

NORMAL SUBGROUP GENERATED BY A PLANE POLYNOMIAL AUTOMORPHISM

JEAN-PHILIPPE FURTER AND STÉPHANE LAMY

ABSTRACT. We study the normal subgroup $\langle f \rangle_N$ generated by an element $f \neq \text{id}$ in the group G of complex plane polynomial automorphisms having Jacobian determinant 1. On one hand if f has length at most 8 relatively to the classical amalgamated product structure of G , we prove that $\langle f \rangle_N = G$. On the other hand if f is a sufficiently generic element of even length at least 14, we prove that $\langle f \rangle_N \neq G$.

INTRODUCTION

Let $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ denote the group of complex plane polynomial automorphisms and let G be the subgroup of automorphisms having Jacobian determinant 1. In this paper, we deal with normal subgroups of G generated by a single element.

It is easy to check that G is equal to the commutator subgroup of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ and to its own commutator subgroup as well (see prop. 10). It is more difficult to decide whether G is a simple group or not. There does not seem to exist any natural morphism whose kernel is a proper normal subgroup of G . However, in a short note published in 1974 that seems to have been quite forgotten, V. I. Danilov [Dan74] proves that G is not a simple group. He uses results from P. Schupp [Sch71], namely the so-called small cancellation theory in the context of an amalgamated product. To be precise, he shows that the normal subgroup generated by the automorphism $(ea)^{13}$ where $a = (y, -x)$ and $e = (x, y + 3x^5 - 5x^4)$ is a strict subgroup of G . In fact, he writes $(ea)^{12}$, because he uses a slightly erroneous definition of the condition $C'(1/6)$ (see subsection 3.1).

We now introduce the algebraic length of an automorphism in order to state our main result. The theorem of Jung, Van der Kulk and Nagata asserts that $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is the amalgamated product over their intersection of the groups A and E of affine and elementary automorphisms (see 1.1). Let f be an element of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. If f is not in the amalgamated part $A \cap E$, its algebraic length $|f|$ is defined as the least integer m such that f can be expressed as a composition $f = g_1 \dots g_m$, where each g_i is in some factor (A or E) of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. If f is in the amalgamated part, by convention we set $|f| = 0$ (see [Ser77], §1.3).

The normal subgroup generated by an element f of G will be denoted by $\langle f \rangle_N$. Of course, $\langle f \rangle_N$ remains unchanged when replacing f by one of its conjugates in G . So, one can assume f of minimal algebraic length in its conjugacy class (see subsection 1.4). If $|f| \neq 1$, this amounts to saying that $|f|$ is even. This is for example the case for the previous automorphism $(ea)^{13}$ which has length 26.

Here are the two main results of our paper:

Theorem 1. *If $f \in G$ satisfies $|f| \leq 8$ and $f \neq \text{id}$, then $\langle f \rangle_N = G$.*

Theorem 2. *If $f \in G$ is a generic element of even length $|f| \geq 14$, then the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ (or a fortiori in G) is different from G .*

Here the genericity means that if we write $f^{\pm 1} = a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l$, where $l \geq 7$, $a_1, \dots, a_l \in A \setminus E$ and each $e_i = (x + P_i(y), y)$, then there exists an integer D such that for any sequence d_1, \dots, d_l of integers $\geq D$, (P_1, \dots, P_l) can be chosen generically (in the sense of algebraic geometry, i.e. outside a Zariski-closed hypersurface) in the affine space $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq l} \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$, where we have set $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d} = \{P \in \mathbb{C}[y]; \deg P \leq d\}$.

The theorems 1 and 2 correspond in the text below to theorems 32 and 44. Note that in the latter statements we use a geometric notion of length coming from Bass-Serre theory (see subsection 1.2). This geometric length allows us to obtain more natural statements. In fact, theorem 44 deals with automorphisms satisfying the special condition (C2) (see definition 27). The proof that this condition is indeed generic is postponed to the annex. To convince the reader that such a condition is necessary, we now give examples of automorphisms of arbitrary even length and generating normal subgroups equal to G .

Example 3. Consider the three automorphisms

$$a = (y, -x), \quad e_1 = (x + P(y), y), \quad e_2 = (x + Q(y), y),$$

where P (resp. Q) is an even (resp. odd) polynomial of degree ≥ 2 , and set $f = ae_1(ae_2)^n$, where $n \geq 1$ is an integer. If $u = -\text{id}$, we get $au = ua$, $e_2u = ue_2$ and $e_1u = ue_1^{-1}$, so that the commutator $[f, u] = fuf^{-1}u^{-1}$ is equal to

$$[f, u] = ae_1(ae_2)^n u (ae_2)^{-n} (ae_1)^{-1} u^{-1} = ae_1 u e_1^{-1} a^{-1} u^{-1} = ae_1^2 a^{-1}.$$

Since $[f, u] \in \langle f \rangle_N$, we get $e_1^2 \in \langle f \rangle_N$, so that $\langle f \rangle_N = G$ by theorem 1 (or by lemma 30 below).

One motivation for this work is the still open question of the simplicity of the Cremona group, i.e. the group of birational transformations of \mathbb{C}^2 . For instance in [Giz94] the question is explicitly stated and Gizatullin gives several criterion that would prove that the Cremona group is simple. However, after studying the polynomial case, our sentiment is that the Cremona group could be not simple as well. Indeed, it is known since Iskovskikh [Isk85] that the Cremona group admits a presentation as the quotient of an amalgamated product by the normal subgroup generated by a single element. Take $H_1 = (\text{PGL}(2) \times \text{PGL}(2)) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ the group of birational transformations that extend as automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, and H_2 the group of transformations that preserve the pencil of vertical lines $x = cte$. Note $\tau = (y, x) \in H_1 \setminus H_2$ and $e = (1/x, y/x) \in H_2 \setminus H_1$; then the Cremona group is equal to the quotient

$$(H_1 *_{H_1 \cap H_2} H_2) / \langle f \rangle_N$$

where $f = (\tau e)^3$. To prove that the Cremona group is not simple it would be sufficient to find an element g in the amalgamated product of H_1 and H_2 (that should correspond to a sufficiently general birational transformation) such that the normal subgroup $\langle f, g \rangle_N$ is proper. This is similar to the results we obtain in this paper. However the problem seems harder in the birational setting.

In this paper we chose to work over the field \mathbb{C} of complex numbers, even if most of the results could be adapted to any base field. Note that in the case of a finite field the nonsimplicity result is almost immediate. Let \mathbb{F}_q denote the finite field of $q = p^n$ elements, where p is prime and $n \geq 1$. Let $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{F}_q^2]$ be the group of automorphisms of the affine plane $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^2 = \mathbb{F}_q^2$ and let $\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2]$ be the normal subgroup of automorphisms having Jacobian determinant 1. If X is a finite set, let $\mathfrak{Per}(X)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{Per}^+(X)$) be the group of permutations (resp. even permutations) of X . Since the natural morphism $\phi : \text{Aut}[\mathbb{F}_q^2] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Per}(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$ induces a non-constant morphism $\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2] \rightarrow \mathfrak{Per}(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$ (consider the translations!), it is clear that $\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2]$ is not simple.

Remark 4. If q is odd (i.e. the characteristic p of \mathbb{F}_q is odd), one would easily check that $\phi(\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2]) = \mathfrak{Per}^+(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$. Indeed, ϕ is surjective (see [Mau01]), so that $\phi(\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2])$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathfrak{Per}(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$. However, if the cardinal of X is different from 4, it is well known that $\mathfrak{Per}^+(X)$ is the only nontrivial normal subgroup of $\mathfrak{Per}(X)$ (see e.g. [Rot95, ex. 3.21, p. 51]). Therefore, it is enough to show that $\phi(\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2]) \subseteq \mathfrak{Per}^+(\mathbb{F}_q^2)$. But on one hand $\text{Aut}_1[\mathbb{F}_q^2]$ is generated by the elementary automorphisms $(x + P(y), y)$ and $(x, y + Q(x))$, where $P \in \mathbb{C}[y]$, $Q \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ are any polynomials. On the other hand, it is straightforward to check that such automorphisms induce even permutations of \mathbb{F}_q^2 .

As a final remark, we would like to stress the importance of translations in getting our results. Let $\text{Aut}^0[\mathbb{C}^2]$ be the group of automorphisms fixing the origin and let J_n be the natural group-morphism associating to an element of $\text{Aut}^0[\mathbb{C}^2]$ its n -jet at the origin (for $n \geq 1$). For $n \geq 2$, the kernel of J_n is a nontrivial normal subgroup of $G^0 = G \cap \text{Aut}^0[\mathbb{C}^2]$, so that this latter group is not simple. Of course for $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ the morphism J_n does not exist. This explains the fact that our paper strongly relies on translations (see lemmas 7 and 16).

Remark 5. It results from [Ani83] that the image of J_n is exactly the group of n -jets of polynomial endomorphisms fixing the origin and whose Jacobian determinant is a non-zero constant. The precise statement can be found in [Fur07, proposition 3.2].

Our paper is organized as follows.

In section 1 we gather the results from Bass-Serre theory that we need: this includes some basic definitions and facts but also some quite intricate computations, such as in the characterization of tripods (subsection 1.7). This is also the place where we define precisely the condition $(C2)$ that we need in theorem 44.

Section 2 is devoted to the proof of theorem 1. This is the most elementary part of the paper. We only use lemma 7 from section 1.

In section 3 we deal with R-diagrams. This field of combinatorial group theory has been introduced by Lyndon and Schupp in relation with condition $C'(1/6)$ from small cancellation theory (see 3.1). A noteworthy feature of our work is that we use R-diagrams in a completely opposite setting (positive curvature).

In section 4 we are able to give a proof of theorem 2, using the full force of both Bass-Serre and Lyndon-Schupp theories.

We briefly discuss in section 5 the cases not covered by theorems 1 and 2, that is to say when the automorphism has length 10 or 12.

Finally, in the annex, we prove that condition (C2) is generic and we also give explicit examples of automorphisms satisfying this condition.

1. THE BASS-SERRE TREE

1.1. Generalities. The classical theorem of Jung, van der Kulk and Nagata states that the group $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is the amalgamated product of the **affine** group

$$A = \{(\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma, \delta x + \epsilon y + \zeta); \alpha, \dots, \epsilon \in \mathbb{C}, \alpha\epsilon - \beta\delta \neq 0\}$$

and the **elementary** group

$$E = \{(\alpha x + P(y), \beta y + \gamma); \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \alpha\beta \neq 0, P \in \mathbb{C}[y]\}$$

over their intersection (see [Jun42, vdK53, Nag72]). This is usually written in the following way:

Theorem 6. $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2] = A *_{A \cap E} E$.

A geometric proof of this theorem and many references may be found in [Lam02]. Let us also recall that elements of E are often called **triangular** automorphisms.

The Bass-Serre theory ([Ser77]) associates a simplicial tree to any amalgamated product. In our context, let us denote by \mathcal{T} this tree. By definition, the vertices of \mathcal{T} are the disjoint union of the left cosets modulo A (vertices of *type A*) and modulo E (vertices of *type E*). The edges of \mathcal{T} are the left cosets modulo $(A \cap E)$. Finally, if $\phi \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$, the edge $\phi(A \cap E)$ links the vertices ϕA and ϕE . Since $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is generated by A and E , \mathcal{T} is connected. Thanks to the amalgamated structure, \mathcal{T} contains no loop, so that it is indeed a tree.

The group $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ acts naturally on \mathcal{T} by left multiplication: for any $g, \phi \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$, we set $g \cdot \phi A = (g\phi)A$, $g \cdot \phi E = (g\phi)E$ and $g \cdot \phi(A \cap E) = (g\phi)(A \cap E)$. It turns out that this action gives an embedding of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ into the group of simplicial isometries of \mathcal{T} (see [Lam01, Remark 3.5]). This action is transitive on the set of edges, on the set of vertices of type A and on the set of vertices of type E . The stabilizer of a vertex ϕA (resp. of a vertex ϕE , resp. of an edge $\phi(A \cap E)$) is the group $\phi A \phi^{-1}$ (resp. $\phi E \phi^{-1}$, resp. $\phi(A \cap E) \phi^{-1}$).

Following [Wri79, Lam01], one can define systems of representatives of the non-trivial left cosets $A/A \cap E$ and $E/A \cap E$ by taking:

$$\begin{aligned} a(\lambda) &= (\lambda x + y, -x); \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \\ e(Q) &= (x + Q(y), y); \quad Q(y) \in y^2\mathbb{C}[y] \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the minus sign in the expression of $a(\lambda)$ did not appear in [Wri79, Lam01]. We have to introduce it in the present paper in order to get automorphisms with Jacobian determinant 1 (see subsection 1.4).

Then any element $g \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ may be uniquely written $g = ws$ where w is a product of factors of the form $a(\lambda)$ or $e(Q)$, successive factors being of different forms, and $s \in A \cap E$ (see e.g. [Ser77, chap. I, 1.2, th. 1]). Similarly, any edge (resp. vertex of type A , resp. vertex of type E) may be uniquely written $w(A \cap E)$ (resp wA , resp. wE) where w is as above.

We call a **path** a sequence of consecutive edges in \mathcal{T} . To denote a path we enumerate its vertices separated by $-$. For instance the path \mathcal{P} of two edges containing

the vertices $\text{id}A, \text{id}E, eA$, where $e \in E \setminus A$ will be denoted $\mathcal{P} = \text{id}A - \text{id}E - eA$. If we are only interested in the type of the vertices, we say for example that \mathcal{P} is of type $A - E - A$.

If two vertices of \mathcal{T} are fixed by an automorphism of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$, then the path relating them is also fixed. Therefore, the subset of \mathcal{T} fixed by an automorphism is either empty or a subtree. Up to conjugation, this subset has been computed for any automorphism in [Lam01, proof of prop. 3.3]. In particular, it has been computed for the translation $(x + 1, y)$. The following easy and technical lemma is a slight variation of this computation. As in the latter paper, this analogous statement turns out to be very useful. The proof is given for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 7. *The subtree of \mathcal{T} fixed by the translation $(x + c, y)$, $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$, is exactly the union of the paths*

$$\text{id}E - e(P)A - e(P)a(\lambda)E - e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)A$$

where $P \in y^2\mathbb{C}[y]$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $Q(y) = \alpha y^2$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

Note that we (exceptionally) allow P to be zero. In that case, the path should rather be written

$$\text{id}E - \text{id}A - a(\lambda)E - a(\lambda)e(Q)A.$$

In particular, the fixed subtree does not depend on c , has diameter 6 and contains the closed ball of radius 2 centered at $\text{id}E$, i.e. the union of the paths

$$\text{id}E - e(P)A - e(P)a(\lambda)E, \quad P \in y^2\mathbb{C}[y], \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. If $P, Q \in y^2\mathbb{C}[y]$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (x + c, y) \circ e(P) &= e(P) \circ (x + c, y); \\ (x + c, y) \circ a(\lambda) &= a(\lambda) \circ (x, y + c); \\ (x, y + c) \circ e(Q) &= e(Q) \circ f; \end{aligned}$$

where $f = (x + Q(y) - Q(y + c), y + c)$, so that

$$(x + c, y)e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q) = e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)f.$$

Therefore, the vertex $e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)A$ is fixed by $(x + c, y)$ if and only if $f \in A$, i.e. $\deg(Q(y) - Q(y + c)) \leq 1$, i.e. $\deg(Q) \leq 2$. If $Q = \alpha y^2$, this vertex is fixed. Since the vertex $\text{id}E$ is also (obviously) fixed, this shows that the following path is fixed:

$$\text{id}E - e(P)A - e(P)a(\lambda)E - e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)A.$$

If $Q = \alpha y^2$, where $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$, it remains to show that the vertex $e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)a(\mu)E$ is not fixed. Indeed, an easy computation shows that

$$(x + c, y)e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)a(\mu) = e(P)a(\lambda)e(Q)a(\mu)g,$$

where $g = (x - c, 2\alpha cx + y + \mu c - \alpha c^2) \notin E$. □

1.2. Algebraic and geometric lengths. We will use two notions of **length** on $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$.

The **algebraic length** has been defined in the introduction: if $g \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is not in the amalgamated part, $|g|$ is defined as the least integer m such that g can be expressed as a composition $g = g_1 \dots g_m$ where each g_i is in some factor of the amalgam. If g is in the amalgamated part, we set $|g| = 0$.

The **geometric length** is defined by $\lg(g) = \inf_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \text{dist}(g.v, v)$, where \mathcal{V} is the set of vertices of \mathcal{T} and $\text{dist}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the simplicial distance on \mathcal{T} .

1.3. Elliptic and hyperbolic elements. Elements g of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ may be sorted into two classes according to their action on \mathcal{T} .

If $\lg(g) = 0$ (i.e. g has at least one fixed point on \mathcal{T}), we say that g is **elliptic**. This corresponds to the case where g is conjugate to an element belonging to some factor (A or E) of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. Since any element of A is conjugate to some element of E , this amounts to saying that g is triangularizable (i.e. conjugate to some triangular automorphism).

If $\lg(g) > 0$, we say that g is **hyperbolic**. This corresponds to the case where g is conjugate to a composition of generalized Hénon transformations $h_1 \dots h_l$ (see [FM89]). We recall that a generalized Hénon transformation is a map of the form

$$h = (y, ax + P(y)) = (y, x) \circ (ax + P(y), y),$$

where $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $P(y)$ is a polynomial of degree at least 2. Equivalently, g is conjugate to an automorphism of the form

$$f = a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l,$$

where each $a_i \in A \setminus E$ and each $e_i \in E \setminus A$.

The set of points $v \in \mathcal{T}$ satisfying $\text{dist}(g.v, v) = \lg(g)$ defines an infinite geodesic of \mathcal{T} denoted by $\text{Geo}(g)$. Furthermore, g acts on $\text{Geo}(g)$ by translation of length $\lg(g)$. It is not difficult to check that $\lg(g) = \lg(f) = 2l$ and that the geodesic of f is composed of the path $\text{id}A - a_1 E - a_1 e_1 A - \dots - a_l e_l A$ and its translated by the f^k 's ($k \in \mathbb{Z}$). If $g = \phi f \phi^{-1}$, we have of course $\text{Geo}(g) = \phi(\text{Geo}(f))$.

The proof of the following easy result is left to the reader:

Lemma 8. *Let $g \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ be a hyperbolic element.*

(1) *The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) $\lg(g) = |g|$; (ii) *Geo(g) contains the vertices $\text{id}A$ and $\text{id}E$.*

(2) *The following assertions are equivalent:*

(iii) $\lg(g) \leq |g| + 1$; (iv) *Geo(g) contains the vertex $\text{id}A$ or $\text{id}E$.*

1.4. The group G . In this subsection we prove two basic facts about G . Let us set $A_1 = A \cap G$ and $E_1 = E \cap G$. Theorem 6 easily implies the following result:

Proposition 9. $G = A_1 *_{A_1 \cap E_1} E_1$.

Proof. For any $g \in G$, we have to prove that g is a composition of affine and triangular automorphisms with Jacobian determinant 1. We know that we can write g as a composition of $a(\lambda)$ and $e(Q)$, with a correcting term $s \in A \cap E$. Note that the $a(\lambda)$ and $e(Q)$ are automorphisms with Jacobian determinant 1, so s is also of Jacobian determinant 1 and we are done. □

As a consequence of this proposition the whole discussion of the previous subsection still applies to G . In particular we can make the same choice of representatives $a(\lambda)$ and $e(Q)$ to write edges and vertices, so that there exists a natural bijection between the trees associated to $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ and to G .

Proposition 10. *The group G is the commutator subgroup of the group $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$, and is also equal to its own commutator subgroup.*

Proof. Using proposition 9, it is sufficient to check that the commutator subgroup of G contains $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and all triangular automorphisms of the form $(x + P(y), y)$. But on one hand it is well-known that $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is equal to its own commutator subgroup; on the other hand any triangular automorphism $(x + \lambda y^n, y)$, with $n \geq 2$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, is the commutator of $(x + \lambda(1-b)^{-1}y^n, y)$ and $(bx, b^{-1}y)$, where $b \neq 1$ is a n -th root of the unity. Finally, any translation $(x + c, y)$ is the commutator of $(-x, -y)$ and $(x + \frac{c}{2}, y)$. \square

1.5. The color. We now introduce the **color** of a path of type $A - E - A$. This notion will be used to precise the genericity assumptions we need. Note that any path of type $A - E - A$ can be written $\mathcal{P} = \psi e_1 A - \psi E - \psi e_2 A$, where $\psi \in \mathrm{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ and $e_1, e_2 \in E$.

Definition 11. The **color** of \mathcal{P} is the double coset $(A \cap E)e_1^{-1}e_2(A \cap E)$.

One verifies easily that this definition does not depend on the choice of e_1, e_2 . The color is clearly invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. In fact, given two paths of type $A - E - A$ one could even show that one can send one to the other (by an element of $\mathrm{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$) if and only if they have the same color. However, we will not use this result.

If $P \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ is such that the color of \mathcal{P} is equal to the double coset $(A \cap E)e(P)(A \cap E)$, we say that P represents the color of \mathcal{P} . The following lemma implies that this notion does not depend on the orientation of the path. Its proof is easy and left to the reader.

Lemma 12. *Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ be polynomials of degree ≥ 2 . Then P and Q represent the same color if and only if there exist α, \dots, ϵ with $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ such that $Q(y) = \alpha P(\beta y + \gamma) + \delta y + \epsilon$.*

Remark 13. Note that any path of type $A - E - A$ can be sent by an automorphism to a path of the form $\mathrm{id}A - \mathrm{id}E - e(P)A$. It is easy to check that the vertices $e(P)A$ and $e(Q)A$ are equal if and only if there exists $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $Q(y) = P(y) + \alpha y + \beta$.

Fundamental example 14. Let g be a hyperbolic automorphism of geometric length $\mathrm{lg}(g) = 2l$. We know that g is conjugate to an automorphism of the form $f = a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l$ where each $a_i \in A \setminus E$ and each $e_i \in E \setminus A$. Then, the geodesic of g (and f) carries the l colors $(A \cap E)e_i(A \cap E)$ ($1 \leq i \leq l$) which are repeated periodically.

1.6. General color.

Definition 15. A polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ of degree $d \geq 5$ is said to be **general** if it satisfies:

$$\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \deg(P(y) - \alpha P(\beta y + \gamma)) \leq d - 4 \implies \alpha = \beta = 1 \text{ and } \gamma = 0.$$

The color $(A \cap E)e(P)(A \cap E)$ is said to be **general** if P is general. Lemma 12 implies that this notion does not depend on the choice of a representative P .

Lemma 16. *Let $Q \in y^2\mathbb{C}[y]$ be general. The stabilizer of the path $\mathcal{P} = e(Q)A - \mathrm{id}E - \mathrm{id}A$ is equal to $\{(x + \beta y + \gamma, y); \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}\}$. Furthermore, if $\beta \neq 0$, the automorphism $(x + \beta y, y)$ does not fix any path strictly greater than \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. We know that $f \in \mathrm{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ fixes the path $\mathrm{id}E - \mathrm{id}A$ if and only if $f \in A \cap E$. In this case, there exists constants α, \dots, ζ , with $\alpha\epsilon \neq 0$ such that $f = (\alpha x + \beta y +$

$\gamma, \varepsilon y + \zeta$). Since $fe(Q) = e(Q)g$, where $g = (\alpha x + \beta y + \alpha Q(y) - Q(\varepsilon y + \zeta), \varepsilon y + \zeta)$, the vertex $e(Q)A$ is fixed by f if and only if $g \in A$, i.e. $\deg(\alpha Q(y) - Q(\varepsilon y + \zeta)) \leq 1$. The polynomial Q being general, this is equivalent to $\alpha = \varepsilon = 1$ and $\zeta = 0$.

The second assertion comes from the following simple observation:

$$(x + \beta y, y)a(\lambda)E = a(\lambda + \beta)E.$$

Indeed, since $(x + \beta y, y)e(Q) = e(Q)(x + \beta y, y)$, we also have

$$(x + \beta y, y)e(Q)a(\lambda)E = e(Q)a(\lambda + \beta)E.$$

Therefore, the vertices $a(\lambda)E$ and $e(Q)a(\lambda)E$ are fixed by $(x + \beta y, y)$ if and only if $\beta = 0$. \square

Remark 17. The lemma 16 is a kind of converse to lemma 7. Precisely, we obtain that if ϕ fixes a general path of 4 edges centered on $\text{id}E$, then $\phi = (x + c, y)$ (Here by general we mean that the color supported by the two central edges of the path is general, see def. 11 and below).

Note also that since $(x, y + c) = a(0) \circ (x - c, y) \circ a(0)^{-1}$, the subset of \mathcal{T} fixed by $(x, y + c)$ is the image by $a(0)$ of the subset fixed by $(x - c, y)$. In particular, it contains the closed ball of radius 2 centered at $a(0)E$. Furthermore, if ϕ fixes a general path of 4 edges centered at $a(0)E$, it can be written as $\phi = (x, y + c)$.

We now apply the notion of a general color to prove a technical result that we need to prove the theorem 44. We consider a hyperbolic automorphism f and $g = \varphi f \varphi^{-1} \neq f$ a conjugate of f . We want to show that if f is sufficiently general then $\text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(g)$ is a path of length at most 4. More precisely, we also describe all possible types of such paths.

Definition 18. We say that a hyperbolic automorphism satisfies condition (C1) if the colors supported by its geodesic are general and distinct.

In the annex we show that this condition is generic in a natural sense.

Proposition 19. *Let f and $g = \phi f \phi^{-1}$ be two distinct conjugate automorphisms satisfying condition (C1). If the intersection $\text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(g)$ contains at least one edge then this path is of type:*

$$A - E, E - A - E, A - E - A, \text{ or } E - A - E - A - E$$

Proof. We have $\text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(g) = \phi(\mathcal{P})$, where $\mathcal{P} = \text{Geo}(f) \cap \phi^{-1}(\text{Geo}(f))$. Equivalently, one may define \mathcal{P} as the maximal path such that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{Geo}(f)$ and $\phi(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \text{Geo}(f)$.

There is no restriction to assume that \mathcal{P} contains a path of type $A - E - A$, because otherwise \mathcal{P} is at most a path of type $E - A - E$. Without loss of generality, one can conjugate and assume that the latter path of type $A - E - A$ is of the form $e(Q)A - \text{id}E - \text{id}A$. Let us call v its central vertex $\text{id}E$.

Note that we can replace ϕ by ϕf^k where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, without changing g . We take a k for which $\text{lg}(\phi f^k)$ is minimal.

By condition (C1), the geodesic of f carries l distinct colors which are repeated periodically. Therefore, $\text{dist}(v, \phi(v)) \in 2l\mathbb{Z}$. By the minimality condition satisfied by ϕ , we get $\phi(v) = v$, so that ϕ is elliptic.

There are two subcases, depending on whether ϕ preserves the orientation of $\text{Geo}(f)$ or not.

If ϕ preserves this orientation, then ϕ fixes \mathcal{P} point by point. We may assume that \mathcal{P} is strictly greater than $e(Q)A - \text{id}E - \text{id}A$, because otherwise there is nothing to show. Then, by lemmas 7 and 16, we get $\phi = (x + \gamma, y)$. Since the colors of $\text{Geo}(f)$ are general, lemma 7 shows us that \mathcal{P} is of the form $e(Q)a(\lambda)E - e(Q)A - \text{id}E - \text{id}A - a(\mu)E$, so that it is of type $E - A - E - A - E$.

If ϕ does not preserve this orientation, then ϕ fixes only the vertex v of $\text{Geo}(f)$. One can show that ϕ has to be an involution (see lemma 20 below). This implies that \mathcal{P} contains an even number of edges and is centered on v . Since the l colors supported by $\text{Geo}(f)$ are distinct, \mathcal{P} contains only one color, so that it is of type $A - E - A$ or $E - A - E - A - E$. \square

Lemma 20. *Let \mathcal{P} be a path of type $A - E - A$ carrying a general color. If ϕ exchanges the two ends of \mathcal{P} then $\phi^2 = \text{id}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, one can conjugate and assume that the path \mathcal{P} is of the form $e(Q)A - \text{id}E - \text{id}A$. Note that $\phi_1 = e(Q) \circ (-x, y)$ is an involution that exchanges the two vertices $e(Q)A$ and $\text{id}A$. Thus $\phi_1\phi$ fixes the path \mathcal{P} point by point, and since Q is general by lemma 16 we get $\phi = \phi_1 \circ (x + \beta y + \gamma, y)$. Remark that $\phi_1 \circ (x + \beta y + \gamma, y) = (x + \beta y + \gamma, y)^{-1} \circ \phi_1$, hence

$$\phi^2 = \phi_1 \circ (x + \beta y + \gamma, y) \circ (x + \beta y + \gamma, y)^{-1} \circ \phi_1 = \text{id}. \quad \square$$

Example 21. Here we show that all cases allowed by proposition 19 can be realized. In the following examples we suppose that $\text{Geo}(f)$ contains the path $a(0)E - \text{id}A - \text{id}E - e(Q)A - e(Q)a(\mu)E$ where Q is a general polynomial and we choose ϕ such that the path \mathcal{P} has various forms.

Examples with ϕ fixing at least one edge:

- $\phi = (x + P(y), y)$ with $\deg P \geq 2$, $\mathcal{P} = \text{id}A - \text{id}E$;
- $\phi = (\alpha x, \beta y)$ with $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \neq (1, 1)$, $\mathcal{P} = a(0)E - \text{id}A - \text{id}E$;
- $\phi = (x + by, y)$ with $b \neq 0$, $\mathcal{P} = \text{id}A - \text{id}E - e(Q)A$;
- $\phi = (x + c, y)$ with $c \neq 0$, $\mathcal{P} = a(0)E - \text{id}A - \text{id}E - e(Q)A - e(Q)a(\mu)E$.

Examples with ϕ reversing the orientation:

- $\phi = (y, x)$ exchanges $a(0)E$ and $\text{id}E$, $\mathcal{P} = a(0)E - \text{id}A - \text{id}E$;
- $\phi = (-x + Q(y), y)$ exchanges $\text{id}A$ and $e(Q)A$, \mathcal{P} is of length 4 or 2 depending if $\mu = 0$ or not.

Example with ϕ hyperbolic:

- $\phi = e(Q)a(\mu)u$ with $u = (-x, -y)$ sends $\mathcal{P} = a(0)E - \text{id}A - \text{id}E$ on $\phi(\mathcal{P}) = \text{id}E - e(Q)A - e(Q)a(\mu)E$ (the reader should verify that $a(\mu)ua(0) = (x - \mu y, y) \in A \cap E$).

1.7. Independent colors and tripods.

Definition 22. A family of polynomials $P_i \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ ($1 \leq i \leq l$) is said to be **independent** if given any $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\alpha_k\beta_k \neq 0$ and $i_k \in \{1, \dots, l\}$, for $1 \leq k \leq 3$, we have:

$$\deg \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3} \alpha_k P_{i_k}(\beta_k y + \gamma_k) \leq 1 \quad \implies \quad i_1 = i_2 = i_3.$$

The family of colors $(A \cap E)e(P_i)(A \cap E)$ ($1 \leq i \leq l$) is said to be **independent** if the family P_i ($1 \leq i \leq l$) is independent. Lemma 12 implies that this notion does not depend on the choice of the representatives P_i .

Definition 23. Three paths $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3$ of the tree \mathcal{T} define a **tripod** if

- For each $i \neq j$, $\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ contains at least one edge;
- The intersection $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap \mathcal{P}_2 \cap \mathcal{P}_3$ consists of exactly one vertex v .

The three paths $\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}_j$ are called the **branches** of the tripod. The vertex v is called the **center** of the tripod.

If we have a center of type E , we can consider the three colors associated with the three paths of type $A - E - A$ containing the center and included in the tripod. In this situation we say that anyone of these colors is a **mixture** of the two other ones.

Lemma 24. *Let $P_1, P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ be polynomials of degree ≥ 2 . The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) $(A \cap E)e(P_3)(A \cap E)$ is a mixture of the $(A \cap E)e(P_i)(A \cap E)$'s ($1 \leq i \leq 2$);
- (2) $\exists \alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2, \delta, \epsilon \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\alpha_1\beta_1\alpha_2\beta_2 \neq 0$ such that

$$P_3(y) = \alpha_1 P_1(\beta_1 y + \gamma_1) + \alpha_2 P_2(\beta_2 y + \gamma_2) + \delta y + \epsilon.$$

Proof. (1) \implies (2). Assume that there exists a tripod admitting the 3 colors $(A \cap E)e(P_i)(A \cap E)$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$).

We may assume that the center of this tripod is $\text{id}E$ and that one of its branch is $\text{id}E - \text{id}A$. Let $\tilde{P}_1, \tilde{P}_2 \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ be such that the 2 other branches are $\text{id}E - e(\tilde{P}_1)A$, and $\text{id}E - e(\tilde{P}_2)A$ and such that $(E \cap A)e(P_1)(A \cap E) = (E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(E \cap A)e(P_2)(A \cap E) = (E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_2)(A \cap E)$. By lemma 12, for $1 \leq i \leq 2$, there exists $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \delta_i, \epsilon_i$ with $\alpha_i\beta_i \neq 0$ such that $\tilde{P}_i = \alpha_i P_i(\beta_i y + \gamma_i) + \delta_i y + \epsilon_i$.

We then have $(E \cap A)e(P_3)(A \cap E) = (E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_3)(A \cap E)$, where $\tilde{P}_3 = \tilde{P}_1 - \tilde{P}_2$, so (still by lemma 12) this shows that P_3 has the desired form.

(2) \implies (1). Set $\tilde{P}_1 = \alpha_1 P_1(\beta_1 y + \gamma_1)$ and $\tilde{P}_2 = -\alpha_2 P_2(\beta_2 y + \gamma_2)$. By lemma 12, we have $(E \cap A)e(P_1)(A \cap E) = (E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(E \cap A)e(P_2)(A \cap E) = (E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_2)(A \cap E)$.

Consider the tripod with center $\text{id}E$ and branches $\text{id}E - \text{id}A$, $\text{id}E - e(\tilde{P}_1)A$ and $\text{id}E - e(\tilde{P}_2)A$. Its three colors are $(E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_1)(A \cap E)$, $(E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_2)(A \cap E)$ and $(E \cap A)e(\tilde{P}_3)(A \cap E)$, where $\tilde{P}_3 = \tilde{P}_1 - \tilde{P}_2 = \alpha_1 P_1(\beta_1 y + \gamma_1) + \alpha_2 P_2(\beta_2 y + \gamma_2)$. This shows that $(A \cap E)e(P_3)(A \cap E) = (A \cap E)e(\tilde{P}_3)(A \cap E)$ is a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_2)(A \cap E)$. \square

Remark 25. The second condition of lemma 24 may be written under the following symmetric form:

For $1 \leq k \leq 3$, there exists $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\alpha_k\beta_k \neq 0$ such that

$$\deg \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3} \alpha_k P_k(\beta_k y + \gamma_k) \leq 1.$$

Therefore, the following lemma is an easy consequence of the previous one.

Lemma 26. *Consider three colors represented by $P_1, P_2, P_3 \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ which are polynomials of degree ≥ 2 . The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) the three colors $(A \cap E)e(P_i)(A \cap E)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are independent;
- (2) For any $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, if $(A \cap E)e(P_{i_3})(A \cap E)$ is a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_{i_1})(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_{i_2})(A \cap E)$, then $i_1 = i_2 = i_3$.

Definition 27. We say that a hyperbolic automorphism satisfies condition (C2) if the colors supported by its geodesic are general and independent.

In the annex we show that this condition is generic in a natural sense.

Remark 28. One could easily check that independent colors are necessarily distinct. Therefore, condition (C2) is stronger than condition (C1).

By misuse of language, we will say that three hyperbolic automorphisms g_1, g_2, g_3 define a **tripod** if their geodesics $\text{Geo}(g_1), \text{Geo}(g_2), \text{Geo}(g_3)$ define a tripod.

Lemma 29. A tripod associated with three conjugates of a hyperbolic automorphism f satisfying condition (C2) admits branches of length at most 2.

Proof. If the center of the tripod is of type A , by proposition 19 there is nothing to do. Assume now that the center of the tripod is of type E . Without loss of generality one can conjugate and assume that the center is $\text{id}E$, and that $\text{Geo}(f)$ contains the vertices $\text{id}A$ and $a(0)E$. Let us note $g = ufu^{-1}$ and $h = vfv^{-1}$ the two conjugates of f involved in the tripod. By condition (C2) the three colors centered on $\text{id}E$ in the tripod must be equal. In other words, u, v can be chosen fixing the center of the tripod, i.e. $u, v \in E$.

Let us now assume that there exists a branch, say $\text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(h)$, of length strictly greater than 2. Then, by proposition 19, this branch has length 4, with middle point $a(0)E$ (see Fig. 1). Since v fixes point by point the general path $\text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(h)$, by remark 17, it can be written as $v = (x, y + c)$.

Let $e = e(P) = (x + P(y), y) \in E$ be such that the vertex $eA \in \text{Geo}(f) \cap \text{Geo}(h)$. Since $\text{Geo}(h) = v(\text{Geo}(f))$, the vertex $veA \in \text{Geo}(h)$ and finally $veA \in \text{Geo}(g) \cap \text{Geo}(h)$.

We assume that the orientation induced by g on $\text{id}E - eA$ is opposite to the one of f , the other case being symmetric.




FIGURE 1

Since $\text{Geo}(g) = u(\text{Geo}(f))$, u send the path $\text{id}A - \text{id}E - eA$ on the path $eA - \text{id}E - veA$.

On one hand, u sends $\text{id}A$ on eA , i.e. $uA = eA$, i.e. $e^{-1}u \in A$, i.e. $e^{-1}u \in A \cap E$. Since $e^{-1}u \in A \cap E$, it can be written as s_1s_2 , where $s_1 = (a_1x, b_1y + c_1)$, $s_2 = (x + \beta y + \gamma, y) \in A \cap E$ and we have $u = es_1s_2$.

On the other hand u sends eA on veA , i.e. $ueA = veA$, i.e. $es_1s_2eA = veA$. Since $s_2e = es_2$, we have $es_1s_2eA = es_1eA$, so that $es_1eA = veA$. This last equality is still equivalent to $e^{-1}v^{-1}es_1e \in A$. We compute

$$e^{-1}v^{-1}es_1e = (a_1x + a_1P(y) + P(b_1y + c_1) - P(b_1y + c_1 - c), b_1y + c_1 - c).$$

We should have $\deg(a_1P(y) + P(b_1y + c_1) - P(b_1y + c_1 - c)) \leq 1$. Since $a_1 \neq 0$ and $\deg(P(b_1y + c_1) - P(b_1y + c_1 - c)) < \deg P$, this is impossible. \square

2. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We start by looking at the case of an automorphism of algebraic length ≤ 1 , i.e. a triangular or affine automorphism. Note that similar results in the context of birational transformations are proved in [CD08].

Lemma 30. *If $f \in G$ satisfies $|f| \leq 1$ and $f \neq \text{id}$, then $\langle f \rangle_N = G$.*

Proof. Let $g, h \in G$. If g or h belongs to $\langle f \rangle_N$, let us note that their commutator $[g, h] = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$ also. We show that $G = \langle f \rangle_N$ by making the following observations:

- If $f \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $f \neq \pm \text{id}$, we obtain $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) \subseteq \langle f \rangle_N$. We used the fact that $\{\pm \text{id}\}$ is the unique nontrivial normal subgroup of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Indeed, if H is a normal subgroup of $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ not included into $\{\pm \text{id}\}$, we get $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C}) = H \cup (-H)$ by simplicity of $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Therefore, if $g = (y, -x)$, we get $g \in H$ or $-g \in H$, so that $-\text{id} = g^2 = (-g)^2 \in H$ and finally $H = \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$.

Now, if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, we get

$$[(x + \alpha, y + \beta), (-x, -y)] = (x + 2\alpha, y + 2\beta)$$

so that $A \subseteq \langle f \rangle_N$.

If $b \neq 1$ is a n -th root of the unity ($n \geq 2$) and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we get

$$[(x + \lambda(1 - b)^{-1}y^n, y), (bx, b^{-1}y)] = (x + \lambda y^n, y)$$

and we are done.

- If f is a translation, then, conjugating by $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, we see that $\langle f \rangle_N$ contains all translations. So, it contains the commutator

$$[(x, y + 1), (x + y^2, y)] = (x - 2y + 1, y)$$

and also the linear automorphism $(x - 2y, y)$. We conclude by the previous case.

- If f is an affine automorphism which is not a translation, then there exists a translation g which does not commute with f . Therefore, the commutator $[f, g]$ is a nontrivial translation belonging to $\langle f \rangle_N$ and we conclude by the previous case.
- Finally if $f = (ax + P(y), a^{-1}y + c)$ is a triangular non affine automorphism, then, up to replacing f by $[f, g]$, where g is a triangular automorphism non commuting with f , we may assume that $a = 1$. Still replacing f by $[f, g]$, where g is a triangular automorphism non commuting with f , we may even

assume that $c = 0$. Therefore, f is of the form $(x + P(y), y)$. Remark then that the commutator

$$[(x, y + 1), (x + P(y), y)]$$

is a triangular automorphism of the form $(x + R(y), y)$, with $\deg R = \deg P - 1$. By induction on the degree we obtain the existence of a nontrivial translation $(x + c, y)$ in $\langle f \rangle_N$. This case has already been done. \square

Corollary 31. *If $f \in G$ is elliptic (i.e. triangularizable) and $f \neq \text{id}$, then $\langle f \rangle_N = G$.*

We are now ready to prove theorem 1. In fact, we will prove the following stronger and more geometric version:

Theorem 32. *If $f \in G$ satisfies $\text{lg}(f) \leq 8$ and $f \neq \text{id}$, then $\langle f \rangle_N = G$.*

Proof. The crucial fact we use here is the knowledge of the subtree fixed by translations $(x + c, y)$. We know that this subtree is of diameter 6, centered in $\text{id}E$, and that the closed ball of radius 2 and center $\text{id}E$ is contained in this subtree (see lemma 7). In consequence, given an arbitrary path of type $E - A - E - A - E$, there exists a conjugate ψ of $(x + 1, y)$ fixing this path point by point.

Let us choose such a path contained in the geodesic of f and let us set $g = \psi f \psi^{-1}$. Then if $\text{lg}(f) = 2$ or 4 it is clear that $f \circ g^{-1}$ is elliptic, so we can conclude by lemma 30. If $\text{lg}(f) = 6$ then $\text{lg}(f \circ g^{-1}) \leq 4$ so we are done by the previous case.

The case where $\text{lg}(f) = 8$ is more subtle and we have to refine the above argument. Replacing f by one of its conjugates, we may assume $|f| = \text{lg}(f) = 8$. We can then assume (maybe replacing f by f^{-1}) that

$$f = e_1 a_1 e_2 a_2 e_3 a_3 e_4 a_4$$

where $a_i \in A \setminus E$, $e_j \in E \setminus A$. Without loss of generality we can further assume that each e_j is of the form $e_j = e(P_j) = (x + P_j(y), y)$ and that $\deg(e_1) \leq \deg(e_j)$ for $j = 2, 3, 4$.

We know that any translation $(x + c, y)$ fixes the closed ball of radius 2 and center $\text{id}E$. Note also that for any $s \in A \cap E$, $s(x + 1, y)s^{-1}$ is still a translation of the form $(x + c, y)$. In consequence, if we write $e_1 a_1$ under the form $e_1 a_1 = e(P)a(\lambda)s$ with $s \in A \cap E$, the automorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_1 &= e_1 a_1 (x + 1, y) a_1^{-1} e_1^{-1} \\ &= (x + P(y), y) \circ (\lambda x + y, -x) \circ (x + c, y) \circ (-y, \lambda y + x) \circ (x - P(y), y) \\ &= (x + \lambda c + P(y - c) - P(y), y - c) \end{aligned}$$

fixes the closed ball of radius 2 and center $e_1 a_1 E$. Note that $\deg \tilde{e}_1 = \deg e_1 - 1$. Consider

$$g = \tilde{e}_1 f \tilde{e}_1^{-1} \text{ and } h = g^{-1} f.$$

By construction the geodesics $\text{Geo}(g)$ and $\text{Geo}(f)$ have at least 4 edges in common. By lemma 7 we also know that they have at most 6 edges in common. Then we can check (see Fig. 2) that h sends the vertex $v = a_4^{-1} e_4^{-1} a_3^{-1} E$ on a vertex at distance at most 8 (and at least 6) of v . Explicitly, one can compute

$$h = \tilde{e}_1 a_4^{-1} e_4^{-1} a_3^{-1} \tilde{e}_3 a_3 e_4 a_4$$




FIGURE 2. Proof of theorem 32

where $\tilde{e}_3 = e_3^{-1} a_2^{-1} (x - 1, y) a_2 e_3$ is a triangular automorphism with $\deg(\tilde{e}_3) = \deg(e_3) - 1$.

If $\deg(\tilde{e}_1) = \deg(\tilde{e}_3) = 1$ then $\lg(h) = 4$. This corresponds to the case when $\text{Geo}(g)$ and $\text{Geo}(f)$ share 6 edges. Note that $a_3^{-1} \tilde{e}_3 a_3$ and $a_4 \tilde{e}_1 a_4^{-1}$ are indeed non triangular affine automorphisms.

If $\deg(\tilde{e}_1) = 1$ and $\deg(\tilde{e}_3) \geq 2$ then $\lg(h) = 6$. In this case $\text{Geo}(g)$ and $\text{Geo}(f)$ share 5 edges : the vertices $\text{id}A$ and $\tilde{e}_1 A$ coincide.

In the two cases above we are done by the first part of the proof.

Finally if $\deg(\tilde{e}_1) \geq 2$ then h admits a factorization similar to the one of the f we started with except that the first triangular automorphism has a strictly smaller degree. By induction, we can produce an element of length 8 in $\langle f \rangle_N$ with the first triangular automorphism of degree 2, and we are done by the previous argument. \square

3. R-DIAGRAMS

3.1. Generalities on small cancellation theory. In this subsection we consider $H = H_1 *_{H_1 \cap H_2} H_2$ a general amalgamated product of two factors. Of course our motivation is to apply the theory to the group $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ of plane automorphisms.

The following definitions are taken from [LS01], chap. V, §11 (p. 285). If u is an element of H , not in the amalgamated part $H_1 \cap H_2$, a **normal form** of u is any sequence $x_1 \cdots x_m$ such that $u = x_1 \cdots x_m$, each x_i is in a factor of H , successive x_i come from different factors of H , and no x_i is in the amalgamated part. The **length** of u is defined by $|u| = m$. This definition does not depend on the chosen normal form, but only on u . If u is in the amalgamated part of H , by convention we set $|u| = 0$.

We call a **word** an element $u \in H$ given with a factorization $u = u_1 \cdots u_k$, where $u_i \in H$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. A word $u = u_1 \cdots u_k$ is said to have **reduced form** if $|u_1 \cdots u_k| = |u_1| + \cdots + |u_k|$.

Suppose u and v are elements of H with normal forms $u = x_1 \cdots x_m$ and $v = y_1 \cdots y_n$. If $x_m y_1$ is in the amalgamated part, we say that there is **cancellation** between u and v in forming the product uv . Equivalently, this means that $|uv| \leq |u| + |v| - 2$. If x_m and y_1 are in the same factor of H and $x_m y_1$ is not in the

amalgamated part, we say that x_m and y_1 are **consolidated** in forming a normal form of uv . Equivalently, this means that $|uv| = |u| + |v| - 1$.

A word is said to have **semi-reduced form** $u_1 \cdots u_k$ if there is no cancellation in this product. Consolidation is expressly allowed.

A word $u = x_1 \cdots x_m$ in normal form is **strictly** (resp. **weakly**) **cyclically reduced** if $m \leq 1$ or if x_m and x_1 are in different factors of H (resp. the product $x_m x_1$ is not in the amalgamated part).

A subset R of H is **symmetrized** if all elements of R are weakly cyclically reduced and for each $r \in R$, all weakly cyclically reduced conjugates of both r and r^{-1} belong to R .

If f is strictly cyclically reduced, $R(f)$ denotes the symmetrized set generated by f , i.e. the smallest symmetrized set containing f . It is clear that $R(f)$ is equal to the set of conjugates of $f^{\pm 1}$ of length $\leq |f| + 1$.

We now discuss briefly the condition $C'(\lambda)$ (mostly used with $\lambda = 1/6$). We do not need this notion in our construction, but this was the original setting where the notion of R-diagram (see next subsection) was introduced. Let R be a symmetrized subset of H . A word b is said to be a **piece** (relative to R) if there exists distinct elements r_1, r_2 of R such that $r_1 = bc_1$ and $r_2 = bc_2$ in semi-reduced form.

Lemma 33. *If $\lambda > 0$ and $\forall r \in R, |r| > 1/\lambda$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) *If $r \in R$ admits a semi-reduced form $r = bc$, where b is a piece of R , then $|b| < \lambda|r|$;*
- (2) *$\forall r_1, r_2 \in R$ such that $r_1 r_2 \neq 1$, $|r_1 r_2| > |r_1| + |r_2| - 2\lambda \min\{|r_1|, |r_2|\} + 1$.*

Proof. The equivalence is easily obtained from the following claim.

Let $r_1 = bc_1$ and $r_2 = bc_2$ be semi-reduced expressions with $b \neq 1$ and $r_1 \neq r_2$.

Claim. There exists b', c'_1, c'_2 such that:

- a) the equalities $r_1 = b'c'_1$ and $r_2 = b'c'_2$ hold;
- b) these expressions are semi-reduced;
- c) exactly one of these expressions is reduced;
- d) the expression $(c'_1)^{-1}c'_2$ is reduced;
- e) $|b'| \geq |b|$.

□

Definition 34. When the equivalent assertions of lemma 33 are satisfied, we say that R satisfies condition $C'(\lambda)$.

The first assertion is the one used by Lyndon and Schupp. The second one is used by Danilov, except that he forgets the +1 in the formula. This leads to the slight error in his statement that we mentioned in the introduction.

3.2. Construction of an R-diagram. The idea of associating diagrams in the Euclidean plane to some products in amalgamated groups appears in [VK33].

In 1966, Lyndon independently arrived at the same idea and Weinbaum rediscovered van Kampen's paper (see [Lyn66, Wei66] and [LS01], p. 236). For the basic definition of a **diagram**, we refer to [LS01], chap. V, §1, p. 235. Here follows a quick review of this notion.

A diagram is a plane graph (or more generally a graph on an orientable surface, we will consider spherical diagrams in lemma 41). Vertices are divided into two types, **primary** and **secondary**. The edge joining two vertices will be called a **half-segment**. The notation 'edge' will be used later on to refer to some special unions of half-segments (see remark on terminology below). A half-segment will always join vertices of different types. By definition, **segments** will denote some special successions of two half-segments that we now describe. If e_1, \dots, e_r are the half-segments arriving at some secondary vertex v and taken counterclockwise, then, by definition, the segments passing through v are the successive half-segments e_i, e_{i+1}^{-1} and their inverses $e_{i+1}e_i^{-1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$, where i and $i+1$ are taken modulo r . If two successive half-segments e, e' define a segment, the latter will be noted ee' . Note that the initial and terminal vertices of a segment have to be primary. By convention, each segment (resp. half-segment) has length 1 (resp. $1/2$). Each oriented half segment e will be labeled by an element $\phi(e)$ belonging to a factor of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$, with the labels on successive half-segments at a secondary vertex belonging to the same factor. This labelling gives a labelling on segments, by taking $\phi(ee') = \phi(e)\phi(e')$. The label on an individual half-segment may be in the amalgamated part, but if e, e' are the two half-segments of a segment, we will usually insist that $\phi(ee')$ is not in the amalgamated part (in fact, there will be only one exception to this rule, see step 4 in the proof of the theorem 35). We call **region** a bounded connected component of the complement of the graph in the surface. A **boundary cycle** of a region is a collection of half-segments that run along the entire boundary of D (say counterclockwise in the case of the plane, or in a way compatible with the orientation in general) with initial vertex of primary type. Similarly, a boundary cycle of the diagram is a collection of half-segments that run along the boundary of the diagram. Let us note that a segment necessarily belongs to the boundary of some region and/or to the boundary of the diagram.

Now let f be an element of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ and consider $R(f)$ the associated symmetrized set. We say that a diagram is a **$R(f)$ -diagram** if for any region D and any boundary cycle $e_1 \dots e_s$ of D , we have $\phi(e_1) \dots \phi(e_s) \in R(f)$.

Terminology. Note that we use two kinds of graph in this paper: the Bass-Serre tree and the diagrams of Lyndon-Schupp. In the context of the Bass-Serre tree we have already used the term *edge*, and we have called a *path* the union of several edges. In the context of Lyndon-Schupp diagrams, we have *segments* and *half-segments*. We call *edge* in this context a connected component of the intersection of the boundary of two regions, which is a collection of half-segments.

The following result will be the key ingredient for the proof of theorem 2. Its proof will occupy the rest of this subsection.

Theorem 35. *Let $f \in G$ be a strictly cyclically reduced element of G of even algebraic length $|f| \geq 2$. Assume that the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is equal to G . Then there exists a planar $R(f)$ -diagram M such that:*

- (1) M is connected and simply connected;
- (2) The boundary of M has length $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1;
- (3) If $e_1, e'_1 \dots e_t, e'_t$ is a boundary cycle of some region of M , then $t = |f|$ and $\phi(e_1e'_1) \dots \phi(e_te'_t)$ is a reduced form of a strictly cyclically reduced conjugate of f .

Proof. We start by choosing an element $g \neq \text{id}$ in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2] = \langle f \rangle_N$ with $\text{lg}(g) = 0$. We can write

$$g = (\phi_1 f^{\pm 1} \phi_1^{-1}) \cdots (\phi_n f^{\pm 1} \phi_n^{-1}).$$

with $\phi_i \in \text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$.

We assume that we have chosen g such that n is minimal. By lemma 36, we may assume that each $\phi_i f^{\pm 1} \phi_i^{-1}$ is expressed under reduced form $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}$ (i.e. $|\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}| = |\psi_i| + |r_i| + |\psi_i^{-1}|$) where $r_i \in R(f)$. There is no restriction to assume that $|\psi_i| = 0$ if and only if $\psi_i = \text{id}$. Note also that the four following assertions are equivalent:

a) r_i is strictly cyclically reduced; b) $|r_i| = |f|$; c) $|r_i|$ is even; d) $|\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}|$ is even.

If anyone of these assertions is satisfied, we necessarily have $\psi_i = \text{id}$ (since the expression $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}$ is reduced).

Let us now explain the construction of M , that we perform in several steps:

Step 1. We associate a diagram to each $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}$.

Our construction will involve a base point O which will be considered as a primary vertex. Let $r_i = x_1 \dots x_m$ be a normal form of r_i .

• Assume that r_i is strictly cyclically reduced, i.e. $m = |f|$.

The diagram for $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1} = r_i$ is the loop at the base point O consisting of $2m$ half-segments $d_1, d'_1, \dots, d_m, d'_m$ such that $\phi(d_j d'_j) = x_j$ for each j .

• Assume that r_i is not strictly cyclically reduced, i.e. $m = |f| + 1$.

The diagram for $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}$ is a loop at a vertex v joined to the base point O by a path.

Let $\psi_i = z_1 \dots z_k$ be a normal form of ψ_i .

The path Ov consists of $2k$ half-segments $e_1, e'_1, \dots, e_k, e'_k$ such that $\phi(e_j e'_j) = z_j$ for each j and an additional final half-segment e .

The loop at v consists of $2m - 2$ half-segments $b, d_2, d'_2, \dots, d_{m-1}, d'_{m-1}, c$ such that $\phi(d_j d'_j) = x_j$ for each j .

The three half-segments e, b, c which meet at the secondary vertex v are labeled to satisfy the necessary (and compatible) conditions $\phi(eb) = x_1$, $\phi(ce^{-1}) = x_m$ and $\phi(cb) = x_m x_1$. For instance we can take $\phi(b) = x_1$, $\phi(c) = x_m$ and $\phi(e) = \text{id}$.

Step 2. The initial diagram for the composition

$$g = (\psi_1 r_1 \psi_1^{-1}) \cdots (\psi_n r_n \psi_n^{-1})$$

consists of the initial diagrams for each $\psi_i r_i \psi_i^{-1}$ arranged, in counterclockwise order, around the base point O . This initial diagram has the desired properties (1) and (3).

Step 3. We will now proceed to the identification of some half-segments of M until the boundary length of M is ≤ 2 .

Note that in these identifications:

- We shall always identify primary vertices with primary vertices and secondary vertices with secondary vertices, preserving this distinction;
- The label of a segment will never be in the amalgamated part;

- The number n of regions of M will not change and (1) and (3) will be satisfied at each stage;
- If α is a boundary cycle of M , then $\phi(\alpha)$ is conjugate to g .

For grounds of brevity, the tiresome and easy verification of the second point (on label of segments) has been omitted in the two cases below.

If the boundary length of M is ≥ 3 , there necessarily exists successive segments ee' and ff' in ∂M such that the labels $\phi(ee')$ and $\phi(ff')$ are in the same factor of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. Indeed, otherwise, any boundary cycle $\alpha = e_1, e'_1, \dots, e_i, e'_i$ of M would have even length $i \geq 4$ and its label $\phi(\alpha) = \phi(e_1) \dots \phi(e_i)$ would be a strictly cyclically reduced conjugate of g : A contradiction.

So we consider the element $s = \phi(ee')\phi(ff')$ which lies in a factor of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$.

Case 1: Assume that s is not in the amalgamated part.

Change the label on the half-segment e' to 1, readjusting the labels on the other half-segments at the secondary vertex separating e and e' . In other words this amounts, for each half-segment g ending at this secondary vertex, to replace its label $\phi(g)$ by $\phi(ge')$.

In the same way, change the label on the half-segment f to 1, readjusting the labels on the other half-segments at the secondary vertex separating f and f' .

Then we identify the (oriented) half-segments e' and f^{-1} (which now have the same labels) (see Fig. 3, where the \bullet are primary vertices and the \circ are secondary vertices).




FIGURE 3. Relabellings and identifications in case 1.

Case 2: Assume that s is in the amalgamated part.

Note first that the diagram has no loop of length ≤ 2 . Indeed, such a loop α would be a boundary cycle of some strictly smaller subdomain, so

that, by lemma 37 below, $\phi(\alpha)$ would be the product of strictly less than n conjugates of f . This would contradict the minimality of n .

Therefore, if u is the initial vertex of ee' , v its terminal vertex (as well as the initial vertex of ff') and w the terminal vertex of ff' , then the vertices u, v, w are distinct.

Recall that $\phi(f)\phi(f') = \phi(e')^{-1}\phi(e)^{-1}s$. We change the labels in the following way (see Fig. 4):

- we change the label of f to $\phi(e')^{-1}$, readjusting the labels on the other half-segments at the secondary vertex separating f and f' ;
- we change the label of f' to $\phi(e)^{-1}$;
- for each half-segment g having w as initial vertex, we replace its label $\phi(g)$ by $s\phi(g)$.

Then we identify the (oriented) segments e, e' and f'^{-1}, f^{-1} (which now have the same labels).




FIGURE 4. Relabellings and identifications in case 2.

Note that after performing the identification in case 1 (resp. in case 2) the boundary length drops by 1 (resp. by 2). Note also that if two regions D_1 and D_2 share at least one half-segment, and if r_1, r_2 are two boundary cycles of these regions with respect to a common starting point, then we can not have $r_1 = r_2^{-1}$. Indeed, if it was the case, removing the two regions from the diagram and applying lemma 37 we would obtain a new element in $R(f)$ that would contradicts the minimality of n . In fact, by lemma 38, two regions in the diagram never share an edge of length greater than 4.

Step 4. By induction, the previous step gave us a diagram with a boundary length ≤ 2 . We now perform one last more identification to obtain that the boundary length of M is at most 1. If the last identification falls under case 1 there is no particular problem. However, if we are in case 2, then we can no longer assume that the vertices u and w are disjoint. So we slightly modify the procedure: we keep the

label of f' to be $\phi(e)^{-1}s$ and we only identify the half-segments e' and f . It may happen that after this identification the label of the segment ef' on the boundary of M is in the amalgamated part: appart from being slightly non aesthetical, this will not be a problem in the proof of theorem 44. \square

Lemma 36. *Any conjugate of f (notation as in theorem 35) can be written under reduced form $\psi r \psi^{-1}$, where r is a weakly cyclically reduced conjugate of f .*

Proof. Recall that a hyperbolic element of $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is strictly (resp. weakly) cyclically reduced if and only if its geodesic contains (resp. intersects) the edge $e = \text{id}(A \cap E)$ in the Bass-Serre tree (see lemma 8). Let now g be a conjugate of f . If the geodesic of g intersects e , we can just set $\psi = \text{id}$, $r = g$. Therefore, let us assume that this geodesic does not intersect e .

Let d be the natural distance on the Bass-Serre tree and I be the middle of the edge e . For any element h of G , we have $|h| = d(I, h(I))$.

Let $p \in \text{Geo}(g)$ be the unique vertex such that $d(\text{Geo}(g), e) = d(p, e)$. Since $d(p, e) \geq 1$, there exists a unique point I' on the geodesic $[p, I]$ such that $d(p, I') = \frac{1}{2}$. The group G acting transitively on the middles of the edges of the Bass-Serre tree, there exists an element ψ of G such that $\psi(I) = I'$. Let us set $r = \psi^{-1}g\psi$. We have $\text{Geo}(r) = \psi^{-1}(\text{Geo}(g))$ and $d(\text{Geo}(g), I') = \frac{1}{2}$, so that $d(\text{Geo}(r), I) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\text{Geo}(r)$ meets e , i.e. r is weakly cyclically reduced. Finally, we have $|g| = |f| + 2d(I, I') + 1$, $|\psi| = d(I, I')$ and $|r| = |f| + 1$, so that $|g| = |\psi| + |r| + |\psi^{-1}|$. \square

The following result can be proven similarly as lemma 1.2 in [LS01, p. 239] (that is, by induction on the number m of regions).

Lemma 37. *Let M be an oriented connected and simply connected diagram with m regions D_1, \dots, D_m . Let α be a boundary cycle of M (beginning at some vertex of ∂M) and let β_i be a boundary cycle of D_i (beginning at some vertex of ∂D_i), for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\phi(\alpha)$ belongs to the normal subgroup generated by the $\phi(\beta_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq m$. More precisely, there exists u_1, \dots, u_m in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ such that*

$$\phi(\alpha) = (u_1 \phi(\beta_1) u_1^{-1}) \dots (u_m \phi(\beta_m) u_m^{-1}).$$

3.3. A dictionary between Bass-Serre and Lyndon-Schupp theories. Let α be a boundary cycle of some region of M (as in theorem 35) beginning at some vertex v . If v is primary (resp. secondary), $\phi(\alpha)$ is a reduced form of a strictly cyclically reduced (resp. non strictly cyclically reduced) element of $R(f)$.

Lemma 38. *If D_1, D_2 are two distinct regions of a diagram M having a common edge, there exists a primary vertex v of $\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2$ such that the labels g_1, g_2 of the boundary cycles of D_1, D_2 beginning at v satisfy*

$$|\text{Geo}(g_1) \cap \text{Geo}(g_2)| \geq |\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2|.$$

Proof. If k is the largest integer such that $k < |\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2|$, there exists a path of k segments s_1, \dots, s_k included into $\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2$. We can just take for v the initial or terminal vertex of this path (if $k = 0$, these two vertices coincide). Indeed, we may assume that g_1 has normal form $g_1 = \phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k) x_1 \dots x_m$ (where each x_i is in some factor of G). Therefore, g_2^{-1} has normal form $g_2^{-1} = \phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k) y_1 \dots y_m$ (where each y_i is in some factor of G).

The geodesics $\text{Geo}(g_1)$ and $\text{Geo}(g_2^{-1}) = \text{Geo}(g_2)$ contain the $k + 1$ consecutive edges:

$$\text{id}(A \cap E), \phi(s_1)(A \cap E), \dots, \phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k)(A \cap E).$$

□

Example 39. Assume that M contains the two regions depicted in Fig. 5 (the \bullet are primary vertices, the secondary vertices are denoted by \circ only when they have valence ≥ 3).




FIGURE 5

We get $g_1 = a_1 e_1 a_2 e_2$, $g_2 = e_3 a_3 e_4 a_1^{-1}$ and Fig. 6 gives the picture in the Bass-Serre tree. Note that here for simplicity we took D_1 and D_2 with boundary length 4, but in the context of theorem 35 any region has boundary length at least 10.




FIGURE 6

Lemma 40. *If v is a vertex of valence 3 of M with regions D_1, D_2, D_3 meeting at v and if g_1, g_2, g_3 are the labels of the boundary cycles of these regions beginning at v , then the geodesics of the g_i 's form a tripod in the Bass-Serre tree and for all i, j 's:*

$$|\text{Geo}(g_i) \cap \text{Geo}(g_j)| \geq |\partial D_i \cap \partial D_j|.$$

Proof. The vertex v is necessarily secondary. Let e_1 (resp. e_2 , resp. e_3) be the (oriented) half-segment having v as initial vertex and included into $\partial D_2 \cap \partial D_3$ (resp. $\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_3$, resp. $\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2$). The $\phi(e_i)$'s are in the same factor of G and if $i \neq j$, $\phi(e_i)\phi(e_j)^{-1}$ is not in the amalgamated part. As in lemma 38, let k be the largest integer such that $k < |\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2|$ and let s_1, \dots, s_k be segments such that the path e_3, s_1, \dots, s_k is included into $\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2$. We may assume that g_1 has normal form

$$g_1 = \phi(e_3)\phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k)x_1 \dots x_m\phi(e_2)^{-1},$$

where each x_i is in some factor of G . Therefore, $g'_1 = \phi(e_3)^{-1}g_1\phi(e_3)$ is strictly cyclically reduced and has normal form

$$g'_1 = \phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k)x_1 \dots x_{m+1},$$

where $x_{m+1} = \phi(e_2)^{-1}\phi(e_3)$. Since the geodesic of g'_1 contains the consecutive edges

$$\text{id}(A \cap E), \phi(s_1)(A \cap E), \dots, \phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k)(A \cap E),$$

it is clear that the geodesic of g_1 contains the consecutive edges

$$\phi(e_3)(A \cap E), \phi(e_3)\phi(s_1)(A \cap E), \dots, \phi(e_3)\phi(s_1) \dots \phi(s_k)(A \cap E).$$

One would show in the same way that these edges are also contained in the geodesic of g_2 , so that we get $|\text{Geo}(g_1) \cap \text{Geo}(g_2)| \geq |\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2|$. The other inequalities are proven similarly. We finish the proof by noting that $\text{Geo}(g_1) \cap \text{Geo}(g_3)$ contains the edge $\phi(e_2)(A \cap E)$ and that $\text{Geo}(g_2) \cap \text{Geo}(g_3)$ contains the edge $\phi(e_1)(A \cap E)$. If the $\phi(e_i)$'s are in the factor A (resp. E), it is clear that the three edges $\phi(e_i)(A \cap E)$ intersect at the vertex $\text{id}A$ (resp. $\text{id}E$). □

4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 2

4.1. A result about curvature. Let us recall some notations from [LS01]. If v is a vertex of a diagram M , the degree $d(v)$ (or valence) of v will denote the number of oriented edges having v as initial vertex (thus, if an edge has both endpoints at v , we count it twice). If D is a region, the degree $d(D)$ of D will denote the number of edges of D . The following formula defines a curvature contribution for each region:

$$\delta(D) = 2 - d(D) + \sum_{v \in D} \frac{2}{d(v)}.$$

Lemma 41. *For any diagram on the 2-sphere, we have*

$$4 = \sum_D \delta(D).$$

Proof. Let V, E, F be the numbers of vertices, edges and faces of the diagram. The formula is a direct consequence of Euler's formula on the sphere $2 = V - E + F$ and of the obvious relations $2E = \sum_{(v,D)} 1$, $V = \sum_{(v,D)} \frac{1}{d(v)}$ and $F = \sum_{(v,D)} \frac{1}{d(D)}$:

$$4 = 2V + 2F - 2E = \sum_{(v,D)} \left(\frac{2}{d(v)} + \frac{2}{d(D)} - 1 \right) = \sum_D \delta(D)$$

where the first sum runs over the couples (v, D) with v a vertex and D a face such that $v \in D$. □

Corollary 42. *For any planar diagram homeomorphic to the disk, we have*

$$2 \leq \sum_D \delta(D).$$

Proof. Let K be this diagram. Let L be the spherical diagram obtained by sticking along their boundaries two copies K_1 and K_2 of K . Since L is homeomorphic to

the sphere, we have $4 = \sum_{D \in L} \delta(D)$, i.e.

$$4 = \sum_{D \in K_1} \delta(D) + \sum_{D \in K_2} \delta(D) = 2 \sum_{D \in K_1} \delta(D) \leq 2 \sum_{D \in K} \delta(D).$$

The last inequality comes from the fact that for each boundary region D in K the contribution curvature $\delta(D)$ computed in the disk diagram is strictly bigger than the contribution computed in the spherical diagram. \square

Remark 43. Here is a (non complete) list of faces D having negative or zero curvature:

- D with $d(D) \geq 6$;
- D with $d(D) = 5$ and at most 3 vertices of D are tripods;
- D with $d(D) = 4$ and each vertex of D has valence at least 4;
- D with $d(D) = 4$ and D admits a tripod, two vertices of valence at least 4 and a fourth vertex of valence at least 6;
- D with $d(D) = 3$ and each vertex of D has valence at least 6.

4.2. The end of the proof. We are now in position to prove theorem 2. As in theorem 1, we will prove a stronger and more geometric version:

Theorem 44. *If $f \in G$ is a hyperbolic element of geometric length $\lg(f) \geq 14$ satisfying conditions (C2), then the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is different from G .*

Proof. We can assume that f is a strictly cyclically reduced element of length $\lg(f) = |f| = 2l \geq 14$. If the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ was equal to G then, by theorem 35, there would exist an $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ -labeled oriented diagram M such that:

- (1) M is connected and simply connected;
- (2) The perimeter of M is ≤ 1 ;
- (3) If $f_1 \dots f_t$ is a boundary cycle of some region of M , then $t = |f|$ and $\phi(f_1) \dots \phi(f_t)$ is a reduced form of a strictly cyclically reduced conjugate of f .

Let D_1, D_2 be two distinct regions of M having a common edge. By proposition 19 and lemma 38, we have $|\partial D_1 \cap \partial D_2| \leq 4$. Since $|\partial D_1| \geq 14$, we conclude that any interior region has at least 4 edges.

Furthermore, if D_1, D_2, D_3 are three distinct regions of M having a common vertex of valence 3, by lemmas 29 and 40, we know that each edge $\partial D_i \cap \partial D_j$ is at most of length 2. In consequence, if an interior region has at least 1 interior vertex of valence 3, then this region has at least 5 edges. Similarly, if an interior region has at least 3 interior vertices of valence 3, then this region has at least 6 edges.

By the previous observations, and using remark 43, we conclude that the curvature contribution $\delta(D)$ of any interior region D is non positive. Let us examine now the contribution of the boundary regions. Since the perimeter is at most 1 (i.e. at most two half-segments), there are at most 2 boundary regions.

Suppose there are exactly 2 boundary regions. Since the boundary edge of such a region D is an half-segment, it is easy to check that D has at least 5 edges, and that if at least one interior vertex is of valence 3 then D has at least 6 edges. Thus $\delta(D) \leq 0$.

Assume now that there is only 1 boundary region D . Then the only boundary vertex of D (which has to be counted twice) has valence at least 4. So D has at least 5 edges, and if D has exactly 5 edges then the 3 interior vertices can not be of valence 3, and again we obtain $\delta(D) \leq 0$.

In conclusion we have $\sum \delta(D) \leq 0$, which is contradictory with lemma 42. We conclude that the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ can not be equal to G . \square

5. THE REMAINING CASES: LENGTH 10 AND 12

In this section we present some of the problems that await the reader who would like to extend our results to the case of an automorphism of length 10 or 12, along with two striking examples of configuration in the Bass-Serre tree.

5.1. Length 12. The main problem to adapt our strategy to the case of f with $\text{lg}(f) = 12$ is that we have to deal with regions in a $R(f)$ -diagram that are triangles with 3 edges of length 4. Then we would have to study not only tripods coming from 3 conjugates of f , but their generalization, which we call n -pods, coming from n conjugates f_i ($0 \leq i \leq n-1$) of f . It is the case where the geodesics $\text{Geo}(f_i)$ have a common vertex and where each pair $\text{Geo}(f_i), \text{Geo}(f_{i+1})$ has at least one edge in common (where $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ and the index are taken modulo n). Precisely to be sure that the curvature of such a triangle is non positive it would be sufficient to have the following

Lemma/conjecture 45. *If n conjugates of f form a n -pod in the Bass-Serre tree, with two consecutive branches of length 4, then $n \geq 6$.*

We believe that this result is true, but the verification seems to have to involve a very long list of cases: that is why we do not think reasonable to try to present a proof. However it is interesting to note that there exists 6-pods with branches of length 4.

Example 46 (6-pod with all branches of length 4). Let us consider an automorphism f_0 with $\text{lg}(f_0) \geq 8$, that we can suppose (up to conjugacy and taking the inverse) to be strictly cyclically reduced of the form

$$f_0 = e_1 a_1 e_2 a_2 \cdots e_l a_l$$

In order to simplify computations we will suppose $a_i = a(0) = (y, -x)$ for all i , but it would be possible to do the general case in a similar way. We note $e = e_1 = (x + P(y), y)$. We are going to construct f_1, \dots, f_5 five conjugates of f_0 such that their geodesics form a 6-pod (see figure 7).

For $i = 1, \dots, 5$ we choose constants $c_i \neq 0$ and we set $t_i = (x, y + c_i)$. We take $f_i = \phi_i f_0 \phi_i^{-1}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= e t_1 e^{-1} \\ \phi_2 &= e t_1 e^{-1} t_2 \\ \phi_3 &= e t_1 e^{-1} t_2 e t_3 e^{-1} \\ \phi_4 &= e t_1 e^{-1} t_2 e t_3 e^{-1} t_4 \\ \phi_5 &= e t_1 e^{-1} t_2 e t_3 e^{-1} t_4 e t_5 e^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $f_2 = \phi_1 t_2 f_0 t_2^{-1} \phi_1^{-1} = \phi_1 t_2 \phi_1^{-1} f_1 \phi_1 t_2^{-1} \phi_1^{-1}$ thus the geodesic of f_1 and f_2 share 4 edges. We can make a similar remark for all pairs f_i, f_{i+1} with $i = 0, \dots, 4$.




FIGURE 7. A 6-pod with all branches of length 4 (example 46)

Now suppose that the constants c_i satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 + c_2 + c_3 &= 0 \\ c_2 + c_3 + c_4 &= 0 \\ c_3 + c_4 + c_5 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

For instance one can take $(c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5) = (1, 1, -2, 1, 1)$.

A straightforward computation shows that

$$et_1e^{-1}t_2et_3e^{-1}t_4et_5e^{-1} =$$

$$(x + P(y + c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 + c_5) - P(y + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 + c_5) + P(y + c_3 + c_4 + c_5) - P(y + c_4 + c_5) + P(y + c_5) - P(y), y + c_1 + c_2 + c_3 + c_4 + c_5) = (x, y - c_3)$$

and this implies that the geodesics of f_0 and f_5 share 4 edges, as shown on Fig. 7.

5.2. Length 10. The case of f of length 10 seems even more doubtful. For instance one could have pentagonal regions with all edges of length 2 and all vertices of valence 3. It is probably easy to rule out this case, but there are some harder ones. One could have triangular regions with edges of length 4, 4, 2. The example 46 allows us to glue 6 such triangles along their edge of length 4, to obtain a $R(f)$ -diagram with boundary length 12. One can wonder if it possible to glue two such diagrams to obtain a $R(f)$ -diagram on a sphere (in this case our strategy would fail). One would need to have 4-pods with branches 4, 2, 4, 2. We do not know if this is possible, but the following example shows again that we would have to rely on very careful computations to exclude this case (note also that the assumption 'consecutive' was crucial in the statement of lemma 45)

Example 47 (4-pod with branches of length 4, 1, 4, 1). Similarly to the previous example we take $f_i = \phi_i f_0 \phi_i^{-1}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1 &= et_1e^{-1} \\ \phi_2 &= et_1e^{-1}t_2 \\ \phi_3 &= et_1e^{-1}t_2et_3e^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

with $t_1 = t_3 = (x + c, y)$ and $t_2 = (-x, y - c)$. Then one can verify that $\phi_3 = (-x, y + c)$ and the geodesics of the f_i form a 4-pods as on figure 8.




FIGURE 8. A 4-pod with branches 4,1,4,1 (example 47)

ANNEX: GENERICITY OF CONDITION (C2)

We begin with a reformulation of theorem 44:

Theorem 48. *Let $l \geq 7$ be an integer. Assume that the polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_l \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ are general and independent. If the element f of G can be written $f = a_1e_1 \dots a_l e_l$ where $e_i = e(P_i)$ and $a_i \in A \setminus E$ for each i , then the normal subgroup generated by f in $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$ is different from G .*

In this section, we will show that if P_1, \dots, P_l are generic (in some sense), then they are general and independent. We will also finish by giving explicit examples.

A. Genericity of condition (C1). The aim of this subsection is to show that condition (C1) is generic (see corollary 56 and remark 57). For technical purposes we introduce a variation of the notion of general polynomial (see def. 15).

Lemma 49. *Let $Q \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ be a polynomial. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \quad Q(y) = \alpha Q(\beta y + \gamma) \implies \alpha = \beta = 1 \text{ and } \gamma = 0;$
- (2) $\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \quad Q(y) = \alpha Q(\beta y + \gamma) \implies \beta = \alpha.$

Proof. (1) \implies (2) is obvious. Let us prove (2) \implies (1). If Q satisfies (2), note that Q can not be constant. If $Q(y) = \alpha Q(y + \gamma)$, it is enough to show that $\gamma = 0$. Let ζ be a root of Q . Since $\zeta + n\gamma$ is also a root of Q for any integer n , we must have $\gamma = 0$. \square

Definition 50. We say that Q is **weakly general** if it satisfies the equivalent assertions of lemma 49.

Remark 51. Clearly if Q' is weakly general then Q is also weakly general. Furthermore, $Q^{(k)}$ is weakly general if and only if the following equivalent assertions are satisfied:

- (1) $\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \deg(Q(y) - \alpha Q(\beta y + \gamma)) < k \implies \alpha = \beta = 1 \text{ and } \gamma = 0;$
- (2) $\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \deg(Q(y) - \alpha Q(\beta y + \gamma)) < k \implies \beta = \alpha.$

In other words, a polynomial Q of degree $d \geq 5$ is general if and only if $Q^{(d-3)}$ is weakly general.

Lemma 52. *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) Q is not weakly general;
- (2) there exists $c \in \mathbb{C}, R \in \mathbb{C}[y], k \geq 0, n \geq 2$ such that $Q(y + c) = y^k R(y^n)$.

Proof. (1) \implies (2). If Q is not weakly general, there exists α, β, γ with $\beta \neq 1$ such that $Q(y) = \alpha Q(\beta y + \gamma)$. If we set $c = \frac{\gamma}{1-\beta}$, then the polynomial $P(y) = Q(y + c)$ satisfies $P(y) = \alpha P(\beta y)$. Writing $P = \sum_i p_i y^i$, the last equation is equivalent to

$\forall i, (1 - \alpha\beta^i)p_i = 0$. If β is not a root of unity, this implies that there exists $k \geq 0$ such that $P = p_k y^k$. Assume now that β is a primitive n th root of the unity. If $P \neq 0$, there exists $k \geq 0$ such that $p_k \neq 0$ and so $\alpha = \beta^{-k}$. Since $p_i \neq 0$ implies $i \equiv k \pmod{n}$, we get $P = y^k R(y^n)$, where $R(y) = \sum_i p_{k+ni} y^i$.

(2) \implies (1). This is a consequence of the previous computation. \square

Proposition 53. (1) *If $d \geq 3$, the generic element of $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d}$ is weakly general;*
 (2) *If $d \geq 5$, the generic element of $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d}$ is general.*

Proof. If $u \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote its integer part by $[u]$.

(1) If $Q \in \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d}$ is not weakly general, by lemma 52 we can write

$$Q(y) = (y - c)^k R((y - c)^n)$$

where $0 \leq k \leq d$, $2 \leq n \leq d$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $e = [d/n]$ and $R \in \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq e}$. Therefore, Q belongs to the image of the following morphism

$$\varphi_{k,n} : \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq e} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[y], (c, R(y)) \mapsto (y - c)^k R((y - c)^n). \text{ However}$$

$$\dim \text{Im} \varphi_{k,n} \leq \dim(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq e}) = e + 2 \leq \frac{d}{n} + 2 \leq \frac{d}{2} + 2 < d + 1 = \dim \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d}.$$

(2) is a direct consequence of (1), by considering the map $Q \mapsto Q^{(d-3)}$, and using remark 51. \square

Proposition 54. *If $d_1, d_2 \geq 5$ and (P_1, P_2) is a generic element of $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}$, then P_1, P_2 represent different colors.*

Proof. By lemma 12, if P_1, P_2 represent the same color, then (P_1, P_2) belongs to the image of the following morphism: $\varphi : \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[y] \times \mathbb{C}[y]$, $(P_1, (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon)) \mapsto (P_1, \alpha P_1(\beta y + \gamma) + \delta y + \epsilon)$. However,

$$\dim \text{Im} \varphi \leq d_1 + 6 < \dim \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}. \quad \square \quad \square$$

Remark 55. If $d_1 \neq d_2$, proposition 54 is still more obvious. Indeed, the generic element P_i of $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$ has degree d_i . Therefore, if (P_1, P_2) is a generic element of $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}$, then $\deg P_1 \neq \deg P_2$, which clearly implies that P_1, P_2 represent different colors.

Propositions 53 and 54 give us the following result.

Corollary 56. *Fix a sequence of integers $d_1, \dots, d_l \geq 5$. If (P_1, \dots, P_l) is a generic element of $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq l} \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$, then the polynomials P_i are general and represent distinct colors.*

Remark 57. In other words, if $a_i \in A \setminus E$ and $e_i = e(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$, then the automorphism $a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l$ satisfies condition (C1).

B. Genericity of condition (C2). The aim of this subsection is to show that condition (C2) is generic (see corollary 60 and remark 61).

Proposition 58. *If $d_1, d_2, d_3 \geq 8$ and (P_1, P_2, P_3) is generic in $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$, then the polynomials P_1, P_2, P_3 are independent.*

Proof. By permutations, it is enough to show the following two points:

1) If (P_1, P_2) is generic in $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}$, then $(A \cap E)e(P_2)(A \cap E)$ is not a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$.

2) If (P_1, P_2, P_3) is generic in $\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_3}$, then $(A \cap E)e(P_3)(A \cap E)$ is not a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_2)(A \cap E)$.

Proof of 1. Define $\phi : \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}^8 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]$,

$$(P_1, (\alpha, \dots, \theta)) \mapsto (P_1, \alpha P_1(\beta y + \gamma) + \delta P_1(\epsilon y + \zeta) + \eta y + \theta).$$

We have $\dim \text{Im } \phi \leq d_1 + 1 + 8 < \dim \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}$. If $(P_1, P_2) \in (\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2}) \setminus \text{Im } \phi$, it is clear that $(A \cap E)e(P_2)(A \cap E)$ is not a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$.

Proof of 2. Define $\psi : \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2} \times \mathbb{C}^8 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2} \times \mathbb{C}[y]$,

$$(P_1, P_2, (\alpha, \dots, \theta)) \mapsto (P_1, P_2, \alpha P_1(\beta y + \gamma) + \delta P_2(\epsilon y + \zeta) + \eta y + \theta).$$

We have $\dim \text{Im } \psi \leq (d_1 + 1) + (d_2 + 1) + 8 < \dim \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_3}$. If $(P_1, P_2, P_3) \in (\mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_1} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_2} \times \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_3}) \setminus \text{Im } \psi$, it is clear that $(A \cap E)e(P_3)(A \cap E)$ is not a mixture of $(A \cap E)e(P_1)(A \cap E)$ and $(A \cap E)e(P_2)(A \cap E)$. \square

Corollary 59. *Fix a sequence of integers $d_1, \dots, d_l \geq 8$. The generic element (P_1, \dots, P_l) of $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq l} \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$ is an independent sequence.*

Combining corollaries 56 and 59, we get:

Corollary 60. *Fix a sequence of integers $d_1, \dots, d_l \geq 8$. The generic element (P_1, \dots, P_l) of $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq l} \mathbb{C}[y]_{\leq d_i}$ defines a sequence of general and independent polynomials.*

Remark 61. In other words, if $a_i \in A \setminus E$ and $e_i = e(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$, then the automorphism $a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l$ satisfies condition (C2).

C. Explicit examples. Lemmas 62 and 65 below will allow us to give explicit examples of polynomials $P_1, \dots, P_l \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ which are general and independent (see example 66).

Lemma 62. *Let $P \in \mathbb{C}[y]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 3$ and let $M = -\frac{p_{d-1}}{d p_d}$ be the arithmetic mean of its roots. If there exists two consecutive integers $k \geq 0$ such that $P^{(k)}(M) \neq 0$, then P is weakly general.*

Proof. If $P(y) = \alpha P(\beta y + \gamma)$, then the automorphism f of the affine line given by $f(y) = \beta y + \gamma$ permutes the roots of P . Since f is affine, we must have $f(M) = M$. By substituting M for y in the equality $P^{(k)}(y) = \alpha \beta^k P^{(k)}(f(y))$, we get $(1 - \alpha \beta^k) P^{(k)}(M) = 0$. Whence the result. \square

Remark 63. We always have $P^{(d-1)}(M) = 0$. Therefore, if P has degree 2, it is not possible to find two consecutive integers k such that $P^{(k)}(M) \neq 0$. As a consequence, it is not possible to show that P is weakly general by using an analogous version of lemma 62. In fact, it is easy to check that no polynomial of degree 2 is weakly general!

Example 64. Let $P = \sum_i p_i y^i$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 5$.

- (1) If $p_{d-1} = 0$ and $p_{d-2} p_{d-3} \neq 0$, then P is general;
- (2) If $p_{d-1} \neq 0$ and $p_{d-2} = p_{d-3} = 0$, then P is general.

Lemma 65. *A family $(P_i)_i$ of general polynomials satisfying $|\deg P_i - \deg P_j| > 3$ for any $i \neq j$ is independent.*

Proof. Let us assume (by contradiction) that $\deg \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 3} \alpha_k P_{i_k}(\beta_k y + \gamma_k) \leq 1$ and that we do not have $i_1 = i_2 = i_3$.

First case. i_1, i_2, i_3 are distinct.

By the assumption, $\deg P_{i_1}, \deg P_{i_2}, \deg P_{i_3}$ are distinct, this is impossible.

Second case. i_1, i_2, i_3 are not distinct.

We may assume that $i_1 = i_2 \neq i_3$.

Since P_{i_1} is general, for any α, β, γ , the polynomial $P_{i_1}(y) - \alpha P_{i_1}(\beta y + \gamma)$ either has degree $\geq \deg P_{i_1} - 3$ or is null. More generally, the same result holds for $Q(y) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq 2} \alpha_k P_{i_1}(\beta_k y + \gamma_k)$. But $|\deg P_{i_3} - \deg P_{i_1}| > 3$ by the assumption, so that $\deg Q \neq \deg P_{i_3}$. Therefore, we cannot have $\deg(Q + \alpha_3 P_{i_3}(\beta_3 y + \gamma_3)) \leq 1$. \square

Example 66. By example 64, the polynomial $y^d + y^{d-1}$ is general for $d \geq 5$. Therefore, if we set $P_d = y^{4d+1} + y^{4d}$, the polynomials P_1, \dots, P_l are general and independent (for any l). As a consequence, if $a_i \in A \setminus E$ and $e_i = e(P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$, then $f = a_1 e_1 \dots a_l e_l$ satisfies condition (C2). If we assume furthermore that $f \in G$ and $l \geq 7$, then $\langle f \rangle_N \neq G$ by theorem 44.

REFERENCES

- [Ani83] David J. Anick. Limits of tame automorphisms of $k[x_1, \dots, x_N]$. *J. Algebra*, 82(2):459–468, 1983.
- [CD08] Dominique Cerveau and Julie Deserti. Transformations birationnelles de petit degré. *Preprint arXiv:0811.2325*, 2008.
- [Dan74] V. I. Danilov. Non-simplicity of the group of unimodular automorphisms of an affine plane. *Mat. Zametki*, 15:289–293, 1974.
- [FM89] Shmuel Friedland and John Milnor. Dynamical properties of plane polynomial automorphisms. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 9(1):67–99, 1989.
- [Fur07] Jean-Philippe Furter. Jet groups. *J. Algebra*, 315(2):720–737, 2007.
- [Giz94] M. H. Gizatullin. The decomposition, inertia and ramification groups in birational geometry. In *Algebraic geometry and its applications (Yaroslavl', 1992)*, Aspects Math., E25, pages 39–45. Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1994.
- [Isk85] V. A. Iskovskikh. Proof of a theorem on relations in the two-dimensional Cremona group. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 40(5(245)):255–256, 1985.
- [Jun42] Heinrich W. E. Jung. Über ganze birationale Transformationen der Ebene. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 184:161–174, 1942.
- [Lam01] Stéphane Lamy. L'alternative de Tits pour $\text{Aut}[\mathbb{C}^2]$. *J. Algebra*, 239(2):413–437, 2001.
- [Lam02] Stéphane Lamy. Une preuve géométrique du théorème de Jung. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 48(3-4):291–315, 2002.
- [LS01] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp. *Combinatorial group theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. Reprint of the 1977 edition.
- [Lyn66] Roger C. Lyndon. On Dehn's algorithm. *Math. Ann.*, 166:208–228, 1966.
- [Mau01] Stefan Maubach. Polynomial automorphisms over finite fields. *Serdica Math. J.*, 27(4):343–350, 2001.
- [Nag72] Masayoshi Nagata. *On automorphism group of $k[x, y]$* . Kinokuniya Book-Store Co. Ltd., Tokyo, 1972. Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Lectures in Mathematics, No. 5.
- [Rot95] Joseph J. Rotman. *An introduction to the theory of groups*, volume 148 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, fourth edition, 1995.
- [Sch71] Paul E. Schupp. Small cancellation theory over free products with amalgamation. *Math. Ann.*, 193:255–264, 1971.

- [Ser77] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Arbres, amalgames, SL_2* . Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1977. Avec un sommaire anglais, Rédigé avec la collaboration de Hyman Bass, Astérisque, No. 46.
- [vdK53] W. van der Kulk. On polynomial rings in two variables. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde (3)*, 1:33–41, 1953.
- [VK33] E.R. Van Kampen. On the connection between the fundamental groups of some related spaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 55:261–267, 1933.
- [Wei66] C. M. Weinbaum. Visualizing the word problem, with an application to sixth groups. *Pacific J. Math.*, 16:557–578, 1966.
- [Wri79] David Wright. Abelian subgroups of $\text{Aut}_k(k[X, Y])$ and applications to actions on the affine plane. *Illinois J. Math.*, 23(4):579–634, 1979.

LABORATOIRE MIA, UNIVERSITÉ DE LA ROCHELLE AVENUE M. CRÉPEAU, 17042 LA ROCHELLE CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: `jpfurter@univ-lr.fr`

MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY CV4 7AL, UNITED KINGDOM (ON LEAVE FROM INSTITUT CAMILLE JORDAN, UNIVERSITÉ LYON 1, FRANCE)

E-mail address: `s.lamy@warwick.ac.uk`