebeck-Sh-Tiep (2018), Guralnick-Larsen-Tiep (2019, 2020), Taylor-Tiep (2020).

The character connection:

Frobenius: $C_1, \dots, C_k \subset G$ conjugacy classes, $g \in G$. Then

$$P_{C_1, \dots, C_k}(g) = |G|^{-1} \sum_{\chi} \frac{\chi(C_1) \cdots \chi(C_k) \bar{\chi}(g)}{\chi(1)^{k-1}}.$$

Use the theory of **exponential character bounds**: $|\chi(g)| \leq \chi(1)^{\alpha(g)}$.

For S_n : Fomin-Lulov (1996), Liebeck-Sh (2004), Muller-Puchta (2007), Larsen-Sh (2008).

For Lie type groups: Bezrukavnikov-Liebeck-Sh-Tiep (2018), Guralnick-Larsen-Tiep (2019, 2020), Taylor-Tiep (2020).

Tools from Algebraic Geometry:

Lang-Weil theorem estimating the number of q -rational points on varieties.

Hrushovski: The Elementary Theory of Frobenius Automorphisms.

Applications I: word maps

For $w : G^d \rightarrow G$, $g \in G$, set $P_{w,G}(g) := |w^{-1}(g)|/|G|^d$.

Larsen-Sh-Tiep 2019: for every $\ell \geq 1$ there exists $N = N(\ell)$ s.t. if $1 \neq w_1, \dots, w_N \in F_d$ are words in disjoint sets of variables, G a FSG, then

$$\|P_{w_1 \dots w_N, G} - U_G\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |G| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Changing the probabilistic model and using the bounded rank theorem, we obtain an almost uniform distribution in L_∞ **much faster**:

Applications I: word maps

For $w : G^d \rightarrow G$, $g \in G$, set $P_{w,G}(g) := |w^{-1}(g)|/|G|^d$.

Larsen-Sh-Tiep 2019: for every $\ell \geq 1$ there exists $N = N(\ell)$ s.t. if $1 \neq w_1, \dots, w_N \in F_d$ are words in disjoint sets of variables, G a FSG, then

$$\|P_{w_1 \dots w_N, G} - U_G\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |G| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Changing the probabilistic model and using the bounded rank theorem, we obtain an almost uniform distribution in L_∞ **much faster:**

Corollary

Let $1 \neq w_1, w_2 \in F_d$ and let G be a FSG of Lie type of bounded rank. Then $\|P_{w_1(G), w_2(G)} - U_G\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ as $|G| \rightarrow \infty$.

A version for classical groups of unbounded rank (Nikolov-Pyber):

$$\|P_{w_1(G), w_2(G), w_3(G)} - U_G\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } |G| \rightarrow \infty.$$

Applications II: Derangements

$G \leq S_n$ a permutation group. A **derangement** is a fixed-point-free permutation $g \in G$. Their study goes back three centuries.

Monmort 1708: the proportion of derangements in S_n (in its natural action) tends to $1/e$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Jordan 1870s: If G is transitive and $2 \leq n < \infty$ then there is a derangement $g \in G$.

Cameron-Cohen 1990: The proportion of derangements in G as above is $\geq 1/n$ (sharp).

Applications II: Derangements

$G \leq S_n$ a permutation group. A **derangement** is a fixed-point-free permutation $g \in G$. Their study goes back three centuries.

Monmort 1708: the proportion of derangements in S_n (in its natural action) tends to $1/e$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Jordan 1870s: If G is transitive and $2 \leq n < \infty$ then there is a derangement $g \in G$.

Cameron-Cohen 1990: The proportion of derangements in G as above is $\geq 1/n$ (sharp).

Conjecture (Boston-Sh 1990s)

The proportion of derangements in any finite simple transitive permutation group is $\geq \epsilon$ for some fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

$D(G) :=$ the set of derangements in G . $D(G) = D(G)^{-1}$ is a normal subset of G . The conjecture states that $|D(G)| \geq \epsilon|G|$. For G transitive with a point-stabilizer H , $D(G) = G \setminus \bigcup_{g \in G} H^g$.

Derangements width 1

Theorem (Fulman-Guralnick 2002-2018)

The conjecture holds. If $|G| \gg 0$ we may take $\epsilon = 0.016$.

Since FSGs are quasi-random, Gowers trick yields:

Corollary

For all sufficiently large transitive simple permutation groups G , every permutation in G is a product of three derangements.

Can we replace three by two?

Derangements width 1

Theorem (Fulman-Guralnick 2002-2018)

The conjecture holds. If $|G| \gg 0$ we may take $\epsilon = 0.016$.

Since FSGs are quasi-random, Gowers trick yields:

Corollary

For all sufficiently large transitive simple permutation groups G , every permutation in G is a product of three derangements.

Can we replace three by two?

Theorem

Let G be a finite simple transitive permutation group which is alternating or of Lie type of bounded rank. If $|G| \gg 0$ then every element of G is a product of two derangements.

Indeed, we proved that $T^2 = G$ for $|T| \geq \epsilon|G|$. Take $T := D(G)$.

Derangements width II

It remains to deal with classical groups G of unbounded rank. We may assume primitive action, i.e. a point-stabilizer H is a maximal subgroup.

Cameron Conjecture: Almost all permutations in S_n ($n \rightarrow \infty$) do not lie in a proper transitive subgroup (not containing A_n).

1993 Łuczak-Pyber: Cameron Conjecture holds. They also posed a similar problem for $GL_n(p)$ (p fixed).

1998 Sh: Almost all matrices in $GL_n(q)$ (q fixed, $n \rightarrow \infty$) do not lie in a proper irreducible subgroup (not containing $SL_n(q)$).

2018 Fulman-Guralnick: A similar result for all classical groups of rank $\rightarrow \infty$ (q arbitrary); if $G = Sp_{2r}(2^k)$ exclude $O_{2r}^\pm(2^k)$.

The union $X(G)$ of the above subgroups H has size $< |G|/2$ for $n \gg 0$. $\cup_{g \in G} H^g \subseteq X(G)$ implies $|D(G)| \geq |G| - |X(G)| > |G|/2$, hence $D(G)^2 = G$. This proves:

Corollary

$G \in Cl_n(q)$ has derangement width two when $n \gg 0$ and the point-stabilizer H is irreducible and not $O_n^\pm(2^k)$ when $G = Sp_n(2^k)$.

Remaining cases: $H < G$ is reducible so G acts in a subspace action, or $(G, H) = (Sp_n(2^k), O_n^\pm(2^k))$.

These are resolved using character-theory as a main tool. [This completes the proof of:](#)

Corollary

$G \in Cl_n(q)$ has derangement width two when $n \gg 0$ and the point-stabilizer H is irreducible and not $O_n^\pm(2^k)$ when $G = Sp_n(2^k)$.

Remaining cases: $H < G$ is reducible so G acts in a subspace action, or $(G, H) = (Sp_n(2^k), O_n^\pm(2^k))$.

These are resolved using character-theory as a main tool. [This completes the proof of:](#)

Theorem

Let G be a finite simple transitive permutation group. If G is sufficiently large, then every element of G is a product of two derangements.

Are there any exceptions? CONJECTURE: NO

O'Brien: positive computational evidence

Appendix: Growth for Representations

G a finite simple group of Lie type, χ a character of G .

Define $|\chi| = \sum_i \chi_i(1)^2$, where χ_i are the (distinct) irreducible constituents of χ (a normalized Plancherel measure).

We show:

1. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$, independent of G , s.t. if χ is an irreducible character of G satisfying $|\chi| \leq |G|^{1-\delta}$, then $|\chi^2| \geq |\chi|^{1+\epsilon}$.
2. The same holds for non-irreducible characters χ , assuming the rank r of G satisfies $r \geq f(\delta)$.

Advantages of characters over subsets:

2-step growth (instead of 3-step); no bounded rank assumption.

Appendix: Growth for Representations

G a finite simple group of Lie type, χ a character of G .

Define $|\chi| = \sum_i \chi_i(1)^2$, where χ_i are the (distinct) irreducible constituents of χ (a normalized Plancherel measure).

We show:

1. For every $\delta > 0$ there exists $\epsilon > 0$, independent of G , s.t. if χ is an irreducible character of G satisfying $|\chi| \leq |G|^{1-\delta}$, then $|\chi^2| \geq |\chi|^{1+\epsilon}$.
2. The same holds for non-irreducible characters χ , assuming the rank r of G satisfies $r \geq f(\delta)$.

Advantages of characters over subsets:

2-step growth (instead of 3-step); no bounded rank assumption.

Thank you and Happy Birthday to Udi!