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ABSTRACT. Let $X$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex admitting a proper cocompact action by a group $G$. We give three conditions on the action, any one of which ensures that $X$ has a factor system in the sense of [BHS14]. We also prove that one of these conditions is necessary. This combines with [BHS14] to show that $G$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic group; this partially answers questions raised in [BHS14, BHS15]. Under any of these conditions, our results also affirm a conjecture of Behrstock-Hagen on boundaries of cube complexes, which implies that $X$ cannot contain a convex staircase. The necessary conditions on the action are all strictly weaker than virtual cospecialness, and we are not aware of a cocompactly cubulated group that does not satisfy at least one of the conditions.

Introduction

Much work in geometric group theory revolves around generalizations of Gromov hyperbolicity: relatively hyperbolic groups, weakly hyperbolic groups, acylindrically hyperbolic groups, coarse median spaces, semihyperbolicity, lacunary hyperbolicity, etc. Much attention has been paid to groups acting properly and cocompactly on CAT(0) cube complexes, which also have features reminiscent of hyperbolicity. Such complexes give a combinatorially and geometrically rich framework to build on, and many groups have been shown to admit such actions (for a small sample, see [Sag95, Wis04, OW11, BW12, HW15]).

Many results follow from studying the geometry of CAT(0) cube complexes, often using strong properties reminiscent of negative curvature. For instance, several authors have studied the structure of quasiflats and Euclidean sectors in cube complexes, with applications to rigidity properties of right-angled Artin group [Xie05, BKS08, Hua14]. These spaces have also been shown to be median [Che00] and to have only semi-simple isometries [Hag07]. Further, under reasonable assumptions, a CAT(0) cube complex $X$ either splits as a nontrivial product or Isom($X$) must contain a rank-one element [CS11]. Once a given group is known to act properly and cocompactly on a CAT(0) cube complex the geometry of the cube complex controls the geometry and algebra of the group. For instance, such a group is biautomatic and cannot have Kazhdan’s property (T) [NR98, NR97], and it must satisfy a Tits alternative [SW03].

Here, we examine cube complexes admitting proper, cocompact group actions from the point of view of certain convex subcomplexes. Specifically, given a CAT(0) cube complex $X$, we study the following set $\mathcal{F}$ of convex subcomplexes: $\mathcal{F}$ is the smallest set of subcomplexes that contains $X$, contains each combinatorial hyperplane, and is closed under cubical closest-point projection, i.e. if $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $g_B(A) \in \mathcal{F}$, where $g_B : X \to B$ is the cubical closest point projection.

Main results. The collection $\mathcal{F}$ of subcomplexes is of interest for several reasons. It was first considered in [BHS14], in the context of finding hierarchically hyperbolic structures on $X$. Specifically, in [BHS14], it is shown that if there exists $N < \infty$ so that each point of $X$ is contained in at most $N$ elements of $\mathcal{F}$, then $X$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space, which has
numerous useful consequences outlined below; the same finite multiplicity property of $\mathcal{F}$ has other useful consequences outlined below. When this finite multiplicity condition holds, we say, following [BHS14], that $\mathcal{F}$ is a factor system for $\mathcal{X}$.

We believe that if $\mathcal{X}$ is proper and some group $G$ acts properly and cocompactly by isometries on $\mathcal{X}$, then the above finite multiplicity property holds, and thus $G$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic group. In [BHS14], it is shown that this holds when $G$ has a finite-index subgroup acting cocompactly on $\mathcal{X}$, and it is also verified in a few non-cospecial examples.

This conjecture has proved surprisingly resistant to attack; we earlier believed we had a proof. However, a subtlety in Proposition 5.1 means that at present our techniques only give a complete proof under various conditions on the $G$–action, namely:

**Theorem A.** Let $G$ act properly and cocompactly on the proper $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complex $\mathcal{X}$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is a factor system for $\mathcal{X}$ provided any one of the following conditions is satisfied (up to passing to a finite-index subgroup of $G$):

- the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is rotational;
- the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies the weak finite height condition for hyperplanes;
- the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies the essential index condition and the Noetherian intersection of conjugates condition (NICC) on hyperplane-stabilisers.

Hence, under any of the above conditions, $\mathcal{X}$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $G$ a hierarchically hyperbolic group.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{F}$ is a factor system, then the $G$–action satisfies the essential index condition and the NICC.

The auxiliary conditions are as follows. The action of $G$ is rotational if, whenever $A, B$ are hyperplanes of $\mathcal{X}$, and $g \in \text{Stab}_G(B)$ has the property that $A$ and $gA$ cross or osculate, then $A$ lies at distance at most 1 from $B$. This condition is prima facie weaker than requiring that the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ be cospecial, so Theorem A generalises the results in [BHS14]. (In fact, the condition above is slightly stronger than needed; compare Definition 4.1.)

A subgroup $K \leq G$ satisfies the weak finite height condition if the following holds. Let $\{g_i\}_{i \in I} \subset G$ be an infinite set so that $K \cap \bigcap_{i \in J} K^{g_i}$ is infinite for all finite $J \subset I$. Then there exist distinct $g_i, g_j$ so that $K \cap K^{g_i} = K \cap K^{g_j}$. The action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies the weak finite height condition for hyperplanes if each hyperplane stabiliser satisfies the weak finite height condition.

This holds, for example, when each hyperplane stabiliser has finite height in the sense of [GMRS98]. Hence Theorem A implies that $\mathcal{F}$ is a factor system when $\mathcal{X}$ is hyperbolic, without invoking virtual specialness [Ago13] because quasiconvex subgroups (in particular hyperplane stabilisers) have finite height [GMRS98]; the existence of a hierarchically hyperbolic structure relative to $\mathcal{F}$ also follows from recent results of Spriano in the hyperbolic case [Spri17]. Also, if $\mathcal{F}$ is a factor system and $\mathcal{X}$ does not decompose as a product of unbounded CAT(0) cube complexes, then results of [BHS14] imply that $G$ is acylindrically hyperbolic. On the other hand, recent work of Genevois [Gen16] uses finite height of hyperplane-stabilisers to verify acylindrical hyperbolicity for certain groups acting on CAT(0) cube complexes. In our opinion, this provides some justification for the naturality of the weak finite height condition for hyperplanes.

The NIC condition for hyperplanes asks the following for each hyperplane-stabiliser $K$. Given any $\{g_i\}_{i \geq 0}$ so that $K_n = K \cap \bigcap_{i=0}^{n} K^{g_i}$ is infinite for all $n$, there exists $\ell$ so that $K_n$ and $K_j$ are commensurable for $n \geq \ell$. Note that $\ell$ is allowed to depend on $\{g_i\}_{i \geq 0}$. The accompanying essential index condition asks that there exists a constant $\zeta$ so that for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$, the stabiliser of $F$ has index at most $\zeta$ in the stabiliser of the essential core of $F$, defined in [CS11]. These conditions are somewhat less natural than the preceding conditions, but they follow fairly easily from the finite multiplicity of $\mathcal{F}$.
We prove Theorem \[ A \] in Section 6. There is a unified argument under the weak finite height and NICC hypotheses, and a somewhat simpler argument in the presence of a rotational action.

To prove Theorem \[ A \] the main issue is to derive a contradiction from the existence of an infinite strictly ascending chain \( \{ F_i \} \), in \( \mathcal{F} \), using that the corresponding chain of orthogonal complements must strictly descend. The existence of such chains can be deduced from the failure of the finite multiplicity of \( \mathcal{F} \) using only the proper cocompact group action; it is in deriving a contradiction from the existence of such chains that the other conditions arise.

Any condition that allows one to conclude that the \( F_i \) have bounded-diameter fundamental domains for the actions of their stabilisers yields the desired conclusion. So, there are most likely other versions of Theorem \[ A \] using different auxiliary hypotheses. We are not aware of a cocompactly cubulated group which is not covered by Theorem \[ A \].

Hierarchical hyperbolicity. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces/groups (HHS/G’s), introduced in \[ BHS14, BHS15 \], were proposed as a common framework for studying mapping class groups and (certain) cubical groups. Knowledge that a group is hierarchically hyperbolic has strong consequences that imply many of the nice properties of mapping class groups.

Theorem \[ A \] and results of \[ BHS14 \] (see Remark 13.2 of that paper) together answer Question 8.13 of \[ BHS14 \] and part of Question A of \[ BHS15 \] — which ask whether a proper cocompact CAT(0) cube complex has a factor system — under any of the three auxiliary hypotheses in Theorem \[ A \]. Hence our results expand the class of cubical groups that are known to be hierarchically hyperbolic. Some consequences of this are as follows, where \( \mathcal{X} \) is a CAT(0) cube complex on which \( G \) acts geometrically, satisfying any of the hypotheses in Theorem \[ A \]:

- In combination with \[ BHS14, Corollary 14.5 \], Theorem \[ A \] shows that \( G \) acts acylindrically on the contact graph of \( \mathcal{X} \), i.e. the intersection graph of the hyperplane carriers, which is a quasi-tree \[ H14 \].
- Theorem \[ A \] combines with Theorem 9.1 of \[ BHS14 \] to provide a Masur-Minsky style distance estimate in \( G \): up to quasi-isometry, the distance in \( \mathcal{X} \) from \( x \) to \( gx \), where \( g \in G \), is given by summing the distances between the projections of \( x, gx \) to a collection of uniform quasi-trees associated to the elements of the factor system.
- Theorem \[ A \] combines with Corollary 9.24 of \[ DHS16 \] to prove that either \( G \) stabilizes a convex subcomplex of \( \mathcal{X} \) splitting as the product of unbounded subcomplexes, or \( G \) contains an element acting loxodromically on the contact graph of \( \mathcal{X} \). This is a new proof of a special case of the Caprace-Sageev rank-rigidity theorem \[ CST11 \].

Proposition 11.4 of \[ BHS14 \] combines with Theorem \[ A \] to prove:

**Theorem B.** Let \( G \) act properly and cocompactly on the proper CAT(0) cube complex \( \mathcal{X} \), with the action satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem \[ A \]. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the factor system, and suppose that for all subcomplexes \( A \in \mathcal{F} \) and \( g \in G \), the subcomplex \( gA \) is not parallel to a subcomplex in \( \mathcal{F} \) which is in the orthogonal complement of \( A \). Then \( \mathcal{X} \) quasi-isometrically embeds in the product of finitely many trees.

The set \( \mathcal{F} \) is shown in Section 2 to have a graded structure: the lowest-grade elements are combinatorial hyperplanes, then we add projections of combinatorial hyperplanes to combinatorial hyperplanes, etc. This allows for several arguments to proceed by induction on the grade. Essentially by definition, a combinatorial hyperplane \( H \) is the orthogonal complement of a 1-cube \( e \), i.e. a maximal convex subcomplex \( H \) for which \( \mathcal{X} \) contains the product \( e \times H \) as a subcomplex. We show, in Theorem 3.3, that \( \mathcal{F} \) is precisely the set of convex subcomplexes \( F \) such that there exists a compact, convex subcomplex \( C \) so that the orthogonal complement of \( C \) is \( F \). This observation plays an important role.

Relatedly, we give conditions in Proposition 5.1 ensuring that \( \mathcal{F} \) is closed under the operation of taking orthogonal complements. As well as being used in the proof of Theorem \[ A \]
this is needed for applications of recent results about hierarchically hyperbolic spaces to cube complexes. Specifically, in [ABDI], Abbott-Behrstock-Durham introduce hierarchically hyperbolic spaces with clean containers, and work under that (quite natural) hypothesis. Among its applications, they produce largest, universal acylindrical actions on hyperbolic spaces for hierarchically hyperbolic groups. We will not give the definition of clean containers for general hierarchically hyperbolic structures, but for the CAT(0) cubical case, our results imply that it holds for hierarchically hyperbolic structures on $\mathcal{X}$ obtained using $\mathfrak{F}$, as follows:

**Theorem C (Clean containers).** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex on which the group $G$ acts properly and cocompactly, and suppose $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system. Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}$, and let $V \in \mathfrak{F}$ be properly contained in $F$. Then there exists $U \in \mathfrak{F}$, unique up to parallelism, such that:

- $U \subset F$;
- $V \hookrightarrow F$ extends to a convex embedding $V \times U \hookrightarrow F$;
- if $W \in \mathfrak{F}$, and the above two conditions hold with $U$ replaced by $W$, then $W$ is parallel to a subcomplex of $U$.

**Proof.** Let $x \in V$ be a 0–cube and let $U' = V^\perp$, the orthogonal complement of $V$ at $x$ (see Definition 1.10). Proposition 5.1 implies that $U' \in \mathfrak{F}$, so $U = U' \cap F$ is also in $\mathfrak{F}$, since $\mathfrak{F}$ is closed under projections. By the definition of the orthogonal complement, $V \to \mathcal{X}$ extends to a convex embedding $V \times U' \to \mathcal{X}$, and $(V \times U') \cap F = V \times U$ since $V \subset F$ and $F, V \times U'$ are convex. Now, if $W \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $W \subset F$, and $V \to \mathcal{X}$ extends to a convex embedding $V \times W \to \mathcal{X}$, then $V \times W$ is necessarily contained in $F$, by convexity. On the other hand, by the definition of the orthogonal complement, $W$ is parallel to a subcomplex of $U'$. Hence $W$ is parallel to a subcomplex of $U$. This implies the third assertion and uniqueness of $U$ up to parallelism. □

We now turn to applications of Theorem A that do not involve hierarchical hyperbolicity.

**Simplicial boundary and staircases.** Theorem A also gives insight into the structure of the boundary of $\mathcal{X}$. We first mention an aggravating geometric/combinatorial question about cube complexes which is partly answered by our results.

A *staircase* is a CAT(0) cube complex $Z$ defined as follows. First, a ray-strip is a square complex of the form $S_n = [n, \infty) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, with the product cell-structure where $[n, \infty)$ has 0–skeleton $\{m \in Z : m \geq n\}$ and $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ is a 1–cube. To build $Z$, choose an increasing sequence $(a_n)_n$ of integers, collect the ray-strips $S_{a_n} \cong [a_n, \infty) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$, and identify $[a_{n+1}, \infty) \times \{-\frac{1}{2}\} \subset S_{a_{n+1}}$ with $[a_n, \infty) \times \{\frac{1}{2}\} \subset S_{a_n}$ for each $n$. The model staircase is the cubical neighbourhood of a Euclidean sector in the standard tiling of $\mathbb{E}^2$ by squares, with one bounding ray in the $x$–axis, but for certain $(a_n)_n$, $Z$ may not contain a nontrivial Euclidean sector. (One can define a $d$–dimensional staircase analogously for $d \geq 2$.) We will see below that the set of “horizontal” hyperplanes in $Z$ – see Figure 1 for the meaning of “horizontal” – is interesting because there is no geodesic ray in $Z$ crossing exactly the set of horizontal hyperplanes.

![Figure 1. Part of a staircase.](image)

Now let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a group $G$ acting properly and cocompactly. Can there be a convex staircase subcomplex in $\mathcal{X}$? A positive answer seems very implausible, but this question is open and has bothered numerous researchers.

In Section 7, we prove that if $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system, then $\mathcal{X}$ cannot contain a convex staircase. Hence, if $\mathcal{X}$ admits a geometric group action satisfying any of the hypotheses in Theorem A.
then $\mathcal{X}$ cannot contain a convex staircase. In fact, we prove something more general, which is best formulated in terms of the simplicial boundary $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$.

Specifically, the simplicial boundary $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ of a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{X}$ was defined in [Hag13]. Simplices of $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ come from equivalence classes of infinite sets $\mathcal{H}$ of hyperplanes such that:

- if $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}$ are separated by a hyperplane $V$, then $V \in \mathcal{H}$;
- if $H_1, H_2, H_3 \in \mathcal{H}$ are disjoint, then one of $H_1, H_2, H_3$ separates the other two;
- for $H \in \mathcal{H}$, at most one halfspace associated to $H$ contains infinitely many $V \in \mathcal{H}$.

These boundary sets are partially ordered by coarse inclusion (i.e., $A \preceq B$ if all but finitely many hyperplanes of $A$ are contained in $B$), and two are equivalent if they have finite symmetric difference; $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ is the simplicial realization of this partial order. The motivating example of a simplex of $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ is: given a geodesic ray $\gamma$ of $\mathcal{X}$, the set of hyperplanes crossing $\gamma$ has the preceding properties. Not all simplices are realized by a geodesic ray in this way: a simplex in $\mathcal{X}$ is called visible if it is. For example, if $Z$ is a staircase, then $\partial_\Delta Z$ has an invisible 0-simplex, represented by the set of horizontal hyperplanes.

Corollary 2.8 of [BH16] holds that every simplex of $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ is visible when $\mathcal{X}$ admits a proper cocompact group action; Theorem A hence proves a special case. Slightly more generally:

**Corollary D.** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex which admits a proper and cocompact group action satisfying the NICC for hyperplanes. Then every simplex is $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ is visible. Moreover, let $v \in \partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ be a 0-simplex. Then there exists a CAT(0) geodesic ray $\gamma$ such that the set of hyperplanes crossing $\gamma$ represents $v$.

The above could, in principle, hold even if $\mathcal{X}$ is not a factor system, since we have not imposed the essential index condition. The “moreover” part follows from the first part and [Hag13, Lemma 3.32]. Corollary D combines with [BH16, Theorem 5.13] to imply that $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ detects thickness of order 1 and quadratic divergence for $G$, under the NICC condition. Corollary D also implies the corollary about staircases at the beginning of this paper. More generally, we obtain the following from Corollary D and a simple argument in [Hag13]:

**Corollary E.** Let $\gamma$ be a CAT(0)-metric or combinatorial geodesic ray in $\mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is as in Corollary D and the set of hyperplanes crossing $\gamma$ represents a d-dimensional simplex of $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$. Then there exists a combinatorially isometrically embedded $d+1$-dimensional orthant subcomplex $\mathcal{O} \subseteq Hull(\gamma)$. Moreover, $\gamma$ lies in a finite neighbourhood of $\mathcal{O}$.

(A $k$-dimensional orthant subcomplex is a CAT(0) cube complex isomorphic to the product of $k$ copies of the standard tiling of $[0, \infty)$ by 1-cubes, and the convex hull $Hull(A)$ of a subspace $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is the smallest convex subcomplex containing $A$.)

Corollary E is related to Lemma 4.9 of [Hua14] and to statements in [Xie05, BKS08] about Euclidean sectors in cocompact CAT(0) cube complexes and arcs in the Tits boundary. In particular it shows that in any CAT(0) cube complex with a proper cocompact group action satisfying NICC, nontrivial geodesic arcs on the Tits boundary extend to arcs of length $\pi/2$.

**Further questions and approaches.** We believe that any proper cocompact CAT(0) cube complex admits a factor system, but that some additional ingredient is needed to remove the auxiliary hypotheses in Theorem A; we hope that the applications we have outlined stimulate interest in finding this additional idea. Since the property of admitting a factor system is inherited by convex subcomplexes [BHS14], we suggest trying to use $G$-cocompactness of $\mathcal{X}$ to arrange for a convex (non-$G$-equivariant) embedding of $\mathcal{X}$ into a CAT(0) cube complex $\mathcal{Y}$ where a factor system can be more easily shown to exist. One slightly outrageous possibility is:

**Question 1.** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a CAT(0) cube complex which admits a proper and cocompact group action. Does $\mathcal{X}$ embed as a convex subcomplex of the universal cover of the Salvetti complex of some right-angled Artin group?
However, there are other possibilities, for example trying to embed $X$ convexly in a CAT(0) cube complex whose automorphism group is sufficiently tame to enable one to use the proof of Theorem [A] or some variant of it.

**Plan of the paper.** In Section 1, we discuss the necessary background. Section 2 contains basic facts about $F$ and Section 3 relates $F$ to orthogonal complements. Section 4 introduces the auxiliary hypotheses for Theorem [A], which we prove in Section 6. The applications to the simplicial boundary are discussed in Section 7.
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1. **Background**

1.1. **Basics on CAT(0) cube complexes.** Recall that a $CAT(0)$ cube complex $X$ is a simply-connected cube complex in which the link of every vertex is a simplicial flag complex (see e.g. [BH99, Chapter II.5], [Sag14, Wis, Che00] for precise definitions and background). In this paper, $X$ always denotes a CAT(0) cube complex. Our choices of language and notation for describing convexity, hyperplanes, gates, etc. follow the account given in [BHS14, Section 2].

**Definition 1.1** (Hyperplane, carrier, combinatorial hyperplane). A midcube in the unit cube $c = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]^n$ is a subspace obtained by restricting exactly one coordinate to 0. A hyperplane in $X$ is a connected subspace $H$ with the property that, for all cubes $c$ of $X$, either $H \cap c = \emptyset$ or $H \cap c$ consists of a single midcube of $c$. The carrier $N(H)$ of the hyperplane $H$ is the union of all closed cubes $c$ of $X$ with $H \cap c \neq \emptyset$. The inclusion $H \to X$ extends to a combinatorial embedding $H \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \cong N(H) \to X$ identifying $H \times \{0\}$ with $H$. Now, $H$ is isomorphic to a $CAT(0)$ cube complex whose cubes are the midcubes of the cubes in $N(H)$. The subcomplexes $H^\pm$ of $N(H)$ which are the images of $H \times \{\pm 1\}$ under the above map are isomorphic as cube complexes to $H$, and are combinatorial hyperplanes in $X$. Thus each hyperplane of $X$ is associated to two combinatorial hyperplanes lying in $N(H)$.

**Remark.** The distinction between hyperplanes (which are not subcomplexes) and combinatorial hyperplanes (which are) is important. Given $A \subseteq X$, either a convex subcomplex or a hyperplane, and a hyperplane $H$, we sometimes say $H$ crosses $A$ to mean that $H \cap A \neq \emptyset$. Observe that the set of hyperplanes crossing a hyperplane $H$ is precisely the set of hyperplanes crossing the associated combinatorial hyperplanes.

**Definition 1.2** (Convex subcomplex). A subcomplex $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq X$ is convex if $\mathcal{Y}$ is full — i.e. every cube $c$ of $X$ whose 0–skeleton lies in $\mathcal{Y}$ satisfies $c \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ — and $\mathcal{Y}^{(1)}$, endowed with the obvious path-metric, is metrically convex in $X^{(1)}$.

There are various characterizations of cubical convexity. Cubical convexity coincides with $CAT(0)$–metric convexity for subcomplexes [Hag07], but not for arbitrary subspaces.
Definition 1.3 (Convex Hull). Given a subset $A \subseteq X$, we denote by $Hull(A)$ its convex hull, i.e., the intersection of all convex subcomplexes containing $A$.

If $Y \subseteq X$ is a convex subcomplex, then $Y$ is a CAT(0) cube complex whose hyperplanes have the form $H \cap Y$, where $H$ is a hyperplane of $X$, and two hyperplanes $H \cap Y, H' \cap Y$ intersect if and only if $H, H'$ intersect.

Recall from [Che00] that the graph $X^{(1)}$, endowed with the obvious path metric $d_X$ in which edges have length 1, is a median graph (and in fact being a median graph characterizes 1–skeleta of CAT(0) cube complexes among graphs): given 0–cubes $x, y, z$, there exists a unique 0–cube $m = m(x, y, z)$, called the median of $x, y, z$, so that $Hull(x, y) \cap Hull(y, z) \cap Hull(x, z) = \{m\}$.

Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a convex subcomplex. Given a 0–cube $x \in X$, there is a unique 0–cube $y \in Y$ so that $d_X(x, y)$ is minimal among all 0–cubes in $Y$. Indeed, if $y' \in Y$, then the median $m$ of $x, y, y'$ lies in $Y$, by convexity of $Y$, but $d_X(x, y') = d_X(x, m) + d_X(m, y')$, and the same is true for $y$. Thus, if $d_X(x, y')$ and $d_X(x, y)$ realize the distance from $x$ to $Y^{(0)}$, we have $m = y = y'$.

Definition 1.4 (Gate map on 0–skeleton). For a convex subcomplex $Y \subseteq X$, the gate map to $Y$ is the map $g_Y : X^{(0)} \to Y^{(0)}$ so that or all $v \in X^{(0)}$, $g_Y(v)$ is the unique 0–cube of $Y$ lying closest to $v$.

Lemma 1.5. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a convex subcomplex. Then the map $g_Y$ from Definition 1.4 extends to a unique cubical map $g_Y : X \to Y$ so that the following holds: for any d–cube $c$, of $X$ with vertices $x_0, \ldots, x_{2d} \in X^{(0)}$, the map $g_Y$ collapses $c$ to the unique $k$–cube $c'$ in $Y$ with 0–cells $g_Y(x_0), \ldots, g_Y(x_{2d})$ in the natural way, respecting the cubical structure.

Furthermore, for any convex subcomplex $Y, Y' \subseteq X$, the hyperplanes crossing $g_Y(Y')$ are precisely the hyperplanes which cross both $Y$ and $Y'$.

Proof. The first part is proved in [BHS14, p. 1743]: observe that the integer $k$ is the number of hyperplanes that intersect both $c$ and $Y$. The hyperplanes that intersect $c'$ are precisely the hyperplanes which intersect both $c$ and $Y$. Indeed, the Helly property ensures that there are cubes crossing exactly this set of hyperplanes, while convexity of $Y$ shows that at least one such cube lies in $Y$; the requirement that it contain $g_Y(z)$ then uniquely determines $c'$.

To prove the second statement, let $H$ be a hyperplane crossing $Y$ and $Y'$. Then $H$ separates 0–cubes $y_1, y_2 \in Y'$, and thus separates their gates in $Y$, since, because it crosses $Y$, it cannot separate $y_1$ or $y_2$ from $Y$. On the other hand, if $H$ crosses $g_Y(Y')$, then it separates $g_Y(y_1), g_Y(y_2)$ for some $y_1, y_2 \in Y'$. Since it cannot separate $y_1$ or $y_2$ from $Y$, the hyperplane $H$ must separate $y_1$ from $y_2$ and thus cross $Y$. (Here we have used the standard fact that $H$ separates $y_i$ from $g_Y(y_i)$ if and only if $H$ separates $y_i$ from $Y$; see e.g. [BHS14, p. 1743].) Hence $H$ crosses $g_Y(Y')$ if and only if $H$ crosses $Y, Y'$.

The next definition formalizes the relationship between $g_Y(Y'), g_{Y'}(Y)$ in the above lemma.

Definition 1.6 (Parallel). The convex subcomplexes $F$ and $F'$ are parallel, written $F \parallel F'$, if for each hyperplane $H$ of $X$, we have $H \cap F \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $H \cap F' \neq \emptyset$. The subcomplex $F$ is parallel into $F'$ if $F$ is parallel to a subcomplex of $F'$, i.e. every hyperplane intersecting $F$ intersects $F'$. We denote this by $F \hookrightarrow F'$. Any two 0–cubes are parallel subcomplexes.

The following is proved in [BHS14, Section 2] and illustrated in Figure 2

Lemma 1.7. Let $F, F'$ be parallel subcomplexes of the CAT(0) cube complex $X$. Then $Hull(F \cup F') \cong F \times A$, where $A$ is the convex hull of a shortest combinatorial geodesic with endpoints on $F$ and $F'$. The hyperplanes intersecting $A$ are those separating $F, F'$. Moreover, if $D, E \subseteq X$ are convex subcomplexes, then $g_E(D) \subseteq E$ is parallel to $g_D(E) \subseteq D$.

The next Lemma will be useful in Section 2.
Lemma 1.8. For convex subcomplexes $C, D, E$, we have $g_{D}(E) ∥ g_{C}(g_{D}(E)) ∥ g_{C}(g_{E}(D))$.

Proof. Let $F = g_{C}(D)$. Let $H$ be a hyperplane so that $H ∩ g_{F}(E) ≠ ∅$. Then $H ∩ C, H ∩ D ≠ ∅$, by Lemma 1.5. Thus $g_{F}(E)$ is parallel into $g_{C}(g_{D}(E))$ and $g_{C}(g_{E}(D))$. However, the hyperplanes crossing either of these are precisely the hyperplanes crossing all of $C, D, E$. Thus, they cross $F$ and $D$, and thus cross $g_{F}(E)$ by Lemma 1.5. □

The next lemma will be used heavily in Section 6, and gives a group theoretic description of the stabilizer of a projection.

Lemma 1.9. Let $X$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex on which $G$ acts properly and cocompactly. Let $H, H'$ be two convex subcomplexes in $X$ such that $\text{Stab}_G(H)$ acts cocompactly on $H$ and $\text{Stab}_G(H')$ acts cocompactly on $H'$. Then $\text{Stab}_G(g_{H}(H'))$ is commensurable with $\text{Stab}_G(H) \cap \text{Stab}_G(H')$. Further, for any finite collection $H_1, \ldots, H_n$ of convex subcomplexes whose stabilisers act cocompactly, $\text{Stab}_G(g_{H_1}(\cdot \cdot \cdot g_{H_n}(H_n) \cdot \cdot \cdot))$ is commensurable with $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \text{Stab}_G(H_i)$.

Proof. Let $H$ and $H'$ be two convex subcomplexes and suppose that $g \in \text{Stab}_G(H) \cap \text{Stab}_G(H')$. Then $g \in \text{Stab}_G(g_{H}(H'))$, and thus $\text{Stab}_G(H) \cap \text{Stab}_G(H') \leq \text{Stab}_G(g_{H}(H'))$.

Let $d = d(H, H')$. In particular, for any 0-cube in $g_{H}(H')$, its distance to $H'$ is exactly $d$. However, there are only finitely many such translates of $H'$ in $X$, and any element of $\text{Stab}_G(g_{H}(H'))$ must permute these. Further, there are only finitely many translates of $H$ in $X$ that contain $g_{H}(H')$, and any element of the stabilizer must also permute those. Thus, there is a finite index subgroup (obtained as the kernel of the permutation action on the finite sets of hyperplanes) that stabilizes both $H$ and $H'$. A similar argument covers the case of finitely many complexes. □

Definition 1.10 (Orthogonal complement). Let $A ⊆ X$ be a convex subcomplex. Let $P_A$ be the convex hull of the union of all parallel copies of $A$, so that $P_A \cong A × A^\perp$, where $A^\perp$ is a CAT(0) cube complex that we call the abstract orthogonal complement of $A$ in $X$. Let $\phi_A : A × A^\perp \to X$ be the cubical isometric embedding with image $P_A$.

For any $a \in A^{0}$, the convex subcomplex $\phi_A(\{a\} × A^\perp)$ is the orthogonal complement of $A$ at $a$. See Figures 3 and 4.

Lemma 1.11. Let $A \subseteq X$ be a convex subcomplex. For any $a \in A$, a hyperplane $H$ intersects $\phi_A(\{a\} × A^\perp)$ if and only if $H$ is disjoint from every parallel copy of $A$ but intersects each hyperplane $V$ with $V \cap A ≠ ∅$. Hence $\phi_A(\{a\} × A^\perp), \phi_A(\{b\} × A^\perp)$ are parallel for all $a, b \in A^{0}$.

Proof. This follows from the definition of $P_A$: the hyperplanes crossing $P_A$ are partitioned into two classes, those intersecting $A$ (and its parallel copies) and those disjoint from $A$ (and any of
Finally, in [CS11], Caprace and Sageev defined the notion of an essential hyperplane and an essential action. We record the necessary facts here.

Definition 1.12. Let $X$ be a CAT(0) cube complex, and let $F \subseteq X$ be a convex subcomplex. Let $G \leq \text{Aut}(X)$ preserve $F$.

1. We say that a hyperplane $H$ is essential in $F$ if $H$ crosses $F$, and each halfspace associated to $H$ contains 0–cubes of $F$ which are arbitrarily far from $H$.

2. We say that $H$ is $G$–essential in $F$ if for any 0–cube $x \in F$, each halfspace associated to $H$ contains elements of $Gx$ arbitrarily far from $H$.

3. We say that $G$ acts essentially on $F$ if every hyperplane crossing $F$ is $G$–essential in $F$.

If $G$ acts cocompactly on $F$, then a hyperplane is $G$–essential if and only if it is essential in $F$.

Proposition 1.13. Let $X$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex admitting a proper cocompact action by a group $\Gamma$, let $F \subseteq X$ be a convex subcomplex, and let $G \leq \Gamma$ act on $F$ cocompactly. Then:

1. there exists a $G$–invariant convex subcomplex $\hat{F}_G$, called the $G$–essential core of $F$, crossed by every essential hyperplane in $F$, on which $G$ acts essentially and cocompactly;

2. $\hat{F}_G$ is unbounded if and only if $F$ is unbounded;

3. if $G' \leq \text{Aut}(X)$ also acts on $F$ cocompactly, then $\hat{F}_{G'}$ is parallel to $\hat{F}_G$;

4. if $G' \leq G$ is a finite-index subgroup, we can take $\hat{F}_{G'} = \hat{F}_G$.

5. the subcomplex $\hat{F}_G$ is finite Hausdorff distance from $F$.

Proof. By [CS11] Proposition 3.5], $F$ contains a $G$–invariant convex subcomplex $\hat{F}_G$ on which $G$ acts essentially and cocompactly (in particular, $\hat{F}_G$ is unbounded if and only if $F$ is, and $d_{\text{Haus}}(F, \hat{F}_G) < \infty$). The hyperplanes of $F$ crossing $\hat{F}_G$ are precisely the $G$–essential hyperplanes. Observe that if $H$ is a hyperplane crossing $\hat{F}_G$ essentially, then cocompactness of the $G$–action on $F$ implies that $H$ is $G$–essential and thus crosses $\hat{F}_G$. It follows that if $G, G'$ both
act on \(F\) cocompactly, then a hyperplane crossing \(F\) is \(G\)-essential if and only if it is \(G'\)-essential, so \(\hat{F}_G, \hat{F}_{G'}\) cross the same hyperplanes, i.e. they are parallel. If \(G' \leq G\), then \(\hat{F}_G\) is \(G'\)-invariant, and if \([G : G'] < \infty\), then \(G'\) also acts cocompactly on \(F\), so we can take \(\hat{F}_G = \hat{F}_{G'}\). \(\square\)

1.2. Hyperclosure and factor systems.

**Definition 1.14** (Factor system, hyperclosure). The **hyperclosure** of \(\mathcal{X}\) is the intersection \(\mathfrak{F}\) of all sets \(\mathfrak{F}'\) of convex subcomplexes of \(\mathcal{X}\) that satisfy the following three properties:

1. \(\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{F}'\), and for all combinatorial hyperplanes \(H\) of \(\mathcal{X}\), we have \(H \in \mathfrak{F}'\);
2. If \(F, F' \in \mathfrak{F}'\), then \(g_F(F') \in \mathfrak{F}'\);
3. If \(F \in \mathfrak{F}'\) and \(F'\) is parallel to \(F\), then \(F' \in \mathfrak{F}'\).

Note that \(\mathfrak{F}\) is \(\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})\)-invariant. If there exists \(\xi\) such that for all \(x \in \mathcal{X}\), there are at most \(\xi\) elements \(F \in \mathfrak{F}\) with \(x \in F\), then, following [BHS14], we call \(\mathfrak{F}\) a factor system for \(\mathcal{X}\).

**Remark 1.15.** The definition of a factor system in [BHS14] is more general than the definition given above. The assertion that \(\mathcal{X}\) has a factor system in the sense of [BHS14] is equivalent to the assertion that the hyperclosure of \(\mathcal{X}\) has finite multiplicity, because any factor system (in the sense of [BHS14]) contains all elements of \(\mathfrak{F}\) whose diameters exceed a given fixed threshold. Each of the five conditions in Definition 8.1 of [BHS14] is satisfied by \(\mathfrak{F}\), except possibly the finite multiplicity condition, Definition 8.1.(3). Indeed, parts (1),(2),(4) of that definition are included in Definition 1.14 above. Part (5) asserts that there is a constant \(p\) so that \(g_F(F')\) is in the factor system provided \(F, F'\) are and \(\text{diam}(g_F(F')) \geq p\). Hence Definition 1.14(2) implies that this condition is satisfied by \(\mathfrak{F}\), with \(p = 0\).

2. Analysis of the hyperclosure

Fix a proper \(\mathcal{X}\) with a group \(G\) acting properly and cocompactly. Let \(\mathfrak{F}\) be the hyperclosure.

2.1. Decomposition. Let \(\mathfrak{F}_0 = \{\mathcal{X}\}\) and, for each \(n \geq 1\), let \(\mathfrak{F}_n\) be the subset of \(\mathfrak{F}\) consisting of those subcomplexes that can be written in the form \(g_H(F)\), where \(F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}\) and \(H\) is a combinatorial hyperplane. Hence \(\mathfrak{F}_1\) is the set of combinatorial hyperplanes in \(\mathcal{X}\).

**Lemma 2.1** (Decomposing \(\mathfrak{F}\)). Each \(F \in \mathfrak{F} - \{\mathcal{X}\}\) is parallel to a subcomplex of the form

\[g_{H_1}(g_{H_2}(\cdots g_{H_{n-1}}(H_n))\cdots)]

for some \(n \geq 1\), where each \(H_i\) is a combinatorial hyperplane, i.e. \(\mathfrak{F}/p = (\cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{F}_n)/p\).

**Proof.** This follows by induction, Lemma 1.8 and the definition of \(\mathfrak{F}\). \(\square\)

**Corollary 2.2.** \(\mathfrak{F} = \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{F}_n\).

**Proof.** It suffices to show \(\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \cup_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{F}_n\). Let \(F \in \mathfrak{F}\). If \(F = \mathcal{X}\), then \(F \in \mathfrak{F}_0\). Otherwise, by Lemma 2.1 there exists \(n \geq 1\), a combinatorial hyperplane \(H\), and a convex subcomplex \(F' \in \cup_{k \leq n} \mathfrak{F}_k\) with \(F \parallel g_H(F')\). Consider \(\phi_F(F) = F \times F^\perp\) and choose \(f \in F^\perp\) so that \(\phi_F(F \times \{f\})\) coincides with \(F\). Then \(\phi_F(F \times \{f\})\) lies in some combinatorial hyperplane \(H'\) – either \(H' = H\) and \(F = g_H(F)\), or \(F\) is non-unique in its parallelism class, so lies in a combinatorial hyperplane in the carrier of a hyperplane crossing \(F\). Consider \(g_{H'}(g_H(F'))\). On one hand, \(g_{H'}(g_H(F')) \subseteq \cup_{k \leq n+1} \mathfrak{F}_k\). But \(g_{H'}(g_H(F')) = F\). Hence \(F \in \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{F}_n\). \(\square\)

2.2. Stabilizers act cocompactly. The goal of this subsection is to prove that \(\text{Stab}_G(F)\) acts cocompactly on \(F\) for each \(F \in \mathfrak{F}\). The following lemma is standard but we include a proof in the interest of a self-contained exposition.

**Lemma 2.3** (Coboundedness from finite multiplicity). Let \(X\) be a metric space and let \(G \rightarrow \text{Ison}(X)\) act cocompactly, and let \(\mathcal{Y}\) be a \(G\)-invariant collection of subspaces such that every ball intersects finitely many elements of \(\mathcal{Y}\). Then \(\text{Stab}_G(P)\) acts coboundedly on \(P\) for every \(P \in \mathcal{Y}\).
Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{Y}$, choose a basepoint $r \in X$, and use cocompactness to choose $t < \infty$ so that $d(x, G \cdot r) \leq t$ for all $x \in X$. Choose $g_1, \ldots, g_s \in G$ so that the $G$-translates of $P$ intersecting $\mathcal{N}_{10t}(r)$ are exactly $g_i P$ for $i \leq s$. Since $\mathcal{Y}$ is $G$-invariant and locally finite, $s < \infty$. (In other words, the assumptions guarantee that there are finitely many cosets of $\text{Stab}_G(P)$ whose corresponding translates of $P$ intersect $\mathcal{N}_{10t}(r)$, and we have fixed a representative of each of these cosets.) Let $K_r = \max_{i \leq s} d(r, g_i r)$. For each $g \in G$, the translates of $P$ that lie within distance 10$t$ of $g \cdot r$ are precisely $g g_i P, \ldots, g g_s P$. Letting $K_{gr} = \max_{i \leq s} d(g r, g g_i r)$, we have $K_{gr} = K_r$ just because $d(r, g_i r) = d(g \cdot r, g g_i \cdot r)$.

Fix a basepoint $p \in P$ and let $q \in P$ be an arbitrary point; choose $h_p, h_q \in G$ so that $d(h_p \cdot r, p) \leq t, d(h_q \cdot r, q) \leq t$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $h_q = 1$. Then $\{h_p g_i P\}_{i=1}^s$ is the set of $P$-translates intersecting $\mathcal{N}_{10t}(h_p \cdot r)$. Now, $p \in P$ and $d(h_p \cdot r, p) < 10t$, so there exists $i$ so that $h_p g_i P = P$, i.e. $h_p g_i \in \text{Stab}_G(P)$. Finally,

$$d(h_p g_i \cdot q, p) \leq d(h_p g_i \cdot r, h_p g_i \cdot q) + d(h_p \cdot r, p) + d(h_p g_i \cdot r, h_p \cdot r) \leq 2t + K_{h_p r} = 2t + K_r,$$

which is uniformly bounded. Hence the action of $\text{Stab}_G(P)$ on $P$ is cocompact. $\square$

Remark 2.4. We use Lemma 2.3 when $X$ and $P$ are proper, to get a cocompact action.

Lemma 2.5. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a group $G$ acting cocompactly. Let $Y, Y' \subset \mathcal{X}$ be parallel convex subcomplexes, then $\text{Stab}_G(Y)$ and $\text{Stab}_G(Y')$ are commensurable. Thus, if $\text{Stab}_G(Y)$ acts cocompactly on $Y$, then $\text{Stab}_G(Y) \cap \text{Stab}_G(Y')$ acts cocompactly on $Y'$.

Proof. Let $T$ be the set of $\text{Stab}_G(Y)$-translates of $Y'$. Then each $gY' \in T$ is parallel to $Y$, and $d_\mathcal{X}(gY', Y) = d_\mathcal{X}(Y', Y)$. Since $Y'$ is locally finite, $|T| < \infty$. Hence $K = \ker(\text{Stab}_G(Y) \to \text{Sym}(T))$ has finite index in $\text{Stab}_G(Y)$ but lies in $\text{Stab}_G(Y) \cap \text{Stab}_G(Y')$. By Lemma 1.7, $K$ acts cocompactly on $Hull(Y \cup Y')$, stabilizing $Y'$, and thus acts cocompactly on $Y'$. $\square$

Definition 2.6. Let $H \in \mathfrak{H}_1$. For $n \geq 1, k \geq 0$, let $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ be the set of $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ so that $F = g_H(F')$ for some $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ with $d(H, F') \leq k$. Let $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H} = \cup_{k \geq 0} \mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_{n,k} = \cup_{H \in \mathfrak{H}_1} \mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$.

Proposition 2.7 (Cocompactness). Let $n \geq 1$. Then, for any $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$, $\text{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on $F$. Hence $\text{Stab}_G(F)$ acts cocompactly on $F$ for each $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$.

Proof. The second assertion follows from the first and Corollary 2.2. We argue by double induction on $n, k$ to prove the first assertion, with $k$ as in Definition 2.6. First, observe that $\mathfrak{F}_n$ are $G$-invariant for all $n, k$. Similarly, $\mathfrak{F}_{n,H,k}$ is $\text{Stab}_G(H)$-invariant for all $H \in \mathfrak{H}_1$.

Base Case: $n = 1$. From local finiteness of $\mathcal{X}$, cocompactness of the action of $G$ and Lemma 2.3, we see that $\text{Stab}_G(H)$ acts cocompactly on $H$ for each $H \in \mathfrak{H}_1$.

Inductive Step 1: $(n, k)$ for all $k$ implies $(n+1, 0)$. Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n+1,0}$. Then $F = H \cap F'$, where $H \in \mathfrak{H}_1$ and $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_n$. By definition, $F' = g_H(F'')$ for some $F'' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $H' \in \mathfrak{H}_1$. Thus $K = \text{Stab}_G(F')$ acts cocompactly on $F''$ by induction.

Let $S = \{k(H \cap F') : k \in K\}$, which is a $K$-invariant set of convex subcomplexes of $F'$. Moreover, since the set of all $K$-translates of $H$ is a locally finite collection, because $\mathcal{X}$ is locally finite and $H$ is a combinatorial hyperplane, $S$ has the property that every ball in $F'$ intersects finitely many elements of $S$. Lemma 2.3 applied to the cocompact action of $K$ on $F'$, shows that $\text{Stab}_K(H \cap F')$ (which equals $\text{Stab}_K(F')$), and hence $\text{Stab}_G(F')$, acts cocompactly on $F'$.

Inductive Step 2: $(n, k)$ implies $(n, k+1)$. Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_{n,k+1}$ so that $F = g_H(F')$ with $H \in \mathfrak{H}_1$, $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $d = d(H, F') \leq k+1$. If $d \leq k$, induction applies. Thus, we can assume that $d = k+1$. Then there is a product region $F \times [0,d] \subset \mathcal{X}$ with $F \times \{0\} = F$, and $F \times \{d\} \subset F'$. Now, $F_1 := F \times \{1\}$ is a parallel copy of $F$ contained in the carrier of the hyperplane $H''$ parallel to $H''$ dual to the edge $[0,1]$ of $[0,d]$. Letting $H'$ be the combinatorial hyperplane parallel to $H''$ in $N(H'')$ and separated from $F$ by $H''$, we have $F_1 \subset g_H(F')$. Moreover, $d(H', F') \leq d - 1 = k$. By induction $L = \text{Stab}_G(g_H(F'))$ acts cocompactly on $g_H(F')$. 


We claim that $F_1 = g_H(F') \cap g_H(H)$. To see this, note that the hyperplanes that cross $F_1$ are exactly the hyperplanes that cross $F'$ and $H$. However, those are the hyperplanes which cross $H'$ and $F'$ which also cross $H$. It easily follows that the two subcomplexes are equal.

Now let $T$ be the set of $L$-translates of $F_1 = g_H(F') \cap g_H(H)$ in $g_H(F')$. This is an $L$-invariant collection of convex subcomplexes of $g_H(F')$. Moreover, each ball in $g_H(F')$ intersects finitely many elements of $T$. Indeed, $T$ is a collection of subcomplexes of the form $T_{l \ell} = g_{H,l}(H) \cap g_{H,l}(F')$, where $\ell \in L$. Recall that $d_{X}(H, H') = 1$. Hence, fixing $y \in g_{H,l}(F')$ and $t \geq 0$, if $\{T_{l \ell} : \ell \in T\}$ is a collection of elements of $T$, all of which intersect $N_I(y)$, then $\{\ell_0 H, \ell_1 H'\} \in T$ all intersect $N_I(y)$. However, by local finiteness of $X$ there are only finitely many distinct $\ell_0 H, \ell_1 H'$. Further, if $\ell_0 H = \ell_1 H$ and $\ell_1 H' = \ell_2 H'$, then $T_{\ell_0} = T_{\ell_2}$. Thus, the index set $I$ must be finite. Hence, by Lemma 2.5 and cocompactness of the action of $L$ on $g_H(F')$, we see (as in Inductive Step 1) that $\text{Stab}_{G}(F_1)$ acts cocompactly on $F_1$. Now, since $F_1$ is parallel to $F$, we see by Lemma 2.5 that $\text{Stab}_{G}(F)$ acts cocompactly on $F$.

The next Lemma explains how to turn the algebraic conditions on the $G$-action described in Section 4 into geometric properties of the convex subcomplexes in $\mathfrak{F}$. This is of independent interest, giving a complete algebraic characterization of when two cocompact subcomplexes have parallel essential cores.

**Lemma 2.8** (Characterization of commensurable stabilizers). Let $Y_1$ and $Y_2$ be two convex subcomplexes of $X$ and let $G_i = \text{Stab}_{G}(Y_i)$. Suppose further that $G_i$ acts on $Y_i$ cocompactly. Then $G_1$ and $G_2$ are commensurable if and only of the $G_1$–essential core $\hat{Y}_1$ and the $G_2$–essential core $\hat{Y}_2$ are parallel.

**Proof.** First, if $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2$ are parallel, then Lemma 2.5 shows that $\text{Stab}_{G}(\hat{Y}_1), \text{Stab}_{G}(\hat{Y}_2)$ contain $\text{Stab}_{G}(\hat{Y}_1) \cap \text{Stab}_{G}(\hat{Y}_2)$ as a finite-index subgroup. Since $\text{Stab}_{G}(\hat{Y}_1)$ contains $G_1$ as a finite-index subgroup, it follows that $G_1 \cap G_2$ has finite index in $G_1$ and in $G_2$.

Conversely, suppose that $G_1, G_2$ have a common finite-index subgroup. Thus, $G_1 \cap G_2$ acts cocompactly on both $Y_1$ and $Y_2$. This implies that $Y_1, Y_2$ lie at finite Hausdorff distance, since choosing $r > 0$ and $y_i \in Y_i$ so that $(G_1 \cap G_2) B_r(y_i) = Y_i$, we see that $Y_i$ is in the $d(y_1, y_2) + r$ neighbourhood of $Y_2$, and vice-versa. Further, this implies that $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2$ lie at finite Hausdorff distance, since $\hat{Y}_i$ is finite Hausdorff distance from $Y_i$.

Suppose that $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2$ are not parallel. Then, without loss of generality, some hyperplane $H$ of $X$ crosses $\hat{Y}_1$ but not $\hat{Y}_2$. Since $G_1$ acts on $\hat{Y}_1$ essentially and cocompactly, $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{S}\mathbb{H}1$ provides a hyperbolic isometry $g \in G_1$ of $\hat{Y}_1$ so that $g\hat{H} \subsetneq \hat{H}$, where $\hat{H}$ is the halfspace of $X$ associated to $H$ and disjoint from $Y_2$. Choosing $n > 0$ so that the translation length of $g^n$ exceeds the distance from $Y_2$ to the point in which some $g$–axis intersects $H$, we see that $H$ cannot separate $g^n \hat{Y}_2$ from the axis of $g$. Thus, $g^n \hat{Y}_2 \cap \hat{H} \neq \emptyset$, whence $(g) \cap G_2 = \{1\}$, contradicting that $G_1$ and $G_2$ are commensurable (since $g$ has infinite order). Thus $\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2$ are parallel.

### 2.3. Ascending or descending chains.

We reduce Theorem [A] to a claim about chains in $\mathfrak{F}$.

**Lemma 2.9** (Finding chains). Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$ be an infinite subset satisfying $\bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \ni x$ for some $x \in X$. Then one of the following holds:

- there exists a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ so that $x \in F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}$ for all $i$;
- there exists a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ so that $x \in F_i$ and $F_i \supseteq F_{i+1}$ for all $i$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathfrak{F}_x \supseteq \mathcal{U}$ be the set of $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $x \in F$. Let $\Omega$ be the directed graph with vertex set $\mathfrak{F}_x$, with $(F, F')$ a directed edge if $F \subseteq F'$ and there does not exist $F'' \in \mathfrak{F}_x$ with $F \subseteq F'' \subseteq F'$.

Let $F_0 = \{x\}$. Since $x$ is the intersection of the finitely many hyperplane carriers containing it, $F_0 \in \mathfrak{F}$ and in particular $F_0 \in \mathfrak{F}_x$. Moreover, note that $F_0$ has no incoming $\Omega$–edges, since
F_0 cannot properly contain any other subcomplex. For any F ∈ ℤ_x, either Ω contains an edge from F_0 to F, or there exists F' ∈ ℤ_x such that F_0 ⊂ F' ⊂ F.

Hence either ℤ_x contains an infinite ascending or descending ⊑-chain, or Ω is a connected directed graph in which every non-minimal vertex as an immediate predecessor, and every non-maximal vertex has an immediate successor. In the first two cases, we are done, so assume that the third holds. In the third case, there is a unique vertex namely F_0, with no incoming edges and there is a finite length directed path from F_0 to any vertex.

Let F ∈ ℤ_x and suppose that \{F_i\}_i is the set of vertices of Ω so that (F, F_i) is an edge. For i ≠ j, we have F ⊆ F_i ∩ F_j ⊆ F_i, so since F_i ∩ F_j = gF_i(F_j) ∈ ℤ, we have F_i ∩ F_j = F.

The set \{F_i\}_i is invariant under the action of Stab_G(F). Also, by Proposition 2.7 Stab_G(F) acts cocompactly on F. A 0-cube y ∈ F is diplomatic if there exists i so that y is joined to a vertex of F_i − F by a 1-cube in F_i. Only uniformly finitely many F_i can witness the diplomacy of y since Ω is uniformly locally finite and F_i ∩ F_j = F whenever i ≠ j. Also, y is diplomatic, witnessed by F_{i_1},...,F_{i_k}, if and only if only if y is diplomatic, witnessed by gF_{i_1},...,gF_{i_k}, for each g ∈ Stab_G(F). Since Stab_G(F) ∩ F cocompactly, we thus get |\{F_i\}_i|/Stab_G(F)| < ∞.

Let ̂Ω be the graph with a vertex for each F ∈ ℤ containing a point of G · x and a directed edge for minimal containment as above. Then ̂Ω is a graded directed graph as above. For each n ≥ 0, let S_n be the set of vertices in ̂Ω at distance n from a minimal element. The above argument shows that G acts cofinitely on each S_n, and thus ̂Ω/G is locally finite. Hence, by König’s infinity lemma, either ̂Ω/G contains a directed ray or ̂Ω(0)/G is finite. In the former case, ̂Ω must contain a directed ray, in which case there exists F_i ⊊ ℤ with F_i ⊊ F_{i+1} for all i. Up to translating by an appropriate element of G, we can assume that x ∈ F_0. The latter case means that the set of F ∈ ℤ such that F ∩ G · x ≠ ∅ is G-finite. But since G acts properly and cocompactly on X, any G-invariant G-finite collection of subcomplexes whose stabilizers act cocompactly has finite multiplicity, a contradiction.

3. ORTHOGONAL COMPLEMENTS OF COMPACT SETS AND THE HYPERCLOSURE

We now characterise ℤ in a CAT(0) cube complex X, without making use of a group action.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let A ⊆ B ⊆ X be convex subcomplexes and let a ∈ A. Then φ_B(\{a\} × B^⊥) ⊆ φ_A(\{a\} × A^⊥).

**Proof.** Let x ∈ φ_B(\{a\} × B^⊥). Then every hyperplane H separating x from a separates two parallel copies of B and thus separates two parallel copies of A, since A ⊆ B. It follows from Lemma 1.11 that every hyperplane separating a from x crosses φ_A(\{a\} × A^⊥), whence x ∈ φ_A(\{a\} × A^⊥).

Given a convex subcomplex F ⊆ X, fix a base 0-cube f ∈ F and for brevity, let F^⊥ = φ_F(\{f\} × F^⊥) ⊆ X. Note that f ∈ F^⊥, and so we let F^⊥⊥ = φ_{F^⊥}(\{f\} × (F^⊥)^⊥) (here, the (F^⊥)^⊥ is the abstract orthogonal complement of F^⊥), which again contains f, and so we can similarly define \((F^⊥)^⊥)^⊥\) etc.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let F be a convex subcomplex of X. Then \((F^⊥)^⊥)^⊥ = F^⊥.

**Proof.** If F is a convex subcomplex, there is a parallel copy of F^⊥ based at each 0-cube of F, since F × F^⊥ is a convex subcomplex of X. Thus F ⊆ (F^⊥)^⊥, and by Lemma 3.1 we have F^⊥ ⊆ \((F^⊥)^⊥\)^⊥. To obtain the other inclusion, we show that every parallel copy of F is contained in a parallel copy of (F^⊥)^⊥. This is clear since, letting A = F^⊥, we have that
$\phi_A(A \times A^\perp)$ is a convex subcomplex of $X$, but $F \subset A^\perp$ by the above, and thus $\phi_F(F \times F^\perp) \subseteq \phi_{F^\perp}(F^\perp \times (F^\perp)^\perp)$, both of which are convex subcomplexes of $X$. Hence $F^\perp \subseteq ((F^\perp)^\perp)^\perp$, completing the proof. \hfill \Box

3.1. Characterisation of $\mathfrak{F}$ using orthogonal complements of compact sets. In this section, we assume that $X$ is locally finite, but do not need a group action.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $F \subset X$ be a convex subcomplex. Then $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ if and only if there exists a compact convex subcomplex $C$ so that $C^\perp = F$.

**Proof.** Let $C$ be a compact convex subcomplex of $X$. Let $H_1, \ldots, H_k$ be the hyperplanes crossing $C$. Fix a basepoint $x \in C$, and suppose the $H_i$ are labeled so that $x \in \mathcal{N}(H_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $x \notin \mathcal{N}(H_i)$ for $i > m$, for some $m \leq k$. Let $F = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{g}_{H_i}(H_i)$, which contains $x$. Any hyperplane $H$ crosses $\phi_C(\{x\} \times C^\perp)$ if and only if $H$ crosses each $H_i$, which occurs if and only if $H$ crosses $F$. Hence $F = \phi_C(\{x\} \times C^\perp)$, as required.

We now prove the converse. Let $F \in \mathfrak{F}_n$ for $n \geq 1$. If $n = 1$ and $F$ is a combinatorial hyperplane, $F = e^\perp$ for some 1-cube $e$ of $X$. Next, assume that $n \geq 2$ and write $F = \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$ where $F' \in \mathfrak{F}_{n-1}$ and $H$ is a combinatorial hyperplane. Induction on $n$ gives $F' = (C')^\perp$ for some compact convex subcomplex $C'$.

Let $e$ be a 1-cube with orthogonal complement $H \in \mathfrak{F}_1$, chosen as close as possible to $C'$, so that $d(e, C') = d(H, C')$. In particular, any hyperplane separating $e$ from $C'$ separates $H$ from $C'$. Moreover, we can and shall assume that $C'$ was chosen in its parallelism class so that $d(e, C')$ is minimal when $e, C'$ are allowed to vary in their parallelism classes.

Let $C$ be the convex hull of (the possibly disconnected set) $e \cup C'$. We claim that $\mathfrak{g}_H(F') = \{x\} \times C^\perp$. First, suppose that $V$ is a hyperplane crossing $\{x\} \times C^\perp$. Then $V$ separates two parallel copies of $C$, each of which contains a parallel copy of $e$ and one of $C'$. Hence $V$ crosses $H$ and $F'$, so $V$ crosses $\mathfrak{g}_H(F')$. Thus $\{x\} \times C^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_H(F')$.

Conversely, suppose $V$ is a hyperplane crossing $\mathfrak{g}_H(F')$, i.e. crossing $H$ and $F'$. To show that $V$ crosses $\{x\} \times C^\perp$, it suffices to show that $V$ crosses every hyperplane crossing $C$. If $W$ crosses $C$, then either $W$ separates $e, C'$ or crosses $e \cup C'$. In the latter case, $V$ crosses $W$ since $V$ crosses $H$ and $(C')^\perp = F'$. In the former case, since $e, C'$ are as close as possible in their parallelism classes, $W$ separates $e, C'$ only if it separates $H$ from $C' \times (C')^\perp$, so $W$ must cross $V$. Hence $\mathfrak{g}_H(F') \subseteq \{x\} \times C^\perp$. Since only finitely many hyperplanes $V$ either cross $e, C'$, or separate $e$ from $C'$, the subcomplex $C$ is compact. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 3.4.** If $F \in \mathfrak{F}$, then $(F^\perp)^\perp = F$.

**Proof.** If $F \in \mathfrak{F}$, then $F = C^\perp$ for some compact $C$, by Theorem 3.3 and hence $((C^\perp)^\perp)^\perp = (F^\perp)^\perp = C^\perp = F$, by Lemma 3.2. \hfill \Box

4. Auxiliary Conditions

In this section, the group $G$ acts geometrically on the proper $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complex $X$.

4.1. Rotation.

**Definition 4.1** (Rotational). The action of $G$ on $X$ is rotational if the following holds. For each hyperplane $B$, there is a finite-index subgroup $K_B \leq \text{Stab}_G(B)$ so that for all hyperplanes $A$ with $d(A, B) > 0$, and all $k \in K_B$, the carriers $\mathcal{N}(A)$ and $\mathcal{N}(kA)$ are either equal or disjoint.

**Remark 4.2.** For example, if $G \backslash X$ is (virtually) special, then $G$ acts rotationally on $X$, but one can easily make examples of non-cospacial rotational actions on $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes.

To illustrate how to apply rotation, we first prove a lemma about $\mathfrak{F}_2$. 


Lemma 4.3 (Uniform cocompactness in $\mathfrak{H}_2$ under rotational actions). Let $G$ act properly, cocompactly, and rotationally on $\mathcal{X}$. Then for any ball $Q$ in $\mathcal{X}$, there exists $s \geq 0$, depending only on $\mathcal{X}$, and the radius of $Q$, so that for all $A, B \in \mathfrak{H}_1$, at most $s$ distinct translates of $g_B(A)$ can intersect $Q$.

Proof. Note that if $B, gB$ are in the same $G$–orbit, and $K_B \leq \text{Stab}_G(B)$ witnesses the rotation of the action at $B$, then $K_B^g$ does the same for $gB$, so we can assume that the index of $K_B \leq \text{Stab}_G(B)$ is uniformly bounded by some constant $\iota$ as $B$ varies over the (finitely many orbits of) combinatorial hyperplanes.

Next, note that it suffices to prove the claim for $Q$ of radius 0, since the general statement will then follow from uniform properness of $\mathcal{X}$.

Finally, it suffices to fix combinatorial hyperplanes $B$ and $A$ and bound the number of $\text{Stab}_G(B)$–translates of $A$ whose projections on $B$ contain some fixed 0–cube $x \in B$, since only boundedly many translates of $B$ can contain $x$.

We can assume that $A$ is disjoint from $B$, for otherwise $g_B(A) = A \cap B$, and the number of translates of $A$ containing $x$ is bounded in terms of $G$ and $\mathcal{X}$ only.

Now suppose $d(A, B) > 0$. First, let $\{g_1, \ldots, g_k\} \subset K_B$ be such that the translates $g_i g_B(A)$ are all distinct and $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k g_B(g_i A) = \bigcap_{i=1}^k g_i g_B(A)$. For simplicity, we can and shall assume that $g_1 = 1$.

We can also assume, by multiplying our eventual bound by 2, that the $g_i A$ all lie on the same side of $B$, i.e. the hyperplane $B'$ whose carrier is bounded by $B$ and a parallel copy of $B$ does not separate any pair of the $g_i A$. By rotation, $A, g_2 A$ are disjoint, and hence separated by some hyperplane $V$.

Since $V$ cannot separate $g_B(A), g_B(g_2 A)$, we have that $V$ separates either $A$ or $g_2 A$ from $B$. (The other possibility is that $V = B$ but we have ruled this out above.) Up to relabelling, we can assume the former. Then, for $i \geq 2$, we have that $g_i V$ separates $g_i A$ from $g_i B = B$. Moreover, by choosing $V$ as close as possible to $B$ among hyperplanes that separate $A$ from $B$ and $g_2 A$, we see that the hyperplanes $\{g_i V\}_{i=1}^k$ have pairwise-intersecting carriers, and at least two of them are distinct. This contradicts the rotation hypothesis unless $k = 1$.

More generally, the above argument shows that if $\{g_1, \ldots, g_k\} \subset \text{Stab}_G(B)$ are such that the translates $g_i g_B(A)$ are all distinct and $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^k g_B(g_i A) = \bigcap_{i=1}^k g_i g_B(A)$, then the number of $g_i$ belonging to any given left coset of $K_B$ in $\text{Stab}_G(B)$ is uniformly bounded. Since $[\text{Stab}_G(B) : K_B] \leq \iota$, the lemma follows. \hfill \Box

More generally:

Lemma 4.4. Let $G$ act properly, cocompactly, and rotationally on $\mathcal{X}$. Then for all $\rho \geq 0$, there exists a constant $s'$ so that the following holds. Let $F \in \mathfrak{H}$. Then at most $s'$ distinct $G$–translates of $F$ can intersect any $\rho$–ball in $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, it suffices to bound the number of $G$–translates of $F$ containing a given 0–cube $x$. As in the same proof, it suffices to bound the number of $\text{Stab}_G(B)$–translates of $F$ containing $x$, where $B$ is a combinatorial hyperplane for which $x \in F \subset B$.

By the first paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.3 there exists $n$ and combinatorial hyperplanes $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ such that $F = \bigcap_{i=1}^n g_B(A_i)$. If $A_n$ is parallel to $B$, then $F = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n-1} g_B(A_i)$, so by choosing a smallest such collection, we have that no $A_i$ is parallel to $B$.

Let $g_1, \ldots, g_k \in K_B$ have the property that the $g_i F$ are all distinct and contain $x$. Note that $g_i F = \bigcap_{j=1}^n g_B(g_j A_j)$.

Now, if $A_j$ is disjoint from $B$, then rotation implies that for all $i$, either $g_i A_j = A_j$ or $g_i A_j \cap A_j = \emptyset$. If $g_i A_j \neq A_j$, there is a hyperplane $V$ separating them, and $V$ cannot cross or coincide with $B$ (as in the proof of Lemma 4.3). Hence $V$ separates $A_j$, say, from $B$. So $g_i V$ separates $g_i A_j$ from $B$, and $g_i V \neq g_j V$. By choosing $V$ as close as possible to $B$, we have
there exists an infinite subset of \( H \) of \( \text{Stab} \) complex-of-groups subgroups of the local groups for the cells of \( \text{Stab} \) \( X \) on finite subgroups, and the same is true for \( \text{Stab} \) \( Y \) cube complexes. Except we have to work with nonpositively-curved orbi-complexes instead of nonpositively-curved admitting a local isometry to a finite-index torsion-free subgroup.)

III. \( Y \) on follows that in boundedly many translates of each \( \text{Stab} \) \( F \) complex is uniformly bounded, and the number of such cosets is bounded by \( F \).

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, there exists \( F \) a factor system.

**Corollary 4.5.** Let \( G \) act properly, cocompactly, and rotationally on the proper CAT(0) cube complex \( \mathcal{X} \). Then \( \mathfrak{Y} \) is a factor system.

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.4 there exists \( s' \) \( < \) \( \infty \) so that for all \( F \in \mathfrak{Y} \), at most \( s' \) distinct \( G \)-translates of \( F \) can contain a given point. By uniform properness of \( F \) and the proof of Lemma 2.3 there exists \( R \) \( < \) \( \infty \) so that each \( F \in \mathfrak{Y} \) has the following property: fix a basepoint \( x \in F \). Then for any \( y \in F \), there exists \( g \in \text{Stab}_G(F) \) so that \( d(gx, y) \leq R \). Hence there exists \( k \) so that for all \( F \), the complex \( F \) contains at most \( k \) \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \)-orbits of cubes.

**Conclusion in the virtually torsion-free case:** If \( G \) is virtually torsion-free, then (passing to a finite-index torsion-free subgroup) \( G \backslash \mathcal{X} \) is a compact nonpositively-curved cube complex admitting a local isometry \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \rightarrow G \backslash \mathcal{X} \), where \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \) is a nonpositively-curved cube complex with at most \( k \) cubes. Since there are only finitely many such complexes, and finitely many such local isometries, the quotient \( G \backslash \mathfrak{Y} \) is finite. Since each \( x \in \mathfrak{Y} \) is contained in boundedly many translates of each \( F \in \mathfrak{Y} \), and there are only finitely many orbits in \( \mathfrak{Y} \), it follows that \( x \) is contained in boundedly many elements of \( \mathfrak{Y} \), as required.

**General case:** Even if \( G \) is not virtually torsion-free, we can argue essentially as above, except we have to work with nonpositively-curved orbi-complexes instead of nonpositively-curved cube complexes.

First, let \( \mathcal{Y} \) be the first barycentric subdivision of \( \mathcal{X} \), so that \( G \) acts properly and cocompactly on \( \mathcal{Y} \) and, for each cell \( y \) of \( \mathcal{Y} \), we have that \( \text{Stab}_G(y) \) fixes \( y \) pointwise (see [BH99, Chapter III.C.2].) Letting \( F' \) be the first barycentric subdivision of \( F \), we see that \( F' \) is a subcomplex of \( \mathcal{Y} \) with the same properties with respect to the \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \)-action. Moreover, \( F' \) has at most \( k' \) \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \)-orbits of cells, where \( k' \) depends on \( \dim \mathcal{X} \) and \( k \), but not on \( F \).

The quotient \( G \backslash \mathcal{Y} \) is a complex of groups whose cells are labelled by finitely many different finite subgroups, and the same is true for \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \). Moreover, we have a morphism of complexes of groups \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \rightarrow G \backslash \mathcal{Y} \) which is injective on local groups. Since \( G \) acts on \( \mathcal{X} \) properly, the local groups in \( G \backslash \mathcal{Y} \) are finite. Hence there are boundedly many cells in \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \), each of which has boundedly many possible local groups (namely, the various subgroups of the local groups for the cells of \( G \backslash \mathcal{Y} \)). Hence there are finitely many choices of \( \text{Stab}_G(F) \backslash F \), and thus finitely many \( G \)-orbits in \( \mathfrak{Y} \), and we can conclude as above.

4.2. Weak finite height and essential index conditions.

**Definition 4.6** (Weak finite height condition). Let \( G \) be a group and \( H \leq G \) a subgroup. The subgroup \( H \) satisfies the **weak finite height condition** if the following holds. Let \( \{g_i\}_{i \in I} \) be an infinite subset of \( G \) so that \( H \cap \bigcap_{i \in I} H^{g_i} \) is infinite whenever \( J \subset I \) is a finite subset. Then there exists \( i, j \) so that \( H \cap H^{g_i} = H \cap H^{g_j} \).
Definition 4.7 (Noetherian Intersection of Conjugates Condition (NICC)). Let $G$ be a group and $H \leq G$ a subgroup. The subgroup $H$ satisfies the Noetherian intersection of conjugates condition (NICC) if the following holds. Let $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be an infinite subset of distinct elements of $G$ so that $H_n = H \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n Hg_i$ is infinite for all $n$, then there exists $\ell > 0$ so that for all $j, k \geq \ell$, $H_j \cap H_k$ are commensurable.

Definition 4.8 (Conditions for hyperplanes). Let $G$ act on the CAT(0) cube complex $X$. Then the action satisfies the weak finite height condition for hyperplanes or respectively NICC for hyperplanes if, for each hyperplane $B$ of $X$, the subgroup $\text{Stab}_G(B) \leq G$ satisfies the weak finite height condition, or NICC, respectively.

Remark 4.9. Recall that $H \leq G$ has finite height if there exists $n$ so that any collection of at least $n+1$ distinct left cosets of $H$ has the property that the intersection of the corresponding conjugates of $H$ is finite. Observe that if $H$ has finite height, then it satisfies both the weak finite height condition and NICC, but that the converse does not hold.

Definition 4.10 (Essential index condition). The action of $G$ on $X$ satisfies the essential index condition if there exists $\zeta \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $F \in \mathfrak{F}$ we have $[\text{Stab}_G(\hat{F}) : \text{Stab}_G(F)] \leq \zeta$, where $\hat{F}$ is the $\text{Stab}_G(F)$-essential core of $F$.

4.3. Some examples where the auxiliary conditions are satisfied. We now briefly consider some examples illustrating the various hypotheses. Our goal here is just to illustrate the conditions in simple cases.

4.3.1. Special groups. Stabilizers of hyperplanes in a right-angled Artin groups are simply special subgroups generated by the links of vertices. Let $\Gamma$ be a graph generating a right angled Artin group $A_\Gamma$ and let $\Lambda$ be any inducted subgraph. Then $A_\Lambda$ is a special subgroup of $A_\Gamma$, and $A_\Lambda^g$ has non-trivial intersection with $A_j^g$ if and only if $g_jg_j^{-1}$ commutes with some subgraph $\Lambda'$ of $\Lambda$. Further, their intersection is conjugate to the special subgroup $A_\Lambda'$. The weak finite height condition and NICC follow. The essential index condition also holds since each $A_\Lambda$ acts essentially on the corresponding element of $\mathfrak{F}$, which is just a copy of the universal cover of the Salvetti complex of $A_\Lambda$. In fact, these considerations show that hyperplane stabilisers in RAAGs have finite height. It is easily verified that these properties are inherited by subgroups arising from compact local isometries to the Salvetti complex, reconfirming that (virtually) compact special cube complexes have factor systems in their universal covers.

4.3.2. Non-virtually special lattices in products of trees. The uniform lattices in products of trees from $\text{Wis96}$ $\text{BM97}$ $\text{Rat07}$ $\text{JW09}$ do not satisfy the weak finite height condition, but they do satisfy NICC and the essential index condition.

Indeed, let $G$ be a cocompact lattice in $\text{Aut}(T_1 \times T_2)$, where $T_1, T_2$ are locally finite trees. If $A, B$ are disjoint hyperplanes, then $g_B(A)$ is a parallel copy of some $T_i$, i.e. $g_B(A)$ is again a hyperplane; otherwise, if $A, B$ cross, then $g_B(A)$ is a single point. The essential index condition follows immediately, as does the NICC. However, $G$ can be chosen so that there are pairs of parallel hyperplanes $A, B$ so that $\text{Stab}_G(A) \cap \text{Stab}_G(B)$ has arbitrarily large (finite) index in $\text{Stab}_G(B)$, so the weak finite height condition fails.

4.3.3. Graphs of groups. Let $\Gamma$ be a finite graph of groups, where each vertex group $G_v$ acts properly and cocompactly on a CAT(0) cube complex $X_v$ with a factor system $\mathfrak{F}_v$, and each edge group $G_e$ acts properly and cocompactly on a CAT(0) cube complex $X_e$, with a factor system $\mathfrak{F}_e$, so that the following conditions are satisfied, where $v, w$ are the vertices of $e$:

- there are $G$-equivariant convex embeddings $X_e \to X_v, X_w$
- these embedding induce injective maps $\mathfrak{F}_e \to \mathfrak{F}_v, \mathfrak{F}_w$. 
If the action of $G$ on the Bass-Serre tree is acylindrical, then one can argue essentially as in the proof of [BHS15, Theorem 8.6] to prove that the resulting tree of CAT(0) cube complexes has a factor system. Moreover, ongoing work on improving [BHS15, Theorem 8.6] indicates that one can probably obtain the same conclusion in this setting without this acylindricity hypothesis.

Of course, one can imagine gluing along convex cocompact subcomplexes that don’t belong to the factor systems of the incident vertex groups. Also, we believe that the property of being cocompactly cubulated with a factor system is preserved by taking graph products, and that one can prove this by induction on the size of the graph by splitting along link subgroups. This is the subject of recent work in the hierarchically hyperbolic setting; see [BR18].

4.3.4. Cubical small-cancellation quotients. There are various ways of building more exotic examples of non-virtually special cocompactly cubulated groups using groups. In [JW17], Jankiewicz-Wise construct a group $G$ that is cocompactly cubulated but does not virtually split. They start with a group $G'$ of the type discussed in Remark 4.2 and consider a small-cancellation quotient of the free product of several copies of $G'$. This turns out to satisfy strong cubical small-cancellation conditions sufficient to produce a proper, cocompact action of $G$ on a CAT(0) cube complex. However, it appears that the small-cancellation conditions needed to achieve this are also strong enough to ensure that the NICC and essential index properties pass from $G'$ to $G$. The key points are that $G$ is hyperbolic relative to $G'$, and each wall in $G$ intersects each coset of $G'$ in at most a single wall (Lemma 4.2 and Corollary 4.5 of [JW17]).

4.3.5. A non-rotational example. Let $Y$ be a compact nonpositively curved cube complex whose fundamental group $G$ has the following two properties:

- $G$ has no proper finite-index subgroup;
- there exists $g \in G$ such that $g$ is represented by a based combinatorial path $L \to Y$ that is a local isometry.

The examples mentioned in Subsection 4.3.2 show that we can take $Y$ to have universal cover the product of two trees.

Let $M'$ be a copy of $[0, 2] \times [0, |L|]$, endowed with the product cubical structure in which $[0, 2]$ and $[0, |L|]$ are regarded as cube complexes with 0-cubes at integer points. Let $M$ be the quotient of $M'$ obtained by identifying $[0, 2] \times \{0\}$ and $[0, 2] \times \{|L|\}$ by an orientation-reversing combinatorial isometry, so that $M$ is a Möbius strip tiled by squares. Form a cube complex $X$ from $Y \times [0, 1] \cup M$ by identifying $L$ with $\{1\} \times [0, |L|]$ (here we think of $L$ as a the path $L \to Y \times \{0\} \hookrightarrow Y \times [0, 1]$). Then $X$ is nonpositively curved, because $L \to Y \times \{0\}$ is a local isometry and $L \to M$ is a local isometry.

Let $X$ be the universal cover of $X$, on which $\pi_X = G$ acts freely and cocompactly. Now, the preimage of $Y \times \{\frac{1}{2}\}$ under the covering map $\tilde{X} \to X$ has a single component, which is a hyperplane that we call $B$. By construction, the stabiliser of $B$ is $G$, which has no proper finite-index subgroups. Now, let $A$ be a hyperplane of $\tilde{X}$ projecting to an immersed hyperplane of $M$ dual to the image of $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$. Then $\mathcal{N}(A) \cap \mathcal{N}(gA)$ intersect (along an elevation of $L$), while $A$ and $B$ do not cross. Hence the action of $G$ on $\tilde{X}$ is non-rotational; because $G = \text{Stab}_G(B)$ has no proper finite-index subgroup, it was sufficient to find a single hyperplane $A$ and a single $g \in G$ violating the condition in Definition 4.4.

For a less self-contained example, it appears that $G$ can be chosen so that the action of $G$ on $Y$ is not rotational. In fact [BM97] and [Wis96] contain examples where $G$ is acting geometrically on $T_1 \times T_2$, with $T_1, T_2$ trees, but the induced actions on the two factors are not discrete. In particular, it seems that for each edge $e$ of $T_1$, and any $r \geq 0$, there is a vertex of $T_1$ at distance $r$ from $e$ so that the stabiliser of $e$ nontrivially permutes the edges incident to that vertex, and this seems to be an obstruction to the action being rotational. (This is in stark contrast to the case where $G$ is virtually a product of free groups, in which case the action is rotational.)
5. \( \mathcal{F} \) is closed under orthogonal complementation, given a group action

We now assume that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a locally finite CAT(0) cube complex on which the group \( G \) acts properly and cocompactly. Let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the hyperclosure in \( \mathcal{X} \) and let \( B \) be a constant so that each 0–cube \( x \) of \( \mathcal{X} \) lies in \( \leq B \) combinatorial hyperplanes.

For convex subcomplexes \( D, F \) of \( \mathcal{X} \), we write \( F = D^\perp \) to mean \( F = \phi_D(\{f\} \times D^\perp) \) for some \( f \in D \), though we may abuse notation, suppress the \( \phi_D \), and write e.g. \( \{f\} \times D^\perp \) to mean \( \phi_D(\{f\} \times D^\perp) \) when we care about the specific point \( f \).

**Proposition 5.1** (\( \mathcal{F} \) is closed under orthogonal complements). *Let \( G \) act on \( \mathcal{X} \) properly and cocompactly. Suppose that one of the following holds:*

- the \( G \)–action on \( \mathcal{X} \) satisfies the weak finite height property for hyperplanes;
- the \( G \)–action on \( \mathcal{X} \) satisfies the essential index condition and the NICC for hyperplanes;
- \( \mathcal{F} \) is a factor system.

*Let \( A \) be a convex subcomplex of \( \mathcal{X} \). Then \( A^\perp \in \mathcal{F} \). Hence \( \text{Stab}_G(A^\perp) \) acts on \( A^\perp \) cocompactly. In particular, for all \( F \in \mathcal{F} \), we have that \( F^\perp \in \mathcal{F} \).*

We first need a lemma.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let \( A \subset \mathcal{X} \) be a convex subcomplex with \( \text{diam}(A) > 0 \) and let \( x \in A^{(0)} \). Let \( H_1, \ldots, H_k \) be all of the hyperplanes intersecting \( A \) whose carriers contain \( x \), so that for each \( i \), there is a combinatorial hyperplanes \( H_i^+ \) associated to \( H_i \) with \( x \in H_i^+ \). Let \( Y = \cap_{i=1}^k H_i^+ \). Let \( S \) be the set of all combinatorial hyperplanes associated to hyperplanes crossing \( A \). Then

\[
A^\perp = \bigcap_{H' \in S} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H'),
\]

where \( A^\perp \) denotes the orthogonal complement of \( A \) at \( x \). If \( A \) is unique in its parallelism class, then \( A^\perp = \{x\} \). Finally, if \( \text{diam}(A) = 0 \), then \( A^\perp = \mathcal{X} \).*

**Proof.** *If \( A \) is a single 0–cube, then \( A^\perp = \mathcal{X} \) by definition. Hence suppose that \( \text{diam}(A) > 0 \).

Let \( H' \in S \). Since \( \mathfrak{y}_Y(H' \cap A) \subseteq Y \cap A = \{x\} \), we see that \( x \in \mathfrak{y}_Y(H') \). Suppose that \( y \in A^\perp \). Then every hyperplane \( V \) separating \( y \) from \( x \) crosses each of the hyperplanes \( H' \) crossing \( A \), and thus crosses \( Y \), whence \( y \in \mathfrak{y}_Y(H') \). On the other hand, suppose that \( y \in \cap_{H' \in S} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H') \). Then every hyperplane \( H' \) separating \( y \) from \( x \) crosses every hyperplane crossing \( A \), so \( y \in A^\perp \). This completes the proof that \( A^\perp = \cap_{H' \in S} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H') \).

Finally, \( A \) is unique in its parallelism class if and only if \( A^\perp = \{x\} \), by definition of \( A^\perp \).\]

We can now prove the proposition:

**Proof of Proposition 5.1.** *The proof has several stages.

**Setup using Lemma 5.2.** *If \( A \) is a single point, then \( A^\perp = \mathcal{X} \), which is in \( \mathcal{F} \) by definition. Hence suppose \( \text{diam}(A) > 0 \), and let \( H_1, \ldots, H_k, x \in A, Y \subset \mathcal{X} \), and \( S \) be as in Lemma 5.2 so

\[
A^\perp = \bigcap_{H' \in S} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H').
\]

Thus, to prove the proposition, it is sufficient to produce a finite collection \( \mathfrak{F} \) of hyperplanes \( H' \) crossing \( A \) so that

\[
\bigcap_{H' \in \mathfrak{F}} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H') = \bigcap_{H' \in \mathfrak{F}} \mathfrak{y}_Y(H').
\]

Indeed, if there is such a collection, then we have shown \( A^\perp \) to be the intersection of finitely many elements of \( \mathfrak{F} \), whence \( A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F} \), as required. Hence suppose for a contradiction that
for any finite collection $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{S}$, we have
\[ \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H') \subseteq \bigcap_{H' \in \mathcal{H}} \mathfrak{g}_Y(H'). \]

**Bad hyperplanes crossing** $Y$: For each $m$, let $\mathcal{H}_m$ be the (finite) set of hyperplanes $H'$ intersecting $N_m^A(x) = A \cap N_m(x)$ (and hence satisfying $x \in \mathfrak{g}_Y(H')$).

Consider the collection $\mathcal{B}_m$ of all hyperplanes $W$ such that $W$ crosses each element of $\mathcal{H}_m$ and $W$ crosses $Y$, but $W$ fails to cross $A^\perp$. (This means that there exists $j > m$ and some $U \in \mathcal{H}_j$ so that $W \cap U = \emptyset$.)

Suppose that there exists $m$ so that $\mathcal{B}_m = \emptyset$ for $n > m$. Then we can take $\mathcal{H}_m$ to be our desired set $\mathcal{H}$, and we are done. Hence suppose that $\mathcal{B}_m$ is nonempty for arbitrarily large $m$. Note that if $U \in \mathcal{B}_m$, then $N_m^A(x)$ is parallel into $U$, but there exists $j > m$ so that $N_j^A(x)$ is not parallel into $U$. (Here $N_j^A(x)$ denotes the $j$–ball in $A$ about $x$.)

**Elements of $\mathcal{B}_m$ osculating** $A^\perp$: Suppose that $U \in \mathcal{B}_m$, so that $N_j^A(x)$ is not parallel into $U$ for some $j > m$. Suppose that $U'$ is a hyperplane separating $U$ from $A^\perp$.

Then $U'$ separates $U$ from $x$ so, since $U$ intersects $Y$ and $x \in Y$, we have that $U'$ intersects $Y$. Since $\mathfrak{g}_Y(A) = \{x\}$ is not crossed by any hyperplanes, $U'$ cannot cross $A$. Hence $U'$ separates $U$ from $N_j^A(x)$, so $N_j^A(x)$ is parallel into $U'$ (since it is parallel into $U$). On the other hand, since $U'$ separates $U$ from $A^\perp$, $U'$ cannot cross $A^\perp$, and thus fails to cross some hyperplane crossing $A$. Hence $U' \in \mathcal{B}_m$. Thus, for each $m$, there exists $U_m \in \mathcal{B}_m$ whose carrier intersects $A^\perp$. Indeed, we have shown that any element of $\mathcal{B}_m$ as close as possible to $A^\perp$ has this property.

Hence we have a sequence of radii $r_n$ and hyperplanes $U_n$ so that:

- $U_n$ crosses $Y$;
- $\mathcal{N}(U_n) \cap A^\perp \neq \emptyset$;
- $N_j^A(x)$ is parallel into $U_n$ for all $n$;
- $N_{n+1}^A(x)$ is not parallel into $U_n$, for all $n$.

The above provides a sequence $\{V_n\}$ of hyperplanes so that for each $n$:

- $V_n$ crosses $A$;
- $V_n$ crosses $U_m$ for $m \geq n$;
- $V_n$ does not cross $U_m$ for $m < n$.

Indeed, for each $n$, choose $V_n$ to be a hyperplane crossing $N_{r_n}^A(x)$ but not crossing $U_n$. For each $n$, let $\tilde{V}_n$ be one of the two combinatorial hyperplanes (parallel to $V_n$) bounding $\mathcal{N}(V_n)$.

**Claim 1.** For each $n$, the subcomplex $A^\perp$ is parallel into $\tilde{V}_n$.

**Proof of Claim 1** Let $H$ be a hyperplane crossing $A^\perp$. Then, by definition of $A^\perp$, $H$ crosses each hyperplane crossing $A$. But $V_n$ crosses $A$, so $H$ must also cross $V_n$. Thus $A^\perp$ is parallel into $\tilde{V}_n$. \qed

Next, since $G$ acts on $X$ cocompactly, it acts with finitely many orbits of hyperplanes, so, by passing to a subsequence (but keeping our notation), we can assume that there exists a hyperplane $V$ crossing $A$ and elements $g_n \in G, n \geq 1$ so that $V_n = g_n V$ for $n \geq 1$. For simplicity, we can assume $g_1 = 1$.

Next, we can assume, after moving the basepoint $x \in A$ a single time, that $x \in \tilde{V}$, i.e. $\tilde{V}$ is among the $k$ combinatorial hyperplanes whose intersection is $Y$. This assumption is justified by the fact that $\mathfrak{F}$ is closed under parallelism, so it suffices to prove that any given parallel copy of $A^\perp$ lies in $\mathfrak{F}$. Thus we can and shall assume $Y \subset \tilde{V}$.

For each $m$, consider the inductively defined subcomplexes $Z_1 = \tilde{V}$ and for each $m \geq 2$, $Z_m = \mathfrak{g}_Y(\mathfrak{g}_{g_1 V} \cdots (\mathfrak{g}_{g_{m-1} V} (g_mV)) \cdots ))$, which is an element of $\mathfrak{F}$.

**Claim 2.** For all $m \geq 1$, we have $A^\perp \subseteq Z_m$. 


Proof of Claim 3. Indeed, since $A^\perp \subset Y$ by definition, and $Y \subset \hat{V}$, we have $A^\perp \subset \hat{V}$. On the other hand, for each $n$, Claim 1 implies that $A^\perp$ is parallel into $g_n \hat{V}$ for all $n$, so by induction, $A^\perp \subset Z_m$ for all $m \geq 1$, as required.

Claim 3. For all $m \geq 1$, we have $Z_m \supseteq Z_{m+1}$.

Proof of Claim 3. For each $m$, the hyperplane $U_m$ crosses $Y$, by construction. Since $Y \subseteq \hat{V}$, this implies that $U_m$ crosses $\hat{V}$. On the other hand, $U_m$ does not cross $\hat{V}_{m+1}$. This implies that $Z_m \neq Z_{m+1}$. On the other hand, $Z_{m+1} \subset Z_m$ just by definition.

Let $K_m = \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \bigcap_{n=1}^m \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_n}$; by Lemma 1.9 $K_m$ has finite index in $\text{Stab}_G(Z_m)$.

Thus, since $Z_m \in \mathfrak{F}$, we see that $K_m$ acts on $Z_m$ cocompactly. Claim 3 implies that no $Z_m$ is compact, for otherwise we would be forced to have $Z_m = Z_{m+1}$ for some $m$. Since $K_m$ acts on $Z_m$ cocompactly, it follows that $K_m$ is infinite for all $m$.

Thus far, we have not used any of the auxiliary hypotheses. We now explain how to derive a contradiction under the weak finite height hypothesis.

Claim 4. Suppose that the $G$–action on $X$ satisfies weak finite height for hyperplanes. Then, after passing to a subsequence, we have $K_m = K_2$ for all $m \geq 2$.

Proof of Claim 4. Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set and let $m = \max I$. Then $\bigcap_{n \in I} \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_n}$ contains $K_m$, and is thus infinite, since $K_m$ was shown above to be infinite. Hence, since $\text{Stab}_G(V)$ satisfies the weak finite height condition, there exist distinct $m, m'$ so that $\text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m} = \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m}$.

Declare $m \sim m'$ if $\text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m} = \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m}$, so that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{N}$. If any $\sim$–class $[m]$ is infinite, then we can pass to the subsequence $[m]$ and assume that $\text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m} = \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m}$ for all $n$.

Otherwise, if every $\sim$–class is finite, then there are infinitely many $\sim$–classes, and we can pass to a subsequence containing one element from each $\sim$–class. This amounts to assuming that $\text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m} \neq \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m}$ for all distinct $m, m'$, but this contradicts weak finite height, as shown above.

Hence, passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $\text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m} = \text{Stab}_G(V) \cap \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_m}$ for all $m, m' \geq 2$, and hence $K_m = K_2$ for all $m$.

From Claim 3 and the fact that $K_m$ stabilises $Z_m$ for each $m$, we have that $K_2$ stabilises each $Z_m$. Moreover, $K_2$ acts on $Z_m$ cocompactly.

The inclusion $Z_{m+1} \hookrightarrow Z_m$ descends to an inclusion $Z_{m+1}/K_2 \hookrightarrow Z_m/K_2$, and since the latter spaces are compact, we must have some $M$ such that $Z_{m+1}/K_2 \cong Z_m/K_2$ for $M \geq m$.

Hence $Z_m = Z_M$ for all $M \geq M$. This contradicts Claim 3. Hence the the claimed sequence of $U_m$ cannot exist, whence $A^\perp \not\subset \mathfrak{F}$.

Having proved the proposition under the weak finite height assumption, we now turn to the other hypotheses. Let $\{Z_m\}$ and $\{K_m\}$ be as above.

Claim 5. Suppose that the $G$–action on $X$ satisfies the NICC and the essential index condition. Then there exists $\ell$ so that $\text{Stab}_G(Z_m) = \text{Stab}_G(\hat{Z}_\ell)$ for all $m \geq \ell$.

Proof of Claim 5. Let $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ be a finite set and let $m = \max I$. Then $\bigcap_{n \in I} \text{Stab}_G(V)^{g_n}$ contains $K_m$, and is thus infinite, since $K_m$ was shown above to be infinite. Hence, since $\text{Stab}_G(V)$ satisfies the NICC, there exists $\ell$ so that $K_m$ is commensurable with $K_\ell$ for all $m \geq \ell$.

Hence, by Lemma 2.8, we have that $\hat{Z}_m$ and $\hat{Z}_\ell$ are parallel for all $m \geq \ell$. Moreover, since $K_m \leq K_\ell$, Proposition 1.13 implies that we can choose essential cores within their parallelism classes so that $\hat{Z}_m = \hat{Z}_\ell$ for all $m \geq \ell$.

Let $L = \text{Stab}_G(\hat{Z}_\ell) = \text{Stab}_G(\hat{Z}_m)$ for all $m \geq \ell$. The essential index condition implies that $\text{Stab}_G(Z_m)$ has uniformly bounded index in $L$ as $m \to \infty$, so by passing to a further infinite
subsequence, we can assume that \( \text{Stab}_G(Z_m) = \text{Stab}_G(Z_\ell) \) for all \( m \geq \ell \) (since \( L \) has finitely many subgroups of each finite index).

Claim 3 implies that (up to passing to a subsequence), \( \text{Stab}_G(Z_\ell) = \text{Stab}_G(Z_m) \) preserves \( Z_m \) (and acts cocompactly on \( Z_m \)) for all \( m \geq \ell \).

Recall that \( Z_m \subset Z_\ell \) for \( \ell \leq m \). The inclusion \( Z_m \hookrightarrow Z_\ell \) descends to an inclusion \( Z_m/\text{Stab}_G(Z_\ell) \hookrightarrow Z_\ell/\text{Stab}_G(Z_\ell) \), and since the latter spaces are compact, there exists \( M \) such that \( Z_m = Z_M \) for all \( m \geq M \). This again contradicts Claim 3. As before, we therefore cannot have the sequences \((U_m), (V_m)\) with the given properties, and hence \( A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F} \).

**Applying the factor system assumption:** If \( \mathfrak{F} \) is a factor system, then since \( Z_m \in \mathfrak{F} \) for all \( m \), and \( Z_m \supseteq Z_{m+1} \) for all \( m \), we have an immediate contradiction, so \( A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F} \).

**Conclusion:** We have shown that under any of the additional hypotheses, \( A^\perp \in \mathfrak{F} \) when \( A \subset \mathcal{X} \) is a convex subcomplex. This holds in particular if \( A \in \mathfrak{F} \).

The preceding proposition combines with earlier facts to yield:

**Corollary 5.3** (Ascending and descending chains). Let \( G \) act properly and cocompactly on \( \mathcal{X} \), satisfying any of the hypotheses of Proposition 5.1. Suppose that for all \( N \geq \infty \), there exists a 0–cube \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) so that \( x \) lies in at least \( N \) elements of \( \mathfrak{F} \). Then there exist sequences \((F_i)_{i \geq 1}, (F'_i)_{i \geq 1}\) of subcomplexes in \( \mathfrak{F} \) so that all of the following hold for all \( i \geq 1 \):

- \( F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1} \);
- \( F'_i \supsetneq F'_{i+1} \);
- \( F'_i = F_i \perp \).

Moreover, there exists a 0–cube \( x \) that lies in each \( F_i \) and each \( F'_i \).

**Proof.** Lemma 2.9 cocompactness, and \( G \)-invariance of \( \mathfrak{F} \) provide a sequence \((F_i)\) in \( \mathfrak{F} \) and a point \( x \) so that \( x \in F_i \) for all \( i \) and either \( F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1} \) for all \( i \), or \( F_i \supsetneq F_{i+1} \) for all \( i \). For each \( i \), let \( F_i' = \phi_{F_i}(\{x\} \times F_i^\perp) \). Proposition 5.1 implies that each \( F'_i \in \mathfrak{F} \), and Lemma 3.1 implies that \((F'_i)\) is an ascending or descending chain according to whether \((F_i)\) was descending or ascending. Assume first that \( F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1} \) for all \( i \). Now, if \( F'_i = F_i^\perp = F_{i+1}^\perp \), then by Corollary 3.4 we have \( F_i = F_{i+1} \), a contradiction. Hence \((F'_i)\) is properly descending, i.e. \( F'_i \supsetneq F'_{i+1} \) for all \( i \).

The case where \((F_i)\) is descending is identical. This completes the proof. \( \square \)

6. **Proof of Theorem A**

We first establish the setup. Recall that \( \mathcal{X} \) is a proper CAT(0) cube complex with a proper, cocompact action by a group \( G \). We denote the hyperclosure by \( \mathfrak{F} \); our goal is to prove that there exists \( N < \infty \) so that each 0–cube of \( \mathcal{X} \) is contained in at most \( N \) elements of \( \mathfrak{F} \), under any of the three additional hypotheses of Theorem A.

If there is no such \( N \), then Corollary 5.3 implies that there exists a 0–cube \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and a sequence \((F_i)_{i \geq 1}\) in \( \mathfrak{F} \) so that \( x \in F_i \subsetneq F_{i+1} \) for each \( i \geq 1 \). For the sake of brevity, given any subcomplex \( E \supseteq x \), let \( E^\perp \) denote the orthogonal complement of \( E \) based at \( x \). Corollary 5.3 also says that \( F_i^\perp \in \mathfrak{F} \) for all \( i \) and \( F_i^\perp \supsetneq F_{i+1}^\perp \) for all \( i \). Proposition 2.7 shows that \( \text{Stab}_G(F_i^\perp) \) acts on \( F_i^\perp \) cocompactly for all \( i \).

Let \( U = \bigcup_i F_i \) and let \( I = \bigcap_i F_i^\perp \), and note that \( U^\perp = I \) and \( I^\perp = U \). In particular, \( U^\perp \perp = I^\perp \perp = U \). From here, we can now prove our main theorem:

**Proof of Theorem A** We have already proved the theorem under the rotation hypothesis, in Corollary 4.5. Hence suppose that either weak finite height holds or the NICC and essential index conditions both hold, so that Proposition 5.1 implies that \( U, I \in \mathfrak{F} \).

By Corollary 3.4 we have compact convex subcomplexes \( D, E \) with \( U = D^\perp \) and \( I = E^\perp \). Moreover, we can take \( D \subset I \) and \( E \subset U \). Now, Corollary 3.4, Theorem 3.3, and Proposition 5.1
provide, for each $i \geq 1$, a compact, convex subcomplex $C_i$, containing $x$ and contained in $F_i$, so that $C_i \subseteq F_i$.

Let $C_1 = C_1$. For $i \geq 2$, let $C_i = \text{Hull}(\cup_{j<i} C_j)$. Note that $C_i$ is a compact, convex subcomplex contained in $F_i$, so $C_i \subseteq C_i' \subseteq F_i$ for $i \geq 1$.

By Lemma 3.3 for each $i$, $F_i = (C_i') \subseteq C_i$ since $C_i \subseteq C_i'$, and $C_i = (C_i') \subseteq F_i$ for all $i$.

Note that $\bigcap_{i}(C_i') = \bigcap_{i} F_i = I$. However, $I = (\bigcup C_i')$. But, $\bigcup C_i'$ cannot be compact since $C_i \subseteq C_i'$, and by Corollary 3.4 we can choose $E \subseteq \bigcup C_i$ for some $R$. By Lemma 3.3, this means that $I = E \supseteq (C_i') \subseteq F_i$, a contradiction. Thus, $\mathfrak{F}$ must have finite multiplicity, as desired.

We show now that for cube complexes that admit geometric actions, having a factor system implies the NICC for hyperplanes and essential index conditions for hyperplanes. Thus, any proof that $\mathfrak{F}$ forms a factor system for any cocompact cubical groups must necessarily show that any group acting geometrically on a CAT(0) cube complex satisfies these conditions.

**Theorem 6.1.** Let $X$ be a CAT(0) cube complex admitting a geometric action by a group $G$. If $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system, then $G$ satisfies NICC for hyperplanes and the essential index condition.

**Proof.** Suppose that $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system and at most $N$ elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ can contain any given $x \in X(0)$. Then for any $A, B \in \mathfrak{F}$, there are at most $N$ elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ which can contain $F$, the Stab$_G(F)$–essential core of $F$. In particular, there are at most $N$ distinct Stab$_G(F)$–translates of $F$. Thus, $[\text{Stab}_G(F), \text{Stab}_G(F)] \leq N$, verifying the essential index condition.

To verify NICC for hyperplanes, let $H$ be a hyperplane and let $K = \text{Stab}_G(H)$. Let $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be sequence of distinct elements of $G$ so that for $n \geq 1$, the subgroup $K \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n K^{g_i}$ is infinite.

Consider the hyperplane $H$, notice that $K^{g_i}$ is the stabilizer of $g_i H$. Now, consider $F_1 = g_1 H(g_1 H)$ and inductively define $F_k = g_{F_{k-1}}(g_1 H(g_k H))$. Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system, the set of $G$–translates of $F_{k-1}$ and $g_1 H(g_k H)$ have finite multiplicity for all $k \geq 2$, and so we can apply the argument of Lemma 3.3 and induction to conclude that Stab$_G(F_k)$ is commensurable with $G_k = K \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k K^{g_i}$, which is infinite by assumption.

Since $\mathfrak{F}$ is a factor system, there must be some $\ell$ so that for all $k \geq \ell$, $F_k = F_\ell$. In this case, $G_k$ and $G_\ell$ are commensurable for all $k \geq \ell$, and in particular $G_k$ and $G_{k'}$ are commensurable for all $k, k' \geq \ell$, and thus $G$ satisfies NICC for hyperplanes.

7. Factor systems and the simplicial boundary

Corollary D follows from Theorem A, Proposition 7.1 and [Hag13] Lemma 3.32. Specifically, the first two statements provide a combinatorial geodesic ray representing each boundary simplex $v$, and when $v$ is a 0–simplex, [Hag13] Lemma 3.32 allows one to convert the combinatorial geodesic ray into a CAT(0) ray. Proposition 7.1 is implicit in the proof of [DHS16] Theorem 10.1; we give a streamlined proof here.

**Proposition 7.1.** Let $X$ be a CAT(0) cube complex with a factor system $\mathfrak{F}$. Then each simplex $\sigma$ of $\Delta X$ is visible, i.e. there exists a combinatorial geodesic ray $\alpha$ such that the set of hyperplanes intersecting $\alpha$ is a boundary set representing the simplex $\sigma$.

**Remark 7.2.** Proposition 7.1 does not assume anything about group actions on $X$, but instead shows that the existence of an invisible boundary simplex is an obstruction to the existence of a factor system. The converse does not hold: counterexamples can be constructed by beginning with a single combinatorial ray, and gluing to the $n^{th}$ vertex a finite staircase $S_n$, along a single vertex. The staircase $S_n$ is obtained from $[0, n]^2$ by deleting all squares that are strictly above the diagonal joining $(0,0)$ to $(n,n)$. In this case, $\mathfrak{F}$ has unbounded multiplicity, and any factor
system must contain all elements of \( \mathcal{F} \) exceeding some fixed threshold diameter, so the complex cannot have a factor system.

**Proof of Proposition 7.1.** Let \( \sigma \) be a simplex of \( \partial_\Delta \mathcal{X} \). Let \( \sigma' \) be a maximal simplex containing \( \sigma \), spanned by \( v_0, \ldots, v_d \). The existence of \( \sigma' \) follows from [Hag13] Theorem 3.14, which says that maximal simplices exist since \( \mathcal{X} \) is finite-dimensional (otherwise, it could not have a factor system). By Theorem 3.19 of [Hag13], which says that maximal simplices are visible, \( \sigma' \) is visible, i.e. there exists a combinatorial geodesic ray \( \gamma \) such that the set \( \mathcal{H}(\gamma) \) of hyperplanes crossing \( \gamma \) is a boundary set representing \( \sigma' \). We will prove that each 0-simplex \( v_i \) is visible. It then follows from [Hag13] Theorem 3.23 that any face of \( \sigma' \) (hence \( \sigma \)) is visible.

Let \( \mathcal{Y} \) be the convex hull of \( \gamma \). The set of hyperplanes crossing \( \mathcal{Y} \) is exactly \( \mathcal{H}(\gamma) \). Since \( \mathcal{Y} \) is convex in \( \mathcal{X} \), Lemma 8.4 of [BHS14], which provides an induced factor system on convex subcomplexes of cube complexes with factor systems, implies that \( \mathcal{Y} \) contains a factor system.

By Theorem 3.10 of [Hag13], we can write \( \mathcal{H}(\gamma) = \bigcup_{i=1}^d \mathcal{V}_i \), where each \( \mathcal{V}_i \) is a minimal boundary set representing the 0-simplex \( v_i \). Moreover, up to reordering and discarding finitely many hyperplanes (i.e. moving the basepoint of \( \gamma \)) if necessary, whenever \( i < j \), each hyperplane \( H \in \mathcal{V}_j \) crosses all but finitely many of the hyperplanes in \( \mathcal{V}_i \).

For each \( 1 \leq i \leq d \), minimality of \( \mathcal{V}_i \) provides a sequence of hyperplanes \( (V_n^i)_{n \geq 0} \) in \( \mathcal{V}_i \) so that \( V_n^i \) separates \( V_{n+1}^i \) for \( n \geq 1 \) and so that any other \( U \in \mathcal{V}_i \) separates \( V_n^i \) from \( V_k^i \) for some \( m, n \), by the proof of [Hag13] Lemma 3.7 or [CF16], Lemma B.6 (one may have to discard finitely many hyperplanes from \( \mathcal{V}_i \) for this to hold; this replaces \( \gamma \) with a sub-ray and shrinks \( \mathcal{Y} \)).

We will show that, after discarding finitely many hyperplanes from \( \mathcal{H}(\gamma) \) if necessary, every element of \( \mathcal{V}_i \) crosses every element of \( \mathcal{V}_j \), whenever \( i \neq j \). Since every element of \( \mathcal{V}_j \) either lies in \( (V_n^j)_{n \geq 0} \) or separates two elements of that sequence, it follows that \( U \) and \( V \) cross whenever \( U \in \mathcal{V}_i \) and \( V \in \mathcal{V}_j \) and \( i \neq j \). Then, for any \( i \), choose \( n \geq 0 \) and let \( H = \bigcap_{j \neq i} V_j^i \). Projecting \( \gamma \) to \( H \) yields a geodesic ray in \( \mathcal{Y} \), all but finitely many of whose dual hyperplanes belong to \( \mathcal{V}_i \), as required. Hence it suffices to show that \( V_n^i \) and \( V_m^j \) cross for all \( m, n \) whenever \( i \neq j \).

Fix \( j \leq d \) and \( i < j \). For each \( n \geq 0 \), let \( m(n) \geq 0 \) be minimal so that \( V_m^j \) fails to cross \( V_n^i \). Note that we may assume that this is defined: if \( V_n^i \) crosses all \( V_k^m \), then, since \( V_m^j \) crosses all but finitely many of the hyperplanes from \( \mathcal{V}_i \), it crosses \( V_k^j \) for \( k > n \). Since it also crosses \( V_n^i \), it must also cross \( V_r^i \) for all \( n \leq r \leq k \). By discarding \( V_k^j \) for \( k \leq n \) we complete the proof. Now suppose that \( m(n) \) is bounded as \( n \to \infty \). Then there exists \( N \) so that \( V_N^i, V_m^j \) cross whenever \( m, n \geq N \), and we are done, as before.

Hence suppose that \( m(n) \to \infty \) as \( n \to \infty \). In other words, for all \( m \geq 0 \), there exists \( n \geq 0 \) so that \( V_n^i \) crosses \( V_k^j \) if and only if \( k \geq n \). Choose \( M \gg 0 \) and choose \( n \) maximal with \( m(n) < M \). Then all of the hyperplanes \( V_{m(k)}^j \) with \( k \leq n \) cross \( V_k^j \), ... but do not cross \( V_t^j \) for \( t < k \). Hence the subcomplexes \( \text{Hull}(V_k^j) \), \( k \leq n \) are all different: \( \text{Hull}(V_k^j) \) intersects \( V_{m(k)}^j \) but \( \text{Hull}(V_k^j) \) does not. On the other hand, since \( V_k^j \) separates \( V_{m(k)}^j \) from \( V_n^i \) when \( \ell < k \), every hyperplane crossing \( V_n^i \) and \( V_{m(k)}^j \) crosses \( V_k^j \), so \( \text{Hull}(V_k^j) \cap \text{Hull}(V_{m(k)}^j) \neq \emptyset \). Thus the factor system on \( \mathcal{Y} \) has multiplicity at least \( n \). But since \( m(n) \to \infty \), we could choose \( n \) arbitrarily large in the preceding argument, violating the definition of a factor system.

**Proof of Corollary 2.** If \( \gamma \) is a CAT(0) geodesic, then it can be approximated, up to Hausdorff distance depending on \( \text{dim} \, \mathcal{X} \), by a combinatorial geodesic, so assume that \( \gamma \) is a combinatorial geodesic ray. By Corollary [D] the simplex of \( \partial_\Delta \mathcal{X} \) represented by \( \gamma \) is spanned by 0-simplices \( v_0, \ldots, v_d \) with each \( v_i \) represented by a combinatorial geodesic ray \( \gamma_i \). Theorem 3.23 of [Hag13] says that \( \mathcal{X} \) contains a cubical orthant \( \prod_i \gamma_i \), where each \( \gamma_i \) represents \( v_i \). Hence \( \text{Hull}(\cup_i \gamma_i) = \prod_i \text{Hull}(\gamma_i) \). Up to truncating an initial subpath of \( \gamma \), we have that \( \gamma \) is parallel into \( \text{Hull}(\cup_i \gamma_i) \) (and thus lies in a finite neighbourhood of it). The projection of the original CAT(0) geodesic...
approximated by $\gamma$ to each $\text{Hull}(\gamma'_i)$ is a CAT(0) geodesic representing $v_i$. The product of these geodesics is a combinatorially isometrically embedded $(d + 1)$-dimensional orthant subcomplex of $\mathcal{Y}$ containing (the truncated) CAT(0) geodesic in a regular neighbourhood. □

In the presence of a proper, cocompact group action, we can achieve full visibility under slightly weaker conditions than those that we have shown suffice to obtain a factor system:

**Proposition 7.3.** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper CAT(0) cube complex on which the group $G$ acts properly and cocompactly. Suppose that the action of $G$ on $\mathcal{X}$ satisfies NICC for hyperplanes. Then each simplex $\sigma$ of $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ is visible, i.e. there exists a combinatorial geodesic ray $\alpha$ such that the set of hyperplanes intersecting $\alpha$ is a boundary set representing the simplex $\sigma$.

**Proof.** We adopt the same notation as in the proof of Proposition 7.1. As in that proof, if $\partial_\Delta \mathcal{X}$ contains an invisible simplex, then we have two infinite sets $\{V_i\}_{i \geq 0}, \{H_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ of hyperplanes with the following properties:

- for each $i \geq 1$, the hyperplane $H_i$ separates $H_{i-1}$ from $H_{i+1}$;
- for each $j \geq 1$, the hyperplane $V_j$ separates $V_{j-1}$ from $V_{j+1}$;
- there is an increasing sequence $(i_j)$ so that for all $j$, $V_j$ crosses $H_i$ if and only if $i \leq i_j$.

This implies that for all $i \geq 1$, the subcomplex $F_i = \mathcal{G}_{H_0} \mathcal{G}_{H_1} \cdots \mathcal{G}_{H_i} \mathcal{G}_{H_{i+1}} \cdots$ is unbounded. Since $\text{Stab}_G(F_i)$ acts cocompactly, by Proposition 2.7 $\text{Stab}_G(F_i)$ is infinite. By Lemma 1.9 $\text{Stab}_G(F_i)$ is commensurable with $K_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{Stab}_G(H_j)$, and so by NICC, there exists $N$ so that $K_i$ is commensurable with $K_N$ for all $i \geq N$. Thus, after passing to a subsequence, we see that for all $i$, the $K_i$–essential core of $F_i$ is a fixed nonempty (indeed, unbounded) convex subcomplex $\bar{F}$ of $H_0$.

Now, for each $j$, the hyperplane $V_j$ cannot cross $\bar{F}$, because $\bar{F}$ lies in $F_i$ for all $i$, and $V_j$ fails to cross $H_i$ for all sufficiently large $i$. Moreover, this shows that $\bar{F}$ must lie in the halfspace associated to $V_j$ that contains $V_{j+1}$. But since this holds for all $j$, we have that $\bar{F}$ is contained in an infinite descending chain of halfspaces, contradicting that $\bar{F} \neq \emptyset$. □
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