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#### Abstract

Let $F_{2}$ be a free group on two generators, $F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}$ its first and second derived subgroups. We show that if $w \in F^{(1)} \backslash F^{(2)}$, then the corresponding word map $\operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})^{2} \rightarrow \operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ is surjective. We also describe certain words maps that are surjective on $S L(2, \mathbb{C})$.


## 1. Introduction

The surjectivity of word maps on groups became recently a vivid topic: the review on the latest activities may be found in $[\mathrm{Se}],[\mathrm{Ku}],[\mathrm{BGaK}],[\mathrm{KBKP}]$.

Let $w \in F_{d}$ be an element of the free group $F_{d}$ on $d$ generators $g_{1}, \ldots, g_{d}$ :

$$
w=\prod_{i=1}^{n} g_{n_{i}}^{m_{i}}, \quad 1 \leq n_{i} \leq d
$$

For a group $G$ by the same letter $w$ we shall denote the corresponding word map $w: G^{d} \rightarrow G$ defined as a non-commutative product by the formula

$$
w\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d}\right)=\prod_{i=1}^{k} x_{n_{i}}^{m_{i}}
$$

We call $w\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d}\right)$ both $a$ word in $d$ letters if considered as an element of a free group and a word map in d letters if considered as the corresponding map $G^{d} \rightarrow G$.

We assume that it is reduced, i.e. $n_{i} \neq n_{i+1}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $m_{i} \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Let $k$ be a field and $G=H(k)$ a connected semisimple algebraic linear group. Then the image

$$
w_{G}:=w\left(G^{d}\right)=\left\{z \in G: z=w\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d}\right) \text { for some }\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d}\right) \in G^{d}\right\}
$$

is a Zariski dense subset of $H(k)$ if the word $w$ is not identity ( ([Bo],[La]).
In $[\mathrm{Ku}]$ formulated is the following Question.
Question 2.1 (i). Assume that $w$ is not a power of another reduced word and $G=H(k)$ a connected semisimple algebraic linear group.

Is $w$ surjective when $k=\mathbb{C}$ is a field of complex numbers and $H$ is of adjoint type?
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According to $[\mathrm{Ku}]$, Question $2.1(\mathrm{i})$ is still open, even in the simplest case $G=$ $P S L(2, C)$, even for words in two letters.

We consider word maps in two letters on groups $G=S L(2, \mathbb{C})$ and $\tilde{G}=P S L(2, \mathbb{C})$. Put $F:=F_{2}$. We describe certain words $w \in F$ such that the corresponding word maps are surjective on $G$ and/or $\tilde{G}$.

If $w(x, y)=x^{n}$ then $w$ is surjective on $G$ if and only if $n$ is odd (see ([Ch1],[Ch2]). Indeed, the element

$$
x=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
-1 & 1 \\
0 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

is not a square in $S L(2, \mathbb{C})$. Since only the elements with $\operatorname{tr}(x)=-2$ may be outside $w_{G}$ ([Ch1],[Ch2]), the induced by $w$ map $\tilde{w}$ is surjective on $\tilde{G}$.

Assume that a word map $w(x, y): G^{2} \rightarrow G$ is defined by the formula

$$
w(x, y)=\prod_{i=1}^{k} x^{a_{i}} y^{b_{i}} .
$$

We call $w_{i}=x^{a_{i}} y^{b_{i}}$ a syllable of $w$ and $k$ the complexity of $w$.
We will use the following notation:

- $\mathbb{C}_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}}^{n}$ n-dimensional complex affine space with coordinates $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}$;
- $s=\operatorname{tr}(x), t=\operatorname{tr}(y), u=\operatorname{tr}(x y)$, for two matrices $x, y \in G=S L(2, \mathbb{C})$;
- $\pi: G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{s, t, u}^{3}$, is a map $\pi(x, y)=(\operatorname{tr}(x), \operatorname{tr}(y), \operatorname{tr}(x y))$.

$$
i d=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right] .
$$

For every word $w(x, y): G^{2} \rightarrow G$ defined are the trace polynomials $P_{w}(s, t, u)=$ $\operatorname{tr}(w(x, y))$ and $Q_{w}=\operatorname{tr}(w(x, y) y)$ in three variables $s=\operatorname{tr}(x), t=\operatorname{tr}(y), u=\operatorname{tr}(x y)$. ([FK], [Go],[Vo]).

In other words, the maps

$$
\varphi_{w}: G^{2} \rightarrow G^{2}, \varphi_{w}(x, y)=(w(x, y), y)
$$

and

$$
\psi_{w}: \mathbb{C}_{s, t, u}^{3} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{s, t, u}^{3}, \psi_{w}(s, t, u)=\left(P_{w}(s, t, u), t, Q_{w}(s, t, u)\right)
$$

may be included into the following commutative diagram:

\[

\]

For details, one can be referred to ([BGK],[BGaK]).

This diagram immediately implies
Lemma 1.1. For every word $w(x, y) \neq i d$ the image $w(G)$ contains every semi-simple element $z \in G$ with $a=\operatorname{tr}(z) \neq \pm 2$.
Proof. Indeed, let

$$
\Sigma=\left\{(s, t, u) \mid P_{w}(s, t, u)=\operatorname{tr}(z)=a\right\} .
$$

Since $\Sigma \neq \emptyset$, and $\pi$ is a surjective map ([Go]), there is a pair $\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right) \in G^{2}$ such that $\operatorname{tr}\left(w\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right)=a$. Since $a \neq \pm 2, z$ is conjugate to $z_{0}=w\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right):$ there is $v \in G$ such that $v z_{0} v^{-1}=z$. Hence $w\left(v x_{0} v^{-1}, v y_{0} v^{-1}\right)=z$.

Thus, in order to check whether the word map $w$ is surjective on $G$ (or on $\tilde{G}$ ) it is sufficient to check whether the elements $z$ with $\operatorname{tr}(z)= \pm 2$ (or the elements $z$ with $\operatorname{tr}(z)=2$, respectively) are in the image.

## 2. Surjectivity on $\operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$

Consider a word map $w(x, y)=x^{a_{1}} y^{b_{1}} \ldots x^{a_{k}} y^{b_{k}}$, where $a_{i} \neq 0$ and $b_{i} \neq 0$, for all $i=1, \ldots, k$. Denote $A(w)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_{i}, B(w)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_{i}$. Let $\tilde{w}: \tilde{G}^{2} \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ be the induced word map on $\tilde{G}$.

Assume that $A:=A(w) \neq 0$. Then the word map $w_{A}(x, y)=x^{A}$ is surjective on $\tilde{G}$. Thus, considering pairs $\{(x, i d)\}$ we get that $\tilde{w}\left(\tilde{G}^{2}\right)=\tilde{G}$. Similarly, if $B:=B(w) \neq 0$, we have $\tilde{w}\left(\tilde{G}^{2}\right)=\tilde{G}$.

If $A(w)=B(w)=0$, then $w \in F^{(1)}=[F, F]$. Since $F^{(1)}$ is a free group generated by elements $w_{n, m}=\left[x^{n}, y^{m}\right], n \neq 0, m \neq 0$ ([Ser], Chapter $\left.1, \S 1.3\right)$, the word $w$ with $A(w)=B(w)=0$ may be written as a (noncommutative) product ( with $s_{i} \neq 0$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
w=\prod_{1}^{r} w_{n_{i}, m_{i}}^{s_{i}} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the shortest (reduced) representation of this kind is unique. We denote by $S_{w}(n, m)$ the number of appearances of $w_{n, m}$ in representation (2) of $w$ and by $R_{w}(n, m)$ the sum of exponents at all the appearances. We denote by $\operatorname{Supp}(w)$ the set of all pairs $(n, m)$ such that $w_{n, m}$ appears in the product. For example, if $w=$ $w_{1,1} w_{2,2}^{5} w_{1,1}^{-1}$, then

$$
\operatorname{Supp}(w)=\{(1,1),(2,2)\} ; S_{w}(1,1)=2, S_{w}(2,2)=1, R_{w}(1,1)=0, R_{w}(2,2)=5 .
$$

The subgroup

$$
F^{(2)}=\left[F^{(1)}, F^{(1)}\right]=\left\{w \in F^{(1)} \mid R_{w}(n, m)=0 \text { for all }(n, m) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)\right\} .
$$

Example 2.1. The Engel word $e_{n}=\underbrace{[\ldots[x, y], y], \ldots y]}_{n \text { times }}$ belongs to $F^{(1)} \backslash F^{(2)}$ (see also [ET]).

Indeed, the direct computation shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y w_{n, m}=y x^{n} y^{m} x^{-n} y^{-m}=y x^{n} y^{-1} x^{-n} \cdot x^{n} y y^{m} x^{-n} y^{-m} y^{-1} \cdot y=w_{n, 1}^{-1} w_{n, m+1} y, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

(4) $y w_{n, m}^{-1}=y \cdot y^{m} x^{n} y^{-m} x^{-n}=y^{(m+1)} x^{n} y^{-(m+1)} x^{-n} \cdot x^{n} y x^{-n} y^{-1} \cdot y=w_{n, m+1}^{-1} w_{n, 1} y$.

Let us prove by induction that $\left|R_{e_{n}}(1, n)\right|=1, S_{e_{n}}(1, n)=1$ and $S_{e_{n}}(r, m)=0$ if $r \neq 1$ or $m>n$.

Indeed $e_{1}=w_{1,1}$. Assume that the claim is valid for all $k \leq n$. We have $e_{n+1}=$ $e_{n} y e_{n}^{-1} y^{-1}$. Using (3), (4) me can move $y$ toward $y^{-1}$, changing places of $y$ with its right neighbour $w_{1, m}$, one change at each step. By induction assumption, only $w_{1, m}$ appear in $e_{n}$, and for all of them but one $m<n$. Thus at each step we will get factors $w_{1, m+1}$ and $w_{1,1}$ with appropriate powers, and at each step but one $m<n$. There will be precisely one change with $w_{1, n}$ which will provide precisely one appearance of $w_{1, n+1}$. At the last step we will get product of words of type $w_{1, m}$ with proper powers and $y \cdot y^{-1}$ at the end. Thus the claim will remain to be valid for $n+1$.
Theorem 2.2. The word map defined by a word $w \in F^{(1)} \backslash F^{(2)}$ is surjective on $P S L(2, \mathbb{C})$.
Remark 2.3. In $[\mathrm{ET}]$ the words from $F^{(1)} \backslash F^{(2)}$ are proved to be surjective on $S U(n) \times S U(n)$.
Proof. We have only to prove that a matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & K  \tag{5}\\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

for a non-zero $K \neq 0$ is in the image.
Let us take

$$
\begin{align*}
& x=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda & c \\
0 & \frac{1}{\lambda}
\end{array}\right),  \tag{6}\\
& y=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu & d \\
0 & \frac{1}{\mu}
\end{array}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{align*}
x^{n} & =\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{n} & c \cdot h_{|n|}(\lambda) \operatorname{sgn}(n) \\
0 & \frac{1}{\lambda^{n}}
\end{array}\right),  \tag{8}\\
y^{m} & =\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mu^{m} & d \cdot h_{|m|}(\mu) \operatorname{sgn}(m) \\
0 & \frac{1}{\mu^{m}}
\end{array}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

Here $s g n$ is the signum function, and (see [BG], Lemma 5.2)

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{n}(\zeta)=\frac{\zeta^{2 n}-1}{\zeta^{n-1}\left(\zeta^{2}-1\right)} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $h_{n}(1)=n$.
Direct computations show that

$$
\begin{gather*}
x^{n} y^{m}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{n} \mu^{m} & d \cdot \lambda^{n} \operatorname{sgn}(m) h_{|m|}(\mu)+c \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(n) h_{|n|}(\lambda) \mu^{-m} \\
0 & \lambda^{-n} \mu^{-m}
\end{array}\right) .  \tag{11}\\
x^{-n} y^{-m}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{-n} \mu^{-m} & -d \cdot \lambda^{-n} \operatorname{sgn}(m) h_{|m|}(\mu)-c \cdot \operatorname{sgn}(n) h_{|n|}(\lambda) \mu^{m} \\
0 & \lambda^{n} \mu^{m}
\end{array}\right) . \\
w_{n, m}(x, y)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & f(c, d, n, m,) \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right),
\end{gather*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(c, d, n, m)=c h_{|n|}(\lambda) \operatorname{sgn}(n) \lambda^{n}\left(1-\mu^{2 m}\right)+d h_{|m|}(\mu) \operatorname{sgn}(m) \mu^{m}\left(\lambda^{2 n}-1\right) . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence,

$$
w(x, y)=\prod_{1}^{r} w_{n_{i}, m_{i}}^{s_{i}}(x, y)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & F_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)  \tag{15}\\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
F_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)=\sum_{1}^{r} s_{i} f\left(c, d, n_{i}, m_{i}\right)=c \Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)+d \Psi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)} R_{w}(\alpha, \beta) \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha)\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right) \frac{\left(\lambda^{2|\alpha|}-1\right) \lambda^{\alpha}}{\lambda^{|\alpha|-1}\left(\lambda^{2}-1\right)},  \tag{16}\\
& \Psi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)} R_{w}(\alpha, \beta) \operatorname{sgn}(\beta)\left(\lambda^{2 \alpha}-1\right) \frac{\left(\mu^{2|\beta|}-1\right) \mu^{\beta}}{\mu^{|\beta|-1}\left(\mu^{2}-1\right)} .
\end{align*}
$$

(Since the order of factors in $w$ is not relevant for (16) and (17), we use here $\alpha, \beta$ instead of $n_{i}, m_{i}$ to simplify the formulas ).

The function $F_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)=c \Phi(\lambda, \mu)+d \Psi(\lambda, \mu)$, where $c, d$ may be chosen arbitrary, therefore it is sufficient to prove that at least one of $\Phi(\lambda, \mu)$ or $\Psi(\lambda, \mu)$ is not identically zero.
Lemma 2.4. If $\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu) \equiv 0$ then $R_{w}(\alpha, \beta)=0$ for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)$.
Proof. We use induction by the number of elements $|\operatorname{Supp}(w)|$ in $\operatorname{Supp}(w)$ for the word $w$. If $\operatorname{Supp}(w)$ contains only one pair $(\alpha, \beta)$, then there is nothing to prove:

$$
\Phi(\lambda, \mu)=R_{w}(\alpha, \beta) h_{|\alpha|}(\lambda) \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \lambda^{\alpha}\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right) .
$$

Assume that for words $v$ with $|\operatorname{Supp}(v)|=l$ it is proved. Let $w$ be such a word that $|\operatorname{Supp}(w)|=l+1$.

Let $n:=\max \{\alpha \mid(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)\}$.
Case 1. $n>0$.
We have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)} R_{w}(\alpha, \beta) \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha)\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right) \frac{\left(\lambda^{2|\alpha|}-1\right) \lambda^{\alpha}}{\lambda^{|\alpha|-1}\left(\lambda^{2}-1\right)}= \\
\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)} R_{w}(\alpha, \beta) \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha)\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right) \lambda^{a-|a|+1}\left(1+\lambda^{2}+\cdots+\lambda^{2(|\alpha|-1)}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

It means that the coefficient of $\lambda^{2|n|-1}$ in rational function $\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)$ is

$$
p(\mu)=\sum_{(n, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)} R_{w}(n, \beta)\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right) .
$$

Hence, if $\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu) \equiv 0$, then $p(\mu) \equiv 0$, and all $R_{w}(n, \beta)=0$ for all $\beta$.
That means that $\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\Phi_{v}(\lambda, \mu)$, where $v$ is such a word that may be obtained from $w(x, y)=\prod_{1}^{r} w_{n_{i}, m_{i}}^{s_{i}}(x, y)$ by taking away every appearance of $w_{n, \beta}$ :

$$
v=\prod_{\substack{1 \\ n_{i} \neq n}}^{r} w_{n_{i}, m_{i}}^{s_{i}}(x, y) .
$$

But $|\operatorname{Supp}(v)| \leq l$ and by induction assumption Lemma is valid in this case.
Case 2. $n<0$. Let $-n^{\prime}:=\min \{\alpha \mid(\alpha, \beta) \in \operatorname{Supp}(w)\}$ We proceed as in Case 1 with $-n^{\prime}$ instead of $n$ : the coefficient of $\lambda^{-2 n^{\prime}+1}$ is $q(\mu)=\sum_{\left(-n^{\prime}, \beta\right) \in S u p p(w)} R_{w}\left(-n^{\prime}, \beta\right)\left(1-\mu^{2 \beta}\right)$. If $\Phi_{w}(\lambda, \mu) \equiv 0$, then $q(\mu) \equiv 0$, and all $R_{w}\left(-n^{\prime}, \beta\right)=0$ for all $\beta$. Once more, we may replace $w$ by a word $v$ with $|\operatorname{Supp}(v)| \leq l$.

We have proven, that if $w \notin F^{(2)}$ and $x, y$ are defined by (6),(7), then

$$
w(x, y)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & F_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu) \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $F_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)$ is not an identically zero function. Thus, there are elements of the form

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & K \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

for a $K \neq 0$ in the image $w\left(G^{2}\right)$.

## 3. Surjectivity on $S L(2, \mathbb{C})$

We maintain notation of Section 2.
Lemma 3.1. Assume that $w=x^{a_{1}} y^{b_{1}} \ldots x^{a_{k}} y^{b_{k}}, \quad a_{i} \neq 0, \quad b_{i} \neq 0, i+1, \ldots, k A=$ $\sum a_{i} \neq 0$ or $B=\sum b_{i} \neq 0$ and $x, y$ are defined by (6), (7) respectively. Then

$$
w(x, y)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{A} \mu^{B} & \tilde{F}_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)  \tag{18}\\
0 & \lambda^{-A} \mu^{-B}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where

$$
\tilde{F}_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)=c \tilde{\Phi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)+d \tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{\Phi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{i}\right) h_{\left|a_{i}\right|}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j<i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda^{\sum_{j>i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j \geq i} b_{i}}}  \tag{19}\\
& \tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{i}\right) h_{\left|b_{i}\right|}(\mu) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j \leq i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda^{\sum_{j>i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j>i} b_{i}}}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. We use induction on the complexity $k$ of the word $w$. Using (11), we get

$$
x^{a_{1}} y^{b_{1}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{a_{1}} \mu^{b_{1}} & d \cdot \lambda^{a_{1}} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{1}\right) h_{\left|b_{1}\right|}(\mu)+c \cdot \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{1}\right) h_{\left|a_{1}\right|}(\lambda) \mu^{-b_{1}}  \tag{21}\\
0 & \lambda^{-a_{1}} \mu^{-b_{1}}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Thus for $k=1$ the Lemma is valid. Assume that it is valid for $k^{\prime}<k$. Let $u=x^{a_{1}} y^{b_{1}} \ldots x^{a_{k-1}} y^{b_{k-1}}$ and $w=u x^{a_{k}} y^{b_{k}}$.

By induction assumption,

$$
u(x, y)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{A-a_{k}} \mu^{B-b_{k}} & \tilde{F}_{u}(c, d, \lambda, \mu) \\
0 & \lambda^{-A+a_{k}} \mu^{-B+b_{k}}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

From (11) we get

$$
x^{a_{k}} y^{b_{k}}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\lambda^{a_{k}} \mu^{b_{k}} & d \cdot \lambda^{a_{k}} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{k}\right) h_{\left|b_{k}\right|}(\mu)+c \cdot \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{k}\right) h_{\left|a_{k}\right|}(\lambda) \mu^{-b_{k}} \\
0 & \lambda^{-a_{k}} \mu^{-b_{k}}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Multiplying matrices $u$ and $x^{a_{k}} y^{b_{k}}$ we get
$\tilde{F}_{w}(c, d, \lambda, \mu)=\lambda^{A-a_{k}} \mu^{B-b_{k}}\left(d \cdot \lambda^{a_{k}} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{k}\right) h_{\left|b_{k}\right|}(\mu)+c \cdot \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{k}\right) h_{\left|a_{k}\right|}(\lambda) \mu^{-b_{k}}\right)+\tilde{F}_{u}(c, d, \lambda, \mu) \lambda^{-a_{k}} \mu^{-b_{k}}$.
Thus, the induction assumption implies that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tilde{\Phi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{k}\right) h_{\left|a_{k}\right|}(\lambda) \mu^{-b_{k}} \lambda^{A-a_{k}} \mu^{B-b_{k}}+\sum_{1}^{k-1} \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{i}\right) h_{\left|a_{i}\right|}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j<i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda^{\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j=i}^{k} b_{i}}} \\
=\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{i}\right) h_{\left|a_{i}\right|}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j<i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda^{\sum_{j>i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j \geq i} b_{i}}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=\operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{k}\right) h_{\left|b_{k}\right|}(\mu) \lambda^{a_{k}} \lambda^{A-a_{k}} \mu^{B-b_{k}}+\sum_{1}^{k-1} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{i}\right) h_{\left|b_{i}\right|}(\mu) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j \leq i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda^{\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j=i+1}^{k} b_{i}}} \\
=\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{i}\right) h_{\left|a_{i}\right|}(\lambda) \frac{\lambda^{\sum_{j \leq i} a_{i}} \mu^{\sum_{j<i} b_{i}}}{\lambda_{j>i}^{\sum_{j} a_{i}} \mu^{\Sigma_{j>i} b_{i}}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Assume now that for $K \neq 0$ the matrices

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
-1 & K  \tag{22}\\
0 & -1
\end{array}\right)
$$

are not in the image. That means that $\tilde{\Phi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu) \equiv 0$ and $\tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda . \mu) \equiv 0$ on the curve

$$
C=\left\{\lambda^{A} \mu^{B}=-1\right\} \subset \mathbb{C}_{\lambda, \mu}^{2}
$$

Denote:

$$
A_{i}=\sum_{j \leq i} a_{i} ; \quad B_{i}=\sum_{j<i} b_{i} .
$$

Multiplying (19) and (20) by $\lambda^{A} \mu^{B}$ we see that on $C$ the following relations are valid:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{\Phi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=-\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(a_{i}\right) h_{\left|a_{i}\right|}(\lambda) \lambda^{2 A_{i}-a_{i}} \mu^{2 B_{i}}  \tag{23}\\
& \tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda, \mu)=-\sum_{1}^{k} \operatorname{sgn}\left(b_{i}\right) h_{\left|b_{i}\right|}(\mu) \lambda^{2 A_{i}} \mu^{\sum 2 B_{i}+b_{i}} \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\Phi}_{w}(1, \mu)=-\sum_{1}^{k} a_{i} \mu^{2 B_{i}} \\
& \tilde{\Psi}_{w}(\lambda, 1)=-\sum_{1}^{k} b_{i} \lambda^{2 A_{i}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 3.2. Assume that $A \neq 0$ and the word map $w$ is not surjective. Then

$$
\sum_{1}^{k} b_{i} \gamma^{2 A_{i}}=0
$$

for every root $\gamma$ of equation

$$
q(z):=z^{A}+1=0
$$

Assume that
If $B \neq 0$ and the word map $w$ is not surjective, then

$$
\sum_{1}^{k} a_{i} \delta^{2 B_{i}}=0
$$

for every root $\delta$ of equation

$$
p(z):=z^{B}+1=0 .
$$

Proof. Indeed, in these cases, respectively, the pairs $(\gamma, 1)$ and $(1, \delta)$ belong to the curve $C$. We have to use only (27), (26), respectively .

Corollary 3.3. Let $2 B_{i}=k_{i} B+T_{i}$, where $k_{i}$ are integers and $0 \leq T_{i}<B \neq 0$. If $w$ is not surjective, then for every $0 \leq T<B$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i: T_{i}=T} a_{i}(-1)^{k_{i}}=0 \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Indeed in this case

$$
0=\sum_{1}^{k} a_{i} \delta^{2 B_{i}}=\sum_{T=0}^{B-1} \delta^{T}\left(\sum_{i: T_{i}=T} a_{i}(-1)^{k_{i}}\right)
$$

for any root $\delta$ of equation

$$
p(z)=z^{B}+1=0 .
$$

Since $p(z)$ has no multiple roots, it implies that $p(z)$ divides the polynomial

$$
p_{1}(z):=\sum_{T=0}^{B-1} x^{T}\left(\sum_{i: T_{i}=T} a_{i}(-1)^{k_{i}}\right)=0 .
$$

But since degree of $p(z)$ is bigger than degree of $p_{1}(z)$ that can be only if $p_{1}(z) \equiv$ 0.

Corollary 3.4. If all $b_{i}$ are positive, then the word map $w$ is either surjective or the square of another word $v \neq i d$.
Proof. In this case every $0 \leq 2 B_{i}<2 B$. If $w$ is not surjective, $p_{1}(z) \equiv 0$ by Corollary 3.3. Thus for every $0 \leq T<B$ there are at most two indexes $i$ such that $2 B_{i}=k_{i} B+T$, and the corresponding $k_{i}=0$ or $k_{i}=1$. Since $a_{i} \neq 0, p_{1}(z) \equiv 0$ implies that for every $i$ there is $j$ such that $a_{i}-a_{j}=0$ and $T_{i}=T_{j}, 2 B_{i}=2 B_{j}+B$. Since the sequence of $B_{i}$ is increasing, it means that $k=2 l$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
0=2 B_{1}, B=2 B_{l+1} ; \\
B+2 B_{2}=2 B_{l+2} ; \\
\ldots \\
B+2 B_{l}=2 B_{2 l}=2 B-2 b_{k} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Thus, $a_{i}=a_{i+l}$. On the other hand, $b_{s}=B_{s+1}-B_{s}=B_{s+l+1}-B_{s+l}=b_{s+l}$. Therefore the word is the square of $v=x^{a_{1}} y^{b_{1}} \ldots x^{a_{l}} y^{b_{l}}$.

Corollary 3.5. If all $b_{i}$ are negative, then the word map of the word $w$ is either surjective or the square of another word $v \neq i d$.

Proof. We may change $y$ to $z=y^{-1}$ and apply Corollary 3.5 to the word $w(x, z)$.
Corollary 3.6. If all $a_{i}$ are positive, then the word map of the word $w$ is either surjective or the square of another word $v \neq i d$.

Proof. Consider $v=x^{-1}, \quad z=y^{-1}$, a word

$$
w^{\prime}(z, v)=w(x, y)^{-1}=y^{-b_{k}} x^{-a_{k}} \ldots y^{-b_{1}} x^{-a_{1}}=z^{b_{k}} v^{a_{k}} \ldots z^{b_{1}} v^{a_{1}}
$$

and apply Corollary 3.5 to the word $w^{\prime}(z, v)$.

## 4. The word $v(x, y)=[[x,[x, y]],[y[x, y]]]$

In this section we provide an example of a word $v$ that is surjective though it belongs to $F^{(2)}$. The interesting feature of this word is the following: if we consider it as a polynomial in Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s l}_{2},([x, y]$ being the Lie bracket) then it is not surjective ([BGKP], Example 4.9).

Theorem 4.1. The word $v(x, y)=[[x,[x, y]],[y[x, y]]]$ is surjective on $S L(2, \mathbb{C})$ (and, consequently, on $\operatorname{PSL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ ).

Proof. As it was shown in Lemma 1.1, for every $z \in S L(2, \mathbb{C})$ with $\operatorname{tr}(z) \neq \pm 2$ there are $x, y \in S L(2, \mathbb{C})^{2}$ such that $v(x, y)=z$.

Assume now that $a= \pm 2$. We have to show that there are matrices $x, y$ in $S L(2, \mathbb{C})$, such that

$$
v(x, y):=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
q_{11} & q_{12} \\
q_{21} & q_{22}
\end{array}\right)
$$

has the following properties :

- $q_{12}+q_{22}= \pm 2$;
- $q_{12} \neq 0$.

We may look for these pairs among the matrices $x=\left(\begin{array}{ll}0 & b \\ c & d\end{array}\right)$ and $y=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & t \\ 0 & 1\end{array}\right)$.
In the following MAGMA calculations $C=[x, y], D=[[x, y], x], B=[[x, y], y]$, $A=[D, B]$.

Ideal $I$ in the polynomial ring $Q[b, c, d, t]$ is defined by conditions $\operatorname{det}(x)=1, \operatorname{tr}(A)=$ 2. Ideal $J$ in the polynomial ring $Q[b, c, d, t]$ is defined by conditions $\operatorname{det}(x)=1, \operatorname{tr}(A)=$ -2 . These are ideals of affine subsets $T_{+} \subset S L(2)^{2}$ and $T_{-} \subset S L(2)^{2}$ respectively in affine variety $S L(2)^{2}$.

The computations show that $q_{12}$ does not vanish identically on $T_{+}$or $T_{-}$.

```
    > Q:=Rationals();
> R<t,b,c,d>:=PolynomialRing(Q,4);
> X:=Matrix(R,2,2,[0,b,c,d]);
> Y:=Matrix(R,2,2,[ 1,t,0,1]);
> X1:= Matrix(R,2,2,[d,-b,-c,0]);
> Y1:=Matrix(R,2,2,[1,-t,0,1]);
> C:=X*Y*X1*Y1;
> p11:=C[1,1];
> p12:=C[1,2];
> p21:=C[2,1];
> p22:=C[2,2];
> C1:=Matrix(R,2,2,[p22,-p12,-p21,p11]);
> D:=C*X*C1*X1;
>
>
> d11:=D[1,1];
> d12:=D[1,2];
> d21:=D[2,1];
> d22:=D[2,2];
> D1:=Matrix(R,2,2,[d22,-d12,-d21,d11]);
>
> B:=C*Y*C1*Y1;
>
>
> b11:=B[1,1];
> b12:=B[1,2];
> b21:=B[2,1];
> b22:=B[2,2];
> B1:=Matrix(R,2,2,[b22,-b12,-b21,b11]);
>
> A:=D*B*D1*B1;
>
> TA:=Trace(A);
>
> q12:=A[1,2];
> I:=ideal<R|b*c+1,TA-2>;
>
> IsInRadical(q12,I);
false
> J:=ideal<R|b*c+1,TA+2>;
>
> IsInRadical(q12,J);
```

false
>
It follows that the function $q_{12}$ does not vanish identically on the sets $T_{+}$and $T_{-}$, hence, there are pairs with $\operatorname{tr}(v(x, y))=2, v(x, y) \neq i d$, and $\operatorname{tr}(v(x, y))=$ $-2, v(x, y) \neq-i d$.
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