

# Decidability of the Brinkmann Problems for endomorphisms of the free group

André Carvalho\* & Jordi Delgado†

\*Center for Mathematics and Applications (NOVA Math), NOVA FCT

†Departament de Matemàtiques, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya

September 10, 2024

## Abstract

Building on the work of Brinkmann and Logan, we show that both the Brinkmann Problem and the Brinkmann Conjugacy Problem are decidable for endomorphisms of the free group  $\mathbb{F}_n$ .

KEYWORDS: free groups, endomorphisms, Brinkmann problems, orbit-decidability.

MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION 2020: 20E05, 20F05, 20F10.

Let  $\mathbb{N}$  denote the set of natural numbers (including 0), and let  $\mathbb{F}_n$  denote the free group of finite rank  $n$ . In this note, we elaborate on previous work of Brinkmann and Logan to prove the result below.

**Theorem.** *Given two elements  $u, v \in \mathbb{F}_n$  and an endomorphism  $\varphi \in \text{End}(\mathbb{F}_n)$ , it is algorithmically decidable whether:*

- (i) *there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(u)\varphi^k = v$ ;*
- (ii) *there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(u)\varphi^k$  is conjugate to  $v$ .* □

That is, both the *Brinkmann problem* (BrP) and the *Brinkmann Conjugacy Problem* (BrCP) are decidable for endomorphisms of free groups. This result generalizes the analogous claims on automorphisms and monomorphisms of the free group, proved by Brinkmann [Bri10] and Logan [Log23] respectively.

## 1 Background

The study of algorithmic problems for groups dates back to the early twentieth century, when Max Dehn proposed three seminal decision problems (namely, the *word problem*, the *conjugacy problem*, and the *isomorphism problem*) in [Deh11]. The scope of the first two of them is a group  $G$  given by a finite presentation  $\langle X \mid R \rangle$ :

The *Word problem* for  $G$ , denoted by  $WP(G)$ , consists in deciding, given two words  $u, v \in (X^\pm)^*$ , whether they represent the same element in  $G$ .

The *Conjugacy problem* for  $G$ , denoted by  $CP(G)$ , consists in deciding, given  $u, v \in (X^\pm)^*$ , whether they represent conjugate elements in  $G$ .

The problems of this kind (admitting as inputs strings  $w \in \Sigma^*$  in some finite alphabet  $\Sigma$ , and asking whether  $w$  belongs to a certain subset  $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ) are called *decision problems*. A decision problem is said to be *decidable* if there exists an algorithm (formally, a Turing machine) which, on every input  $w$ , outputs YES if  $w \in S$ , and NO if  $w \notin S$ .

It is not difficult to see using Tietze transformations that the outcome of all the problems appearing in this paper does not depend on the chosen presentation. Accordingly, it is common to use the elements of the group and the words representing them (in some presentation) interchangeably, provided that the meaning remains clear from the context.

Natural variations of the previous decision problems soon arose, for example the *Subgroup Membership Problem*, denoted by  $MP(G)$ , consists in deciding, given finitely many words  $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_k$  in  $X^\pm$ , whether the group element represented by  $w_0$  belongs to the subgroup generated in  $G$  by  $w_1, \dots, w_k$ .

Recall that, for an arbitrary group  $G$  and  $g_1, g_2 \in G$ , we say that  $g_1$  is *conjugate* to  $g_2$  (in  $G$ ), and we write  $g_1 \sim g_2$  (or  $g_1 \sim_G g_2$ ), if there exists some element  $h \in G$  such that  $g_1 = h^{-1}g_2h$ . It is routine to check that conjugacy is an equivalence relation in  $G$  whose quotient set, denoted by  $G/\sim$ , does not necessarily inherit the group operation. Also, if  $S \subseteq G$ , we write  $g \sim S$  to mean that  $g \sim h$  for some  $h \in S$ .

In the 1930s, endomorphisms were added to the picture through the now called *Whitehead's orbit problems*: given  $u, v \in (X^\pm)^*$ , decide whether there exists some automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(G)$  such that  $(u)\varphi =_G v$  (resp., whether  $(u)\varphi \sim_G v$ ). If  $G = \langle X \mid R \rangle$ , an endomorphism  $\varphi \in \text{End}(G)$  is given as an input through the set  $(X)\varphi$  of images under  $\varphi$  of the generators for  $G$ .

Although all of the mentioned problems were famously shown to be algorithmically undecidable for a generic finitely presented group in the mid-20th century (see [Nov55; Boo58]), in the context of finitely generated free groups  $\mathbb{F}_n = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \mid - \rangle$ , they are well-known to be decidable:  $WP(\mathbb{F}_n)$  and  $CP(\mathbb{F}_n)$  using elementary arguments involving reduced and cyclically reduced words;  $MP(\mathbb{F}_n)$  using, for example, the nice theory of Stallings automata (see [Sta83; DV24]); and Whitehead orbit problems using the now classical *peak-reduction* technique (see [Whi36]).

## 2 Map orbits and the Brinkmann Problems

At the beginning of the 21st century, equipped with the recently developed theory of relative train track maps ([BH92; BH95]), P. Brinkmann [Bri10] addressed two cyclic variations of the orbit problem for free groups. Concretely, he proved that, given two elements  $u, v \in \mathbb{F}_n$ , and an automorphism  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_n)$ , it is always possible to algorithmically decide whether there exists some exponent  $k$  such that  $u\varphi^k = v$  (resp., whether  $u\varphi^k$  is conjugate to  $v$ ).

Note the ambiguity in the term 'exponent' in the claim above. Is it meant to be an integer? a natural number? does it include zero? Below we specify the different variants that arise,

we clarify the relation between them, and we prove that all of them are algorithmically equivalent in Brinkmann's original context.

**Definition 1.** Let  $G$  be a set, let  $u \in G$ , and let  $\varphi: G \rightarrow G$  be a map. Then,

- the *strict orbit* of  $u$  under  $\varphi$  is  $\text{orb}_\varphi^+(u) = \{u\varphi^k : k > 0\}$ ;
- the (*standard*) *orbit* of  $u$  under  $\varphi$  is  $\text{orb}_\varphi(u) = \{u\varphi^k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ;
- the *strict symmetric orbit* of  $u$  under  $\varphi$  is  $\overline{\text{orb}}_\varphi^+(u) = \{v \in G : v \in \text{orb}_\varphi^+(u) \text{ or } u \in \text{orb}_\varphi^+(v)\}$ ;
- the *symmetric orbit* of  $u$  under  $\varphi$  is  $\overline{\text{orb}}_\varphi(u) = \{v \in G : v \in \text{orb}_\varphi(u) \text{ or } u \in \text{orb}_\varphi(v)\}$ .

Orbits under  $\varphi$  are usually referred as  $\varphi$ -orbits. Note that the symmetric  $\varphi$ -orbit of  $u$  is the union of all the  $\varphi$ -orbits containing  $u$ . Also recall that if  $\varphi$  is bijective then  $\overline{\text{orb}}_\varphi^+(u) = \text{orb}_\varphi^+(u) \cup \text{orb}_{\varphi^{-1}}^+(u) = \{u\varphi^k : k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}\}$ ; and  $\overline{\text{orb}}_\varphi(u) = \text{orb}_\varphi(u) \cup \text{orb}_{\varphi^{-1}}(u)$ .

*Remark 2.* If  $\varphi: G \rightarrow G$  is a homomorphism of groups, then  $\tilde{\varphi}: G/\sim \rightarrow G/\sim$ ,  $[u] \mapsto [u\varphi]$  is a well defined map, and hence it makes sense to consider any of the previous versions of orbits under  $\tilde{\varphi}$  (we call them *orbits of  $\varphi$  modulo conjugacy*).

**Definition 3.** An element  $u \in G$  is said to be *periodic* w.r.t.  $\varphi$  (or  $\varphi$ -*periodic*) if it belongs to its own strict orbit; that is, if  $u = u\varphi^k$  for some  $k > 0$ . If  $u$  is  $\varphi$ -periodic, the minimum integer  $p > 0$  such that  $u\varphi^p = u$  is called the  $\varphi$ -*period* of  $u$ . The set of  $\varphi$ -periodic elements in  $G$  is denoted by  $\text{Per}(\varphi)$ . Accordingly, if  $G$  is a group, we say that  $u \in G$  is *conjugate-periodic* w.r.t.  $\varphi$  (or  $\varphi$ -*conjugate-periodic*) if  $[u] \in G/\sim$  is  $\tilde{\varphi}$ -periodic (that is, if there exists some  $k > 0$  such that  $u\varphi^k \sim u$ ). The *conjugate  $\varphi$ -period* of  $u$  is the  $\tilde{\varphi}$ -period of  $[u]$ , and the set of conjugate-periodic elements under  $\varphi$  is denoted by  $\text{CPer}(\varphi)$ .

The algorithmic problem(s) consisting in deciding whether a given element is periodic w.r.t. certain given maps are called *Orbit Periodicity Problems*.

**Definition 4.** Let  $G$  be a group and let  $\{\text{id}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{End}(G)$ . Then,

- the *Orbit Periodicity Problem* for  $G$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ , consists in deciding, given  $u \in G$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$ , whether  $u$  is  $\varphi$ -periodic.
- the *Orbit Conjugate-Periodicity Problem* for  $G$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\text{OCPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ , consists in deciding, given  $u \in G$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$ , whether  $u$  is  $\varphi$ -conjugate-periodic.

*Remark 5.* If  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\text{WP}(G)$  (resp.,  $\text{OCPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\text{CP}(G)$ ) are decidable, then the orbit and period of any  $\varphi$ -periodic (resp.,  $\varphi$ -conjugate-periodic) element is computable just by inspection.

We agglutinate under the name of *Brinkmann Problems* the problems consisting in deciding whether two elements belong to the same 'orbit' under a map.

**Definition 6.** Let  $G$  be a group and let  $\{\text{id}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{End}(G)$ . Then,

- the (*standard*) *Brinkmann Problem* for  $G$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ , consists in deciding, given  $u, v \in G$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$ , whether  $v \in \text{orb}_\varphi(u)$ .

- the (standard) Brinkmann Conjugacy Problem for  $G$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ , consists in deciding, given  $u, v \in G$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{T}$ , whether  $[v] \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}([u])$ .

The natural variants for strict, symmetric, or strict-symmetric orbits are denoted by  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$ ,  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  for the corresponding Brinkmann Problems; and  $\text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$ ,  $\overline{\text{BrCP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\overline{\text{BrCP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  for the corresponding Brinkmann Conjugacy Problems.

We abbreviate  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{A}}(G) = \text{BrP}_{\text{Aut}(G)}(G)$ ,  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{M}}(G) = \text{BrP}_{\text{Mon}(G)}(G)$ , and  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{E}}(G) = \text{BrP}_{\text{End}(G)}(G)$ , and similarly for the other variants.

*Remark 7.* Note that  $\text{BrP}_{\text{id}_G}(G) = \text{WP}(G)$  and  $\text{BrCP}_{\text{id}_G}(G) = \text{CP}(G)$ . Hence, it is clear that  $\text{WP}(G) \preceq \text{BrP}_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \preceq \text{BrP}_{\mathcal{M}}(G) \preceq \text{BrP}_{\mathcal{E}}(G)$  and  $\text{CP}(G) \preceq \text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{A}}(G) \preceq \text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{M}}(G) \preceq \text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{E}}(G)$ .<sup>1</sup>

(Following the same reasoning, analogous inclusions can be obtained for each of the variants of the Brinkmann Problem in the paragraph following Definition 6.)

*Remark 8.* The decidability of (any of) the Brinkmann's problems allows to compute a witness in case it exists: if the answer of  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  on input  $(u, v, \varphi)$  is YES, then it is enough to keep enumerating the successive images  $((u)\varphi^n)_{n \geq 0}$  and, in parallel, enumerate the consequences of the relators until reaching a guaranteed word of the form  $v^{-1}(u)\varphi^k$ , providing a witness  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . In fact, since  $\text{WP}(G) \preceq \text{BrP}_{\mathcal{A}}(G)$  (resp.,  $\text{CP}(G) \preceq \text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{A}}(G)$ ), we can easily compute the full set of witnesses for Brinkmann's problems (see [CD24b] for details).

The relation between the different variants of the Brinkmann problem is clarified below.

**Proposition 9.** *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $\{\text{id}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{End}(G)$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  is decidable;
- $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  is decidable;
- $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  is decidable;
- both  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  are decidable.

*Proof.* We recall that in any of the four cases, the outcomes of the inputs of the form  $(u, v, \text{id}_G)$  correspond to  $\text{WP}(G)$ , which therefore can be assumed to be decidable throughout the proof.

To see that (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b), note that the output of  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  on input  $(u, v, \varphi)$  is the same as the output of  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  on input  $(u\varphi, v, \varphi)$ .

The implication (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c) is also obvious since deciding whether  $v \in \overline{\text{orb}}_{\varphi}^{+}(u)$  immediately reduces to two instances of  $\text{BrP}^{+}(G)$ .

To see that (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d), first note that, on inputs of the form  $(u, u, \varphi)$ , problem  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  corresponds exactly to  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ . On the other hand, the decidability of  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  follows clearly from those of  $\text{WP}(G)$  (which is implied by  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$ ) and  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$ : given an input  $(u, v, \varphi)$ , use  $\text{WP}(G)$  to check whether  $u =_G v$ , and  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{+}(G)$  to check whether  $v \in \overline{\text{orb}}^{+}(u)$ . The output of  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  is NO if both answers are negative, and YES otherwise.

<sup>1</sup>We write  $P \preceq Q$  to express that  $P$  can be solved using a potential algorithm solving  $Q$ .

Finally, to see that (d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a), let us assume that both  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  are decidable, and consider an input  $(u, v, \varphi)$  for  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ . We start giving  $(u, v, \varphi)$  as an input for  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ . If the answer is NO then neither  $u\varphi^k = v$  nor  $u\varphi^k = v$  (for  $k \geq 0$ ) is possible, and the answer to  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  on the same input is NO as well.

So, let us finally assume that  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  answers YES on  $(u, v, \varphi)$ . This means that:

$$\text{either } v \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}(u) \text{ or } u \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}(v) \text{ (or both).} \quad (1)$$

Since at least one of the conditions in (1) holds, we can start enumerating in parallel the elements in  $\text{orb}_{\varphi}(u)$  and  $\text{orb}_{\varphi}(v)$  until either  $v$  appears in  $\text{orb}_{\varphi}(u)$  or  $u$  appears in  $\text{orb}_{\varphi}(v)$ . In the first case  $v \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}(u)$  and hence the answer to  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  on input  $(u, v, \varphi)$  is YES. Otherwise (if  $u \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}(v)$ ), note that  $v \in \text{orb}_{\varphi}(u)$  (and hence the answer to  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  is YES) if and only if  $v$  is periodic, which we can check using  $\text{OPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ . So, we have decided  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  for every possible input  $(u, v, \varphi)$  and the proof of (d)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) is complete.  $\square$

An analogous result can be obtained for for the conjugacy version of the problems (replacing equality by conjugacy and WP by CP in the proof).

**Proposition 10.** *Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $\{\text{id}_G\} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{End}(G)$ . Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (a)  $\text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  is decidable;
- (b)  $\text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\pm}(G)$  is decidable;
- (c)  $\overline{\text{BrCP}}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\pm}(G)$  is decidable;
- (d) both  $\overline{\text{BrCP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\text{OCPP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  are decidable.

That is, from a decidability perspective, we only have two different variants of Brinkmann orbit problems; namely  $\text{BrP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\overline{\text{BrP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  (resp.,  $\text{BrCP}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$  and  $\overline{\text{BrCP}}_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ ).

### 3 Brinkmann Problems for the free group

According to Propositions 9 and 10, all the equality (resp., conjugacy) variants of the Brinkmann Problem are equivalent in any ambient group with solvable OPP (resp., OCPP). It follows from Theorem 11 that this is precisely the case when the ambient is a finitely generated free group (and, in particular, in the context of  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  originally considered by Brinkmann in [Bri10]). Hence, we will no longer distinguish between the standard and symmetric forms of the Brinkmann Problem throughout this section.

The initial work of Brinkmann (proving the decidability of  $\text{BrP}_A(\mathbb{F}_n)$  and  $\text{BrCP}_A(\mathbb{F}_n)$ ) found natural continuation in [Log23], where Logan uses Mutanguha's recent techniques extending to endomorphisms the computability of the fixed subgroups of  $\mathbb{F}_n$  (see [Mut22]) to prove the decidability of CP for ascending HNN-extensions of free groups. On his way to this result, Logan considers and solves several variants of the Brinkmann Problem including  $\text{BrP}_M(\mathbb{F}_n)$  and  $\text{BrCP}_M(\mathbb{F}_n)$ , and two-sided versions of both problems. While not answering the general question for endomorphisms, in [Log23, Section 5], Logan proves two results for endomorphisms that we will use to extend his analysis to reach the decidability of the general endomorphism cases.

**Theorem 11.** *The Brinkmann Problems  $\text{BrP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  and  $\text{BrCP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  are algorithmically decidable.*

*Proof.* Let  $u, v \in \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $\varphi \in \text{End}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  be our input (given in terms of a basis  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of  $\mathbb{F}_n$ ; in particular  $\varphi$  is given by the  $n$ -tuple of words  $v_1 = (x_1)\varphi, \dots, v_n = (x_n)\varphi$ ).

In order to decide whether there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $u\varphi^k = v$  we start using the decidability of  $\text{WP}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  to check whether  $u = v$ ; if so, the answer to  $\text{BrP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  is YES (with  $k = 0$ ). Otherwise, we can use the decidability of  $\text{MP}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  to check whether  $v \in \text{im}(\varphi) = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$ . If not, then the answer to  $\text{BrP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  is NO as well. Finally, if  $v \in \text{im}(\varphi)$ , then we can easily compute (either by brute force, or more efficiently using Stallings automata, see e.g. [DV24]) an expression  $v = w(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  (of  $v$  in terms of  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ ) and, from it, a preimage  $v' = w(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \varphi^{-1}(v)$ . Now it is clear that, for  $k \geq 1$ ,  $u\varphi^k = v$  if and only if  $u\varphi^{k-1} \in v' \ker(\varphi)$ , and we can use the algorithm from Theorem 5.5 in [Log23] (with inputs  $u, v'$ , and  $\varphi$ ) to decide about the existence of such an integer  $k$ . Hence,  $\text{BrP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  is decidable, as claimed.

For the second claim, first note that Theorem 5.2 in [Log23] provides an algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  that, on input  $u, v \in \mathbb{F}_n$  and  $\varphi \in \text{End}(\mathbb{F}_n)$ , decides whether there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $u\varphi^k \sim v \ker(\varphi)$ , and outputs one such  $k$  if it exists.

In order to prove the decidability of  $\text{BrCP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$  we use the previous algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  in a combined manner. On one side we run  $\mathfrak{A}$  on input  $(u, v, \varphi)$ . If  $\mathfrak{A}(u, v, \varphi)$  answers NO, it means that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $u\varphi^k \not\sim v \in v \ker(\varphi)$ , and the answer to  $\text{BrCP}_E(u, v, \varphi)$  is also NO. Otherwise,  $\mathfrak{A}(u, v, \varphi)$  outputs an  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $u\varphi^k \sim v \ker(\varphi)$ . It is important to note that this means that  $u\varphi^{k+1} \sim v\varphi$ .

On the other hand, we run  $\mathfrak{A}$  on input  $(v\varphi, v, \varphi)$ . Now, if  $\mathfrak{A}(v\varphi, v, \varphi)$  answers NO then  $v\varphi^p \not\sim v \ker(\varphi)$  for every  $p \geq 1$ . But since  $u\varphi^{k+1} \sim v\varphi$ , this also means that for every  $p \geq 1$ ,  $u\varphi^{k+p} \sim v\varphi^p \not\sim v \ker(\varphi)$ , and, in particular, that  $u\varphi^{k+p} \not\sim v$ , for every  $p \geq 1$ . That is, in this case there are only finitely many candidates and it is enough to use  $\text{CP}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  to check whether  $u\varphi^j \sim v$  for some  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ . If the answer to all of them is NO, then the answer to  $\text{BrCP}_E(u, v, \varphi)$  is NO. Otherwise, the answer to  $\text{BrCP}_E(u, v, \varphi)$  is YES.

It remains to consider the case where  $\mathfrak{A}(u, v, \varphi)$  outputs  $k$  (and hence  $u\varphi^{k+1} \sim v\varphi$ ) and  $\mathfrak{A}(v\varphi, v, \varphi)$  outputs  $p$ . Note that then  $v\varphi^{p+1} \sim v \ker(\varphi)$  and hence  $v\varphi^{p+2} \sim v\varphi$ . Moreover,

$$u\varphi^{k+1} \sim v\varphi \sim v\varphi^{p+2} = (v\varphi)\varphi^{p+1} \sim (u\varphi^{k+1})\varphi^{p+1} = u\varphi^{k+p+2},$$

which means that there are only finitely many conjugacy classes in the  $\varphi$ -orbit of  $u$  and, again, it is enough to check whether  $u\varphi^i \sim v$  for  $i \in \{0, \dots, k+p+1\}$ . The answer to  $\text{BrCP}_E(u, v, \varphi)$  is NO if the answer to all of them is NO, and YES otherwise. This concludes the proof of the decidability of  $\text{BrCP}_E(\mathbb{F}_n)$ .  $\square$

Finally, we note that this work has continuation in [CD24a] and [CD24b], where the same authors study Brinkmann Problems in some natural extensions of free groups.

## Acknowledgements

The first author is funded by national funds through the FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the scope of the projects UIDB/00297/2020 and UIDP/00297/2020 (Center for Mathematics and Applications).

The second author acknowledges support from the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación through grant PID2021-126851NB-I00 (AEI/ FEDER, UE), as well as from the Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya in the form of a “María Zambrano” scholarship.

## References

- [BH95] M. Bestvina and M. Handel. “Train-tracks for surface homeomorphisms”. *Topology* 34.1 (Jan. 1995), pp. 109–140 (cit. on p. 2).
- [BH92] M. Bestvina and M. Handel. “Train Tracks and Automorphisms of Free Groups”. *Annals of Mathematics*. Second Series 135.1 (1992), pp. 1–51 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Boo58] W. W. Boone. “The Word Problem”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 44.10 (Oct. 1958), pp. 1061–1065 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Bri10] P. Brinkmann. “Detecting automorphic orbits in free groups”. *Journal of Algebra* 324.5 (Sept. 2010), pp. 1083–1097 (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 5).
- [CD24a] A. Carvalho and J. Delgado. “Orbit problems for free-abelian times free groups and related families”. *Journal of Algebra and Its Applications* (Aug. 2024) (cit. on p. 6).
- [CD24b] A. Carvalho and J. Delgado. *Free-abelian by free groups: homomorphisms and algorithmic explorations*. Jan. 2024 (cit. on pp. 4, 6).
- [Deh11] M. Dehn. “Über unendliche diskontinuierliche Gruppen”. *Mathematische Annalen* 71.1 (1911), pp. 116–144 (cit. on p. 1).
- [DV24] J. Delgado and E. Ventura. “Stallings’ automata”. In: *Languages and Automata. GAGTA BOOK 3. GAGTA. De Gruyter, 2024* (cit. on pp. 2, 6).
- [Log23] A. D. Logan. “The Conjugacy Problem for ascending HNN-extensions of free groups”. (*preprint*) (Apr. 2023) (cit. on pp. 1, 5, 6).
- [Mut22] J. P. Mutanguha. “Constructing stable images”. (*preprint*) (Jan. 2022) (cit. on p. 5).
- [Nov55] P. S. Novikov. “On the algorithmic unsolvability of the word problem in group theory”. *Acad. Sci. USSR Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov.* Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. 44 (1955), pp. 3–143 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Sta83] J. R. Stallings. “Topology of finite graphs”. *Inventiones Mathematicae* 71 (Mar. 1983), pp. 551–565 (cit. on p. 2).
- [Whi36] J. H. C. Whitehead. “On Equivalent Sets of Elements in a Free Group”. *The Annals of Mathematics*. Second Series 37.4 (Oct. 1936), pp. 782–800 (cit. on p. 2).

André Carvalho  
CENTER FOR MATHEMATICS AND APPLICATIONS (NOVA MATH), NOVA FCT  
[andreacruzcarvalho@gmail.com](mailto:andreacruzcarvalho@gmail.com)

Jordi Delgado  
DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA  
[jorge.delgado@upc.edu](mailto:jorge.delgado@upc.edu)