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#### Abstract

Let $G$ be a random torsion-free nilpotent group generated by two random words of length $\ell$ in $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$. Letting $\ell$ grow as a function of $n$, we analyze the step of $G$, which is bounded by the step of $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$. We prove a conjecture of Delp, Dymarz, and Schaffer-Cohen, that the threshold function for full step is $\ell=n^{2}$.
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## 1. Introduction

A group $G$ is nilpotent if its lower central series,

$$
G=G_{0} \geq G_{1} \geq \cdots \geq G_{r}=\{1\}
$$

defined by $G_{i+1}=\left[G, G_{i}\right]$, eventually terminates. The first index $r$ for which $G_{r}=\{1\}$ is called the step of $G$. One may ask what a generic nilpotent group looks like, including its step. Questions about generic properties of groups can be answered with random groups, first introduced by Gromov [5]. Since Gromov's original few relators and density models are nilpotent with probability 0 , they cannot tell us about generic properties of nilpotent groups. Thus, there is a need for new random group models that are nilpotent by construction.

Delp, et al. (2019) [3] introduced a model for random nilpotent groups, motivated by the observation that any finitely generated torsion-free nilpotent group can be embedded in the group $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$ of $n \times n$ upper triangular integer matrices with ones on the diagonal [4]. Note that, since any finitely generated nilpotent group contains a torsion-free subgroup of finite index, we are not losing much by restricting our attention to torsion-free groups. (Another model is considered in [2]).

We construct a random subgroup of $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$ as follows. Let $E_{i, j}$ be the elementary matrix with 1 's on the diagonal, a 1 at position $(i, j)$ and 0 's elsewhere. Then $S=\left\{E_{i, i+1}^{ \pm 1}: 1 \leq i<n\right\}$ forms the standard generating set for $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$. We call the entries at positions $(i, i+1)$ the superdiagonal entries. Define a random walk of length $\ell$ to be a product

$$
V=V_{1} V_{2} \ldots V_{\ell}
$$

where each $V_{i}$ is chosen independently and uniformly from $S$. Let $V$ and $W$ be two independent random walks of length $\ell$. Then $G=\langle V, W\rangle$ is a random subgroup of $U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})$. We have $\operatorname{step}(G) \leq \operatorname{step}\left(U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})\right)$, and it is not hard to check that $\operatorname{step}\left(U_{n}(\mathbb{Z})\right)=n-1$. If step $(G)=n-1$, we say $G$ has full step.

Now let $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\ell=\ell(n)$ grow as a function of $n$. We say a proposition $P$ holds asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s.) if $\mathbb{P}[P] \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Delp et al. (2019) gave results on the step of $G$, depending on the growth rate of $\ell$ with respect to $n$. Recall that $f=o(g(n))$ means $f(n) / g(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $f=\omega(g(n))$ means $f(n) / g(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.1 (Delp-Dymarz-Schaffer-Cohen). Let $n, \ell(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $G=\langle V, W\rangle$ where $V, W$ are independent random walks of length $\ell$. Then:
(1) If $\ell(n)=o(\sqrt{n})$ then a.a.s. $\operatorname{step}(G)=1$, i.e. $G$ is abelian.
(2) If $\ell(n)=o\left(n^{2}\right)$ then a.a.s. step $(G)<n-1$.
(3) If $\ell(n)=\omega\left(n^{3}\right)$ then a.a.s. step $(G)=n-1$, i.e. $G$ has full step.

In this paper we close the gap between cases 2 and 3 .
Theorem 1.2. Let $n, \ell(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $G=\langle V, W\rangle$. If $\ell(n)=\omega\left(n^{2}\right)$ then a.a.s. $G$ has full step.

To prove this requires a careful analysis of the nested commutators that generate $G_{n-1}$. In Section 1, we give a combinatorial criterion for a nested commutator of $V$ 's and $W$ 's to be nontrivial. In Section 2, we show this criterion is satisfied asymptotically almost surely when $V, W$ are random walks.

## 2. Nested commutators

Let $G=G_{0} \geq G_{1} \geq \ldots$ be the lower central series of $G$. We have

$$
G_{i}=\left[G, G_{i-1}\right]=[G,[G, \ldots,[G, G] \ldots]]
$$

In particular, $G_{i}$ includes all $i+1$-fold nested commutators of elements of $G$. We restrict our attention to commutators where each factor is $V$ or $W$.

Let $\{0,1\}^{d}$ be the $d$-dimensional cube, or the set of all length $d$ binary vectors. For $x \in\{0,1\}^{d}, y \in\{0,1\}^{e}$ we define the norm $N(x)=\sum_{1 \leq i \leq d} x_{i}$ and the concatenation $x y \in\{0,1\}^{d+e}$. For example if $x=(1,0,0)$ and $y=(0,1)$ then $x y=(1,0,0,0,1)=10^{3} 1$.

We define a family of maps $C_{d}:\{0,1\}^{d} \rightarrow G_{d}$ as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{1}(1) & =V \\
C_{1}(0) & =W \\
C_{d}(1 x) & =\left[V, C_{d-1}(x)\right] \\
C_{d}(0 x) & =\left[W, C_{d-1}(x)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus for example, $C_{5}\left(10^{3} 1\right)=C_{5}(10001)=[V,[W,[W,[W, V]]]]$. We omit the subscript $d$ when it is obvious. To prove $G$ has full step, it suffices to find an $x \in\{0,1\}^{n-1}$ such that $C(x)$ is nontrivial. We begin with Lemma 2.3 from [3], which gives a recursive formula for the entries of a nested commutator.
Lemma 2.1. Let $a \in\{0,1\}, x \in\{0,1\}^{d-1}$. Then $C(a x) \in G_{d}$ and we have

$$
C(a x)_{i, i+d}=C(a)_{i, i+1} C(x)_{i+1, i+d}-C(a)_{i+d-1, i+d} C(x)_{i, i+d-1}
$$

and furthermore $C(a x)_{i, j}=0$ for $j<i+d$.
In particular, for $d=n-1$ only the upper rightmost entry $C(a x)_{1, n}$ can be nonzero.

From the formula, it is clear that $C(a x)_{i, i+d}$ is a degree- $d$ polynomial in the superdiagonal entries of $V$ and $W$. Let us state this more precisely and analyze the coefficients of the polynomial.

Lemma 2.2. Let $d \geq 1$. There exists a function $K_{d}:\{0,1\}^{d} \times\{0,1\}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq n-d$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(x)_{i, i+d}=\sum_{\substack{y \in\{0,1\}^{d} \\ N(y)=N(x)}} K_{d}(x, y) \prod_{i \leq j<i+d} V_{j, j+1}^{y_{j}} W_{j, j+1}^{1-y_{j}} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, setting $K_{d}(x, y)=0$ for $N(x) \neq N(y)$ we have a recursion

$$
K_{d}(a x, b y c)=K_{1}(a, b) K_{d-1}(x, y c)-K_{1}(a, c) K_{d-1}(x, b y)
$$

with base cases

$$
\begin{aligned}
& K_{1}(0,0)=K_{1}(1,1)=1 \\
& K_{1}(0,1)=K_{1}(1,0)=0
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $K_{d}(x, y)$ does not depend on $i$. We also drop the subscript $d$ since it can be inferred from $x$ and $y$.
Proof. Abbreviate

$$
U(i, d, y):=\prod_{i \leq j<i+d} V_{j, j+1}^{y_{j}} W_{j, j+1}^{1-y_{j}}
$$

We first prove inductively that there exist coefficients $K_{d}:\{0,1\}^{d} \times\{0,1\}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$
C(x)_{i, i+d}=\sum_{y \in\{0,1\}^{d}} K_{d}(x, y) U(i, d, y)
$$

The case $d=1$ is trivial. Assume it holds for $d-1$. Let $a \in\{0,1\}$ and $x \in$ $\{0,1\}^{d-1}$, then we have

$$
C(a x)_{i, i+d}=C(a)_{i, i+1} C(x)_{i+1, i+d}-C(a)_{i+d-1, i+d} C(x)_{i, i+d-1}
$$

Expanding $C(a)_{i, i+1}$ and $C(x)_{i+1, i+d}$, the first term is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\left[K_{1}(a, 1) V_{i, i+1}+K_{1}(a, 0) W_{i, i+1}\right]\left[\sum_{y \in\{0,1\}^{d-1}} K_{d-1}(x, y) U(i+1, d-1, y)\right] \\
& =\sum_{y \in\{0,1\}^{d-1}} K_{1}(a, 1) K_{d-1}(x, y) U(i, d, 1 y)+K_{1}(a, 0) K_{d-1}(x, y) U(i, d, 0 y) \\
& =\sum_{\substack{b, c \in\{0,1\} \\
y^{\prime} \in\{0,1\}^{d-2}}} K_{1}(a, b) K_{d-1}\left(x, y^{\prime} c\right) U\left(i, d, b y^{\prime} c\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the second term is

$$
=\sum_{\substack{b, c \in\{0,1\} \\ y^{\prime} \in\{0,1\}^{d-2}}} K_{1}(a, c) K_{d-1}\left(x, b y^{\prime}\right) U\left(i, d, b y^{\prime} c\right)
$$

Combining, we get

$$
C(a x)_{i, i+d}=\sum_{\substack{b, c \in\{0,1\} \\ y \in\{0,1\}^{d-2}}}\left[K_{1}(a, b) K_{d-1}(x, y c)-K_{1}(a, c) K_{d-1}(x, b y)\right] U(i, d, b y c)
$$

and setting $K_{d}(a x, b y c)=K_{1}(a, b) K_{d-1}(x, y c)-K_{1}(a, c) K_{d-1}(x, b y)$, the lemma is proved for $d$. It is also easy to see inductively that $K_{d}(x, y)=0$ for $N(x) \neq$ $N(y)$, so we may add the condition $N(x)=N(y)$ under the sum.

We now have a strategy for choosing $x \in\{0,1\}^{n-1}$ such that $C(x)$ is nontrivial. In the random model, it may happen that $V_{i, i+1}=0$ for some $i$. Define the vector $v \in\{0,1\}^{n-1}$ by $v_{i}=1$ if $V_{i, i+1} \neq 0$ and $v_{i}=0$ otherwise. For now assume $0<N(v)<n-1$. If we choose $x$ such that $N(x)=N(v)$, then Equation 1 simplifies to

$$
C_{n-1}(x)_{1, n}=K_{d}(x, v) \prod_{1 \leq i<n} V_{i, i+1}^{v_{i}} W_{i, i+1}^{1-v_{i}} .
$$

If we assume there is no $i$ such that $V_{i, i+1}=W_{i, i+1}=0$, the product of matrix entries is nonzero. So, we just need to choose $x$ such that $K_{d}(x, v) \neq 0$. We can do this with some additional assumptions on $v$.
Lemma 2.3. Let $v \in\{0,1\}^{n-1}$ with $0<N(v)<n-1$. Writev $=1^{a_{1}} 01^{a_{2}} \ldots 1^{a_{k}-1} 01^{a_{k}}$. Assume that $a_{i} \geq 1$ for all i, i.e., there are no adjacent 0 's, and that $a_{1} \neq a_{k}$. Then there exists $x \in\{0,1\}^{n-1}$ such that $K(x, v) \neq 0$.

We will prove in section 2 that all assumptions used hold asymptotically almost surely.

Proof. Using the recursion from Lemma 2.2, the following identities are easily verified by induction:
(1) If $a, b \geq 0$, then

$$
K\left(1^{a+b} 0,1^{a} 01^{b}\right)=\binom{a+b}{a}(-1)^{b}
$$

(2) If $a, b \geq 1, c \geq 0$ with $c<\min (a, b)$, then

$$
K\left(1^{c} 0 x, 1^{a} y 1^{b}\right)=0
$$

(3) Let $a, b \geq 0$. If $a<b$ then

$$
K\left(1^{a} 0 x, 1^{a} 0 y 1^{b}\right)=K\left(x, y 1^{b}\right)
$$

If $b<a$ then

$$
K\left(1^{b} 0 x, 1^{a} y 01^{b}\right)=K\left(x, 1^{a} y\right)(-1)^{b+1}
$$

(4) If $a, b \geq 0$ then

$$
K\left(1^{a+b} 0^{2} x, 1^{a} 01 y 101^{b}\right)=2\binom{a+b}{a}(-1)^{b} K(x, 1 y 1)
$$

Let $v=1^{a_{1}} 01^{a_{2}} \ldots 01^{a_{k}}$. First assume $k=2 \ell$ is even. We set

$$
x=1^{a_{1}+a_{2 \ell}} 0^{2} 1^{a_{2}+a_{2 \ell-1}} 0^{2} \ldots 1^{a_{\ell}+a_{\ell+1}} 0
$$

Then applying identity 4 repeatedly followed by identity 1 , we obtain

$$
K(x, v)=2^{\ell}(-1)^{a_{2 \ell}+a_{2 \ell-1}+\cdots+a_{\ell+1}}\binom{a_{1}+a_{2 \ell+1}}{a_{1}}\binom{a_{2}+a_{2 \ell}}{a_{2}} \ldots\binom{a_{\ell}+a_{\ell+1}}{a_{\ell}}
$$

If $k$ is odd, we apply identity 3 once and proceed as before.

## 3. Asymptotics

In Section 1, we derived a combinatorial condition on the superdiagonal entries of $V$ and $W$ sufficient for $G$ to have full step. Define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V} & =\left\{i: 1 \leq i<n, V_{i, i+1}=0\right\} \\
\mathcal{W} & =\left\{i: 1 \leq i<n, W_{i, i+1}=0\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, to apply Lemma 2.3 , we need that
(1) $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are nonempty.
(2) $\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{W}=\emptyset$.
(3) $\mathcal{V}$ has no adjacent elements.
(4) $\min \mathcal{V} \neq n-\max \mathcal{V}$.

If condition (1) does not hold, then Theorem 1.2 follows by a modification of Lemma 5.4 in [3].

We now show that in the random model, if $\ell=\omega\left(n^{2}\right)$, then the superdiagonal entries satisfy conditions (2)-(4) asymptotically almost surely. Recall that $V$ and $W$ are random walks

$$
\begin{aligned}
V & =V_{1} V_{2} \ldots V_{\ell} \\
W & =W_{1} W_{2} \ldots W_{\ell}
\end{aligned}
$$

where each $V_{i}, W_{i}$ is chosen independently and uniformly from the generating set $S=\left\{E_{i, i+1}^{ \pm 1}: 1 \leq i<n\right\}$.

Define

$$
\sigma_{j}(Z)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
1 & \text { if } Z=E_{j, j+1} \\
-1 & \text { if } Z=E_{j, j+1}^{-1} \\
0 & \text { otherwise }
\end{array} .\right.
$$

Then we have

$$
V_{i, i+1}=\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \sigma_{i}\left(V_{j}\right)
$$

When $\ell \gg n$, the superdiagonal entries $V_{i, i+1}$ behave roughly like independent random walks on $\mathbb{Z}$. We restate Corollary 3.2 from [3].

Lemma 3.1. Suppose $\ell=\omega(n)$. Then uniformly for $1 \leq k_{1}<k_{2}<\cdots<k_{d}<n$ we have

$$
\mathbb{P}\left[k_{i} \in \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{W} \text { for all } i\right] \sim\left(\frac{n}{2 \pi \ell}\right)^{d}
$$

By the union bound, we have $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{W} \neq \emptyset] \ll n^{2} / \ell \rightarrow 0$. Thus, condition (2) holds a.a.s. For conditions (3) and (4), we will need a bound on the size of $\nu$.

Lemma 3.2. Fix $\epsilon>0$. Then $\mathbb{P}[|\mathcal{V}|>\epsilon \sqrt{n}] \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
Proof. Define random variables

$$
X_{i}= \begin{cases}1 & V(i, i+1)=0 \\ 0 & V(i, i+1) \neq 0\end{cases}
$$

So $|\mathcal{V}|=\sum_{i} X_{i}$. From Lemma 3.1 we have $\mathbb{E}\left[X_{i}\right] \ll \sqrt{n / \ell}$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[X_{i} X_{j}\right] \ll$ $n / \ell$ for $1 \leq i<j<n$. Hence $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V}|] \ll \sqrt{n^{3} / \ell}$ and $\operatorname{Var}[|\mathcal{V}|] \ll n^{3} / \ell$. By Chebyshev's inequality,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[|\mathcal{V}| \geq \epsilon \sqrt{n}] & \leq \mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{V}|-\sqrt{n^{3} / \ell} \geq \sqrt{n}\left(\epsilon-\sqrt{n^{2} / \ell}\right)\right] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\left(\epsilon-\sqrt{n^{2} / \ell}\right)^{2}\left(\ell / n^{2}\right)} \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that the distribution of $\mathcal{V}$ is invariant under permutation. In other words, for a fixed set $\mathcal{S} \subset\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and a permutation $\pi$ on $\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ we have

$$
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{S}]=\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{V}=\pi \mathcal{S}]
$$

and hence,

$$
\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{V}=\mathcal{S}]=\frac{1}{\binom{n-1}{|\mathcal{S}|}} \mathbb{P}[|V|=|\mathcal{S}|]
$$

Let $A(k)$ be the number of sets $\mathcal{S} \subset\{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ of size $k$ with at least one pair of adjacent elements. We have

$$
A(k) \leq(n-2)\binom{n-3}{k-2}
$$

Let $B(k)$ be the number of sets $\mathcal{S}$ for which $\min \mathcal{S}=n-\max \mathcal{S}$. Summing over the possible values of $\min \mathcal{S}$ we have

$$
B(k) \leq \sum_{1 \leq a \leq n / 2}\binom{n-1-2 a}{k-2}
$$

One easily checks

$$
\frac{A(k)+B(k)}{\binom{n-1}{k}} \leq \frac{2 k^{2}}{n}
$$

For $k \leq \epsilon \sqrt{n}$, this is $\leq 2 \epsilon^{2}$. On the other hand, $\mathbb{P}[|V|>\epsilon \sqrt{n}] \rightarrow 0$, so we are done.
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