Groups acting on tree-graded spaces and splittings of relatively hyperbolic groups

Cornelia Druţu and Mark Sapir

$\mathbb{R}$-trees

Observation due to Bestvina and Paulin: if a group has many actions on a Gromov-hyperbolic metric space then it acts non-trivially (i.e. without a global fixed point) by isometries on the asymptotic cone of that space which is an $\mathbb{R}$-tree.

$\mathbb{R}$-trees

Observation due to Bestvina and Paulin: if a group has many actions on a Gromov-hyperbolic metric space then it acts non-trivially (i.e. without a global fixed point) by isometries on the asymptotic cone of that space which is an $\mathbb{R}$-tree.

What does "many" means?

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does "many" means?

x

$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle, \; x \in X,$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does "many" means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does "many" means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does “many” means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does “many” means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,\ d_\phi = \min_x d(x).$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.

What does "many" means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,\ d_\phi = \min_x d(x).$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.
Then we can divide the metric in X by d_ϕ, obtaining X_ϕ, $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$.

What does “many” means?



$$G = \langle a, b, c \rangle,\ x \in X,\ d_\phi = \min_x d(x).$$

The word many means that the translation numbers d_ϕ are unbounded.
Then we can divide the metric in X by d_ϕ, obtaining X_ϕ, $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$. The $\mathbb{R}$-tree is the limit $\mathrm{Con}(X, (d_\phi), (x_\phi))$.

Indeed, triangles in X_ϕ become thinner and thinner and in the limit all geodesic triangles are tripods:



Indeed, triangles in X_ϕ become thinner and thinner and in the limit all geodesic triangles are tripods:



Indeed, triangles in X_ϕ become thinner and thinner and in the limit all geodesic triangles are tripods:



Indeed, triangles in X_ϕ become thinner and thinner and in the limit all geodesic triangles are tripods:



Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$;

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded,

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded which means that $|x_\phi^{-1}\phi(s)x_\phi|$ is bounded (for all generators s).

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded which means that $|x_\phi^{-1}\phi(s)x_\phi|$ is bounded (for all generators s). So up to conjugacy ϕ maps the generating set of Λ to a ball of bounded radius, hence there are only finitely many ϕ's up to conjugacy.

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded which means that $|x_\phi^{-1}\phi(s)x_\phi|$ is bounded (for all generators s). So up to conjugacy ϕ maps the generating set of Λ to a ball of bounded radius, hence there are only finitely many ϕ's up to conjugacy.

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded which means that $|x_\phi^{-1}\phi(s)x_\phi|$ is bounded (for all generators s). So up to conjugacy ϕ maps the generating set of Λ to a ball of bounded radius, hence there are only finitely many ϕ's up to conjugacy.

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

   Indeed, if the translation numbers d_ϕ of $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$ are bounded, then $\mathrm{dist}(\phi(s)x_\phi, x_\phi)$ is bounded which means that $|x_\phi^{-1}\phi(s)x_\phi|$ is bounded (for all generators s). So up to conjugacy ϕ maps the generating set of Λ to a ball of bounded radius, hence there are only finitely many ϕ's up to conjugacy.

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;
2. $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite;

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;
2. $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite;
3. G is not co-Hopfian, i.e. it has a non-surjective but injective endomorphism ϕ;

Applications

Given an action on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree, we can apply Rips -Bestvina - Feighn - Levitt -Sela - Guirardel... and split the group into a graph of groups.

The Bestvina-Paulin's observation applies, for example, when the group G is hyperbolic and one of the following holds:

1. There are infinitely many pairwise non-conjugate homomorphisms from a finitely generated group Λ into G; then there are "many" actions of Λ on the Cayley graph of G: $g \cdot x = \phi(g)x$ for every $\phi \colon \Lambda \to G$;
2. $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite;
3. G is not co-Hopfian, i.e. it has a non-surjective but injective endomorphism ϕ;
4. G is not Hopfian, i.e. it has a non-injective but surjective endomorphism ϕ.

What if G is not hyperbolic?

Note that in all four cases, the group acts non-trivially on the asymptotic cone of the metric space even if the metric space is not hyperbolic.

What if G is not hyperbolic?

Note that in all four cases, the group acts non-trivially on the asymptotic cone of the metric space even if the metric space is not hyperbolic.

The asymptotic cones of non-hyperbolic spaces need not be trees.

What if G is not hyperbolic?

Note that in all four cases, the group acts non-trivially on the asymptotic cone of the metric space even if the metric space is not hyperbolic.

The asymptotic cones of non-hyperbolic spaces need not be trees.

But in many cases they are tree-graded spaces. Recall the definition.

Tree-graded spaces

Definition Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a complete geodesic metric space and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of closed geodesic subsets (called *pieces*). Suppose that the following two properties are satisfied:

Tree-graded spaces

Definition Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a complete geodesic metric space and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of closed geodesic subsets (called *pieces*). Suppose that the following two properties are satisfied:

(T_1) Every two different pieces have at most one common point.

Tree-graded spaces

Definition Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a complete geodesic metric space and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of closed geodesic subsets (called *pieces*). Suppose that the following two properties are satisfied:

(T_1) Every two different pieces have at most one common point.

(T_2) Every simple geodesic triangle (a simple loop composed of three geodesics) in $\mathbb{F}$ is contained in one piece.

Tree-graded spaces

Definition Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a complete geodesic metric space and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of closed geodesic subsets (called *pieces*). Suppose that the following two properties are satisfied:

(T_1) Every two different pieces have at most one common point.

(T_2) Every simple geodesic triangle (a simple loop composed of three geodesics) in $\mathbb{F}$ is contained in one piece.

Then we say that the space $\mathbb{F}$ is *tree-graded with respect to* $\mathcal{P}$.

The main property of tree-graded spaces

For every:

- two points a, b in X,

The main property of tree-graded spaces

For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

The main property of tree-graded spaces



For every:

- two points a, b in X,
- geodesic $[a, b]$, and
- piece intersected by $[a, b]$,

every arc connecting a and b passes through the entry and exit points of this geodesic in this piece.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druţu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure:

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.
(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.
(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.
(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.

(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druţu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.

(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.

(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.
(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Indeed, (T_2) follows from the fact that every simple triangle does not have a cut point. So it is contained in a maximal subset without cut points.

(T_1) If two maximal subsets without cut points have more than one point in common then their union does not have cut points.



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Having cut-points in asymptotic cones is a very weak form of hyperbolicity:

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druţu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Having cut-points in asymptotic cones is a very weak form of hyperbolicity: it is equivalent to having super-linear divergence of geodesics

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Having cut-points in asymptotic cones is a very weak form of hyperbolicity: it is equivalent to having super-linear divergence of geodesics

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druţu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Having cut-points in asymptotic cones is a very weak form of hyperbolicity: it is equivalent to having super-linear divergence of geodesics



Cut points and tree-graded structures

Note (Druțu, S.). Any complete geodesic metric space with cut-points has non-trivial canonical tree-graded structure: pieces are maximal connected subsets without cut points.

Having cut-points in asymptotic cones is a very weak form of hyperbolicity: it is equivalent to having super-linear divergence of geodesics



The length of the blue arc should be $> O(R)$.

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Recall that hyperbolicity $\equiv$

Cut points and tree-graded structures

Recall that hyperbolicity $\equiv$superlinear divergence of any pair of geodesic rays with common origin.

Transversal trees

Definition. For every point x in a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$, the union of geodesics $[x, y]$ intersecting every piece by at most one point is an $\mathbb{R}$-tree called a *transversal* tree of $\mathbb{F}$.

Transversal trees

Definition. For every point x in a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$, the union of geodesics $[x, y]$ intersecting every piece by at most one point is an $\mathbb{R}$-tree called a *transversal* tree of $\mathbb{F}$.

The geodesics $[x, y]$ from transversal trees are called *transversal geodesics*.

Transversal trees, an example

Transversal trees, an example



A tree-graded space. Pieces are the circles and the points on the line.

Transversal trees, an example



A tree-graded space. Pieces are the circles and the points on the line.

The line is a transversal tree, the other transversal trees are points on the circles.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space. The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Statement 2. Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of tree-graded spaces, ω be a ultrafilter.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Statement 2. Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of tree-graded spaces, ω be a ultrafilter.Let $\lim^{\omega}(X_n, o_n)$ be the ω-limit of X_n with observation points o_n.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Statement 2. Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of tree-graded spaces, ω be a ultrafilter.Let $\lim^{\omega}(X_n, o_n)$ be the ω-limit of X_n with observation points o_n. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ be the set of ω-limits $\lim^{\omega}(M_n)$ where $M_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is tree-graded with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, ...$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Statement 2. Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of tree-graded spaces, ω be a ultrafilter.Let $\lim^{\omega}(X_n, o_n)$ be the ω-limit of X_n with observation points o_n. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ be the set of ω-limits $\lim^{\omega}(M_n)$ where $M_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is tree-graded with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

Statement 3 Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of homogeneous unbounded tree-graded metric spaces with observation points o_n.

Cut points continued

Statement 1. (M.Kapovich-B. Kleiner-B.Leeb) Let (X, dist) be a geodesic metric space.The asymptotic cone $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Con}^{\omega}(X, (o_n), (d_n))$ has cut points if X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$, $n = 1, 2, \ldots$ with $|\mathfrak{g}_n| = O(d_n)$, $\mathrm{dist}(\mathfrak{g}_n, o_n) = O(d_n)$, and superlinear divergence.

Statement 2. Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of tree-graded spaces, ω be a ultrafilter.Let $\lim^{\omega}(X_n, o_n)$ be the ω-limit of X_n with observation points o_n. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ be the set of ω-limits $\lim^{\omega}(M_n)$ where $M_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ is tree-graded with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$.

Statement 3 Let $\mathbb{F} = (X_n, \mathcal{P}_n)$ be a sequence of homogeneous unbounded tree-graded metric spaces with observation points o_n. Let ω be an ultrafilter. Then the ultralimit $\lim^{\omega}(\mathbb{F}, (o_n))$ has a tree-graded structure with a non-trivial transversal tree at every point.

The description

Proposition. Let X be a homogeneous geodesic metric space such that one of the asymptotic cones of X has a cut point.

The description

Proposition. Let X be a homogeneous geodesic metric space such that one of the asymptotic cones of X has a cut point. Then X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$ with superlinear divergence.

The description

Proposition. Let X be a homogeneous geodesic metric space such that one of the asymptotic cones of X has a cut point. Then X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$ with superlinear divergence.

Proposition. (M. Kapovich-B.Kleiner-B.Leeb) A CAT(0) group G acting on (CAT(0)) X does not have cut points in its asymptotic cones

The description

Proposition. Let X be a homogeneous geodesic metric space such that one of the asymptotic cones of X has a cut point. Then X contains a sequence of geodesics $\mathfrak{g}_n$ with superlinear divergence.

Proposition. (M. Kapovich-B.Kleiner-B.Leeb) A CAT(0) group G acting on (CAT(0)) X does not have cut points in its asymptotic cones iff every bi-infinite geodesic bounds a half-plane.

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);
- RAAGs (J. Behrstock, C. Drutu, L. Mosher);

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);
- RAAGs (J. Behrstock, C. Drutu, L. Mosher);
- Fundamental groups of graph-manifolds which are not Sol or Nil manifolds (M. Kapovich, B. Kleiner, B. Leeb).

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);
- RAAGs (J. Behrstock, C. Drutu, L. Mosher);
- Fundamental groups of graph-manifolds which are not Sol or Nil manifolds (M. Kapovich, B. Kleiner, B. Leeb).
- Conjecture (S): any non-trivial amalgamated product and HNN-extension except for the obvious cases.

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druţu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);
- RAAGs (J. Behrstock, C. Drutu, L. Mosher);
- Fundamental groups of graph-manifolds which are not Sol or Nil manifolds (M. Kapovich, B. Kleiner, B. Leeb).
- Conjecture (S): any non-trivial amalgamated product and HNN-extension except for the obvious cases.
- (Olshanskii- S.) There exists a torsion group with cut points in every asymptotic cone (no bounded torsion groups with this property exist).

Examples

Groups and other metric spaces whose asymptotic cones have cut-points:

- relatively hyperbolic groups and metrically relatively hyperbolic spaces (Druțu, Osin, Sapir);
- Mapping class groups of punctured surfaces (J. Behrstock);
- Teichmuller spaces with Weil-Petersson metric (J. Behrstock);
- RAAGs (J. Behrstock, C. Drutu, L. Mosher);
- Fundamental groups of graph-manifolds which are not Sol or Nil manifolds (M. Kapovich, B. Kleiner, B. Leeb).
- Conjecture (S): any non-trivial amalgamated product and HNN-extension except for the obvious cases.
- (Olshanskii- S.) There exists a torsion group with cut points in every asymptotic cone (no bounded torsion groups with this property exist).
- (Olshanskii - S.) There exists a f.g. group such that one asymptotic cone has cut points and another one does not.

Actions on tree-graded spaces

Thus it is important to study actions of groups on tree-graded spaces.

Actions on tree-graded spaces

Thus it is important to study actions of groups on tree-graded spaces.

Our main result shows that a group acting “nicely” on a tree-graded space also acts “nicely” on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree.

Stabilizers

Notation: For every group G acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$,

Stabilizers

Notation: For every group G acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$,

- $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$ is the set of subgroups stabilizing pairs of distinct pieces in $\mathcal{P}$,

Stabilizers

Notation: For every group G acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$,

- $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$ is the set of subgroups stabilizing pairs of distinct pieces in $\mathcal{P}$,
- $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$ is the set of stabilizers of pairs of points of $\mathbb{F}$ not from the same piece,

Stabilizers

Notation: For every group G acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$,

- $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$ is the set of subgroups stabilizing pairs of distinct pieces in $\mathcal{P}$,
- $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$ is the set of stabilizers of pairs of points of $\mathbb{F}$ not from the same piece,
- $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$ is the set of stabilizers of triples of points of $\mathbb{F}$ neither from the same piece nor on the same transversal geodesic.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

(I) The group G acts by isometries on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree non-trivially, with stabilizers of non-trivial arcs in $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$, and with stabilizers of non-trivial tripods in $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

(I) The group G acts by isometries on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree non-trivially, with stabilizers of non-trivial arcs in $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$, and with stabilizers of non-trivial tripods in $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$.

(II) The group G acts on a simplicial tree with stabilizers of pieces or points of $\mathbb{F}$ as vertex stabilizers, and stabilizers of pairs (a piece, a point inside the piece) as edge stabilizers.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

(**I**) The group G acts by isometries on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree non-trivially, with stabilizers of non-trivial arcs in $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$, and with stabilizers of non-trivial tripods in $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$.

(**II**) The group G acts on a simplicial tree with stabilizers of pieces or points of $\mathbb{F}$ as vertex stabilizers, and stabilizers of pairs (a piece, a point inside the piece) as edge stabilizers.

(**III**) The group G acts non-trivially on a simplicial tree with edge stabilizers from $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely generated group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

(I) The group G acts by isometries on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree non-trivially, with stabilizers of non-trivial arcs in $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$, and with stabilizers of non-trivial tripods in $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$.

(II) The group G acts on a simplicial tree with stabilizers of pieces or points of $\mathbb{F}$ as vertex stabilizers, and stabilizers of pairs (a piece, a point inside the piece) as edge stabilizers.

(III) The group G acts non-trivially on a simplicial tree with edge stabilizers from $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$.

(IV) The group G acts on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree by isometries, non-trivially, stabilizers of non-trivial arcs are locally inside $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$-by-Abelian subgroups, and stabilizers of tripods are locally inside subgroups in $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$.

The main result

Theorem Let G be a finitely presented group acting on a tree-graded space $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following hold:

(i) Every isometry $g \in G$ permutes the pieces;

(ii) No piece or point in $\mathbb{F}$ is stabilized by the whole group G;

Then one of the following four situations occurs.

(I) The group G acts by isometries on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree non-trivially, with stabilizers of non-trivial arcs in $\mathcal{C}_2(G)$, and with stabilizers of non-trivial tripods in $\mathcal{C}_3(G)$.

(II) The group G acts on a simplicial tree with stabilizers of pieces or points of $\mathbb{F}$ as vertex stabilizers, and stabilizers of pairs (a piece, a point inside the piece) as edge stabilizers.

(III) The group G acts non-trivially on a simplicial tree with edge stabilizers from $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$.

(IV) The group G acts on a complete $\mathbb{R}$-tree by isometries, non-trivially, stabilizers of non-trivial arcs are in $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$, and stabilizers of tripods are locally inside subgroups in $\mathcal{C}_1(G)$.

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Suppose that the set of arc stabilizers satisfies ACC and no arc stabilizer properly contains a conjugate of itself, and every stabilizer of a non-stable arc is finitely generated.

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Suppose that the set of arc stabilizers satisfies ACC and no arc stabilizer properly contains a conjugate of itself, and every stabilizer of a non-stable arc is finitely generated.

Then one of the following three situations occurs:

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Suppose that the set of arc stabilizers satisfies ACC and no arc stabilizer properly contains a conjugate of itself, and every stabilizer of a non-stable arc is finitely generated.

Then one of the following three situations occurs:

(1) the group G splits over the stabilizer of a non-super-stable arc or over the stabilizer of a tripod;

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Suppose that the set of arc stabilizers satisfies ACC and no arc stabilizer properly contains a conjugate of itself, and every stabilizer of a non-stable arc is finitely generated.

Then one of the following three situations occurs:

(1) the group G splits over the stabilizer of a non-super-stable arc or over the stabilizer of a tripod;

(2) G splits over a virtually cyclic extension of the stabilizer of a super-stable arc;

Splitting

Theorem (V. Guirardel) Let G be a finitely generated group and let T be a real tree on which G acts minimally.

Suppose that the set of arc stabilizers satisfies ACC and no arc stabilizer properly contains a conjugate of itself, and every stabilizer of a non-stable arc is finitely generated.

Then one of the following three situations occurs:

(1) the group G splits over the stabilizer of a non-super-stable arc or over the stabilizer of a tripod;

(2) G splits over a virtually cyclic extension of the stabilizer of a super-stable arc;

(3) T is a line and G has a subgroup of index at most 2 that is an extension of the kernel of that action by a finitely generated free Abelian group.

When an action satisfies Guirardel's condition?

Statement. Let G be a finitely generated group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree T with finite of size at most D tripod stabilizers,

When an action satisfies Guirardel's condition?

Statement. Let G be a finitely generated group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree T with finite of size at most D tripod stabilizers, and (finite of size at most D)-by-Abelian arc stabilizers,

When an action satisfies Guirardel's condition?

Statement. Let G be a finitely generated group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree T with finite of size at most D tripod stabilizers, and (finite of size at most D)-by-Abelian arc stabilizers, for some constant D.

When an action satisfies Guirardel's condition?

Statement. Let G be a finitely generated group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree T with finite of size at most D tripod stabilizers, and (finite of size at most D)-by-Abelian arc stabilizers, for some constant D.

Then an arc with stabilizer of size $> (D+1)!$ is super-stable.

When an action satisfies Guirardel's condition?

Statement. Let G be a finitely generated group acting on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree T with finite of size at most D tripod stabilizers, and (finite of size at most D)-by-Abelian arc stabilizers, for some constant D.

Then an arc with stabilizer of size $> (D+1)!$ is super-stable.
Hence the action has finite height.


$\mathfrak{g}$



$\mathfrak{g}_1$
$\mathfrak{g}$



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$

$|H| > (D+1)!$





$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$

$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$





$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.
$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.
$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$
$|C(U) \cap H| > D$



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$

$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.

$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$

$|C(U) \cap H| > D$



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.
$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$
$|C(U) \cap H| > D$

hHh^{-1} fixes $h\mathfrak{g}$



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.
$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$
$|C(U) \cap H| > D$

hHh^{-1} fixes $h\mathfrak{g}$
$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.
$|H_1 : C(U)| \leq D!$
$|C(U) \cap H| > D$

hHh^{-1} fixes $h\mathfrak{g}$
$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.
If $h \in U$, $C(U) \cap H \subseteq H \cap hHh^{-1}$.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$

H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.



$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.

Hence $U \subseteq H$.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.

$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.

Hence $U \subseteq H$.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$



H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.

$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.

Hence $U \subseteq H$.
Hence $H' < H$, H is normal in H_1.



$H = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g})$
$|H| > (D+1)!$

$H_1 = \mathrm{Stab}(\mathfrak{g}_1)$

H_1/U is Abelian, $|U| \leq D$.



$|H \cap hHh^{-1}| < D$
since this subgroup fixes a tripod.

Hence $U \subseteq H$.
Hence $H' < H$, H is normal in H_1.
Hence $D > |H \cap hHh^{-1}| = |H| > (D+1)!$.

Dahmani's result

Definition Following Dahmani, we say that a homomorphism ϕ from a group Λ into a relatively hyperbolic group G has an *accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or

Dahmani's result

Definition Following Dahmani, we say that a homomorphism ϕ from a group Λ into a relatively hyperbolic group G has an *accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or Λ splits over a subgroup C such that $\phi(C)$ is either parabolic or finite.

Dahmani's result

Definition Following Dahmani, we say that a homomorphism ϕ from a group Λ into a relatively hyperbolic group G has an *accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or Λ splits over a subgroup C such that $\phi(C)$ is either parabolic or finite.

Theorem (Dahmani) If Λ is finitely presented, and G is relatively hyperbolic then there are finitely many subgroups of G, up to conjugacy, that are images of Λ in G by homomorphisms without accidental parabolics.

Homomorphisms into groups

Instead of homomorphic images, we consider the set of homomorphisms.

Homomorphisms into groups

Instead of homomorphic images, we consider the set of homomorphisms.

Note that if a group G splits over an Abelian subgroup C, say, $G = A *_C B$, then it typically has many outer automorphisms that are identity on A and conjugate B by elements of C. Hence we need to modify the definition of accidental parabolics as follows.

Weakly accidental parabolics

Definition. A homomorphism $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ has a *weakly accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or

Weakly accidental parabolics

Definition. A homomorphism $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ has a *weakly accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or Λ splits over a subgroup C such that $\phi(C)$ is either virtually cyclic or parabolic.

Weakly accidental parabolics

Definition. A homomorphism $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ has a *weakly accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or Λ splits over a subgroup C such that $\phi(C)$ is either virtually cyclic or parabolic.

Theorem Let Λ be a finitely generated group, G be a relatively hyperbolic group and parabolic subgroups are small (no free non-Abelian subgroups).

Weakly accidental parabolics

Definition. A homomorphism $\phi\colon \Lambda \to G$ has a *weakly accidental parabolic* if either $\phi(\Lambda)$ is parabolic or Λ splits over a subgroup C such that $\phi(C)$ is either virtually cyclic or parabolic.

Theorem Let Λ be a finitely generated group, G be a relatively hyperbolic group and parabolic subgroups are small (no free non-Abelian subgroups).

Then the number of pairwise non-conjugate in G injective homomorphisms $\Lambda \to G$ without weakly accidental parabolics is finite.

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Relatively hyperbolic groups with infinite $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ and non-co-Hopf relatively hyperbolic groups have been studied extensively (Paulin, Rips-Sela, T.Delzant-L.Potyagailo, D. Groves and I. Belegradek - A. Szczepański.)

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Relatively hyperbolic groups with infinite $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ and non-co-Hopf relatively hyperbolic groups have been studied extensively (Paulin, Rips-Sela, T.Delzant-L.Potyagailo, D. Groves and I. Belegradek - A. Szczepański.)

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Relatively hyperbolic groups with infinite $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ and non-co-Hopf relatively hyperbolic groups have been studied extensively (Paulin, Rips-Sela, T.Delzant-L.Potyagailo, D. Groves and I. Belegradek - A. Szczepański.)

Out(G)

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

Out(G)

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

Out(G)

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

Out(G)

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups (otherwise we can replace peripheral subgroups by smaller peripheral subgroups).

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

If $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite then one of the followings cases occurs.

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

If $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite then one of the followings cases occurs.

- G splits over a virtually cyclic subgroup;

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

If $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite then one of the followings cases occurs.

- G splits over a virtually cyclic subgroup;
- G splits over a parabolic (finite of uniformly bounded size)-by-Abelian-by-(virtually cyclic) subgroup;

$\mathrm{Out}(G)$

Theorem (Druțu, S.) Suppose that the peripheral subgroups of G are not relatively hyperbolic with respect to proper subgroups

If $\mathrm{Out}(G)$ is infinite then one of the followings cases occurs.

- G splits over a virtually cyclic subgroup;
- G splits over a parabolic (finite of uniformly bounded size)-by-Abelian-by-(virtually cyclic) subgroup;
- G can be represented as a non-trivial amalgamated product or HNN extension with one of the vertex groups a maximal parabolic subgroup of G.

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

Let ϕ be an injective but not surjective homomorphism $G \to G$.

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

Let ϕ be an injective but not surjective homomorphism $G \to G$.

Then one of the following holds:

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

Let ϕ be an injective but not surjective homomorphism $G \to G$.

Then one of the following holds:

- $\phi^k(G)$ is parabolic for some k.

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

Let ϕ be an injective but not surjective homomorphism $G \to G$.

Then one of the following holds:

- $\phi^k(G)$ is parabolic for some k.
- G splits over a parabolic or virtually cyclic subgroup.

co-Hopfian groups

Theorem Suppose that a relatively hyperbolic group G is not co-Hopfian.

Let ϕ be an injective but not surjective homomorphism $G \to G$.

Then one of the following holds:

- $\phi^k(G)$ is parabolic for some k.
- G splits over a parabolic or virtually cyclic subgroup.

Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

The most natural tree, associated with any tree-graded space is essentially the union of all transversal trees, and can be described as a certain factor-space $\mathbb{F}/\approx$. The action of G on $\mathbb{F}$ induces an action of G on $\mathbb{F}/\approx$.

Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

The most natural tree, associated with any tree-graded space is essentially the union of all transversal trees, and can be described as a certain factor-space $\mathbb{F}/\approx$. The action of G on $\mathbb{F}$ induces an action of G on $\mathbb{F}/\approx$.



Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

The most natural tree, associated with any tree-graded space is essentially the union of all transversal trees, and can be described as a certain factor-space $\mathbb{F}/\approx$. The action of G on $\mathbb{F}$ induces an action of G on $\mathbb{F}/\approx$.



Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

The most natural tree, associated with any tree-graded space is essentially the union of all transversal trees, and can be described as a certain factor-space $\mathbb{F}/\approx$. The action of G on $\mathbb{F}$ induces an action of G on $\mathbb{F}/\approx$.



Plan of the proof

Given an action of G on $\mathbb{F}$, we need to extract an action of G on a tree.

The most natural tree, associated with any tree-graded space is essentially the union of all transversal trees, and can be described as a certain factor-space $\mathbb{F}/\approx$. The action of G on $\mathbb{F}$ induces an action of G on $\mathbb{F}/\approx$.



An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are "mid thirds" used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are “mid thirds” used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are "mid thirds" used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are "mid thirds" used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are “mid thirds” used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

An example

An example of a non-trivial tree-graded structure: X is a unit interval, pieces are "mid thirds" used to obtain the Cantor set, and single points.

Note that pieces do not intersect.

Case A.

Suppose that the action of G on $T = \mathbb{F}/\approx$ is non-trivial.

Case A.

Suppose that the action of G on $T = \mathbb{F}/\approx$ is non-trivial.
Then the stabilizer of an arc in T is from $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Case A.

Suppose that the action of G on $T = \mathbb{F}/\approx$ is non-trivial.
Then the stabilizer of an arc in T is from $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Indeed, every arc in T contains an arc from a transverse tree of $\mathbb{F}$.

Case A.

Suppose that the action of G on $T = \mathbb{F}/\approx$ is non-trivial.
Then the stabilizer of an arc in T is from $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Indeed, every arc in T contains an arc from a transverse tree of $\mathbb{F}$.

Thus in this case G acts non-trivially on an $\mathbb{R}$-tree with arc stabilizers from $\mathcal{C}_2$.

Case B.

Suppose that G fixes a point in T.

Case B.

Suppose that G fixes a point in T.

The corresponding $\approx$-class is a union of pieces and is a tree-graded space $(R, \mathcal{R})$ with trivial transversal trees. G acts on R.

Transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

Let $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be a tree-graded space.

Transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

Let $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be a tree-graded space.

We define $a \sim b$ iff $[a, b]$ is covered by finitely many pieces.

Transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

Let $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be a tree-graded space.

We define $a \sim b$ iff $[a, b]$ is covered by finitely many pieces.

Then we define pieces of $\mathcal{P}'$ as closures of the $\sim$-equivalence classes.

Transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

Let $(\mathbb{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be a tree-graded space.

We define $a \sim b$ iff $[a, b]$ is covered by finitely many pieces.

Then we define pieces of $\mathcal{P}'$ as closures of the $\sim$-equivalence classes.



A transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

We have a sequence:

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_1 = {\mathcal{P}_0}' < \mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1' \ldots$$

A transfinite sequence of tree-graded structures

We have a sequence:

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{R} < \mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_0{}' < \mathcal{P}_2 = \mathcal{P}_1' \ldots$$

It must stabilize at $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Case B1.

G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Case B1.

G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Consider minimal δ such that G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\delta$.

Case B1.

G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Consider minimal δ such that G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\delta$.

We prove that δ is not a limit cardinal.

Case B1.

G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Consider minimal δ such that G fixes a piece in $\mathcal{P}_\delta$.

We prove that δ is not a limit cardinal.

Then we define a simplicial tree having pieces of $\mathcal{P}_{\delta-1}$ and intersections of these pieces as vertices, and edges connecting a piece and a vertex inside it.

The stabilizers of edges depend on whether $\delta = 1$ or not.

The stabilizers of edges depend on whether $\delta = 1$ or not.

If $\delta = 1$, the stabilizers of edges are inside stabilizers of pieces in $\mathcal{P}$.

The stabilizers of edges depend on whether $\delta = 1$ or not.

If $\delta = 1$, the stabilizers of edges are inside stabilizers of pieces in $\mathcal{P}$.

In case $\delta > 1$, the edge stabilizers are in $\mathcal{C}_1$.

Case B2.

G does not fix a point in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Case B2.

G does not fix a point in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Then G acts on the set X of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$-pieces.

Case B2.

G does not fix a point in $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$.

Then G acts on the set X of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$-pieces.

We define the structure of a pre-tree (Bowditch) on X.

Pretrees

Definition A *pretree* is a set equipped with a ternary *betweenness* relation xyz satisfying the following conditions:

Pretrees

Definition A *pretree* is a set equipped with a ternary *betweenness* relation xyz satisfying the following conditions:

- (PT0) $(\forall x, y)(\neg xyx)$.

Pretrees

Definition A *pretree* is a set equipped with a ternary *betweenness* relation xyz satisfying the following conditions:

- (PT0) $(\forall x, y)(\neg xyx)$.
- (PT1) $xzy \Leftrightarrow yzx$.

Pretrees

Definition A *pretree* is a set equipped with a ternary *betweenness* relation xyz satisfying the following conditions:

- (PT0) $(\forall x, y)(\neg xyx)$.
- (PT1) $xzy \Leftrightarrow yzx$.
- (PT2) $(\forall x, y, z)(\neg(xyz \wedge xzy))$.

Pretrees

Definition A *pretree* is a set equipped with a ternary *betweenness* relation xyz satisfying the following conditions:

- (PT0) $(\forall x, y)(\neg xyx)$.
- (PT1) $xzy \Leftrightarrow yzx$.
- (PT2) $(\forall x, y, z)(\neg(xyz \wedge xzy))$.
- (PT3) xzy and $z \neq w$ then $(xzw \vee yzw)$.

If $\mathbf{x}, y, z$ are pieces of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ then we say xyz iff there exists a geodesic in $\mathbb{F}$ starting in x, ending in z and crossing y.

If $\mathbf{x}, y, z$ are pieces of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ then we say *xyz* iff there exists a geodesic in $\mathbb{F}$ starting in x, ending in z and crossing y.

That pre-tree embeds equivariantly into an $\mathbb{R}$-tree,

If $\mathbf{x}, y, z$ are pieces of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ then we say xyz iff there exists a geodesic in $\mathbb{F}$ starting in x, ending in z and crossing y.

That pre-tree embeds equivariantly into an $\mathbb{R}$-tree,

So G acts on that $\mathbb{R}$-tree by non-nested automorphisms of the pretree structure, the arc stabilizers are from $\mathcal{C}_1$.

If $\mathbf{x}, y, z$ are pieces of $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ then we say xyz iff there exists a geodesic in $\mathbb{F}$ starting in x, ending in z and crossing y.

That pre-tree embeds equivariantly into an $\mathbb{R}$-tree,

So G acts on that $\mathbb{R}$-tree by non-nested automorphisms of the pretree structure, the arc stabilizers are from $\mathcal{C}_1$.

We apply a version of Levitt's theorem and complete the proof.