arXiv:2307.08400v2 [math.GR] 22 Jul 2023

# UNIFORM EXPONENTIAL GROWTH FOR GROUPS WITH PROPER PRODUCT ACTIONS ON HYPERBOLIC SPACES

RENXING WAN AND WENYUAN YANG

Abstract. This paper studies the locally uniform exponential growth and product set growth for a finitely generated group $G$ acting properly on a finite product of hyperbolic spaces. Under the assumption of coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on factors, we prove that any finitely generated non-virtually abelian subgroup has uniform exponential growth. These assumptions are full-filled in many hierarchically hyperbolic groups, including mapping class groups, specially cubulated groups and BMW groups.

Moreover, if $G$ acts weakly acylindrically on each factor, we show that, with two exceptional classes of subgroups, $G$ has uniform product set growth. As corollaries, this gives a complete classification of subgroups with product set growth for any group acting discretely on a simply connected manifold with pinched negative curvature, for groups acting acylindrically on trees, and for 3-manifold groups.

## 1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a finitely generated group and $S = S^{-1}$ be a finite symmetric generating set. Denote by $\mathcal{G}(G, S)$ the Cayley graph of $G$ relative to $S$, equipped with word metric $d_S$. Let $S^{\leqslant n}$ denote the ball of radius no more than $n$ in $\mathcal{G}(G, S)$ around the identity 1. We often write $|g|_S = d_S(1, g)$.

The *exponential growth rate* of $G$ relative to $S$ is defined to be the following limit:

$$\omega(G, S) = \lim_{n\to\infty} |S^{\leqslant n}|^{1/n}$$

which always exists by the sub-multiplicative inequality for $|S^{\leqslant n}|$. If $\omega(G, S) > 1$, then it is true for any finite symmetric generating set and $G$ has *exponential growth*. Define the *uniform exponential growth rate* of $G$ as

$$\omega(G) = \inf\{\omega(G, S) : \text{finite symmetric generating sets } S\}.$$

If $\omega(G) > 1$, we say that $G$ has *uniform exponential growth*.

Many groups of exponential growth have uniform exponential growth. This includes non-elementary hyperbolic groups [40], relatively hyperbolic groups [55], solvable groups [2], [45], nontrivial amalgamated free products and HNN-extensions [35], one-relator groups [12], linear groups over a field of characteristic zero [27], and many hierarchically hyperbolic groups [1]. The first examples of groups without uniform exponential growth were constructed by Wilson [52]. In [38], Kar-Sageev showed that if a group acts freely on a CAT(0) square complex, then either it has uniform exponential growth or it is virtually abelian. Later on, this is generalized to any proper actions on CAT(0) square complexes by Gupta-Jankiewicz-Ng [31].

We say that $G$ has *locally uniform exponential growth* if there is a constant $\omega_0 > 1$ such that every finitely generated non-virtually abelian subgroup $H$ has $\omega(H) \geqslant \omega_0$. This property is sometimes called "uniform uniform exponential growth" in literature. Such uniform bound on the growth of subgroups has been shown by Mangahas for the mapping class group [43] (depending on the complexity of the surface), by Kar-Sageev for groups acting freely on square complexes [38], and by Kropholler-Lyman-Ng for the automorphism group of a torsion-free one-ended hyperbolic group [41].

*Key words and phrases.* Uniform exponential growth, product actions, hyperbolic spaces, product set growth, acylindrical actions.

The goal of this paper is to study the uniform exponential growth for groups with a *proper product action on hyperbolic spaces*, i.e.: acting properly on a finite product of hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ endowed with $\ell_1$-metric and preserving each factor. Any group acts properly on a proper hyperbolic space (e.g. the combinatorial horoball over the Cayley graph), and the usual assumption to exclude this situation is requesting the existence of two independent loxodromic elements. In this paper, we make use of one of another two assumptions. The first is that the product action has *coarsely dense orbits*, which is equivalent to say that the product action is co-bounded. The second is *shadowing property* (see Definition 2.13) on each factor. Roughly speaking, this requests a family of preferred quasi-geodesics in the Caylay graph that are projected to un-parameterized quasi-geodesics in each factor $X_i$. This property is first studied by Masur-Minsky in mapping class groups, where the preferred paths are given by hierarchy paths.

In [6], Bestvina-Bromberg-Fujiwara showed that the mapping class group $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ of a finite type surface $\Sigma$ with $\chi(\Sigma) < 0$ acts properly (with quasi-isometric embedded orbits) on a finite product of hyperbolic graphs

$$\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma) \curvearrowright \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^1) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^l) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ denotes a quasi-tree of curve graphs of subsurfaces with the same "color". The existence of finitely many colors (also called as BBF-coloring) for all subsurfaces is due to [6, Proposition 5.8]. In [7], $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ can be further replaced with finite products of quasi-trees (i.e. quasi-isometric to a simplicial tree). Proper action on finite product of quasi-trees is referred to as *Property (QT)* there. This property is characterized for 3-manifold groups in [34], and carefully examined in recent works of Button [14,16]. The study of so-called proper product actions on hyperbolic spaces in this paper arise in a similar circle of ideas, for which we investigate on the uniform exponential growth.

### 1.1. **Uniform exponential growth.** Our first main result reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 4.1)**.** *Suppose that a finitely generated group $G$ admits a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ with either coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on each factor. Then $G$ has locally uniform exponential growth: any finitely generated non-virtually abelian subgroup has uniform exponential growth.*

We remark that if $G \curvearrowright X$ is cocompact, then the shadowing property holds automatically on each factor by Lemma 2.17.

Our first application is given to the class of hierarchically hyperbolic groups (HHGs), introduced by Berhstock-Hagen-Sisto [4] with the prototype examples of mapping class groups and many cubical groups. HHGs have been receiving very active research interests in recent years, with many examples found and techniques developed. See [51] for a nice introduction to this topic. In [33, Prop. 3.10], Hagen-Petyt showed that any HHG with a *BBF-coloring* (in analog with $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$) admits a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces with shadowing property on each factor. Note that examples of HHGs which do not virtually admit BBF-colorings were also produced in [32].

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let $(G, \mathfrak{G})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic group with a BBF-coloring. Then $G$ has locally uniform exponential growth.*

It would be interesting to compare this with a recent result of Abbott-Ng-Spriano [1] that for a virtually torsion-free HHG, either it has uniform exponential growth, or its Cayley graph is quasi-isometric to a direct product of the integers $\mathbb{Z}$ and a metric space. In the category of HHGs with BBF-colorings, our corollary generalizes their result with uniform exponential growth for any non-virtually abelian subgroups. On the other hand, the first examples of HHGs which are not virtually torsion-free were produced by Hughes in [36]. Since the Hughes group is also a uniform lattice in product of trees, it has locally uniform exponential growth as a corollary of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.2 also gives a partial answer to the question [1, Question 1.6] raised by Abbott-Ng-Spriano. Thus, their question is reduced to the following.

**Question 1.3.** *Does there exist a hierarchically hyperbolic group that is not colorable and does not have (locally) uniform exponential growth?*

Another application is given to BMW groups (this terminology is introduced and described in [18]), which generalizes the original construction of Burger and Mozes. A group $G$ is a BMW group if it acts by isometries on the product of two trees $T_1 \times T_2$ such that every element preserves the product decomposition and the action on the vertex set of $T_1 \times T_2$ is free and transitive. Using these groups, Wise [54] and Burger-Mozes [13] produced the first examples of non-residually finite and virtually simple CAT(0) groups respectively. BMW groups have been extensively studied and have rich connections to the study of automata groups and commensurators (see Caprace's survey [18]). A recent result of Abbott-Ng-Spriano [1, Example 1.5] gave a new proof of uniform exponential growth for BMW groups. As a corollary of Theorem 1.1, we have

**Corollary 1.4.** *BMW groups have locally uniform exponential growth.*

1.2. **Product set growth.** Recently, there is an increasing research interest in establishing product set growth in various class of groups, which is a finer version of uniform exponential growth. We say that a subset $U$ of $G$ has *product set growth* if there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for any $n \geqslant 1$. If $U$ generates $G$ as a semi-group, then it implies $\omega(G, U) \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta}$, so the product set growth implies uniform exponential growth. On the other hand, a group with infinite center clearly fails to have product set growth, but may have uniform exponential growth.

Such an inequality as above was first obtained for any non-elementary subgroup $\langle U \rangle$ in the class of hyperbolic groups in [3], where $U$ is assumed to be symmetric. Until very recently, after the work of non-symmetric case in free groups [47, 48], establishing the product set growth for "non-elementary" subgroups in various classes of groups has becoming an active topic in Geometric Group Theory. Now, the product set growth has been known in hyperbolic groups [26] and Burnside groups [21] for non-symmetric $U$, non-elementary subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups [15, 22], groups acting acylindrically on trees [19], and mapping class groups [39] for symmetric $U$. In the recent work of Fujiwara-Sela [29], the product set growth serves as a first step to establish the well-ordered growth rates in hyperbolic groups (see [28] for the results on more general classes of groups).

*Convention.* In practice, it appears harder to prove the product set growth for a non-symmetric subset $U$. In this paper, we always consider the case that (possibly non-symmetric) $U$ generates a **subgroup** denoted by $\langle U \rangle$: every element in $\langle U \rangle$ can be written as a word over the alphabet set $U$ and thus $U \cup U^{-1}$. To be brief, we shall say that $U$ generates $\langle U \rangle$ as a semigroup.

The next goal of this paper is aiming to explore the product set growth for groups with proper product action on hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ with *weakly acylindrical* action on each factor $X_i$. Generalizing the usual acylindrical one, a weakly acylindrical action is defined by Delzant [25] as a uniformized version of WWPD action in [6]. Roughly speaking, the projection of the quasi-axis for any loxodromic element $g \in G$ to any other $G$-translate has a linear upper bound comparable to the stable length of $g$. See Definition 2.19 for details.

Before stating the general form of the main result, Theorem 1.9, we would like to first point out some corollaries of it, where there is only one factor, i.e. $l = 1$.

Thanks to Margulis Lemma, Delzant observed in [25, Example 1] that any discrete group action on a simply connected negatively pinched Riemannian manifold is weakly acylindrical. As by-product to the proof of Theorem 1.9 we are able to prove the product set growth for these groups. This strengthens an earlier result obtained by Besson-Courtois-Gallot [5].

**Theorem 1.5** (Theorem 5.15)**.** *Let $M$ be a Riemannian manifold with pinched negative curvature. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on dimension and curvature such that for any finite (possibly non-symmetric) $U \subset \pi_1(M)$ generating a group $\langle U \rangle$ as a semi-group, one of the following is true:*

(1) *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually nilpotent.*
(2) *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Recall that a subgroup $H$ of a relatively hyperbolic group is called elementary if the limit set of $H$ contains no more than two points in Bowditch boundary. The proof of Theorem 1.9, together with Lemma 2.22, also improves the result in [22].

**Theorem 1.6.** *Let $G$ be a non-elementary relatively hyperbolic group. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with the following property. Let $U$ be any finite possibly non-symmetric subset such that $U$ generates a non-elementary subgroup $\langle U \rangle$ as a semi-group. Then $|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

The following result removes the symmetry of $U$ in a result of Cerocchi-Sambusetti [19, Theorem 1]. Compare also with Delzant-Steenbock [26, Theorem 1.11], where the optimal $\beta = 1/2$ is obtained, under a large lower bound on the displacement of any finite $U$ (not contained in a virtually cyclic subgroup).

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let $G$ be any group acting acylindrically on a simplicial tree $X$. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ with the following property. Let $U$ be any finite possibly non-symmetric subset such that $U$ generates a non-virtually cyclic subgroup $\langle U \rangle$ without global fixed point in $X$. Then $|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

As a corollary, we can classify subgroups with the product set growth in 3-manifold groups. If a compact 3-manifold $M$ has trivial JSJ decomposition, then the Geometrization Theorem tells us that $M$ supports one of the eight Thurston geometries. Except hyperbolic and Sol geometry, the other six geometries admit a central extension of surface subgroups, so it is straightforward to describe subgroups with product set growth. The question whether the product set growth holds in (non-nilpotent) solvable groups seems widely open. With Sol geometry undetermined yet, we can describe the product set growth for all the remaining cases.

**Corollary 1.8.** *Let $M$ be a connected compact oriented irreducible 3-manifold with empty or tori boundary, either with hyperbolic geometry or with nontrivial JSJ decomposition and that does not support the Sol geometry. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for any finite possibly non-symmetric $U \subset \pi_1(M)$, one of the following is true:*

1. *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually abelian of rank at most 2 or a subgroup of a Seifert sub-manifold group with infinite center.*
2. *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Now let us state our main result about product set growth for a proper product action with weakly acylindrical actions on factors.

**Theorem 1.9** (Theorem 5.3)**.** *Let $G$ admit a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$, with shadowing property on factors. Suppose that $G$ acts weakly acylindrically on each factor. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending on $\delta, l$ such that for every finite symmetric subset $U \subset G$, at least one of the following is true:*

1. *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually abelian.*
2. *There exists a factor $X_i$ so that no uniform bound exists on $|E(h) \cap E(b) \cap \langle U \rangle|$ for any two independent loxodromic elements $b, h \in \langle U \rangle$ on $X_i$.*
3. *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Moreover, if there is no lineal action of $\langle U \rangle$ on factors, then $U$ can be assumed non-symmetric in the above conclusion.*

At last, we would like mention an application of Theorem 1.9 concerning mapping class groups $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ of a surface $\Sigma$. See Corollary 5.16 for the more elaborated version where $\langle U \rangle$ is a subgroup.

**Corollary 1.10.** *Let $\Sigma$ be an orientable finite-type surface of $\chi(\Sigma) < 0$ with possibly cusps without boundary. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on $\Sigma$ such that for every finite possibly non-symmetric subset $U$ generating $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ as a semi-group, one of the following is true:*

1. *There exist a factor $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ in (1) and two independent loxodromic elements $b, h$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ such that $|E(h) \cap E(b)|$ is infinite.*

(2) $|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ *for every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

In a recent work of Kerr, the uniform product set growth has been classified for mapping class groups [39, Theorem 1.0.1], where $U$ is assumed to be symmetric: $\langle U \rangle$ has product set growth if and only if $Z(H)$ is finite for any finite-index subgroup $H \leqslant \langle U \rangle$. The question whether the symmetry of $U$ could be removed remains open. On one hand, Corollary 1.10 allows $U$ to be non-symmetric; on the other hand, it is not clear whether the item (1) happens exactly when $\langle U \rangle$ have virtually infinite center.

**Structure of the paper.** This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall some standard materials in Gromov's hyperbolic geometry and give definitions of shadowing property and weakly acylindrical actions. In addition, we removes the symmetry condition in a lemma of Cui-Jiang-Yang [22] which produces a short loxodromic element from a large displacement. In Section 3, we utilise the shadowing property on each factor to transfer a large displacement from the product space to some factor space. In Section 4, we first show that any non-virtually abelian group has an arbitrarily large commutator subset, which in turn is used to prove the existence of two short independent loxodromic elements on some factor space. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is then finished with a result of Breuillard-Fujiwara [9]. In Section 5, we first give some fundamental results about product set growth for non-symmetric subsets, and the proofs of Theorems 1.9 and 1.7 are then completed in §5.2 following the outline of Cui-Jiang-Yang [22]. With some preparation in §5.3, the proof of Theorem 1.5 is presented for the uniform product set growth for the fundamental group of a Riemannian manifold with pinched negative curvature. At last, we give more applications including Theorem 1.6, and Corollaries 1.8, 1.10 about 3-manifold groups and mapping class groups in §5.4.

**Acknowledgments.** We are grateful to Prof. Thomas Delzant for helpful communications, in particular, for providing the proof of Lemma 5.14. Thanks also go to Sam Hughes for pointing out the references and very helpful comments. W. Y. is supported by National Key R & D Program of China (SQ2020YFA070059), and NSFC No.12131009.

## 2. Preliminary

In this section, we introduce the preliminaries that we will use later on.

### 2.1. Gromov hyperbolic spaces and classification of isometric actions.

Let $(X, |\cdot|)$ be a geodesic metric space. For any $a, b \in X$, we often denote by $[a, b]$ a choice of a geodesic between $a, b$, if there is no ambiguity in context. A geodesic triangle $\Delta = \Delta(a, b, c)$ consists of three geodesics $[a, b], [b, c], [c, a]$. For any $a, b, c \in X$, define *Gromov product* $\langle a, c \rangle_b$ as follows:

$$\langle a, c \rangle_b = \frac{|a-b| + |c-b| - |a-c|}{2}.$$

We say that $X$ is a *$\delta$-hyperbolic space* for some $\delta \geqslant 0$ if every geodesic triangle has a point within a distance $\delta$ to each side.

By enlarging $\delta$ by a constant times, one can show the following stronger thin-triangle property:

If $x \in [b, a]$ and $y \in [b, c]$ so that $|b - x| = |b - y| \leqslant \langle a, c \rangle_b$, then $|x - y| \leqslant \delta$.

Unless otherwise stated, all hyperbolic spaces in this paper are assumed to be $\delta$-hyperbolic for a fixed constant $\delta$.

**Definition 2.1.** Given $k \geqslant 1, c > 0$, a map between two metric spaces $f : (X, d_X) \to (Y, d_Y)$ is called a *$(k, c)$-quasi-isometric embedding* if the following inequality holds

$$\frac{d_X(x, x')}{k} - c \leqslant d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leqslant k d_X(x, x') + c,$$

for all $x, x' \in X$. Furthermore, if there exists $R > 0$ such that $Y \subset N_R(f(X))$, then $f$ is called a *$(k, c)$-quasi-isometry*.

When $k, c$ are clear in context or do not matter, we omit them and just say $f$ is a quasi-isometric embedding or quasi-isometry.

If a path $p$ in $X$ is rectifiable, denote by $Len(p)$ the length of $p$, and by $p_-, p_+$ the endpoints of $p$.

**Definition 2.2.** A path $p$ in $(X, d)$ is called a $(k, c)$-*quasi-geodesic* for $k \geqslant 1, c \geqslant 0$ if the following holds

$$Len(q) \leqslant k|q_- - q_+| + c$$

for any rectifiable subpath $q$ of $p$.

Sometimes, a $(k, k)$-quasi-geodesic will be called a $k$-quasi-geodesic for simplicity.

**Lemma 2.3** (Morse Lemma)**.** *Let $p, q$ be two $(k, c)$-quasi-geodesics with the same endpoints in a hyperbolic space $X$. Then there exists $D = D(\delta, k, c)$ such that $p \subset N_D(q)$ and $q \subset N_D(p)$.*

We shall need the following (un)parametrized version of quasi-geodesic paths.

**Definition 2.4.** Let $I$ be a possibly infinite interval of $\mathbb{R}$. A map $p$ from $I$ to a metric space $X$ is called an *unparametrized* $(k, c)$-*quasi-geodesic* for $k \geqslant 1, c \geqslant 0$ if there exists a monotone non-decreasing map $\tau : I \to I$ such that $p \cdot \tau$ is a $(k, c)$-quasi-geodesic in the usual sense.

Another useful fact in hyperbolic geometry is the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let $\alpha$ be a $(k, c)$-quasi-geodesic in a hyperbolic space $X$ and $q : X \to \alpha$ be the closest point projection. Then there exists a constant $C = C(k, c, \delta)$ so that for any $x, y \in X$,*

$$d(q(x), q(y)) \leqslant d(x, y) + C$$

By Gromov [30], the isometries of a hyperbolic space $X$ can be subdivided into three classes. A nontrivial element $g \in \mathrm{Isom}(X)$ is called *elliptic* if some $\langle g \rangle$-orbit is bounded. Otherwise, it is called *loxodromic* (resp. *parabolic*) if it has exactly two fixed points (resp. one fixed point) in the Gromov boundary of $X$. If $g$ is a loxodromic element, any $\langle g \rangle$-invariant quasi-geodesic between the two fixed points shall be refereed as a *quasi-axes* for $g$, denoted by $L_g$.

If an isometry has three fixed points in the boundary, then it leaves the center coarsely invariant, so it must be an elliptic element. Hence, this gives a complete classification of isometries.

Loxodromic elements play an important role in what follows. We list a few well-known facts for later use.

**Lemma 2.6.** *[20, Lemma 9.2.2] If an isometry $g$ on a hyperbolic space $X$ satisfies*

$$d(o, go) \geqslant 2\langle o, g^2 o \rangle_{go} + 6\delta$$

*for some point $o \in X$, then $g$ is loxodromic.*

For an isometry $g$ on a metric space $(X, d)$, the *stable translation length* of $g$ is defined to be $\tau(g) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{d(x, g^n x)}{n}$ for any $x \in X$, and the *minimal translation length* of $g$ is defined to be $\lambda(g) = \inf_{x \in X} d(x, gx)$.

**Lemma 2.7.** *[20, Prop. 10. 6.4] If $g$ is a loxodromic element on a hyperbolic space $X$, then $|\tau(g) - \lambda(g)| \leqslant 16\delta$.*

**Lemma 2.8.** *[22, Lemma 2.4] If $g, h$ are two isometries satisfying*

$$\frac{1}{4} \min\{d(go, o), d(ho, o)\} \geqslant L \geqslant \max\{\langle go, h^{-1}o \rangle_o, \langle g^{-1}o, ho \rangle_o\} + \delta$$

*for some point $o \in X$ and some $L > 0$. Then*

1. *$gh$ is loxodromic.*
2. *there exist constants $\lambda, c > 0$ depending only on $L$ and $\delta$ such that the concatenated path $\alpha := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (gh)^i ([o, go] \cdot g[o, ho])$ is a $(\lambda, c)$-quasi-geodesic.*

Furthermore, an unbounded isometric group action on Gromov hyperbolic spaces can be classified into the following four types:

(1) *horocyclic* if it has no loxodromic element;
(2) *lineal* if it has a loxodromic element and any two loxodromic elements have the same fixed points in Gromov boundary;
(3) *focal* if it has a loxodromic element, is not lineal and any two loxodromic elements have one common fixed point;
(4) *of general type* if it has two loxodromic elements with no common fixed point.

Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be an unbounded isometric action on a hyperbolic space. A point $p$ in $\partial X$ is called a *limit point* of $G$ if there exists a sequence of elements $g_n \in G$ such that $g_n o \to p$ for some (or any) $o \in X$. The set of all limit points forms the *limit set* denoted by $\Lambda G$.

In this paper, a *quasi-tree* is a graph quasi-isometric to a simplicial tree.

A lineal action of a group $G$ on a hyperbolic space is intimately related to the following notion.

**Definition 2.9.** [44, Definition 2.4] A map $f : G \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *quasi-character* if there exists $K \geqslant 0$ such that for any $g, h \in G$ ,

$$|\Delta f(g,h)| = |f(gh) - f(g) - f(h)| \leqslant K$$

If in addition, $f(g^n) = nf(g)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $g \in G$, then $f$ is a *pseudo-character*. The quantity $\|\Delta f\| = \sup\{|\Delta f(g,h)| : g, h \in G\}$ is called *defect* of $f$.

*Remark* 2.10. It is well-known that the homogenuous version of a quasi-character defined as follows

$$\varphi(g) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(g^n)}{n}$$

is a pseudo-character, so that $\|f - \varphi\|_\infty$ bounded above by $\|\Delta f\|$. A pseudo-character $\varphi$ takes the constant on conjugacy classes: $\varphi(g) = \varphi(aga^{-1})$ for any $a, g \in G$. This implies that $|\varphi([a,b])| \leqslant \|\Delta\varphi\| \leqslant 4\|\Delta f\|$ for any $a, b \in G$.

A lineal action of a group $G$ on a hyperbolic space $X$ is called *orientable* if no element of $G$ permutes the two limit points of $G$ on $\partial X$.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be an orientable lineal action on a quasi-line. Then $G$ admits a pseudo-character $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{R}$ so that the induced quasi-action is quasi-conjugated to the action $G \curvearrowright X$.*

*Proof.* The proof is well-known. We present it for completeness.

By [44, Lemma 3.7], there exists an almost isometry $p : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with almost isometry $q$ as quasi-inverse. Define a quasi-action of $G$ on $\mathbb{R}$ by $g \circ y = p(g \cdot qy)$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, each $g \in G$ acts on $\mathbb{R}$ by almost translation: there exists a uniform $D > 0$ independent of $g$ and $y$ so that $|g \circ y - \tau_g(y)| \leqslant D$ where $\tau_g$ is a translation on $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $p$ quasi-conjugates the action $G \curvearrowright X$ to the quasi-action of $G$ on $\mathbb{R}$, i.e.: there exists $C > 0$ so that $|p(g \cdot x) - g \circ p(x)| \leqslant C$ for all $x \in X$. Fix any $x \in X$. Define $\varphi : G \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\varphi(g) := p(g \cdot x)$. Then $|\varphi(gh) - gh \circ (px)| \leqslant |p(gh \cdot x) - gh \circ (px)| \leqslant C$. As $g, h$ act by almost translations on $\mathbb{R}$, we have $|\varphi(gh) - \varphi(g) - \varphi(h)| \leqslant 3C + 3D$. □

As an immediate consequence, we have the following result.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let $G \curvearrowright X$ be an orientable lineal action on a quasi-line. Then there exists $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that for any $g, h \in G$ and $o \in X$, $|[g,h]o - o| \leqslant C$.*

2.2. **Shadowing property.** Now we define *shadowing property* for an isometric action on a metric space.

**Definition 2.13.** We say that an isometric action of $G$ on a metric space $X$ has *shadowing property* if for some (or any) finite symmetric generating set $F$ of $G$ and a basepoint $o \in X$, the Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G,F)$ admits a path system $\mathcal{P}$ of uniform quasi-geodesics with the following properties:

(1) Any two $g, h \in G$ are connected by some $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$.
(2) The (connected) subpaths of any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$ are contained in $\mathcal{P}$.
(3) For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$, the image path $\tilde{\gamma} = \Phi(\gamma)$ in $X$ is a uniform un-parameterized quasi-geodesic, where $\Phi : \mathcal{G}(G,F) \to X$ is the orbit map given by $g \mapsto g \cdot o$.

*Remark* 2.14. The shadowing property does not depend on the choice of finite generating set $F$ and the basepoint $o \in X$. Indeed, the Cayley graphs for different generating sets are bi-Lipschitz, so the path system $\mathcal{P}$ with properties (1) (2) for one generating set is a path system of quasi-geodesics with different parameters and with same properties (1) (2). Moreover, if an orbital image path $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a quasi-geodesic for one basepoint $o$, then it is true for any other basepoint $o' \in X$ (with different parameters).

By Lemma 2.3, an immediate consequence of the above property (3) is as follows.

**Lemma 2.15.** *Assume that $G \curvearrowright X$ has shadowing property, where $X$ is hyperbolic. There exists a constant $D > 0$ depending only on the path system $\mathcal{P}$ with the following property. For any $g, h \in G$, let $\gamma$ be a path connecting $g$ to $h$ in $\mathcal{P}$, then*

$$[go, ho] \subset N_D(\Phi(\gamma)), \quad \Phi(\gamma) \subset N_D([go, ho]).$$

The shadowing property applied to hyperbolic spaces implies the cobounded action.

**Lemma 2.16.** *Assume that $G \curvearrowright X$ has shadowing property, where $X$ is hyperbolic. Then $G$ acts on $X$ with quasi-convex $G$-orbit. In particular, by taking the weak convex hull of any $G$-orbit, we can assume that $G$ acts co-boundedly on $X$.*

*Proof.* Let $o \in X$ be a basepoint. We shall show that $Go$ is a quasiconvex subset of $X$. It suffices to find a constant $R > 0$ such that any geodesic with endpoint in $Go$ is contained in $N_R(Go)$. Let $\alpha = [go, ho]$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$ connecting $g$ to $h$ be given by the definition of shadowing property. It is clear that the image of $\gamma$ under the orbital map is contained in $Go$. As $\Phi(\gamma)$ is a unparametrized quasi-geodesic, the Morse Lemma shows that $\alpha$ is contained in $N_R(Go)$.

Let $\tilde{X}$ be the weak convex hull of $Go$, which is the union of all geodesics with two endpoints in $Go$. By hyperbolicity, $\tilde{X}$ is contained in a uniform neighbourhood of $Go$, on which $G$ acts co-boundedly. It is obvious that $\tilde{X}$ induced with length metric is quasi-isometrically embedded into $X$. The conclusion follows. □

Here is a useful fact to obtain shadowing property in a certain situation.

**Lemma 2.17.** *Suppose that a finitely generated group $G$ acts properly and co-compactly on a finite product $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ of proper metric spaces and preserves the factors. Then $G \curvearrowright X_i$ has the shadow property for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$.*

*Proof.* By Svarc-Milnor Lemma, $G$ admits a finite symmetric generating set $F$ so that the Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G, F)$ is quasi-isometric to $X$. Note that any geodesic in $X$ endowed with $\ell_1$ or $\ell_2$ metric projects to an un-parametrized geodesic in each $X_i$. Via quasi-isometry, we choose the path system $\mathcal{P}$ so that each quasi-geodesic $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$ is sent into a uniform neighborhood of a geodesic in $X$. In addition, by the co-compact action, the properties (1) and (3) can be easily fulfilled. The conclusion thus follows. □

2.3. **Weakly acylindrical action.** Assume that $G$ acts isometrically on a hyperbolic space $X$. If $g$ is a loxodromic element, let $E(g)$ be the subgroup of elements $h \in G$ which fixes setwise the endpoints of the quasi-axes $L_g$.

For any $x \in X$, the *displacement* of a subset $S \subset G$ at $x$ is defined as follows:

$$\lambda_x(S, X) := \max_{s \in S} |x - sx|.$$

Define the *displacement* of $S$ on any subset $Y \subset X$ as

$$\lambda(S, Y) := \inf_{y \in Y} \max_{s \in S} |y - sy|. \tag{2}$$

**Definition 2.18.** The action of $G$ on a hyperbolic space $X$ is *acylindrical* if there exist an integer $N$ and a positive number $K$ such that for every pair of points $x, y$ with $d(x, y) \geqslant K$, the set $\{g \in G | d(x, gx) + d(y, gy) \leqslant 1000\delta\}$ is finite with cardinality $\leqslant N$.

**Definition 2.19.** [25, Definition 6] The action of $G$ on a hyperbolic space $X$ is *weakly acylindrical* if there exists a constant $D > 0$ such that for every loxodromic element $g$, and every $h \notin E(g)$, the diameter of the projection of $hL_g$ to $L_g$ is bounded by $D(1 + \lambda(g, X))$.

If the constant $D$ is specified, the action is called *$D$-weakly acylindrical.*

**Lemma 2.20.** *Suppose that $G$ acts weakly acylindrically on a hyperbolic space $Y$ with a loxodromic element. Then $G \curvearrowright Y$ is either lineal or of general type.*

*Proof.* Suppose that $G \curvearrowright Y$ is focal. Then any two loxodromic elements $g, h$ has a common fixed point on $Y$, so the projection of $hL_g$ to $L_g$ is unbounded, which contradicts with the definition of weakly acylindrical actions. □

**Lemma 2.21.** *Assume that $G$ acts weakly acylindrically on a hyperbolic space $X$. Let $h$ be a loxodromic element in $G$ so that for some point $o \in X$ and $k, c > 0$, the path $\alpha = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}[h^n o, h^{n+1}o]$ is a $(k, c)$-quasi-geodesic in $X$. Then for any given $\theta > 0$, there exists $N = N(k, c, \delta, \theta)$ independent of the point $o$ such that for any $f \notin E(h)$, we have*

$$diam(\alpha \cap N_R(f\alpha)) \leqslant N \cdot d(o, ho) + N$$

*where $R := \theta \cdot d(o, ho)$.*

*Proof.* Let $p : X \to \alpha$ be a closest point projection. It follows from the definition of weakly acylindrical action and Morse Lemma that there exists a constant $D_0 = D_0(k, c, \delta)$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(p(f\alpha)) \leqslant D_0(1 + \lambda(h))$. Set $\beta := p(f\alpha) \subset \alpha$. Then $\mathrm{diam}(\beta) \leqslant D_0(1 + \lambda(h)) \leqslant D_0(1 + d(o, ho))$.

For any $x \in \alpha \cap N_R(f\alpha)$, there exists $y \in f\alpha$ with $d(x, y) \leqslant R$. It follows that $d(y, p(y)) \leqslant d(y, x) \leqslant R$ and then $d(x, p(y)) \leqslant d(x, y) + d(y, p(y)) \leqslant 2R$. As a result, $d(x, \beta) \leqslant 2R$ and then $\alpha \cap N_R(f\alpha) \subset N_{2R}(\beta)$.

Thus, $\mathrm{diam}(\alpha \cap N_R(f\alpha)) \leqslant \mathrm{diam}(\beta) + 4R \leqslant (D_0 + 4\theta)d(o, ho) + D_0$. By setting $N = D_0 + 4\theta$, we complete the proof. □

2.4. **Short loxodromic elements.** Let $X$ be a hyperbolic geodesic metric space, and $S$ a finite (not necessarily symmetric) set of isometries of $X$. Denote $S^{\leqslant n} := \bigcup_{i=0}^{n} S^i$, where $S^i$ is the set of isometries which can be expressed as $i$ products of isometries in $S$. Note that $S^{\leqslant n}$ may not be symmetric as well.

The following result improves [22, Lemma 3.2] and allows $S$ to be a finite non-symmetric set of isometries. The proof is almost word by word copy of [22, Lemma 3.2], but the latter assumes $S$ to be symmetric. So we include a detailed proof here to spell out the differences.

**Lemma 2.22.** *Assume that $\lambda(S, X) \geqslant 30\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then $S^{\leqslant 2}$ contains a loxodromic element $b$ with the following property.*

*Let $o \in X$ such that $|\lambda_o(S, X) - \lambda(S, X)| < \delta$. There exist constants $\lambda_0, c_0 > 0$ depending only on $\delta$ such that*

$$d(o, bo) \geqslant \lambda(S, X) - 10\delta$$

*and the path*

$$\alpha := \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} b^n[o, bo]$$

*is a $(\lambda_0, c_0)$-quasi-axis for $b$.*

*Proof.* Set $L_0 = 4\delta$ and then $\lambda_o(S, X) > 7L_0$. Denote by $S_0$ the (non-empty) set of elements $s \in S$ so that

$$d(o, so) \geqslant \lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 - \delta.$$

Let $t \in S$ such that $\lambda_o(S, X) = d(o, to)$, and $m \in [o, to]$ so that $d(o, m) = L_0$.

The main observation is as follows.

*Claim.* There exists an isometry $s \in S_0$ such that $s$ is either loxodromic with $\langle o, s^2o\rangle_{so} \leqslant L_0$ or satisfies

$$\max\{\langle t^{-1}o, so\rangle_o, \langle to, s^{-1}o\rangle_o\} \leqslant L_0.$$

*Proof of the Claim.* Assume to the contrary that for all $s \in S_0$, we have

$$\max\{\langle t^{-1}o, so\rangle_o, \langle to, s^{-1}o\rangle_o\} > L_0. \tag{3}$$

Moreover, each $s \in S_0$ is either non-loxodromic or loxodromic with $\langle o, s^2o\rangle_{so} > L_0$. If $s \in S_0$ is non-loxodromic, by Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\langle o, s^2o\rangle_{so} \geqslant d(o, so)/2 - 3\delta \geqslant (\lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 - \delta)/2 - 3\delta \geqslant L_0.$$

Hence, for each $s \in S_0$, we have $\langle o, s^2o\rangle_{so} \geqslant L_0$. In particular, $\langle t^{-1}o, to\rangle_o \geqslant L_0$.




FIGURE 1. The configuration with $\epsilon = -1$. Replacing $t$, $s^{-1}$ and $s^{-2}$ by $t^{-1}$, $s$ and $s^2$ respectively gives the other possibility $\epsilon = 1$.

By (3), there exists $\epsilon \in \{1, -1\}$ so that $\langle t^{-\epsilon}o, s^{\epsilon}o\rangle_o > L_0$. See Figure 1 for illustration with $\epsilon = -1$. Choose $m_1, m_2 \in [o, s^{\epsilon}o]$ for $s \in S_0$ so that $d(o, m_1) = d(s^{\epsilon}o, m_2) = L_0$. Using hyperbolicity, we have

$$\langle s^{\epsilon}o, to\rangle_o \geqslant \min\{\langle s^{\epsilon}o, t^{-\epsilon}o\rangle_o, \langle t^{-1}o, to\rangle_o\} - \delta \geqslant L_0 - \delta$$

which by the $\delta$-thin triangle property implies $d(m, m_1) \leqslant 3\delta$. Noting $\langle o, s^{2\epsilon}o\rangle_{s^{\epsilon}o} = \langle s^{-\epsilon}o, s^{\epsilon}o\rangle_o \geqslant L_0$, we obtain again from $\delta$-thin triangle that $d(m_2, s^{\epsilon}m_1) \leqslant \delta$.

We shall derive $\lambda_m(S, X) < \lambda(S, X)$, which is a contradiction. Indeed, for each $s \in S_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(m, s^{\epsilon}m) &\leqslant 2d(m, m_1) + d(m_1, s^{\epsilon}m_1) \leqslant 7\delta + d(m_1, m_2) \\ &\leqslant 7\delta + d(o, s^{\epsilon}o) - 2L_0 \\ &\leqslant \lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 + 7\delta \leqslant \lambda_o(S, X) - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

If $s \in S\backslash S_0$, then $d(o, so) \leqslant \lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 - \delta$ and thus

$$d(m, sm) \leqslant 2d(o, m) + d(o, so) \leqslant 2L_0 + d(o, so) < \lambda_o(S, X) - \delta.$$

We obtain the contradiction $\lambda_m(S, X) \leqslant \lambda_o(S, X) - \delta < \lambda(S, X)$. The proof of the claim is now complete. □

By the above claim, there exists $s \in S_0$ such that either

$$\langle so, s^{-1}o\rangle_o + \delta \leqslant L_0 + \delta \leqslant \frac{1}{4}d(o, so)$$

or

$$\max\{\langle t^{-1}o, so\rangle_o, \langle to, s^{-1}o\rangle_o\} + \delta \leqslant L_0 + \delta \leqslant \frac{1}{4}\min\{d(o, so), d(o, to)\}.$$

Accordingly, we apply Lemma 2.8 to $g = h = s$ or $g = t^{-1}, h = s$. In the first case, $d(o, so) > \lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 - \delta \geqslant \lambda(S, X) - 10\delta$. In the second case, as $\langle t^{-1}o, so\rangle_o \leqslant L_0$, it follows that $d(o, tso) = d(t^{-1}o, so) \geqslant d(o, t^{-1}o) + d(o, so) - 2L_0 \geqslant 2\lambda_o(S, X) - 2L_0 - \delta \geqslant \lambda(S, X) - 10\delta$. Then $b := s$ or

$b := ts$ is the desired loxodromic element with the $(\lambda_0, c_0)$-quasi-axis $\alpha$. The proof is then completed by Lemma 2.8. □

If the space $X$ is a tree, the lower bound on the displacement $\lambda(S, X)$ could be improved as follows, which is equivalent to say that $S$ has no global fixed point.

**Corollary 2.23.** *Let $S$ be a finite set of isometries acting on a simplicial tree $X$ with combinatorial metric. If $\lambda(S, X) > 0$, then $S^{\leqslant 2}$ contains a loxodromic element $b$ with the following property.*

*Let $o \in X$ such that $\lambda_o(S, X) = \lambda(S, X)$. There exist constants $\lambda_0, c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$d(o, bo) \geqslant \lambda(S, X) - 30\delta$$

*and the path*

$$\alpha := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b^n[o, bo]$$

*is a $(\lambda_0, c_0)$-quasi-axis for $b$.*

*Proof.* As a tree is 0-hyperbolic, letting $\delta = 1$ in the proof of Lemma 2.22 proves the conclusion for $\lambda(S, X) > 30$. It thus remains to consider the cases where $0 < \lambda(S, X) \leqslant 30$. If $S^{\leqslant 2}$ contains any loxodromic element $b$, then the above inequality on $d(o, bo)$ holds due to $\lambda(S, X) < 30$, and the conclusion follows again. If any element in $S^{\leqslant 2}$ has a fixed point on $X$, then $S$ must possesses a common fixed point by [49, Corollary 2 in §6.5]. This is impossible by assumption $\lambda(S, X) > 0$. The proof is thus complete. □

2.5. **Proper product actions.** Recall that an isometric group action on a metric space $G \curvearrowright X$ is called *metrically proper* if for any bounded subset $K \subset X$, the set

$$\{g \in G \mid gK \cap K \neq \varnothing\}$$

is finite. As we always consider metrically proper actions in this paper, we shall write proper actions for brevity.

For a product action $G \curvearrowright X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$, we say that $G \leqslant \mathrm{Isom}(X)$ *preserves each factor* if there exists a group homomorphism from $G$ to $\prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathrm{Isom}(X_i)$.

**Proposition 2.24.** *[17, Theorem 6.1] Suppose that $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ is a finite product of connected graphs with the $\ell_1$-metric or $\ell_\infty$-metric, where each $X_i$ is equipped with the induced path metric. Suppose that $G$ is any group of isometries on $X$. Then $G$ has a finite index subgroup preserving each factors of $X$.*

In what follows, we say a *proper product action* of $G$ on $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ if it acts properly on $X$ and preserves each factors.

## 3. Short Loxodromic Element for product actions

In this section, we always assume that $G$ admits a proper product action on finite hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ with either coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on each factor. Fix a basepoint $o = (o_1, \cdots, o_l) \in X$. Let $D$ be the coarsely density constant (i.e.: for any $x \in X$, there exists $g \in G$ such that $|x - go| \leqslant D$) or shadowing constant given by Lemma 2.15. In the latter case, $G$ acts coboundedly on each factor by Lemma 2.16. So we refer the readers that $D$ is independent of $o$ in both cases.

Let $S$ be a finite subset in $G$. For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$, recall that $\lambda_{x_i}(S, X_i)$ is the displacement of $S$ at $x_i \in X_i$, and $\lambda(S, X_i)$ the displacement of $S$ on $X_i$ as in (2). In particular,

$$\lambda(S, Go) = \inf_{g \in G} \max_{s \in S} |go - sgo|$$

Note that $\lambda(S, X), \lambda(S, X_i)$ are invariant under conjugation.

Fix once for all a finite generating set $F$ of $G$. Let $\Phi : G \to X$ be the orbital map given by $g \mapsto go$ for any $g \in G$. For each edge $[1, s]$ for $s \in F$, define

$$\forall s \in F,\ \Phi([1, s]) := [o, so]$$

which then extends equivariantly to all the edges of Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G, F)$ to $X$.

Then

$$\Phi_i := \pi_i \cdot \Phi :\ \mathcal{G}(G, F) \to X_i$$

is induced by the corresponding orbital map of $G$ on $X_i$ with respect to the basepoint $o_i \in X_i$.

The main result of this section is as follows.

**Theorem 3.1.** *For any $M > 0$, there exists $N_0 = N_0(M, D, \delta, l) > 0$ with the following property. For any finite subset $S$ of $G$ with $|S| \geqslant N_0$, there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$ such that $\lambda(S, X_i) > M$.*

We emphasize that $S$ is not required to be symmetric.

The following proposition plays a very important role in proving Theorem 3.1.

**Proposition 3.2.** *There exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(D, \delta, l) > 0$ such that for any $M > 0$ and any finite subset $S$ in $G$, one of the following must hold:*

1. *there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ such that $\lambda(S, X_i) > M$.*
2. *$\lambda(S, Go) \leqslant C_1(M + 1)$ for any $o \in X$.*

We first need the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $G$ act isometrically on a hyperbolic space $X$ and $S \subset G$ be a finite subset. Fix a point $x \in X$. Then for any $o \in X$ there exists a point $z \in [o, so]$ for some $s \in S$ such that $\lambda_z(S, X) \leqslant 6\lambda_x(S, X) + 24\delta$.*

*Proof.* Denote $L = \lambda_x(S, X)$ in the proof. We first prove the following claim.

*Claim.* For any $s \in S$, if $m \in [o, so]$ is the middle point and $y \in [o, x]$, $y' \in [so, x]$ are the points satisfying

$$|x - y| = |x - y'| = \max\{|x - o| - |o - m| - L/2, 0\}, \tag{4}$$

then $|sy - y| \leqslant L + 2\delta$ and $|y - m| \leqslant 5L/2 + 10\delta$.

*Proof of Claim.* We prove in two cases.

**Case I**: $|x - o| - |o - m| - L/2 \leqslant 0$. In this case, $x = y = y'$. Clearly $|sx - x| \leqslant L < L + 2\delta$. Then we estimate $|x - m|$.

As the Gromov product $\langle o, so\rangle_x$ with respect to $x$ is bounded:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle o, so\rangle_x &= \frac{|x - o| + |x - so| - |o - so|}{2}\\ &\leqslant \frac{2|x - o| + |x - sx| - 2|o - m|}{2}\\ &\leqslant |x - o| - |o - m| + L/2 \leqslant L,\end{aligned}$$

$d(x, [o, so]) \leqslant \langle o, so\rangle_x + 4\delta \leqslant L + 4\delta$. Let $z \in [o, so]$ satisfy $d(x, z) = d(x, [o, so])$, then

$$|d(o, x) - d(o, z)| \leqslant |x - z| \leqslant L + 4\delta.$$

As $|o - so| = 2|o - m| \leqslant |o - x| + |x - sx| + |sx - so| \leqslant 2|o - x| + L$, one has also

$$|d(o, x) - d(o, m)| \leqslant L/2.$$

Hence, $|z - m| = |d(o, z) - d(o, m)| \leqslant 3L/2 + 4\delta$ and then $|x - m| \leqslant |x - z| + |z - m| \leqslant 5L/2 + 8\delta$.

**Case II**: $|x-o|-|o-m|-L/2>0$. At first, compute the Gromov product of $\langle o, so\rangle_x$ with respect to $x$:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle o, so\rangle_x &= \frac{|x-o|+|x-so|-|o-so|}{2}\\ &\geqslant \frac{2|x-o|-|x-sx|-2|o-m|}{2}\\ &\geqslant |x-o|-|o-m|-L/2.\end{aligned}$$

From (4), $|x-y|=|x-y'|\leqslant\langle o, so\rangle_x$, so by $\delta$-thin triangle property, we have $|y-y'|\leqslant\delta$.

Look at the triangle $\Delta(x, sx, so)$ where the side $[x, sx]$ is of length at most $L=\lambda(S, x)$. As $|d(so, sy)-d(so, y')|=|d(so, sx)-d(so, x)|\leqslant|x-sx|\leqslant L$, the $\delta$-thin property implies $|y'-sy|\leqslant L+\delta$, and then $|y-sy|\leqslant L+2\delta$. Noting from (4) that $|y-o|=|x-o|-|x-y|=L/2+|o-m|$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|o-so|=2|o-m| &\leqslant |o-y|+|y-sy|+|sy-so|\\ &\leqslant 2|o-y|+L+2\delta\leqslant 2|o-m|+2L+2\delta\\ &\leqslant |o-so|+2L+2\delta.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the path $[o, y][y, sy][sy, so]$ is a $(1, 2L+2\delta)$–quasi-geodesic. This implies $\langle o, so\rangle_y\leqslant L+\delta$, so the distance $d(y, [o, so])\leqslant\langle o, so\rangle_y+4\delta\leqslant L+5\delta$. As $|d(o, m)-d(o, y)|=L/2$ we obtain

$$|y-m|\leqslant 2d(y, [o, so])+L/2\leqslant 5/2L+10\delta.$$

In conclusion, the claim is proved. □

Now, let $t\in S$ be an element maximizing $\lambda_o(S, X)$ at the base point $o$:

$$|to-o|=\max_{s\in S}|so-o|.$$

If $\hat{m}\in[o, to]$ is the middle point, and $\hat{y}\in[o, x]$ satisfies (4) with $m$ replaced with $\hat{m}$, the claim implies that $|t\hat{y}-\hat{y}|\leqslant L+2\delta$ and $|\hat{y}-\hat{m}|\leqslant 5/2L+10\delta$.

Recall that $|to-o|$ is maximal among $s\in S$. If $y$ is the point satisfing (4) for the element $s\in S\backslash\{t\}$, then $|x-\hat{y}|\leqslant|x-y|$, so $\hat{y}\in[x, y]$. Applying the above claim shows $|y-sy|\leqslant L+2\delta$. By assumption, for $|x-sx|\leqslant L$, the $2\delta$-thin quadrilateral with four points $x, sx, y, sy$ shows that

$$|\hat{y}-s\hat{y}|\leqslant 2\delta+\max\{|x-sx|, |y-sy|\}\leqslant L+4\delta$$

for any $s\in S$. Thus,

$$|s\hat{m}-\hat{m}|\leqslant|s\hat{y}-\hat{y}|+2|\hat{y}-\hat{m}|\leqslant 6L+24\delta$$

for all $s\in S$. The proof is complete. □

Now we turn to the proof of Proposition 3.2.

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* For any $M>0$ and any finite set $S$ in $G$, assume that $\lambda(S, X_i)\leqslant M$ for all $1\leqslant i\leqslant l$. We shall show that $\lambda(S, Go)$ is bounded by a linear multiple of $M$ depending only on $l, \delta, D$ for any $o\in X$. Noting that

$$\lambda(S, Go)=\lambda(g^{-1}Sg, Go)\leqslant\lambda_o(g^{-1}Sg, X)\leqslant\sum_{i=1}^{l}\lambda_{o_i}(g^{-1}Sg, X_i),$$

the idea is to find an element $g\in G$ such that $\lambda_{o_i}(g^{-1}Sg, X_i)$ are uniformly bounded for all $1\leqslant i\leqslant l$.

We construct inductively the conjugates of $S$. Set $S_0=S$ and $M_0=0$.

Suppose $S_i$ has been defined for $i\geqslant 0$, and for $1\leqslant i\leqslant n-1$, set

$$M_i:=\max\{\lambda_{o_j}(S_i, X_j):1\leqslant j\leqslant i\}. \tag{5}$$

The goal is to inductively define $S_{i+1}(i\geqslant 0)$ and then to bound $M_{i+1}$ by a linear multiple of $M$ depending on $i, \delta, D$.

As the displacement of $S$ is a conjugacy invariant, we have $\lambda(S_i, X_{i+1}) = \lambda(S, X_{i+1}) \leqslant M$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that there exists $s_i \in S_i$ and $z_{i+1} \in [o_{i+1}, s_i o_{i+1}]$ such that $\lambda_{z_{i+1}}(S_i, X_{i+1}) \leqslant 6M + 24\delta$.

*Claim.* There exists an element $g_{i+1} \in G$, such that $|z_{i+1} - g_{i+1}o_{i+1}| \leqslant D$ and $d(g_{i+1}o_j, [o_j, s_i o_j]) \leqslant D$ for any $1 \leqslant j \leqslant i$.

*Proof of Claim.* We prove in two cases.

**Case I**: $G$ acts on $X$ with coarsely dense orbits. For the chosen $s_i$ and $z_{i+1}$, we choose a point $z$ on the geodesic path $[o, s_i o] \subset X$ such that the $(i+1)$-th coordinate of $z$ satisfies $\pi_{i+1}(z) = z_{i+1}$. As $X \subset N_D(Go)$, there exists $g_{i+1} \in G$ such that $|z - g_{i+1}o| \leqslant D$. Since $|z - g_{i+1}o| = \sum_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant l} |\pi_j(z) - g_{i+1}o_j| \leqslant D$, then $|z_{i+1} - g_{i+1}o_{i+1}| \leqslant D$ and $d(g_{i+1}o_j, [o_j, s_i o_j]) \leqslant d(g_{i+1}o_j, \pi_j(z)) \leqslant D$ for any $j \leqslant i$.

**Case II**: $G$ acts on each factor with shadowing property.

Consider a path $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}$ from 1 to $s_i$ in Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G, F)$. By Lemma 2.15, $[o_{i+1}, s_i o_{i+1}] \subset N_D(\Phi_{i+1}(\gamma))$. Hence, there exists $g_{i+1} \in \gamma$ such that $|z_{i+1} - g_{i+1}o_{i+1}| \leqslant D$.




FIGURE 2. The shadowing quasi-geodesic $\Phi_{i+1}(\gamma)$ in $X_{i+1}$

For any $j \leqslant i$, by shadowing property of $G \curvearrowright X_j$, $\Phi_j(\gamma)$ is a uniform quasi-geodesic connecting $o_j$ to $s_i o_j$ in $X_j$, so by Lemma 2.15, $d(g_{i+1}o_j, [o_j, s_i o_j]) \leqslant D$. See Figure 3 for illustration.

In conclusion, the claim is proved. □




FIGURE 3. The shadowing quasi-geodesic $\Phi_j(\gamma)$ in $X_j$ for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant i$

Next, we set the new conjugates $S_{i+1} := g_{i+1}^{-1} S_i g_{i+1}$. We need to estimate $M_{i+1}$ where $S_i$ in the definition of $M_i$ in (5) is changed to $S_{i+1}$.

First of all, we consider the displacement on $o_{i+1}$ in $X_{i+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{o_{i+1}}(S_{i+1}, X_{i+1}) &= \max_{t \in S_{i+1}} |o_{i+1} - to_{i+1}| = \max_{t \in S_i} |g_{i+1}o_{i+1} - tg_{i+1}o_{i+1}| \\
&\leqslant 2|g_{i+1}o_{i+1} - z_{i+1}| + \max_{t \in S_i} |z_{i+1} - tz_{i+1}| \\
&\leqslant \lambda_{z_{i+1}}(S_i, X_{i+1}) + 2D \leqslant 6M + 24\delta + 2D.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to update the displacement of $S_{i+1}$ on the point $o_j \in X_j$ for each $1 \leqslant j \leqslant i$. From Figure 3, $|o_j - g_{i+1}o_j| \leqslant D + |o_j - s_i o_j| \leqslant \lambda_{o_j}(S_i, X_j) + D$ as $s_i \in S_i$. Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{o_j}(S_{i+1}, X_j) &= \max_{t \in S_{i+1}} |o_j - to_j| = \max_{t \in S_i} |g_{i+1}o_j - tg_{i+1}o_j| \\
&\leqslant \max_{t \in S_i} |o_j - to_j| + 2|o_j - g_{i+1}o_j| \\
&\leqslant 3\lambda_{o_j}(S_i, X_j) + 2D \leqslant 3M_i + 2D.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$M_{i+1} \leqslant \max\{6M + 27\delta + 2D, 3M_i + 2D\}. \tag{6}$$

After $l$ steps, we set $S_l = g^{-1}Sg$ where $g = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_l$ and

$$\lambda(S, Go) = \lambda(S_l, Go) \leqslant \lambda_o(S_l, X) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^{l} \lambda_{o_i}(S_l, X_i) \leqslant lM_l.$$

It follows from (6) that there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(l, \delta, D)$ such that $lM_l \leqslant C_1(M + 1)$. The proof is completed. □

The proof of Proposition 3.2 actually implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For any finite $S \subset G$ and $o \in X$, we have*

$$\lambda(S, X) \leqslant \lambda(S, Go) \leqslant C_1 \lambda(S, X) + C_1$$

*Proof.* As $Go \subset X$, $\lambda(S, X) \leqslant \lambda(S, Go)$ follows from the definition (2) of displacement.

Set $M := \lambda(S, X)$. Pick $o' = (o'_1, \cdots, o'_l) \in X$ such that $\lambda(S, X) = \lambda_{o'}(S, X)$. For each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$, let $s_i \in S$ so that $\lambda_{o'_i}(S, X_i) = |o'_i - s_i o'_i|$. Then the second inequality follows from Proposition 3.2 combined with the following estimate:

$$\lambda(S, X_i) \leqslant \lambda_{o'_i}(S, X_i) = |o'_i - s_i o'_i| \leqslant \sum_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant l} |o'_j - s_i o'_j| \leqslant \lambda_{o'}(S, X) = \lambda(S, X) = M.$$

□

The following lemma comes from the proper product action $G \curvearrowright X$ and Lemma 3.4.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For any $M > 0$ there exists $N = N(M) > 0$ such that for any finite subset $S$ of $G$, if $|S| > N$, then $\lambda(S, X) > M$.*

*Proof.* Since $G$ acts properly on $X$, for any $M > 0$ and $o \in X$, the following set

$$N(o, C_1 M + C_1) := \{g \in G : |o - go| \leqslant C_1 M + C_1\}$$

has finite cardinality. Let $N := \inf_{o \in X} |N(o, C_1 M + C_1)| = |N(o', C_1 M + C_1)|$ for some $o' \in X$.

For any finite subset $S \subset G$ with $|S| > N$, the displacement of $S$ on $o'$ is larger than $C_1 M + C_1$. As $|g^{-1}Sg| = |S| > N$, $\lambda_{o'}(g^{-1}Sg, X) > C_1 M + C_1$ for any $g \in G$. Hence, $\lambda(S, Go') = \inf_{g \in G} \lambda_{o'}(g^{-1}Sg, X) > C_1 M + C_1$. By Lemma 3.4, $\lambda(S, X) \geqslant \frac{1}{C_1}\lambda(S, Go') - 1 > M$. □

Now we can complete the proof of Theorem 3.1.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let $C_1$ be the constant given by Proposition 3.2. For any $M > 0$, let $N_0 = N(C_1 M + C_1)$ be given by Lemma 3.5. For any finite set $S$ with $|S| \geqslant N_0$, Lemma 3.5 gives that $\lambda(S, X) > C_1 M + C_1$. Thus, the displacement of $S$ must be larger than $M$ on some factor space $X_i$ by Proposition 3.2. □

## 4. Uniform Exponential Growth

The goal of this section is Theorem 1.1 re-stated as follows, proving locally uniform exponential growth of proper product actions.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose that $G$ admits a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces with either coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on each factor. Then there exists a constant $\omega_0 > 1$ such that $\omega(H) \geqslant \omega_0$ for any finitely generated non-virtually abelian subgroup $H$.*

At first, we observe the following elementary facts. For any two subsets $H, K \subset G$, denote

$$\mathcal{C}(H, K) := \{[h, k] : h \in H, k \in K\}$$

and $[H, K]$ is the group generated by $\mathcal{C}(H, K)$.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $G$ be a group generated by a finite set $S$. Suppose that $g \in G$ is of infinite order so that $\langle g \rangle \cap Z(G)$ is finite. Then there exists $a \in S$ such that $[g^k, a] \neq 1$ for all integers $k \geqslant 1$. In particular, $\mathcal{C}(G, G)$ is infinite.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that each element of $S$ commutes with some nontrivial power of $g$. Let $K > 0$ be the least common multiplier so that $g^K$ commutes with every element in $S$. Thus, $\langle g^K \rangle \leqslant Z(G)$, which contradicts the finiteness of $\langle g \rangle \cap Z(G)$. Hence, there exists $a \in S$ such that $[g^k, a] \neq 1$ for all $k \geqslant 1$. This implies $[g^i, a] \neq [g^j, a]$ for any $i \neq j$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}(G, G)$ is infinite. □

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let $G$ be a non-virtually abelian group generated by a symmetric set $S$. Then there exists a constant $c \in (0, 1)$ independent of $S$ such that $|\mathcal{C}(S^{\leqslant n}, S^{\leqslant n})| \geqslant cn$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* Denote $\mathcal{C}_n = \mathcal{C}(S^{\leqslant n}, S^{\leqslant n})$ for simplicity. Since $G$ is non-abelian, we see that $|\mathcal{C}_1| \geqslant 2$ and $\mathcal{C}_n \subset \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. According to the nilpotent class of $G$, we divide the proof into three cases.

**Case I**: $G$ is a nilpotent group of class $\leqslant 2$, i.e. $[G, [G, G]] = 1$.

*Claim.* $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*Proof of Claim.* As $[G, G] \leqslant Z(G)$, $G/Z(G)$ is abelian. As $G$ is non-virtually abelian, $G/Z(G)$ must be infinite.

Let $\pi : G \to G/Z(G)$ be the quotient map. Since $\pi(S)$ generates $G/Z(G)$ and $G/Z(G)$ is abelian, there exists an infinite order element $\overline{a} \in \pi(S)$. Let $a \in S$ be a preimage of $\overline{a}$. Then $\langle a \rangle \cap Z(G) = \{1\}$. By Lemma 4.2, there exists $b \in S$ such that $[a^k, b] \neq 1$ for any $k \geqslant 1$.

Hence, $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant |\{[a^k, b] : 1 \leqslant k \leqslant n\}| = n$ and the claim follows. □

**Case II**: $G$ has a subgroup $H$ of finite index $d$ which is nilpotent of class $\leqslant 2$.

*Claim.* $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant \frac{1}{3d} n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*Proof of Claim.* Denote $U := S^{\leqslant 2d-1} \cap H$. By Shalen-Wagreich Proposition [50, Proposition 3.3], $U$ generates $H$. As a consequence of Case I, $|\mathcal{C}(U^{\leqslant n}, U^{\leqslant n})| \geqslant n$.

Then, if $n \geqslant 3(2d-1)$, one has

$$|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant |\mathcal{C}(U^{\leqslant n/(2d-1)}, U^{\leqslant n/(2d-1)})| \geqslant \frac{n}{2d-1} - 1 \geqslant \frac{n}{3d}.$$

Otherwise, for $1 \leqslant n < 3(2d-1)$, we have $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant 2 \geqslant \frac{n}{3d}$ as well. Hence, the claim is proved. □

**Case III**: $G$ does not contain a finite index nilpotent group of class $\leqslant 2$.

*Claim.* $|\mathcal{C}_n| \geqslant \frac{1}{2} n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*Proof of Claim.* We argue by contradiction. As the claim clearly holds for $n \leqslant 2$, we suppose that $|\mathcal{C}_n| < \frac{n}{2}$ for some $n \geqslant 3$. Note the following relation

$$1 = |\mathcal{C}_0| \leqslant |\mathcal{C}_1| \leqslant \cdots \leqslant |\mathcal{C}_n| < \frac{n}{2}.$$

By pigeonhole principle, there exists $1 \leqslant m \leqslant n-2$ such that $|\mathcal{C}_m| = |\mathcal{C}_{m+2}|$. As $\mathcal{C}_m \subset \mathcal{C}_{m+2}$, we obtain $\mathcal{C}_m = \mathcal{C}_{m+2}$.

For any $s \in S$ and $g, h \in S^{\leqslant m}$, we note that

$$s[g, h]s^{-1} = [sgs^{-1}, shs^{-1}] \in \mathcal{C}_{m+2} = \mathcal{C}_m$$

implying that $\mathcal{C}_m$ is invariant under conjugacy. Recall that $[G, G]$ is the unique smallest normal subgroup so that $G/[G, G]$ is abelian. Thus, the normal subgroup generated by $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{ghg^{-1}h^{-1} : g, h \in S\}$ coincides with $[G, G]$. Consequently, $\mathcal{C}_1 \subset \mathcal{C}_m$ (normally) generates the commutator subgroup $[G, G]$.

Let $H$ be the kernel of the group action of $G$ on $\mathcal{C}_m$ by conjugation. That is to say, every $h \in H$ commutes all elements in $\mathcal{C}_m$, so one has $[H, [G, G]] = 1$. In particular, $[H, [H, H]] = 1$ shows that $H$ is a nilpotent group of class $\leqslant 2$. This results in a contradiction as $H$ is of finite index in $G$. Hence, we prove the claim. □

To conclude, setting $c = \min\{1/3d, 1/2\}$ completes the proof. □

The following lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.3, generalizing a result [11, Lemma II.7.9] that if a group has finite commutator subgroup, then it is virtually abelian. Recall that $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ denotes the set of commutators over $G$, so generates $[G,G]$.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let $G$ be a finitely generated group with $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ finite. Then $G$ is virtually abelian.*

As a corollary, we have that

**Corollary 4.5.** *Suppose that a finitely generated infinite group $G$ acts properly on a finite product of quasi-lines with orientable lineal actions on each factor. Then $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ is a finite set and $G$ is virtually abelian with infinite center.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.12, the orbit of the subset $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ has finite diameter on every factor. Thanks to the proper action, $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ is finite. By Lemma 4.4, $G$ is virtually abelian. As any finitely generated abelian torsion group is a finite group, $G$ must contain an infinite order element. As a result of Lemma 4.2, $Z(G)$ is infinite, otherwise we would obtain that $\mathcal{C}(G,G)$ is infinite. The proof is completed. □

Now, we strength the conclusion of Theorem 3.1.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let $G \curvearrowright \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ be a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces with either coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on each factor. Assume that $H$ is a non-virtually abelian subgroup of $G$ so that all lineal actions of $H$ on factors are orientable. Then for any sufficiently large $M > 0$, there exists $N = N(M, D, \delta, l) > 0$ with the following property.*

*For any finite symmetric generating set $S$ of $H$, there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$ such that*

$$\lambda(\mathcal{C}(S^{\leqslant N}, S^{\leqslant N}), X_i) > M$$

*and $H \curvearrowright X_i$ is either focal or of general type.*

*Proof.* Fix any $M \geqslant \max\{C, 30\delta\}$, where $C$ is the constant in Lemma 2.12. Let $N_0 = N_0(M, D, \delta, l)$ be given by Theorem 3.1 and $N := [N_0/c] + 1$ where $c$ is the constant in Lemma 4.3.

Set $S' := \mathcal{C}(S^{\leqslant N}, S^{\leqslant N})$. Then Lemma 4.3 gives that $|S'| \geqslant N_0$. As a result of Theorem 3.1, there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$ such that $\lambda(S', X_i) > M$. As $M > 30\delta$, Lemma 2.22 guarantees the existence of a loxodromic element in $S'^{\leqslant 2}$ on $X_i$. Thus, the action of $H$ on $X_i$ is either lineal and orientable, or focal, or of general type.

By way of contradiction, assume that $H \curvearrowright X_i$ is lineal and orientable. By the above definition, $S'$ consists of commutators in $G$, so according to Lemma 2.12, there exists $x_i \in X_i$ such that $|sx_i - x_i| \leqslant C$ for any $s \in S'$. This results in a contradiction as follows

$$M < \lambda(S', X_i) = \inf_{x \in X_i} \max_{s \in S'} |sx - x| \leqslant \max_{s \in S'} |sx_i - x_i| \leqslant C.$$

We thus prove that $H \curvearrowright X_i$ must be focal or of general type. □

The last ingredient is the following criterion to generate a free semigroup. Recall that $\tau(g)$ is the stable translation length of any loxodromic isometry $g$.

**Proposition 4.7.** *[9, Prop. 11.1] Let $X$ be a $\delta$-hyperbolic space for some $\delta \geqslant 0$. Suppose $g$ and $h$ are loxodromic isometries whose fixed point sets in $\partial X$ are not equal (possibly with a common point). If $\tau(g), \tau(h) > 10000\delta$, then some pair in $\{g^{\pm 1}, h^{\pm 1}\}$ generates a free semigroup.*

We are ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Suppose $G$ admits a proper product action on finite hyperbolic spaces $\prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ with either coarsely dense orbits or shadowing property on each factor. Let $H$ be any finitely generated non-virtually abelian subgroup. Choose a subgroup $H_0$ of finite index in $H$ such that all lineal actions of $H_0$ on factors $X_i$ are orientable. As $H_0$ is still non-virtually abelian, it follows from Corollary 4.5 that not all $H_0$-actions on factors are lineal and thus $[H : H_0] \leqslant 2^{l-1}$. As a result of [35, Prop. 2.4]

which gives the relation of uniform exponential growth between a group and its finite index subgroup, $\omega(H)^{2^l-1} \geqslant \omega(H_0)$.

Fix $N_1$ in Proposition 4.6 for $M = 10026\delta + C$ where $C$ is the constant in Lemma 2.12, and then set $N_2 = 4N_1$. Let $S$ be a finite symmetric generating set of $H_0$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}(S^{\leqslant N_1}, S^{\leqslant N_1}) \subset S^{\leqslant N_2}$. As a result of Proposition 4.6, there exists $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$ such that $\lambda(S^{\leqslant N_2}, X_i) > 10026\delta + C$ and $H_0 \curvearrowright X_i$ is focal or of general type.

It follows from Lemma 2.22 that there exists a loxodromic element $g \in S^{\leqslant 2N_2}$ on $X_i$. Moreover, Lemma 2.22 and [22, Lemma 2.7] give a lower bound of $\lambda(g, X_i)$ by $\lambda(S^{\leqslant N_2}, X_i) - 10\delta$. Hence, $\lambda(g, X_i) > 10016\delta + C$ and then $\tau(g) > 10000\delta + C$ by Lemma 2.7.

Since the action $H_0 \curvearrowright X_i$ is not lineal, there exists at least one $h \in S$ such that $h \notin E(g)$. Note that $\tau(h^{-1}gh) = \tau(g) > 10000\delta + C$. By applying Proposition 4.7, one gets that some pair in $\{g^{\pm 1}, h^{-1}g^{\pm 1}h\}$ generates a free semigroup.

To conclude, set $\kappa := 2N_2 + 2$. Then

$$\omega(H_0, S) \geqslant \omega(H_0, S^{\leqslant \kappa})^{1/\kappa} \geqslant \omega(H_0, \{g^{\pm 1}, h^{-1}g^{\pm 1}h\})^{1/\kappa} = 2^{1/\kappa},$$

for any finite symmetric generating set $S$ of $H_0$ and thus $\omega(H_0) \geqslant 2^{1/\kappa}$. By setting $\omega_0 = 2^{1/[\kappa(2^l-1)]}$, one has that $\omega(H) \geqslant \omega(H_0)^{1/(2^l-1)} \geqslant \omega_0$. The proof is thus completed. □

The first application of Theorem 4.1 is given to the class of hierarchically hyperbolic groups (HHGs).

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let $(G, \mathfrak{G})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic group with a BBF-coloring. Then $G$ has locally uniform exponential growth.*

*Proof.* A result of M. Hagen and H. Petyt [33, Theorem 3.1, Proposition 3.10] shows that any hierarchically hyperbolic group $(G, \mathfrak{G})$ with a BBF-coloring $\mathfrak{G} = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{l} \mathfrak{G}_i$ admits a quasimedian quasi-isometric embedding into a finite product of hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathcal{C}\mathfrak{G}_i$ and preserves each factor with shadowing property. □

Another application is to BMW groups. Recall that a group $G$ is a BMW group if it acts by isometries on the product of two trees $T_1 \times T_2$ such that every element preserves the product decomposition and the action on the vertex set of $T_1 \times T_2$ is free and transitive.

**Corollary 4.9.** *BMW groups have locally uniform exponential growth.*

## 5. Product Set Growth

In this section, we shall study a stronger growth property, called *product set growth*, for groups with a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces.

In this section, when we say that a finite set $U$ generates a group $H$ as a semi-group (resp. group), we mean that any element of $H$ can be written as a word over the alphabet $U$(resp. $U \cup U^{-1}$).

For any finite subset $S \subset G$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the *n-th product set* of $S$ is denoted as $S^n := \{s_1 \cdots s_n : s_1, \ldots, s_n \in S\}$.

**Definition 5.1.** Let $G$ be a group and $\mathcal{H}$ be a class of subgroups. We say that the pair $(G, \mathcal{H})$ has *uniform product set growth* if there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for every finite (symmetric) $U \subset G$ so that $\langle U \rangle \notin \mathcal{H}$, we have that

$$\forall n \geqslant 1: \ |U^n| \geqslant (\alpha |U|)^{\beta n}.$$

*Remark* 5.2. For any finite subset $U$ and $n \geqslant 1$, $|U^n| \geqslant |U^{n-1}|$. This follows immediately from that $|U^n| \geqslant |aU^{n-1}| = |U^{n-1}|$ for any $a \in U$.

Now, we state our main result Theorem 1.9 in this section.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let $G$ admit a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^{l} X_i$ with shadowing property on factors. Suppose that $G$ acts weakly acylindrically on each factor. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on $\delta, l$ such that for every finite symmetric subset $U \subset G$, at least one of the following is true:*

(1) *$\langle U\rangle$ is virtually abelian.*
(2) *There exists a factor $X_i$ so that no uniform bound exists on $|E(h)\cap E(b)\cap\langle U\rangle|$ for any two independent loxodromic elements $b,h\in\langle U\rangle$ on $X_i$.*
(3) *$|U^n|\geqslant(\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$.*

*Moreover, if there is no lineal action of $\langle U\rangle$ on factors, then $U$ can be non-symmetric and generates a group $\langle U\rangle$ as a semi-group.*

5.1. **Preparation.** In general, a group with uniform exponential growth need not have uniform product set growth. For example, Kerr showed that any finitely generated group with infinite center (e.g. direct product with abelian group) fails to have uniform product set growth [39, Cor. 2.2.5].

The following lemma follows from a classical combinatorial result of Otto Schreier [42, Proposition I.3.7].

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let $G$ be a group generated by a finite set $U$ as a semi-group. Let $H$ be a normal subgroup of index $d$ in $G$. Then there exists a finite subset $W\subset U^{\leqslant d^2-d+1}$ such that $W$ generates $H$ as a group. Moreover, $|W|\geqslant\frac{1}{d}|U|$.*

*Proof.* As $U$ may be non-symmetric, we re-define the Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(G,U)$ as a directed graph: the vertex set consists of all elements of $G$ and there is a directed edge from $g$ to $h$ if $h=gs$ for some $s\in U$. As $U$ generates $G$, for any two $g,h\in G$, there is a directed path from $g$ to $h$ in $\mathcal{G}(G,U)$. Denote by $d_U(g,h)$ the least length among all directed paths from $g$ to $h$ and $d_U(A,B):=\inf_{g\in A,h\in B}d_U(g,h)$. Since $[G:H]=d$, there exist a subset $T=\{a_1=1,\dots,a_d\}\subset G$ such that $G=\bigsqcup_{i=1}^d a_iH$ and $d_U(1,a_i)=d_U(1,a_iH)$ for $1\leqslant i\leqslant d$.

Denote $\pi:G\to\overline{G}:=G/H$ and $\overline{g}:=\pi(g)$. Note that $d_U(1,a_iH)$ can be regarded as the directed distance of $\overline{1}$ and $\overline{a}_i$ in the Cayley graph $\mathcal{G}(\overline{G},\overline{U})$ of $\overline{G}$ relative to $\overline{U}$. As $\overline{G}$ has $d$ elements, $d_U(1,a_i)=d_U(1,a_iH)\leqslant d-1$.

Define a map: $\phi:G\to T$ so that for any $g\in G$, the image $\phi(g)\in T$ is uniquely determined by the relation $\phi(g)^{-1}g\in H$. Set $W_1:=\{\phi(xy)^{-1}xy:x\in U,y\in T\}\subset H$.

*Claim.* $W_1$ generates $H$ as a semi-group.

*Proof of the Claim.* For any $h\in H$ with $d_U(1,h)=n$, denote $h=u_1\cdots u_n$ where $u_i\in U$ for $1\leqslant i\leqslant n$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}h=&u_1\cdots u_na_1\\=&u_1\cdots u_{n-1}a_{k_1}(\phi(u_na_1)^{-1}u_na_1)\\=&\cdots\\=&a_{k_n}(\phi(u_1a_{k_{n-1}})^{-1}u_1a_{k_{n-1}})\cdots(\phi(u_na_1)^{-1}u_na_1).\end{aligned}$$

where $a_{k_1}=\phi(u_na_1)$ and $a_{k_i}=\phi(u_{n+1-i}a_{k_{i-1}})$ for $2\leqslant i\leqslant n$. As $h\in H$, $a_{k_n}=a_1=1$. Thus any $h\in H$ can be written as a word over $W_1$. □

As $(\overline{a}_i)^d=\overline{1}\in G/H$, one has $a_i^d\in H$ for $1\leqslant i\leqslant d$. Thus, $\phi(xy)^{d-1}xy=\phi(xy)^d\cdot\phi(xy)^{-1}xy\in H$ for $x\in U,y\in T$.

Define $W:=\{a^d:a\in T\}\cup\{\phi(xy)^{d-1}xy:x\in U,y\in T\}$. It follows from $d_U(1,a_i)\leqslant d-1$ that $W\subset U^{\leqslant d^2-d+1}$. Moreover,

$$\phi(xy)^{-1}xy=(\phi(xy))^{-d}\phi(xy)^{d-1}(xy)$$

where $\phi(xy)\in T$ by the definition of $\phi$, so the above Claim implies that $W$ generates $H$ as a group.

To give a bound on $|W|$, note first that $W_2:=\{\phi(x)^{d-1}x:x\in U\}\subset W$. Recall $\phi|_U$ maps $U$ onto the set $T$ of $d$ elements, so by the pigeonhole principle, there is a subset $U_0\subseteq U$ of at least $|U|/d$ elements which has the same image in $T$. This implies $\phi(x)^{d-1}x\neq\phi(x')^{d-1}x'$ for any $x\neq x'\in U_0$. Thus, $|W|\geqslant|W_2|\geqslant|U_0|\geqslant|U|/d$. □

**Corollary 5.5.** *Let $G$ be a group generated by a finite set $U$ as a semi-group. Let $H$ be a subgroup of index $d$ in $G$. Then there exists a finite subset $W \subset U^{\leqslant (d!)^2-d!+1}$ such that $W$ generates $H$ as a group. Moreover, $|W| \geqslant \frac{|U|}{d!}$.*

*Proof.* Consider the action of $G$ on the left cosets of $H$ by left multiplication. This gives a group homomorphism $\rho$ from $G$ to the finite permutation group $S_d$.

As $\ker\rho \lhd G$ and $[G : \ker\rho] = r \leqslant d!$, it follows from Lemma 5.4 that there exists a finite subset $V \subset U^{\leqslant r^2-r+1}$ such that $V$ generates $\ker\rho$ as a group and $|V| \geqslant |U|/r$. As shown in Lemma 5.4, there exists a subset $T = \{a_1 = 1, \dots, a_r\} \subset U^{\leqslant r-1}$ such that $G = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^r a_i \ker\rho$. As $\ker\rho \leqslant H$, it is not hard to observe that $W := V \bigcup (T \bigcap H)$ generates $H$ as a group. Moreover, $W \subset U^{\leqslant (d!)^2-d!+1}$ and $|W| \geqslant |V| \geqslant |U|/d!$. □

For a symmetric version of Corollary 5.5 and the following lemma, see [39, Prop. 2.2.26, Prop. 2.2.27].

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let $H$ be a subgroup of $G$ with index $d \geqslant 2$. If there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for any finite set $W$ generating $H$ as a group, $|W^n| \geqslant (\alpha|W|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for any finite set (possibly non-symmetric) $U$ generating $G$ as a semigroup, there exists $r = r(d) > 0$ such that $|U^n| \geqslant (\frac{\alpha}{d!2^{r/\beta}}|U|)^{(\beta/r)n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* For any finite generating set $U$ of $G$, Corollary 5.5 shows that there exists a constant $r(d) = (d!)^2 - d! + 1$ such that $W := U^{\leqslant r} \bigcap H$ generates $H$ as a group and $|W| \geqslant |U|/d!$.

Then for every integer $n > 0$,

$$|U^{\leqslant n}|^r \geqslant |U^{\leqslant rn}| \geqslant |W^{\leqslant n}| \geqslant |W^n| \geqslant (\alpha|W|)^{\beta n} \geqslant (\frac{\alpha}{d!}|U|)^{\beta n}$$

It follows from Remark 5.2 that $|U^n| \geqslant \frac{1}{n+1}|U^{\leqslant n}|$. Combining these two inequalities together, one has that

$$|U^n| \geqslant \frac{1}{n+1}|U^{\leqslant n}| \geqslant \frac{1}{n+1}(\frac{\alpha}{d!}|U|)^{(\beta/r)n} \geqslant \frac{1}{2^n}(\frac{\alpha}{d!}|U|)^{(\beta/r)n} = (\frac{\alpha}{d!2^{r/\beta}}|U|)^{(\beta/r)n}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. □

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let $\rho : G \to G'$ be an epimorphism with finite $\ker\rho$ . If there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that for any finite set $U$ generating $G'$ as a semi-group (resp. group), $|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for any $n > 0$. Then for any finite set $W$ generating $G$ as a semi-group (resp. group), one has $|W^n| \geqslant (\frac{\alpha}{|\ker\rho|}|W|)^{\beta n}$ for any $n > 0$.*

*Proof.* The conclusion follows immediately from the inequality $|W| \geqslant |\rho(W)| \geqslant \frac{1}{|\ker\rho|}|W|$ for any finite subset $W$ of $G$. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 5.3.** Let $U \subset G$ be any finite subset generating a group $\langle U\rangle$ as a semi-group. If $\langle U\rangle$ is virtually abelian, then the item (1) holds; otherwise, $\langle U\rangle$ is non-virtually abelian. Moreover, we assume that the item (2) does not hold, then it suffices to show that the item (3) holds. Note that the negativity of item (2) implies that there exists a constant $N_0 > 0$ such that, for any $1 \leqslant i \leqslant l$ and any two independent loxodromic elements $b, h$ (if there exist) on $X_i$, $|E(b) \cap E(h) \cap \langle U\rangle| \leqslant N_0$.

Let $H$ be a subgroup of $\langle U\rangle$ with index $\leqslant 2^{l-1}$ such that all lineal actions of $H$ on factors are orientable. According to Corollary 5.5, there exists $r = r(l)$ such that $W := U^r \bigcap H$ generates $H$ as a group.

Denote by $C = C(k, c, \delta)$ the constant so that any quadrilateral with $(k, c)$-quasi-geodesic sides in a $\delta$-hyperbolic space is $C$-thin: any side is contained in the $C$-neighborhood of the other three sides.

Note that $H$ satisfies all conditions of Proposition 4.6. When there exists a lineal action of $\langle U\rangle$ on some factor, we assume more that $U$ is symmetric. As a result of Proposition 4.6 and Lemma 2.22, there exist a constant $N = N(\delta, C) > 0$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, l\}$ such that $W^{\leqslant N}$ contains a loxodromic element $b$ on the factor space $X_i$ with $d(o_i, bo_i) > C$ and $H \curvearrowright X_i$ is of general type (note that $H \curvearrowright X_i$

can not be focal by Lemma 2.20). When there is no lineal action of $\langle U\rangle$ on factors, we get the same conclusion by Theorem 3.1 instead of Proposition 4.6, which avoids the symmetry of $U$.

Let $\phi_i : H \to \mathrm{Isom}(X_i)$ be the homomorphism given by the composition of $\phi : H \to \prod_{i=1}^{l} \mathrm{Isom}(X_i)$ with the natural $i$-th projection. As the action $H \curvearrowright X_i$ is of general type, there are at least two independent loxodromic elements $b_1, b_2$ on $X_i$. Then $\ker \phi_i \leqslant E(b_1)\cap E(b_2)\cap H$, and thus $|\ker \phi_i| \leqslant N_0$ by the above assumption.

Denote $\overline{H} := \phi_i(H) \leqslant \mathrm{Isom}(X_i)$ and $\overline{W} := \phi_i(W)$. By Lemmas 5.6 and 5.7, it suffices to show that there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ such that $|\overline{W}^n| \geqslant (\alpha|\overline{W}|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

In the next, we focus on the action $\overline{H} \curvearrowright X_i$. As the action $\overline{H} \curvearrowright X_i$ is not lineal and $\overline{b} = \phi_i(b) \in \overline{W}^{\leqslant N}$ is loxodromic, there exists $\overline{f} \in \overline{W}$ such that $\overline{f} \notin E(\overline{b})$.

Let $\theta = 2, k = \lambda_0, c = c_0$ be fixed constants given by Lemma 2.22. As $\bar{b}$ is produced from Lemma 2.22, the pair $(\overline{f}, \overline{b})$ satisfies the following set (♣) of properties:

(i) the element $\bar{b}$ is loxodromic so that $d(o_i, \bar{b}o_i) > C$ and $\eta := \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \bar{b}^n[o_i, \bar{b}o_i]$ is a $(k, c)$-quasi-axis,
(ii) the element $\bar{f}$ lies outside $E(\bar{b})$ and satisfies $d(o_i, \bar{f}o_i) \leqslant \theta d(o_i, \bar{b}o_i)$,
(iii) the element $\bar{b}$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 2.21.

We refer the readers that the above facts of $(\bar{f}, \bar{b})$ are exactly the assumptions at the beginning of Section 4 in [22]. As a result, we have the following analogues.

**Lemma 5.8.** *[22, Lemma 4.2] There exist constants $n_1, m_1 > 0$ depending on $\delta, k, c$ with the following property. For any $n \geqslant n_1$, the element $\bar{h} := \bar{f}\bar{b}^n$ is loxodromic with a $(k_1, c_1)$-quasi-axis $\xi$ defined as follows*

$$\xi := \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \bar{h}^i([x, y]_\eta[y, \bar{h}x])$$

*where $x = \bar{b}^{m_1-n}o_i, y = \bar{b}^{-m_1}o_i$ and $k_1, c_1 > 0$ depend only on $\delta, k, c > 0$.*

Denote $F = E(\bar{h}) \cap E(\bar{b})$ when $\bar{h}$ is loxodromic. As the action $\bar{H} \curvearrowright X_i$ is weakly acylindrical, the axes of $\bar{h}$ and $\bar{b}$ have disjoint endpoints in $\partial X_i$, which implies that $\bar{b}$ and $\bar{h}$ are independent. Hence, $|F| \leqslant N_0$ by the assumptions. Clearly, any element in $F$ acts elliptically on $X_i$. By [22, Lemma 2.9], there exists $D = D(k_1, c_1, \delta)$ such that $d(z, gz) \leqslant D$ for any $g \in F$ and $z \in \xi$.

The crucial property in constructing free semi-subgroups is the following property of a loxodromic isometry $\bar{h} = \bar{f}\bar{b}^n$.

**Lemma 5.9.** *[22, Lemma 4.4] Fix $L = 4(m_1 + 6)$ where $m_1$ is given by Lemma 5.8. There exists $n_2 = n_2(k, c, \delta) \geqslant n_1$ such that $\bar{h} = \bar{f}\bar{b}^n$ is loxodromic for any $n \geqslant n_2$ and*

(1) *$|F| \leqslant N_0$ and $\lambda_z(F, X_i) \leqslant D$ for any $z \in \xi$.*
(2) *for any $g \in E(\bar{h})\backslash F$, we have $\lambda(g, X_i) > L \cdot d(o_i, \bar{b}o_i)$.*
(3) *for any $g \in E(\bar{h})$, there exist $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in F$ such that $g = \bar{h}^i t$.*

**Lemma 5.10.** *[22, Lemma 5.1] Choose a largest subset $\bar{W}_0$ of $\bar{W}$ such that $sF \neq s'F$ for any $s \neq s' \in \bar{W}_0$. Then for any $s \neq s' \in \bar{W}_0$, $s^{-1}s' \notin E(\bar{h})$.*

Denote by $C_1 = C_1(k_1, c_1, \delta)$ the constant so that any quadrilateral with $(k_1, c_1)$-quasi-geodesic sides is $C_1$-thin.

Choose the least integer $n_3 \geqslant n_2$ depending only on $\delta$ such that the last inequality in the following

$$\begin{aligned} &d\left(y, \bar{h}^i y\right) \geqslant k_1^{-1}\left(d(y, \bar{h}y) - c_1\right) \\ \geqslant &k_1^{-1}\left(d\left(o_i, \bar{b}^n o_i\right) - 2d\left(o_i, \bar{b}^{m_1} o_i\right) - d(o_i, \bar{f}o_i) - c_1\right) \\ > &\max\left\{LC_1, L^2 d(o_i, \bar{b}o_i)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any $n \geqslant n_3$ and $i \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, $d(y, \bar{h}y) > C_1$ and $d(y, \bar{h}y) > Ld(y, ty)$ for any $t = s^{-1}s'$ where $s \neq s' \in \bar{W}_0$. Moreover, this paragraph verifies that the pair $(t, \bar{h})$ also satisfies the conditions (i), (ii), (iii) in (♣) with the basepoint $y \in \xi$ and $\theta = L, k = k_1, c = c_1$.

Let us now fix $\bar{h} = \bar{f}\bar{b}^{n_3}$. Let $m' = m(k_1, c_1, L, \delta), n' = n(k_1, c_1, L, \delta)$ given by [22, Lemma 4.1]. We define the free bases as follows:

$$T = \{s\bar{h}^{n'} : s \in \bar{W}_0\}. \tag{7}$$

The same proof of [22, Lemma 5.2] proves the following, with free subgroups replaced by free semi-subgroups.

**Lemma 5.11.** *The set $T$ generates a free sub-semigroup of rank $|T|$ in $\overline{H}$.*

Note that $|T| = |\bar{W}_0| \geqslant |\bar{W}|/N_0$. Setting $\kappa = n'(Nn_3 + 1) + 1, \alpha = \frac{1}{2^\kappa N_0}, \beta = \frac{1}{3\kappa}$, then $T \subset \overline{W}^{\leqslant \kappa}$. Therefore, for any $n > 0$, one gets

$$|\overline{W}^{\leqslant n}|^\kappa \geqslant |\overline{W}^{\leqslant \kappa n}| \geqslant |T^{\leqslant n}| \geqslant |T|^n \geqslant (|\overline{W}|/N_0)^n$$

By the same arguments in Lemma 5.6, one finally gets

$$|\overline{W}^n| \geqslant (\alpha|\overline{W}|)^{\beta n}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.3.

If weakly acylindrical action on factors are strengthened to be acylindrical, then we can get a much simpler classification of product set growth of subgroups.

**Corollary 5.12.** *Let $G$ admit a proper product action on hyperbolic spaces $X = \prod_{i=1}^l X_i$ with shadowing property on factors. Suppose that $G$ acts acylindrically on each factor. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on $\delta, l$ such that for every finite (possibly non-symmetric) subset $U \subset G$ generating a group $\langle U \rangle$ as a semi-group, one of the following is true:*

1. *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually cyclic.*
2. *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* Note the following facts:

1. an acylindrical action must be weakly acylindrical [25, Prop. 5].
2. if a group $G$ acts acylindrically on a hyperbolic space, then every loxodromic element $g$ is contained in a unique maximal virtually cyclic subgroup $E(g)$ of $G$ [24, Lemma 6.5]. This implies that every virtually abelian subgroup $H$ of $G$ is virtually cyclic as $H \leqslant E(h)$ for some loxodromic element $h \in H$ on some factor. Hence, there is no lineal action of $H$ on factors if $H$ is non-virtually cyclic.
3. moreover, there exists a constant $N_0 > 0$ such that any torsion group in $E(g)$ has a cardinality $\leqslant N_0$ for any loxodromic element $g$ [46, Lemma 6.8].

The conclusion then follows from Theorem 5.3. □

Theorem 1.7 almost follows from Corollary 5.12 with $l = 1$. However, the shadowing property needs to be replaced by Corollary 2.23, as explained below.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* In Corollary 5.12, the assumption of proper product action on hyperbolic spaces with shadowing property on each factor is used only to guarantee the existence of a short loxodromic element on some factor. When $l = 1$ and $X$ is a tree, Corollary 2.23 gives that for any finite possibly non-symmetric $S \subset G$ without global fixed point on $X$, $S^{\leqslant 2}$ contains a loxodromic element which has almost the same displacement of $S$. Hence, with Corollary 2.23, the proof of Corollary 5.12 proves the conclusion. □

5.3. **Product set growth for groups acting on Hadamard manifolds.** Recall that a metric space $X$ has *bounded packing* with packing constant $P > 0$ if every ball of radius 2 in $X$ can be covered by at most $P$ balls of radius 1.

**Lemma 5.13.** *[9, Corollary 13.13] For integers $P, J > 0$, there exists a constant $k = k(P, J)$ with the following property. Suppose $X$ is a geodesic space and has bounded packing $P$. Let $S$ be a finite (possibly non-symmetric) set in $Isom(X)$ generating a discrete group $\langle S \rangle$ as a semi-group. If $\lambda(S^k, X) < J$, then $\langle S \rangle$ is virtually nilpotent.*

*Proof.* The proof of [9, Corollary 13.13] used a result of Breuillard-Green-Tao [10, Corollary 11.2] which required the symmetry. However, the symmetry assumption in the latter only appears in the first paragraph of the proof, where it was only used to guarantee that $\langle S\rangle$ is a group. Hence, both results still hold when $S$ is non-symmetric and generates a group $\langle S\rangle$ as a semi-group. □

The following result was claimed in [25] with a sketched proof. As this fact is important in this paper, we present a detailed proof communicated to us by T. Delzant.

**Lemma 5.14.** *[25, Example 1] Let $M$ be a $r$-dimensional Riemannian manifold with curvature $-a^2 \leqslant K \leqslant -1$ and $r \geqslant 2$. Then $\pi_1(M) \curvearrowright \widetilde{M}$ is weakly acylindrical.*

*Proof.* Since $\widetilde{M}$ is simply connected and $K \leqslant -1$, $\widetilde{M}$ is CAT(-1) and thus $\delta$-hyperbolic for some $\delta > 0$. Let $\mu$ be the Margulis constant of $M$. For any loxodromic isometry $g$, let $L_g$ be the geodesic axis of $g$ and $\lambda(g)$ be the minimal translation length of $g$. As the distance function in $\mathbb{H}^r$ is strictly convex and the area of each geodesic quadrilateral is uniformly bounded, there exists a constant $D = D(\delta, \mu) > 0$ with the following property. For any geodesic quadrilateral $[x, y][y, w][w, z][z, x]$in $\mathbb{H}^r$ with $d(x, z), d(y, w) \leqslant 2\delta, d(x, y), d(z, w) \geqslant D$, there exists a subpath $[x_1, y_1] \subset [x, y]$ with $d(x_1, y_1) \geqslant d(x, y)/D$ such that $\max_{p\in[x_1,y_1]} d(p, [z, w]) \leqslant \mu/5$.

Let $\pi_{L_g}$ be the shortest projection map to $L_g$. Denote

$$A = \{h \in \pi_1(M) : \mathrm{diam}(\pi_{L_g}(hL_g)) \geqslant 3D(\lambda(g) + 1)\}.$$

It suffices to show that $A \subset E(g)$.

Fix an arbitrary element $h \in A$. By $\delta$-hyperbolicity of $\widetilde{M}$, there exists a subpath $[x, y] \subset L_g$ such that $d(x, y) = 3D(\lambda(g) + 1)$ and $d(x, hL_g), d(y, hL_g) \leqslant 2\delta$. As $\widetilde{M}$ is CAT(-1), there exists a subpath $[x_1, y_1] \subset [x, y]$ with $d(x_1, y_1) \geqslant 3\lambda(g)$ such that $\max_{z\in[x_1,y_1]} d(z, hL_g) \leqslant \mu/5$.

As $d(x_1, y_1) \geqslant 3\lambda(g)$, there exists $z \in [x_1, y_1]$ such that $[z, g^2z] = [z, gz] \cup [gz, g^2z] \subset [x_1, y_1]$. Denote $w = gz$. Then there exist $z', w' \in hL_g$ such that $d(z, z'), d(w, w') \leqslant \mu/5$. By triangle inequality, $|d(z', w') - \lambda(g)| = |d(z', w') - d(z, w)| \leqslant d(z, z') + d(w, w') \leqslant 2\mu/5$.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, g^{-1}hgh^{-1}z) &= d(gz, hgh^{-1}z) \leqslant d(gz, w') + d(w', hgh^{-1}z') + d(z', z) \\ &\leqslant d(w', hgh^{-1}z') + 2\mu/5 = |d(z', w') - d(z', hgh^{-1}z')| + 2\mu/5 \\ &= |d(z', w') - \lambda(g)| + 2\mu/5 \leqslant 4\mu/5. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Denote $\pi : \widetilde{M} \to M$ as the covering map and $\tilde{x}$ as one preimage of $x$. Recall that the thin part of $M$ is defined as $M^{<\mu} := \{x \in M : Inj_x(M) < \mu/2\}$. By thick-thin decomposition of $M$, $M^{<\mu}$ consists of a disjoint union of connected components $C_i$, each of which is homeomorphic to $\widetilde{C}_i/E_i$, where $\widetilde{C}_i$ is a connected component of $\{\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{M} : \inf_{f\neq 1\in\pi_1(M)} d(\tilde{x}, f\tilde{x}) < \mu\}$ and $E_i$ is the maximal elementary subgroup which fixes $\widetilde{C}_i$. Actually, one has that for any element $f \in \pi_1(M)$, $f\widetilde{C}_i \cap \widetilde{C}_i \neq \varnothing$ if and only if $f \in E_i$.

Note that (8) gives that $d(z, g^{-1}hgh^{-1}z) < \mu$. If $g^{-1}hgh^{-1} = 1$, then $hgh^{-1}$ fix the axis $L_g$. Hence, the axis of $hgh^{-1}$, i.e. $hL_g$, coincides with $L_g$, which implies $h \in E(g)$. If $g^{-1}hgh^{-1} \neq 1$, then (8) shows that $\pi(z) \in M^{<\mu}$. Moreover, (8) holds for any point in $[z, gz]$ and thus $\gamma = \pi([z, gz]) \subset M^{<\mu}$. Denote by $C_i$ as the component containing $\gamma$, then $E_i = E(g) = \langle g_0\rangle$ where $g_0$ is a primitive hyperbolic isometry with $L_{g_0} = L_g$ and $\gamma$ is the core curve of $C_i$. Since $\pi(z) \in M^{<\mu}$, there exists $f \neq 1 \in \pi_1(M)$ such that $d(z, fz) = \inf_{f'\neq 1\in\pi_1(M)} d(z, f'z) < \mu$. Hence, $f\widetilde{C}_i \cap \widetilde{C}_i \neq \varnothing$, which implies that $f \in E(g) = \langle g_0\rangle$. Let $f = g_0^m$ for some $m \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $\lambda(g_0) = d(z, g_0z) \leqslant d(z, fz) < \mu$.

By Margulis Lemma, the set $B = \{g^{-1}hgh^{-1} : h \in A\} \cup \{g_0\}$ generates a nilpotent subgroup $K$. By [5, Lemma 2.4], $K \leqslant E(g)$. Hence, $g^{-1}hgh^{-1} \in E(g)$ and thus $h \in E(g)$.

In conclusion, we have proved that the action $\pi_1(M) \curvearrowright \widetilde{M}$ is $3D$-weakly acylindrical. □

With Theorem 5.3 and Lemmas 5.13 and 5.14, we can prove Theorem 1.5 re-called below.

**Theorem 5.15.** *Let $M$ be a $r$-dimensional Riemannian manifold with sectional curvature $-a^2 \leqslant K \leqslant -1$ and $r \geqslant 2$. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on $r, a$ such that for any finite (possibly non-symmetric) $U \subset \pi_1(M)$ generating a group $\langle U \rangle$ as a semi-group, one of the following is true:*

(1) *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually nilpotent.*
(2) *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Proof.* Since $\widetilde{M}$ is simply connected and $K \leqslant -1$, $\widetilde{M}$ is CAT(-1) and $\delta$-hyperbolic for some $\delta > 0$. Since $-a^2 \leqslant K$ and the dimension of $M$ is $r$, we have $Ric \geqslant -(r-1)a^2$. As a result of [9, Lemma 13.15], $\widetilde{M}$ has bounded packing with packing constant $Q = Q(r, a)$.

By setting $P = Q$ and $J = [30\delta] + 1$, Lemma 5.13 implies that there exists a constant $k = k(r, a, \delta)$ such that for any finite (possibly non-symmetric) $U \in \pi_1(M)$ generating a group $\langle U \rangle$ as a semi-group, if $\lambda(U^k, \widetilde{M}) < J$, then $\Gamma := \langle U \rangle$ is virtually nilpotent.

Next, we consider the case that $\Gamma$ is not virtually nilpotent. Then $\lambda(U^k, \widetilde{M}) \geqslant J > 30\delta$ and $\Gamma \curvearrowright \widetilde{M}$ is not lineal, otherwise $\Gamma$ will be virtually cyclic by [5, Lemma 2.5]. By Lemma 2.22, there exist $o \in \widetilde{M}$ and a loxodromic element $b \in U^{\leqslant 2k}$ with $d(o, bo) \geqslant J - 10\delta$.

Denote by $C = C(c, \delta)$ the constant so that any quadrilateral with $c$-quasi-geodesic sides in a $\delta$-hyperbolic space is $C$-thin. Choose $f \in U$ such that $f \notin E(b)$. Up to enlarging $J$ to $J + C$ and with Lemma 2.22, the pair $(f, b)$ satisfies that: (♣)

(i) the element $b$ is loxodromic so that $d(o, bo) > C$ and $\eta := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} b^n[o, bo]$ is a $c$-quasi-axis,
(ii) the element $f$ lies outside $E(b)$ and satisfies $d(o, fo) \leqslant 2d(o, bo)$,
(iii) as Lemma 5.14 shows the action $\pi_1(M) \curvearrowright \widetilde{M}$ is weakly acylindrical, the element $b$ satisfies the conclusion of Lemma 2.21.

Since $\pi_1(M)$ acts freely on $\widetilde{M}$, then $E(g) \cap E(h)$ is trivial for any two independent loxodromic elements $g, h \in \pi_1(M)$. This implies that the second item in Theorem 5.3 disappears here. Hence, with the same arguments in Theorem 5.3, we complete the proof. □

5.4. **More applications.** At the last subsection, we describe the product set growth for relatively hyperbolic groups, mapping class groups and 3-manifold groups.

**Relatively hyperbolic groups**. In [22], Cui-Jiang-Yang obtained Theorem 1.6 under the assumption that $U$ is symmetric. There the symmetry assumption only occurs in [22, Lemma 3.2] and the final construction of free bases for subgroups. Hence, with Lemma 2.22 (a non-symmetric version of [22, Lemma 3.2]) and the above construction (7) of free bases for semi-groups, one gets the version of product set growth in Theorem 1.6.

**Mapping class groups**. As recalled (1) in Introduction, $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ acts on a finite product of $\delta$-hyperbolic spaces $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^1) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^l)$ so that the orbit map is a quasi-isometric embedding in [6]. By [6, Proposition 5.8], there is a subgroup $G < \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ of finite index that preserves each $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$.

**Corollary 5.16.** *Let $\Sigma$ be an orientable finite-type surface with possibly cusps but without boundary. Then there exist $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on $\Sigma$ such that for every finite symmetric $U \subset \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$, at least one of the following is true:*

(1) *$\langle U \rangle$ is virtually abelian.*
(2) *There exist a factor $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ and two independent loxodromic elements $b, h \in \langle U \rangle$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ such that $|E(h) \cap E(b) \cap \langle U \rangle|$ is infinite.*
(3) *$|U^n| \geqslant (\alpha|U|)^{\beta n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

*Moreover, if there is no lineal action of $\langle U \rangle$ on factors, then $U$ can be non-symmetric and generates a group.*

*Proof.* It is known that $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ has a finite-index pure subgroup $\Gamma_3(\Sigma)$ (see [37, Theorem 3]) and any pure subgroup is torsion-free. Denote $N := [\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma) : \Gamma_3(\Sigma)]$. Then any subgroup $H \leqslant \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ satisfies $[H : H \cap \Gamma_3(\Sigma)] \leqslant [\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma) : \Gamma_3(\Sigma)] = N$. As any finite pure subgroup is trivial, the above inequality implies that any finite subgroup in $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ has a cardinality no more than $N$. This gives

that: for any sequence of subgroups $\{H_n\} \subset \mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$, if there is no uniform bound on the cardinality of $H_n$, then there exists an infinite subgroup $H \in \{H_n\}$. This turns the item (2) of Theorem 5.3 into the new item (2) here.

Shadowing property is implied in [33, Proposition 3.10]. Moreover, [25, Lemma 4] shows that the action on each factor is weakly-acylindrical. Hence, the conclusion just follows from Theorem 5.3. □

From the construction of each hyperbolic space $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ [6], there is no lineal action of $\mathrm{Mod}(\Sigma)$ on factors $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{Y}^i)$ (1). Hence, Corollary 1.10 follows from Corollary 5.16.

**3-manifold groups**. Let $M$ be a connected compact oriented irreducible 3-manifold. $M$ has a canonical *JSJ decomposition*, the pieces of which are either Seifert-fibred or admit finite-volume hyperbolic structures according to the Geometrization Conjecture. Such a 3-manifold $M$ is called a *graph manifold* if all the pieces are Seifert fibered spaces; otherwise $M$ is called a *mixed manifold*.

When $M$ is a mixed 3-manifold, then $\pi_1(M)$ is hyperbolic relative to a collection of maximal graph manifold groups and torus groups $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (see [8, 23] for details).

When $M$ is a graph manifold possibly with boundary, the JSJ decomposition induces a (at most) 4-acylindrical splitting of $\pi_1(M)$ (see [53]). Recall that a finitely generated group $G$ *admits a $k$-acylindrical splitting* if $G$ is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a graph of groups such that the action of $G$ on the corresponding Bass-Serre tree is non-elementary and *$k$-acylindrical*, that is, for any $g \neq 1 \in G$, $\mathrm{diam}(Fix(g)) \leqslant k$.

*Proof of Corollary 1.8.* Let $H = \langle U \rangle$ be a subgroup of $\pi_1(M)$ generated by a finite possibly non-symmetric subset $U$.

Suppose first that $\pi_1(M)$ is a graph manifold group with associated Bass-Serre tree $T$. Then $H$ acts acylindrically on $T$. If $H$ does not stabilize a vertex of $T$, then it has product set growth by Theorem 1.7. Otherwise, $H$ is a subgroup of a Seifert-fibered piece $N$ of the JSJ decomposition of $M$. Note that $\pi_1(N)$ is a central extension of a surface subgroup: it is virtually split only if the Euler number of the Seifert fiberation is zero. Thus, if $H$ fails to have product set growth, $H$ must virtually have infinite center: a finite index subgroup has infinite center.

Now we consider a mixed manifold $M$ whose fundamental group is relatively hyperbolic. The elementary subgroups (i.e. with at most two limit points in the Bowditch boundary) are either virtually $\mathbb{Z}$, virtually $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ or virtually a graph manifold group. If $H$ is elementary and has product set growth, then $H$ must be a subgroup of a graph manifold group. We are thus reduced to the above discussion. Hence, the conclusion follows. □

## References


1. Carolyn Abbott, Thomas Ng, Davide Spriano, Radhika Gupta, and Harry Petyt, Hierarchically hyperbolic groups and uniform exponential growth, arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.00439 (2019).
2. Roger C. Alperin, Uniform growth of polycyclic groups, vol. 92, 2002, Dedicated to John Stallings on the occasion of his 65th birthday, pp. 105–113. MR 1934014
3. G. N. Arzhantseva and I. G. Lysenok, A lower bound on the growth of word hyperbolic groups, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **73** (2006), no. 1, 109–125. MR 2197373
4. Jason Behrstock, Mark Hagen, and Alessandro Sisto, Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces II: Combination theorems and the distance formula, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **299** (2019), no. 2, 257–338.
5. Gérard Besson, Sylvestre Gallot, and Gilles Courtois, Uniform growth of groups acting on Cartan-Hadamard spaces, Journal of the European Mathematical Society **13** (2011), no. 5, 1343–1371.
6. Mladen Bestvina, Ken Bromberg, and Koji Fujiwara, Constructing group actions on quasi-trees and applications to mapping class groups, Publications mathématiques de l'IHÉS **122** (2015), no. 1, 1–64.
7. ———, Proper actions on finite products of quasi-trees, Annales Henri Lebesgue **4** (2021), 685–709.
8. Hadi Bigdely and Daniel T. Wise, Quasiconvexity and relatively hyperbolic groups that split, Michigan Math. J. **62** (2013), no. 2, 387–406. MR 3079269
9. Emmanuel Breuillard and Koji Fujiwara, On the joint spectral radius for isometries of non-positively curved spaces and uniform growth, Annales de l'Institut Fourier, vol. 71, 2021, pp. 317–391.
10. Emmanuel Breuillard, Ben Green, and Terence Tao, The structure of approximate groups, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. **116** (2012), 115–221. MR 3090256
11. Martin R Bridson and André Haefliger, Metric spaces of non-positive curvature, vol. 319, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

12. Michelle Bucher and Pierre de la Harpe, Free products with amalgamation and HNN-extensions of uniformly exponential growth, Matematicheskie Zametki **67** (2000), no. 6, 811–815.
13. Marc Burger and Shahar Mozes, Lattices in product of trees, Publications Mathématiques de l'IHÉS **92** (2000), 151–194.
14. J. Button, Groups acting faithfully on trees and properly on products of trees, 2019.
15. J. O. Button, Explicit Helfgott type growth in free products and in limit groups, J. Algebra **389** (2013), 61–77. MR 3065992
16. J. O. Button, Groups acting purely loxodromically on products of hyperbolic graphs, 2020.
17. J. O. Button, Generalised Baumslag-Solitar groups and hierarchically hyperbolic groups, 2022.
18. Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace, Finite and infinite quotients of discrete and indiscrete groups, Groups St Andrews 2017 in Birmingham, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 455, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2019, pp. 16–69. MR 3931408
19. Filippo Cerocchi and Andrea Sambusetti, Entropy and finiteness of groups with acylindrical splittings, Groups Geom. Dyn. **15** (2021), no. 3, 755–799. MR 4322011
20. Michel Coornaert, Thomas Delzant, and Athanase Papadopoulos, Géométrie et théorie des groupes: les groupes hyperboliques de gromov, vol. 1441, Springer, 2006.
21. Rémi Coulon and Markus Steenbock, Product set growth in Burnside groups, J. Éc. polytech. Math. **9** (2022), 463–504. MR 4387462
22. Yu-Miao Cui, Yue-Ping Jiang, and Wen-Yuan Yang, Lower bound on growth of non-elementary subgroups in relatively hyperbolic groups, Journal of Group Theory **25** (2022), no. 5, 799–822.
23. François Dahmani, Combination of convergence groups, Geom. Topol. **7** (2003), 933–963. MR 2026551
24. François Dahmani, Vincent Guirardel, and Denis Osin, Hyperbolically embedded subgroups and rotating families in groups acting on hyperbolic spaces, vol. 245, American Mathematical Society, 2017.
25. Thomas Delzant, Kähler groups, $\mathbb{R}$-trees, and holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces, Geometric and Functional Analysis **26** (2016), no. 1, 160–187.
26. Thomas Delzant and Markus Steenbock, Product set growth in groups and hyperbolic geometry, Journal of Topology **13** (2020), no. 3, 1183–1215.
27. Alex Eskin, Shahar Mozes, and Hee Oh, Uniform exponential growth for linear groups, International Mathematics Research Notices **2002** (2002), no. 31, 1675–1683.
28. Koji Fujiwara, The rates of growth in an acylindrically hyperbolic group, 2023.
29. Koji Fujiwara and Zlil Sela, The rates of growth in a hyperbolic group, Inventiones mathematicae (2023).
30. Mikhael Gromov, Hyperbolic groups, Springer, 1987.
31. Radhika Gupta, Kasia Jankiewicz, and Thomas Ng, Groups acting on CAT(0) cube complexes with uniform exponential growth, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **23** (2023), no. 1, 13–42.
32. Mark Hagen, Non-colorable hierarchically hyperbolic groups, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **33** (2023), no. 2, 337–350. MR 4581212
33. Mark F Hagen and Harry Petyt, Projection complexes and quasimedian maps, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **22** (2023), no. 7, 3277–3304.
34. Suzhen Han, Hoang Thanh Nguyen, and Wenyuan Yang, Property (QT) of 3-manifold groups, arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03361 (2021).
35. Pierre De La Harpe, Uniform growth in groups of exponential growth, Geometriae Dedicata **95** (2002), no. 1, 1–17.
36. Sam Hughes, Lattices in a product of trees, hierarchically hyperbolic groups and virtual torsion-freeness, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **54** (2022), no. 4, 1413–1419. MR 4488315
37. Nikolai V Ivanov, Subgroups of Teichmuller modular groups, vol. 115, American Mathematical Soc., 1992.
38. Aditi Kar and Michah Sageev, Uniform exponential growth for CAT(0) square complexes, Algebraic & Geometric Topology **19** (2019), no. 3, 1229–1245.
39. Alice Kerr, Product set growth in mapping class groups, arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12643 (2021).
40. Malik Koubi, Croissance uniforme dans les groupes hyperboliques, Annales de l'institut Fourier, vol. 48, 1998, pp. 1441–1453.
41. Robert P. Kropholler, Rylee Alanza Lyman, and Thomas Ng, Extensions of hyperbolic groups have locally uniform exponential growth, 2020.
42. Roger C Lyndon, Paul E Schupp, RC Lyndon, and PE Schupp, Combinatorial group theory, vol. 188, Springer, 1977.
43. Johanna Mangahas, Uniform uniform exponential growth of subgroups of the mapping class group, Geometric and Functional Analysis **19** (2010), no. 5, 1468–1480.
44. Jason Fox Manning, Quasi-actions on trees and property (QFA), Journal of the London Mathematical Society **73** (2006), no. 1, 84–108.
45. Denis Osin, The entropy of solvable groups, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **23** (2003), no. 3, 907–918.
46. ———, Acylindrically hyperbolic groups, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **368** (2016), no. 2, 851–888.

47. Alexander A. Razborov, A product theorem in free groups, Ann. of Math. (2) **179** (2014), no. 2, 405–429. MR 3152939
48. S. R. Safin, Powers of subsets of free groups, Mat. Sb. **202** (2011), no. 11, 97–102. MR 2907200
49. Jean-Pierre Serre, Trees., Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York,,, 1980, Translated from the French by John Stillwell. MR 607504
50. Peter B Shalen and Philip Wagreich, Growth rates, $\mathbb{Z}_p$-homology, and volumes of hyperbolic 3-manifolds, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **331** (1992), no. 2, 895–917.
51. Alessandro Sisto, What is a hierarchically hyperbolic space?, Beyond hyperbolicity, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 454, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2019, pp. 117–148. MR 3966608
52. John S Wilson, On exponential growth and uniformly exponential growth for groups, Inventiones mathematicae **155** (2004), no. 2, 287–303.
53. Henry Wilton and Pavel Zalesskii, Profinite properties of graph manifolds, Geom. Dedicata **147** (2010), 29–45. MR 2660565
54. Daniel T Wise, Complete square complexes, Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici **82** (2007), no. 4, 683–724.
55. Xiangdong Xie, Growth of relatively hyperbolic groups, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **135** (2007), no. 3, 695–704.

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China P.R.
*Email address*: 1901110024@pku.edu.cn

Beijing International Center for Mathematical Research, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China P.R.
*Email address*: wyang@math.pku.edu.cn