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ABSTRACT. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces (HHSs) are a large class of spaces that provide a common framework for studying the mapping class group, right-angled Artin and Coxeter groups, and many 3–manifold groups. We investigate quasiconvex subsets in this class and characterize them in terms of their contracting properties, relative divergence, the coarse median structure, and the hierarchical structure itself. Along the way, we obtain new tools to study HHSs, including two new equivalent definitions of hierarchical quasiconvexity and a version of the bounded geodesic image property for quasiconvex subsets. Utilizing our characterization, we prove that the hyperbolically embedded subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups are precisely those which are almost malnormal and quasiconvex, producing a new result in the case of the mapping class group. We also apply our characterization to study quasiconvex subsets in several specific examples of HHSs. We show that while many commonly studied HHSs have the property that any quasiconvex subset is either hyperbolic or coarsely covers the entire space, right-angled Coxeter groups exhibit a wide variety of quasiconvex subsets.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Convexity is a fundamental concept in many areas of geometry. In the study of the coarse geometry of metric spaces, quasiconvexity is a natural “coarse-ification” of the classical definition of convexity. A subset $Y$ of a quasi-geodesic metric space $X$ is quasiconvex if every quasi-geodesic based on $Y$ is contained in a bounded neighborhood of $Y$, where the radius of the neighborhood is determined by the quasi-geodesic constants. Defining quasiconvexity with respect to quasi-geodesics ensures that the image of a quasiconvex subset under a quasi-isometry will be quasiconvex, regardless of the geometry of the ambient space. Quasiconvex subsets are therefore an avenue to study the geometry of a space up to quasi-isometry.

The study of quasiconvex subsets of hyperbolic spaces (particularly quasiconvex subgroups of hyperbolic groups) has been a rich and fruitful endeavor stretching back to Gromov’s
original work on hyperbolic groups [Gro87, Gro93]. More recently, quasiconvex subsets have played a prominent role in the study of hyperbolic cubical groups, 3-manifolds, and the resolution of the virtual Haken conjecture [Wis12, Ago13].

Aiming to generalize the success of quasiconvex subsets to a wider class of spaces and groups, the third author studied quasiconvex subsets and subgroups in [Tra] under the name “strongly quasiconvex subsets.” Using the name Morse instead of quasiconvex, Genevois studied quasiconvex subsets of CAT(0) cube complexes in [Gen] and Kim studied quasiconvex subgroups of the mapping class groups in [Kim]. A strong version of quasiconvexity, called stability, was introduced by Durham-Taylor in [DT15] and has also received considerable study (for a sampling see [KMT17, ADT17, AMST, Beh, ABD]).

In this paper we are primarily interested in understanding the quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces (HHSs). Introduced by Behrstock-Hagen-Sisto in [BHS17b] and refined in [BHSa], examples of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces include hyperbolic spaces, the mapping class group of a surface, Teichmüller space with either the Weil-Petersson or Teichmüller metrics, many cocompactly cubulated groups, and the fundamental groups of 3–manifolds without Nil or Sol components. The definition and much of the theory of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces is inspired by the Masur-Minsky subsurface projection machinery in the mapping class group. Our investigation is therefore a natural extension of the problem purposed by Farb in [Far06, Problem 2.3.8] to study quasiconvexity in the mapping class group.

Heuristically, a hierarchically hyperbolic space consists of a metric space $X$ with an associated collection of hyperbolic spaces $\mathcal{S}$, such that for each space $Z$ in $\mathcal{S}$, there is a projection map $X \to Z$. The philosophy of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces is that one can study the coarse geometry of $X$ by studying the projection of $X$ to each of the spaces in $\mathcal{S}$. In this paper we shall consider hierarchically hyperbolic spaces satisfying the bounded domain dichotomy: a minor regularity condition requiring every space in $\mathcal{S}$ to have either infinite or uniformly bounded diameter. The bounded domain dichotomy is satisfied by every naturally occurring example of a hierarchically hyperbolic space.

Equivalent Conditions to Being Quasiconvex. The main goal of this paper is to provide several equivalent conditions for a subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space to be quasiconvex. A major theme here is that several different notions of convexity all coincide with being quasiconvex in hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. One such notion of convexity is that of contracting subsets. A subset $Y \subseteq X$ of a quasi-geodesic space is contracting if there exists a coarsely Lipschitz retraction $r: X \to Y$ under which large balls far from $Y$ have images with uniformly bounded diameter. Being contracting generalizes the strong contracting behavior of the closest point projection onto a convex subset of the hyperbolic plane. In general, quasiconvex subsets are not contracting (see Example 3.8), however these two notions of convexity tend to agree in the presence of non-positive curvature. Indeed, it is a classical fact that a subset of a hyperbolic space is quasiconvex if and only if it is contracting; Genevois recently established that the same is true for subsets of a CAT(0) cube complex [Gen]. The first of our equivalent condition is to extend these results to hierarchically hyperbolic spaces.

**Theorem A** (Quasiconvex and contracting are equivalent). Let $X$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space with the bounded domain dichotomy. A subset $Y \subseteq X$ is quasiconvex if and only if $Y$ is contracting.

In [ACGH17], a different notion of contracting subset is considered, and it is shown that a subset of a geodesic metric space is quasiconvex if and only if the subset is sublinearly contracting. Example 3.8 demonstrates that our definition of contracting (Definition 2.10) is strictly stronger than sublinear contracting, but the two notions agree in the setting of
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Another key difference between our definition of contracting and that in [ACGH17] is that we do not require the contracting map \( r: X \to Y \) to be the closest point projection but allow for any coarsely Lipschitz retraction which has the contracting property. This has the advantage of turning contracting into a quasi-isometry invariant directly from the definition and is crucial in allowing us to utilize a naturally occurring retraction map in hierarchically hyperbolic spaces that is far more tractable than the closest point projection.

The third notion of convexity considered is hierarchical quasiconvexity, which is specific to hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. Introduced in [BHISa] by Behrstock-Hagen-Sisto, hierarchically quasiconvex subsets have played a central role in the study of hierarchically hyperbolic space [BHISa, BHS17a, BHSb]. Notably, a hierarchical quasiconvex subset of an HHS is itself an HHS. While quasiconvex subsets of a hierarchically hyperbolic space do not coincide exactly with hierarchically quasiconvex subsets, we are able to classify precisely when the two concepts agree. The quasiconvex subsets are exactly the hierarchically quasiconvex subsets which satisfy the orthogonal projection dichotomy (Definition 6.2) that describes how the projections of a quasiconvex subset to each of the associated hyperbolic spaces must look.

**Theorem B** (Quasiconvex subsets are hierarchically hyperbolic). *Let \( X \) be a hierarchically hyperbolic space with the bounded domain dichotomy. A subset \( Y \subseteq X \) is quasiconvex if and only if \( Y \) is hierarchically quasiconvex and has the orthogonal projection dichotomy. In particular, if \( Y \subseteq X \) is quasiconvex, then \( Y \) is hierarchically hyperbolic.*

Theorem [B] is truly the central result of this paper as it explains how the quasiconvex subsets interact with the projections defining the hierarchically hyperbolic structure of the ambient space. Further, this characterization is complete as the theorem fails whenever any of the hypotheses are weakened (see Remark 6.16).

Part of the proof of Theorem [B] involves studying hierarchically quasiconvex hulls in hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. The **hierarchically quasiconvex hull** of a subset \( Y \) is (coarsely) the smallest hierarchically quasiconvex set containing \( Y \). We show that for any subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space one can construct its hull using special quasi-geodesics called hierarchy paths (see Theorem 5.2 for the precise statement).

**Theorem C** (Constructing hulls with hierarchy paths). *If \( Y \) is a subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space \( X \), then the hierarchically quasiconvex hull of \( Y \) can be constructed in a uniformly finite number of steps by iteratively connecting points by hierarchy paths.*

This construction is reminiscent of the construction of convex hulls in hyperbolic spaces by connecting pairs of points by geodesics and is similar to the join construction of hulls in coarse median spaces presented in [Bow]. The main purpose of Theorem [C] in our paper is to establish that hierarchically quasiconvex subsets are exactly the subsets that are “quasiconvex with respect to hierarchy paths.” However, we expect this construction to have further applications in the study of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. In particular, in Section 5.1 we use Theorem [C] to provide a characterization of hierarchical quasiconvexity in terms of the coarse median structure on a hierarchically hyperbolic space. This allows us to conclude that, in the setting of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces, the coarse median hull constructed in [Bow] is coarsely equal to the hierarchically quasiconvex hull; extending [Bow, Lemma 7.3] from finite to arbitrary subsets.

In [ABD], Abbott-Behrstock-Durham give several equivalent conditions for quasi-geodesics in a hierarchically hyperbolic space to be quasiconvex and for a map from a quasi-geodesic space \( Y \) into a hierarchically hyperbolic space to be a stable embedding (see Definition 2.8). Theorems [A] and [B] generalize these results to general quasiconvex subsets and do not require the hypothesis of unbounded products utilized in [ABD, Proposition 4.4 and Corollary 6.2].
This generalization to general quasiconvex subsets is essential to our applications in Section 7 and Section 8.

In [Tra], the third author studied the relation between quasiconvex subsets and lower relative divergence. If $Y$ is a subset of the quasi-geodesic space $X$, the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ (or the divergence of $Y$ in $X$) is a family of functions that measures how efficiently one can travel in $X$ while avoiding $Y$. Building on the work in [Tra] we establish the following.

**Theorem D** (Contracting subsets have at least quadratic divergence). Let $X$ be a quasi-geodesic metric space. If $Y \subseteq X$ is contracting, then the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ is at least quadratic. Further, if $X$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space with the bounded domain dichotomy, then the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ is at least quadratic if and only if $Y$ is quasiconvex (equivalently if and only if $Y$ is contracting).

After proving Theorems A through D we establish several HHS analogues of the “bounded geodesic image property” of quasiconvex subsets of hyperbolic spaces. One of these analogues is the following.

**Theorem E.** Let $Y$ be a quasiconvex subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space $X$ with the bounded domain dichotomy. There is a contracting map $g_Y : X \to Y$ so that for each $\lambda \geq 1$ there exists a constant $r_\lambda > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X$, if $d(g_Y(x), g_Y(y)) > r_\lambda$, then any $\lambda$–hierarchy path from $x$ to $y$ must intersect the $r_\lambda$–neighborhood of $Y$.

**Quasiconvex Subsets in Specific Examples.** After characterizing the quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces, we apply our results to study the quasiconvex subsets of some of the most common examples of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces: the mapping class group, Teichmüller space, right-angled Artin and Coxeter groups, and the fundamental groups of graph manifolds.

It has been shown that quasiconvex subgroups of the mapping class group [Kim], right-angled Artin groups with connected defining graph [Tra, Gen], and certain CFS right-angled Coxeter groups [NT] are either hyperbolic or finite index. We give sufficient conditions for a hierarchically hyperbolic space to have the property that all its quasiconvex subsets are either hyperbolic or coarsely cover the entire space (see Proposition 7.2). Applying this criteria to specific examples yields a new, unified proof of the work of Kim, Tran, Genevois, and Nguyen-Tran as well as the following new results for Teichmüller space, graph manifolds, and a class of right-angled Coxeter groups that we call strongly CFS.

**Corollary F.** The following HHSs have the property that every quasiconvex subset is either hyperbolic or coarsely covers the entire space:

(a) The Teichmüller space of a finite type surface with the Teichmüller metric
(b) The Teichmüller space of a finite type surface of complexity at least 6 with the Weil-Petersson metric
(c) The mapping class group of an oriented, connected, finite type surface
(d) A right-angled Artin group with connected defining graph
(e) A right-angled Coxeter group with strongly CFS defining graph
(f) The fundamental group of a non-geometric graph manifold

In particular, if $H$ is a quasiconvex subgroup in any of the groups (c)-(f), then $H$ is either stable or finite index.

Stable subgroups of the mapping class group and right-angled Artin groups have been studied extensively and have several interesting equivalent characterizations including convex cocompactness in the mapping class group and purely loxodromic in right-angled Artin groups [DT][KMT].
We also use HHS theory and Theorem B to give a new proof of [Tra, Theorem 1.11] and [Gen, Proposition 4.9] characterizing when a special subgroup of a right-angled Coxeter group is quasiconvex. We then utilize this characterization, along with a construction of Behrstock, to demonstrate the large variety of different quasiconvex subsets that can be found in the class of $\mathcal{CF}$ right-angled Coxeter groups.

**Theorem G.** Every right-angled Coxeter group is a quasiconvex subgroup of some $\mathcal{CF}$ right-angled Coxeter group.

**Hyperbolically Embedded Subgroups.** As a final application of our characterization of quasiconvex subsets, we study the hyperbolically embedded subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups. Hyperbolically embedded subgroups are generalizations of peripheral subgroups in relatively hyperbolic groups (see [DGO17]) and are a key component of studying acylindrically hyperbolic groups, a large class of groups exhibiting hyperbolic-like behavior (see [Osi16]). Work of Dahmani-Guirardel-Osin [DGO17] and Sisto [Sis16] showed that if a finite collection of subgroups $\{H_i\}$ is hyperbolically embedded in a finitely generated group $G$, then $\{H_i\}$ is an almost malnormal collection and each $H_i$ is quasiconvex. While the converse of this statement is false in general (see the beginning of Section 8 for a counterexample), the converse does hold in the case of hyperbolic groups [Bow12, Theorem 7.11] and cocompactly cubulated groups [Gen, Theorem 6.31]. We prove the converse in the setting of hierarchically hyperbolic groups.

**Theorem H (Characterization of hyperbolically embedded subgroups).** Let $G$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic group. A finite collection of subgroups $\{H_i\}$ is hyperbolically embedded in $G$ if and only if $\{H_i\}$ is an almost malnormal collection and each $H_i$ is quasiconvex.

By [Kim, Theorem A], an infinite index subgroup of the mapping class group of a surface is quasiconvex if and only if it is convex cocompact (this fact can also be deduced from Corollary F). Thus, as a specific case of Theorem H we have the following new result for the mapping class group.

**Corollary I.** If $S$ is an oriented, connected, finite type surface of complexity at least 2 and $\{H_i\}$ is a finite collection of subgroups of the mapping class group of $S$, then the following are equivalent:

- $\{H_i\}$ is hyperbolically embedded.
- $\{H_i\}$ is an almost malnormal collection and each $H_i$ is quasiconvex.
- $\{H_i\}$ is an almost malnormal collection and each $H_i$ is convex cocompact.

1.1. **Open questions.** We believe that quasiconvex subgroups are a rich area of study with many interesting open questions both in the setting of hierarchically hyperbolic groups and beyond. In light of Theorem A it is natural to wonder which results for quasiconvex subgroups of hyperbolic groups can be extended to quasiconvex subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups (or even finitely generated groups)? As a starting point, one may consider the following question which aims to extends work of Gromov, Arzhantseva, and Gitik on combination theorems for quasiconvex subgroups of hyperbolic groups [Ger87, Arz01, Git99].

**Question 1.** Prove combination theorems for quasiconvex subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups (or even finitely generated groups). In particular, investigate conditions guaranteeing that the subgroup generated by two quasiconvex subgroups, $Q_1$ and $Q_2$, is quasiconvex and isomorphic to $Q_1 *_{Q_1 \cap Q_2} Q_2$.

As quasiconvex subsets are invariant under quasi-isometry, they have the potential to play an important role in the quasi-isometric classification of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. The following would be an interesting first step in this direction.
Question 2. Provide necessary conditions for an HHS to have the property that all its quasiconvex subsets are either hyperbolic or coarsely cover the entire space. Using defining graphs, characterize all right-angled Coxeter groups whose quasiconvex subsets are hyperbolic or coarsely cover the entire group.

Looking beyond hierarchically hyperbolic spaces, we wonder about the possibilities of understanding quasiconvex subsets in other spaces with a notion of non-positive curvature. Specifically we ask the following.

Question 3. For what other spaces are quasiconvex subsets contracting (in the sense of Definition 2.10)?

Some of the first spaces one could consider are CAT(0) spaces, coarse median spaces, and the outer automorphism groups of free groups. In [Sul14] it is shown that quasiconvex geodesics in CAT(0) spaces are always contracting. We conjecture the same holds for all quasiconvex subsets of a CAT(0) space. A possible starting point for coarse median spaces could be the recently posted paper [Bow], in which Bowditch constructs hulls for subsets of coarse median spaces and produces a number of results similar to our work in Section 5.

Our proof of Theorem 5.1 rests strongly upon the equivalence between quasiconvex and contracting subsets. Thus, one may presume that any group that is an answer to Question 3 is also an answer for the following question.

Question 4. For what other finitely generated groups are almost malnormal, quasiconvex subgroups hyperbolically embedded?

A long standing open question in the study of quasiconvex subgroups of hyperbolic group is whether or not finitely generated, almost malnormal subgroups of hyperbolic groups must be quasiconvex. Accordingly, we ask the same for the larger class of hierarchically hyperbolic groups.

Question 5. Are finitely generated, almost malnormal subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups quasiconvex?
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1.2. Outline of the paper. In Section 2 we begin with the basic definitions and properties of quasiconvex subsets and the related notions of stability and contracting subsets of general quasi-geodesic spaces. In Section 3 we define lower relative divergence and study the relationship between contracting subsets, quasiconvex subsets, and lower relative divergence in any quasi-geodesic space. We move on to hierarchically hyperbolic spaces in Section 4 where we give the definition of an HHG and detail the relevant tools and constructions we will need from the theory. In Section 5 we explain how to construct hierarchically quasiconvex hulls using hierarchy paths. As applications of this construction, we give a
characterization of hierarchically quasiconvex sets in terms of the coarse median structure on
the HHS and prove that quasiconvex subsets are also hierarchically quasiconvex. In Section
6 we state and prove our equivalent characterizations of quasiconvex subsets, finishing the
proofs of Theorems A, B, and D. The remaining sections are devoted to applications of
this characterization. We give a generalization of the bounded geodesic image property for
quasiconvex subsets in Section 6.3, study quasiconvex subsets in specific examples in Section
7 and characterize hyperbolically embedded subgroups of HHGs in Section 8.

2. Coarse geometry

2.1. Quasi-geodesic spaces, conventions, and notations. The focus of this paper will
be on understanding the geometry of metric spaces up to quasi-isometry. While many of
the metric spaces we are interested in applying our results to are geodesic metric spaces, many
of the subspaces we will be studying will be quasi-geodesic, but not geodesic metric spaces.
Thus, we will almost always assume our metric spaces are quasi-geodesic metric spaces.

Definition 2.1. A metric space $X$ is a $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic metric space if for all $x, y \in X$
there exists a $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic $\gamma: [a, b] \to X$ with $\gamma(a) = x$ and $\gamma(b) = y$.

Given a $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic metric space $X$, we can construct a geodesic metric space
quasi-isometric to $X$ as follows: fix a $\epsilon$–separated net $N \subseteq X$ and connect a pair of points
$x, y \in N$ by an edge of length $d(x, y)$ if $d(x, y) < 2\epsilon$. The resulting metric graph will be
quasi-isometric to $X$. Since $\epsilon$ can be chosen to depend only on $K$ and $L$, this graph can
be constructed such that the quasi-isometry constants will also depend only on $K$ and $L$.
When convenient, we will exploit this fact to reduce proofs to the geodesic case.

A particularly important collection of metric spaces in geometric group theory is the class
of $\delta$–hyperbolic metric spaces, introduced by Gromov in [Gro87, Gro93]. While
$\delta$–hyperbolic
spaces are usually required to be geodesic, the following is a direct extension of the definition
to the setting of quasi-geodesic metric spaces.

Definition 2.2. A $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic metric space is $\delta$–hyperbolic if for every $(K, L)$–
quasi-geodesic triangle the $\delta$–neighborhood of the union of any two of the edges contains
the third.

Gromov’s four-point condition can also be use to define a hyperbolic quasi-geodesic
metric space, however as shown in [DK18, Example 11.36], this definition fails to be a
quasi-isometry invariant if the spaces are not geodesic. In contrast, Definition 2.2 is a quasi-
isometry invariant among quasi-geodesic spaces. In particular, using the “guessing geodesic”
criterion, from [MS13, Theorem 3.15] or [Bow14, Theorem 3.1], you can show a quasi-
geodesic space is hyperbolic in the sense of Definition 2.2 if and only if it is quasi-isometric
to a geodesic metric space that is hyperbolic in the usual sense.

When referring to a property defined by a parameter (e.g. $\delta$–hyperbolic), we will often
suppress that parameter when its specific value is not needed. To reduce the proliferation of
additive and multiplicative constants throughout this paper, we will adopt the following
notations.

Notation 2.3. Let $A, B, K, L$ be real numbers. We write
$$A \overset{K,L}{\preceq} B \text{ if } A \leq KB + L.$$ 

If $A \overset{K,L}{\preceq} B$ and $B \overset{K,L}{\preceq} A$, we write $A \overset{K,L}{\asymp} B$.

We say two subsets of a metric space $K$–coarsely coincide if their Hausdorff distance is at
most $K$. 

2.2. Quasiconvexity, contracting, and stability. The primary notion of convexity we will consider is the following definition of quasiconvex.

**Definition 2.4** (Quasiconvex subset). A subset $Y$ of a quasi-geodesic metric space $X$ is quasi-geodesically quasiconvex if there is a function $Q: [1, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that for every $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic $\gamma$, we have $\gamma \subseteq N_{Q(K, L)}(Y)$. We call the function $Q$ the convexity gauge for $Y$.

It follows directly from the definition that quasiconvexity is a quasi-isometry invariant in the following sense.

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $X$ and $Z$ be a quasi-geodesic metric spaces and $f: X \to Z$ be a $(K, L)$–quasi-isometry. If $Y$ is a $Q$–quasi-geodesically quasiconvex subset of $X$, then $f(Y)$ is a $Q'$–quasi-geodesically quasiconvex subset of $Z$, with $Q'$ depending only on $Q$, $K$ and $L$.

In the setting of hyperbolic spaces, quasiconvexity is equivalent to the following weaker condition.

**Definition 2.6.** A subset $Y$ of a geodesic metric space $X$ is geodesically quasiconvex if there exists $D > 0$ such that for any geodesic $\gamma$ with endpoints on $Y$, we have $\gamma \subseteq N_D(Y)$. We call the constant $D$ the convexity constant for $Y$.

As remarked above, in a hyperbolic space, geodesic quasiconvexity is equivalent to quasi-geodesic quasiconvexity and the convexity constant and convexity gauge each determines the other. However, in non-hyperbolic spaces, this equivalence fails and geodesic quasiconvexity need not be preserved by quasi-isometry. As we are concerned with studying metric spaces up to quasi-isometry, we will never consider a geodesically quasiconvex subset outside of a hyperbolic space. Thus, we shall almost always refer to a quasi-geodesically quasiconvex subset simply as quasiconvex or $Q$–quasiconvex when we wish to highlight a particular convexity gauge.

If $Y$ is a $Q$–quasiconvex subset of the $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic space $X$, then any two points in $Y$ can be joined by a $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesic in $X$ that lies uniformly close to $Y$. Thus $Y$ equipped with the metric inherited from $X$ will be a $(K', L')$–quasi-geodesic metric space where $K'$ and $L'$ depend only on $K$, $L$, and $Q$. For the rest of the paper, when discussing geometric properties (such as hyperbolicity) of a quasiconvex subset, we shall implicitly do so with respect to the metric inherited from the ambient space. In particular, if $f: X \to Z$ is a quasi-isometry between quasi-geodesic spaces and $Y$ is a quasiconvex subset of $X$, then $Y$ is quasi-isometric to $f(Y)$.

In [DT15], Durham and Taylor introduced the following related notion of convexity.

**Definition 2.7.** A quasi-isometric embedding $\Phi$ from a quasi-geodesic metric space $Y$ into a quasi-geodesic metric space $X$ is a stable embedding if there is a function $R: [1, \infty) \times [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that if $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are two $(K, L)$–quasi-geodesics of $X$ with the same endpoints in $\Phi(Y)$, then $d_{Haus}(\alpha, \beta) \leq R(K, L)$.

While the images of stable embeddings maintain many of the features of quasiconvex subsets of hyperbolic spaces, the definition is highly restrictive. In particular, as the next proposition records, stable embeddings must always be onto hyperbolic subsets.

**Proposition 2.8.** Let $\Phi: Y \to X$ be a quasi-isometric embedding from a quasi-geodesic metric space $Y$ to a quasi-geodesic metric space $X$. Then $\Phi$ is a stable embedding if and only if $Y$ is hyperbolic and $\Phi(Y)$ is quasiconvex. In particular, if $Y$ is a quasiconvex subset of $X$, then the inclusion $i: Y \hookrightarrow X$ is a stable embedding if and only if $Y$ is hyperbolic with respect to the metric inherited from $X$. 
In [Tra, Proposition 4.3], the third author proves the above proposition for the case of geodesic spaces. The more general statement above follows immediately from the fact that a quasi-geodesic space is always quasi-isometric to a geodesic space plus the fact that quasiconvexity, stability, and hyperbolicity are all quasi-isometry invariants.

One class of metric spaces we are particularly interested in are finitely generated groups equipped with a word metric. In this setting we are particularly interested in understanding the quasiconvex and stable subgroups.

**Definition 2.9.** Let $G$ be a finitely generated group equipped with a word metric from some finite generating set. A subgroup $H < G$ is a quasiconvex subgroup of $G$ if $H$ is a quasiconvex subset of $G$ with respect to the word metric on $G$. A subgroup $H < G$ is a stable subgroup if $H$ is a quasiconvex subgroup and $H$ is a hyperbolic group.

The above definition of stable subgroup is different than the one originally given in [DT15], but it is equivalent by Proposition 2.8.

If $H$ is a quasiconvex subgroup of $G$, then $H$ is also finitely generated and undistorted in $G$. Further, since quasiconvex is a quasi-isometry invariant, being a quasiconvex or a stable subgroup is independent of the choice of finite generating set for $G$.

It is common in the literature to study various “contracting” properties of quasiconvex subsets. In this paper, we compare quasiconvex subsets with the following notion of a contracting subset.

**Definition 2.10.** Let $X$ be a quasi-geodesic metric space and $Y \subseteq X$. A map $g : X \to Y$ is said to be $(A, D)$–contracting for some $A \in (0, 1]$ and $D \geq 1$ if the following hold:

1. $g$ is $(D, D)$–coarsely Lipschitz.
2. For any $y \in Y$, $d(y, g(y)) \leq D$.
3. For all $x \in X$, if we set $R = Ad(x, Y)$, then $\text{diam}(g(B_R(x))) \leq D$.

A subset $Y$ is said to be $(A, D)$–contracting if there is an $(A, D)$–contracting map from $X$ to $Y$.

The above definition is motivated by [MM99, Definition 2.2] and generalizes the usual definition of contracting in hyperbolic and CAT(0) spaces to include maps that are not the closest point projection. This is critical to our study of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces in Section 6 and allows quasi-isometry invariance to be established directly from the definition.

**Lemma 2.11.** Let $X$ and $Z$ be a quasi-geodesic metric spaces and $f : X \to Z$ be a $(K, L)$–quasi-isometry. If $Y$ is an $(A, D)$–contracting subset of $X$, then $f(Y)$ is an $(A', D')$–contracting subset of $Z$, where $A'$ and $D'$ depend only on $A, D, K,$ and $L$.

In the setting of hyperbolic spaces, quasiconvex subsets are contracting. The contracting map will be the following coarse closest point projection: if $X$ is a $\delta$–hyperbolic metric space and $Y \subseteq X$ is $Q$–quasiconvex, then there exist $K$ depending on $\delta$ and $Q$ and a $(1, K)$–coarsely Lipschitz map $p_Y : X \to Y$ such that for all $x \in X$, $d(x, p_Y(x)) \leq d(x, Y) + 1$. By an abuse of language, we will refer to $p_Y$ as the closest point projection of $X$ onto $Y$. For any $Q$–quasiconvex subset $Y$ of a $\delta$–hyperbolic space, the map $p_Y$ is $(1, D)$–contracting where $D$ depends only on $Q$ and $\delta$.

3. **Divergence of Contracting Subsets**

In this section we show that contracting subsets are always quasiconvex. Without some negative curvature hypotheses, such as being hierarchically hyperbolic, the converse is not always true as we show in Example 3.3. Both of these statements are proved using lower relative divergence which was originally introduced by the third author in [Tra15]. The lower relative divergence is a family of functions that measures how efficiently one can travel in $X$ while avoiding a subset $Y$ (see Figure 1).
Definition 3.1 (Lower relative divergence). Let $X$ be a geodesic space and $Y \subseteq X$. For $r > 0$ we adopt the following notations:

1. $\partial N_r(Y) = \{x \in X \mid d(x, Y) = r\}$
2. $d_r$ is the induced path metric on $X - N_r(Y)$.

The lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ (or the divergence of $Y$ in $X$), denoted $\text{div}(X, Y)$, is the set of functions $\{\sigma^n_\rho\}$ defined as follows: For each $\rho \in (0, 1]$, integer $n \geq 2$ and $r \in (0, \infty)$, if there is no pair of $x_1, x_2 \in \partial N_r(Y)$ such that $d_r(x_1, x_2) < \infty$ and $d(x_1, x_2) \geq nr$, we define $\sigma^n_\rho(r) = \infty$. Otherwise, we define $\sigma^n_\rho(r) = \inf d_{pr}(x_1, x_2)$ where the infimum is taken over all $x_1, x_2 \in \partial N_r(Y)$ such that $d_r(x_1, x_2) < \infty$ and $d(x_1, x_2) \geq nr$.

![Figure 1. A sketch of a step in the construction of the function $\sigma^n_\rho$. The points $x_1, x_2 \in \partial N_r(Y)$ are at least $nr$ far apart, so we measure the distance between $x_1$ and $x_2$ in the complement of the $\rho r$-neighborhood of $Y$. We then take the infimum of these distances over all such pairs of points to obtain $\sigma^n_\rho(r)$.](image)

The lower relative divergence is often characterized by how the asymptotics of the functions $\{\sigma^n_\rho\}$ compare to linear, polynomial and exponential functions. Such descriptions are described in detail in [Tra15]. For this paper we will restrict our attention to the following two properties of $\text{div}(X, Y)$.

Definition 3.2. Let $X$ be a geodesic metric space and $Y \subseteq X$.

The lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ is completely superlinear if there exists $n_0 \geq 3$ such that for every $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $C > 0$ the set $\{r \in [0, \infty) : \sigma^{n_0}_\rho(r) \leq Cr\}$ is bounded.

The lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ is at least quadratic if there exists a positive integer $M$ such that for every $\rho \in (0, 1]$ and $n \geq 2$ there exist $C > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that $\sigma^M_\rho(r) > Cr^2$ for all $r > r_0$.

The properties of being completely superlinear and at least quadratic are preserved under quasi-isometry in the following sense.

Lemma 3.3 (Consequence of [Tra15 Proposition 4.9]). Let $f : X \to Z$ be a quasi-isometry between geodesic spaces. If $Y \subseteq X$ and $W \subseteq Z$ with $d_{\text{Haus}}(f(Y), W) < \infty$, then $\text{div}(X, Y)$ is completely superlinear (resp. at least quadratic) if and only if $\text{div}(Z, W)$ is completely superlinear (resp. at least quadratic).

In [Tra15], the lower relative divergence was defined only for geodesic ambient spaces, however the definition can be extended to include quasi-geodesic metric spaces as follows.

Definition 3.4 (Lower relative divergence in quasi-geodesic spaces). Let $X$ be a quasi-geodesic space and $Y \subseteq X$. Let $Z$ be a geodesic space and $f : X \to Z$ be a quasi-isometry. Then the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ (or the divergence of $Y$ in $X$), denoted $\text{div}(X, Y)$, is the lower relative divergence of $Z$ with respect to $f(Y)$. 
We say $\text{div}(X,Y)$ is completely superlinear (resp. at least quadratic) if $\text{div}(Z,f(Y))$ is completely superlinear (resp. at least quadratic).

While the definition of $\text{div}(X,Y)$ in a quasi-geodesic space depends on a choice of $Z$ and $f$, $\text{div}(X,Y)$ being completely superlinear (resp. at least quadratic) is independent of this choice by Lemma 3.3. In fact, while it will not be relevant for the content of this paper, $\text{div}(X,Y)$ is independent of the choice of $Z$ and $f$ in a much stronger sense. In [Tra15] the third author defined an equivalence relation $\sim$ between the collections of functions used to define the lower relative divergence. If $f_1 : X \to Z_1$ and $f_2 : X \to Z_2$ are two quasi-isometries with $Z_1$ and $Z_2$ geodesic spaces, then by [Tra15] Proposition 4.9, $\text{div}(Z_1, f_1(Y)) \sim \text{div}(Z_2, f_2(Y))$. Thus $\text{div}(X,Y)$ is well defined up to this notion of equivalence.

The following proposition shows that contracting subsets always have at least quadratic divergence.

**Proposition 3.5.** Let $X$ be a quasi-geodesic space and let $Y$ be a contracting subset of $X$. Then the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$ is at least quadratic.

**Proof.** Since every quasi-geodesic space is quasi-isometric to a geodesic metric space, Lemma 2.11 allows us to assume $X$ is geodesic. Assume that $Y$ is $(A,D)$–contracting and let $g : X \to Y$ be an $(A,D)$–contracting map. We first show that for all $x \in X$,

$$d(x, g(x)) \leq 2D d(x, Y) + 4D.$$  

Let $y \in Y$ such that $d(x, y) \leq d(x, Y) + 1$. Then from the definition of $(A,D)$–contracting we have

$$d(x, g(x)) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, g(y)) + d(g(y), g(x))$$

$$\leq d(x, Y) + 1 + D + D d(x, y) + D$$

$$\leq (D + 1) d(x, Y) + 3D + 1$$

$$\leq 2D d(x, Y) + 4D.$$  

Now, let $\{\sigma^n\}$ be the lower relative divergence of $X$ with respect to $Y$. We claim that for each $n \geq 4D + 2$ and $\rho \in (0, 1]$

$$\sigma^n(\rho) \geq \left(\frac{A\rho}{4D}\right) r^2 \text{ for each } r > 8D.$$  

Let $r > 8D$, $n$ be an integer greater than $4D + 2$, and $\rho \in (0, 1]$. If $\sigma^n(\rho) = \infty$, then the above inequality is true. Otherwise, let $x_1, x_2 \in \partial N_r(Y)$ be such that $d(x_1, x_2) \geq n\rho$ and $d_\rho(x_1, x_2) \leq \infty$. The distances $d(x_1, g(x_1))$ and $d(x_2, g(x_2))$ are bounded above by $2Dr + 4D$. Therefore,

$$d(g(x_1), g(x_2)) \geq d(x_1, x_2) - d(x_1, g(x_1)) - d(x_2, g(x_2))$$

$$\geq n\rho - 4Dr - 8D$$

$$\geq r.$$  

Let $\gamma$ be a rectifiable path in $N_{\rho r}(Y)$ connecting $x_1$ and $x_2$ and $R = A\rho r/2$. There exist $t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_{m-1} < t_m$ such that $\gamma(t_0) = x_1$, $\gamma(t_m) = x_2$ and

$$\frac{R}{2} \leq \ell(\gamma_{[t_{i-1}, t_i]}) \leq R$$

where $\ell(\cdot)$ denotes the length of a path. This implies

$$\ell(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\gamma_{[t_{i-1}, t_i]}) \geq \frac{mR}{2}.$$  

(1)
Since \( g \) is an \((A, D)\)-contracting map and \( d(\gamma(t_{i-1}), \gamma(t_i)) < Ad(\gamma(t_{i-1}), Y) \), we have \( d(g(\gamma(t_{i-1})), g(\gamma(t_i))) \leq D \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). Thus
\[
d(g(x_1), g(x_2)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} d(g(\gamma(t_{i-1})), g(\gamma(t_i))) \leq mD. \tag{2}
\]

Since \( d(g(x_1), g(x_2)) \geq r \), Inequality \([2]\) implies \( m \geq r/D \). Combining this with Inequality \([1]\), we have
\[
\ell(\gamma) \geq \frac{mR}{2} \geq \left( \frac{A\rho}{4D} \right) r^2.
\]
Therefore,
\[
\sigma_{p}^{n}(r) \geq \left( \frac{A\rho}{4D} \right) r^2
\]
for \( n \geq 4D + 2 \), \( \rho \in (0, 1] \), and \( r > 8D \). This implies that the lower relative divergence of \( X \) with respect to \( Y \) is at least quadratic. \( \square \)

In \([\text{Tra15}]\), the third author classified quasiconvex subsets in terms of their lower relative divergence. This result continues to hold in the slightly more general setting of quasi-geodesic spaces.

**Theorem 3.6** (\([\text{Tra} \, \text{Theorem 3.1}]\)). Let \( X \) be a quasi-geodesic space and \( Y \subseteq X \). Then \( Y \) is quasiconvex if and only if the lower relative divergence of \( X \) with respect to \( Y \) is completely superlinear.

*Proof.* Since every quasi-geodesic metric space is quasi-isometric to a geodesic metric space, the result follows immediately from \([\text{Tra} \, \text{Theorem 1.5}]\) when \( Y \) is infinite diameter. If \( \text{diam}(A) = r_0 < \infty \), then for all \( r > r_0 \), \( \partial N_{r_0}(Y) = \emptyset \) and thus \( \sigma_{p}^{n}(r) = \infty \). Hence \( \text{div}(X, Y) \) is completely superlinear and \( Y \) is quasiconvex. \( \square \)

Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 3.6 combine to say that if a subset \( Y \subseteq X \) is \((A, D)\)-contracting, then \( Y \) is quasiconvex. However, the proofs of Proposition 3.5 and \([\text{Tra} \, \text{Proposition 3.1}]\) actually allow us to determine that the quasiconvex gauge of \( Y \) depends only on the constants \((A, D)\) and the quasi-geodesic constants for \( X \).

**Corollary 3.7.** Let \( X \) be a \((K, L)\)-quasi-geodesic space and \( Y \subseteq X \). If \( Y \) is \((A, D)\)-contracting, then \( Y \) is \( Q \)-quasiconvex where \( Q \) is determined by \( A, D, K, \) and \( L \).

*Proof.* Let \( Y \) be a \((A, D)\)-contracting subset of \( X \). We first assume that \( X \) is a geodesic metric space. Let \( \{\sigma_{p}^{n}\} \) be the lower relative divergence of \( X \) with respect to \( Y \). The proof of Proposition 3.5 shows that for each \( n \geq 4D + 2 \) and \( \rho \in (0, 1] \) we have
\[
\sigma_{p}^{n}(r) \geq \left( \frac{A\rho}{4D} \right) r^2 \text{ for all } r > 8D.
\]
Therefore, by fixing \( n = n_0 = 4D + 3 \) and \( \rho = 1 \) we have
\[
\sigma_{1}^{n_0}(r) \geq \left( \frac{A}{4D} \right) r^2 \text{ for all } r > 8D.
\]
If \( \gamma \) is a \((\lambda, \epsilon)\)-quasi-geodesic with endpoints on \( Y \), let \( m = \inf\{B \in \mathbb{R} : \gamma \subseteq N_{B}(Y)\} \). The proof of \([\text{Tra} \, \text{Proposition 3.1}]\) establishes that if \( m \) is larger than a fixed constant depending on \( \lambda \) and \( \epsilon \) then there exist constants \( C_0 \) and \( C_1 \) depending only on \( \lambda, \epsilon \) and \( n_0 \), such that \( \sigma_{1}^{n_0}(C_0 m) \leq C_1 m \). Thus, we have
\[
\left( \frac{A}{4D} \right) (C_0 m)^2 \leq \sigma_{1}^{n_0}(C_0 m) \leq C_1 m,
\]
and hence \( m \) is bounded by some constant depending only on \( \lambda, \epsilon, A, D \). Thus, there exists a function \( Q \) depending only on \( A \) and \( D \) such that \( Y \) is \( Q \)-quasiconvex.

When \( X \) is a \((K,L)\)-quasi-geodesic space, there exist a geodesic metric space \( Z \) and a quasi-isometry \( f: X \to Z \) with constants determined by \( K \) and \( L \). The result follows from the geodesic case by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.11. 

We finish this section by giving a counterexample to the converse of Corollary 3.7.

**Example 3.8** (Quasiconvex subsets need not be contracting). The following example is adapted from [ACGH17, Example 3.4]. Let \( Y \) be a ray with initial point \( x_0 \) and let \( (x_n) \) be the sequence of points along \( Y \) such that for each \( n \geq 1 \) the distance between \( x_{n-1} \) and \( x_n \) is equal to \( n \). We connect each pair \( (x_{n-1}, x_n) \) by an additional segment \( J_n \) of length \( n^{3/2} \) as shown below. Let \( X \) be the resulting geodesic space.

![Figure 2. The space X](image)

By Proposition 3.5 the lower relative divergence of \( X \) with respect to \( Y \) is completely superlinear, but not at least quadratic (heuristically, \( div(X,Y) \) behaves like \( r^{3/2} \)). So \( Y \) is quasiconvex, but not contracting by Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 3.6.

## 4. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces

We now recall the main definitions of hierarchically hyperbolic groups and spaces. The main references, where not specified, are [BHS17b, BHS3a]. While we give the entire definition of an HHS for completeness, we advise the reader that we shall only directly utilize Axioms [1], [2], [3], [5], [8], and [10] of Definition 4.1 in the remainder of the paper.

**Definition 4.1** (Hierarchically hyperbolic space). Let \( \mathcal{X} \) be a quasi-geodesic space. A **hierarchically hyperbolic space (HHS)** structure on \( \mathcal{X} \) consists of constants \( E \geq \kappa_0 > 0 \), an index set \( \mathcal{S} \), and a set \( \{CW: W \in \mathcal{S}\} \) of geodesic \( \delta \)-hyperbolic spaces \( (CW,d_{CW}) \), such that the following conditions are satisfied:

1. **(Projections.)** For each \( W \in \mathcal{S} \), there exists a *projection* \( \pi_W: \mathcal{X} \to 2^{CW} \) such that for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \), \( \pi_W(x) \neq \emptyset \) and \( \text{diam}(\pi_W(x)) < E \). Moreover, there exists \( K \) so that each \( \pi_W \) is \((K,K)\)-coarsely Lipschitz and \( \pi_W(\mathcal{X}) \) is \( K \)-geodesically quasiconvex in \( CW \).
2. **(Nesting.)** \( \mathcal{S} \) is equipped with a partial order \( \subseteq \), and either \( \mathcal{S} = \emptyset \) or \( \mathcal{S} \) contains a unique \( \subseteq \)-maximal element; when \( V \subseteq W \), we say \( V \) is *nested* in \( W \). For each \( W \in \mathcal{S} \), we denote by \( \mathcal{S}_W \) the set of \( V \in \mathcal{S} \) such that \( V \subseteq W \). Moreover, for all \( V, W \in \mathcal{S} \) with \( V \subseteq W \) there is a specified non-empty subset \( \rho^V_W \subseteq CW \) with \( \text{diam}_{CW}(\rho^V_W) \leq E \). There is also a *projection* \( \rho^W_V: CW \to 2^{CV} \).
3. **(Orthogonality.)** \( \mathcal{S} \) has a symmetric and anti-reflexive relation called *orthogonality*: we write \( V \perp W \) when \( V, W \) are orthogonal. Also, whenever \( V \subseteq W \) and \( W \perp U \), we require that \( V \perp U \). Additionally, if \( V \perp W \), then \( V, W \) are not \( \subseteq \)-comparable.
4. **(Containers.)** For each \( T \in \mathcal{S} \) and each \( U \in \mathcal{S}_T \) for which \( \{V \in \mathcal{S}_T : V \perp U\} \neq \emptyset \), there exists \( W \in \mathcal{S}_T - \{T\} \), so that whenever \( V \perp U \) and \( V \subseteq T \), we have \( V \subseteq W \). We say \( W \) is a *container* for \( U \) in \( \mathcal{S}_T \).
(5) **(Transversality and consistency.)** If $V, W \in \mathcal{S}$ are not orthogonal and neither is nested in the other, then we say $V, W$ are *transverse*, denoted $V \cap W$. If $V \cap W$, then there are non-empty sets $\rho_{W}^{V} \subseteq CW$ and $\rho_{V}^{W} \subseteq CV$ each of diameter at most $E$ and satisfying:

$$\min \{d_{W}(\pi_{W}(x), \rho_{W}^{V}), d_{V}(\pi_{V}(x), \rho_{V}^{W})\} \leq \kappa_{0}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For $V, W \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $V \subseteq W$ and for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we have:

$$\min \{d_{W}(\pi_{W}(x), \rho_{W}^{V}), \text{diam}_{CV}(\pi_{V}(x) \cup \rho_{W}^{V}(\pi_{W}(x)))\} \leq \kappa_{0}.$$

Finally, if $U \subseteq V$, then $d_{W}(\rho_{W}^{U}, \rho_{V}^{V}) \leq \kappa_{0}$ whenever $W \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfies either $V \subseteq W$ or $V \cap W$ and $W \not\subseteq U$.

(6) **(Finite complexity.)** There exists $n \geq 0$ so that any set of pairwise–$\leq$–comparable elements has cardinality at most $n$.

(7) **(Large links.)** There exists $\zeta \geq 1$ such that the following holds. Let $W \in \mathcal{S}$ and let $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. There exist $\{U_{i}\}_{i=1,...,m} \subseteq \mathcal{S} - \{W\}$ such that $m \leq \zeta d_{V}(\pi_{W}(x), \pi_{W}(x')) + \zeta$ and for all $V \in \mathcal{S} - \{W\}$, either $V \in \mathcal{S} - U_{i}$ for some $i$, or $d_{V}(\pi_{V}(x), \pi_{V}(x')) < E$. Also, $d_{W}(\pi_{W}(x), \rho_{V}^{U_{j}}) \leq \zeta d_{W}(\pi_{V}(x), \pi_{W}(x')) + \zeta$ for each $i$.

(8) **(Bounded geodesic image.)** For all $W \in \mathcal{S}$, all $V \in \mathcal{S} - \{W\}$, and all geodesics $\gamma$ of $CW$, either $\text{diam}_{CV}(\rho_{V}^{W}(\gamma)) \leq E$ or $\gamma \cap N_{E}(\rho_{V}^{W}) \neq \emptyset$.

(9) **(Partial realization.)** There exists a constant $\alpha$ with the following property. Let $\{V_{j}\}$ be a family of pairwise orthogonal elements of $\mathcal{S}$, and let $p_{j} \in \pi_{V_{j}}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq CV_{j}$. Then there exists $x \in \mathcal{X}$ so that:

- $d_{V_{j}}(x, p_{j}) \leq \alpha$ for all $j$.
- For each $j$ and each $V \in \mathcal{S}$ with $V_{j} \subseteq V$, we have $d_{V}(x, \rho_{V}^{V_{j}}) \leq \alpha$.
- If $W \cap V_{j}$ for some $j$, then $d_{W}(x, \rho_{V}^{V_{j}}) \leq \alpha$.

(10) **(Uniqueness.)** For each $\kappa \geq 0$, there exists $\theta_{u} = \theta_{u}(\kappa)$ such that if $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $d(x, y) \geq \theta_{u}$, then there exists $V \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $d_{V}(x, y) \geq \kappa$.

We will refer to the elements of the index set $\mathcal{S}$ as *domains* and use $\mathcal{S}$ to denote the entire HHS structure, including all the spaces, constants, projections and relations defined above. A quasi-geodesic space $\mathcal{X}$ is a *hierarchically hyperbolic space* (HHS) if it admits a hierarchically hyperbolic structure. We will use the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ to denote $\mathcal{X}$ equipped with the hierarchically hyperbolic structure $\mathcal{S}$.

If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $f: \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ is a quasi-isometry, then $\mathcal{S}$ is also an HHS structure for $\mathcal{Y}$ where the projections maps are defined by $\pi_{W} \circ f$ for each $W \in \mathcal{S}$.

Many of the key examples of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces are finitely generated groups where the Cayley graph admits an HHS structure. In the case where this structure is preserved by the group action, we will call those groups hierarchically hyperbolic groups.

**Definition 4.2** (Hierarchically hyperbolic groups). Let $G$ be a finitely generated group. We say $G$ is a *hierarchically hyperbolic group* (HHG) if

1. $G$ with the word metric from a finite generating set admits an HHS structure $\mathcal{S}$.
2. There is a $\leq$, $\perp$, and $\cap$ preserving action of $G$ on $\mathcal{S}$ by bijections such that $\mathcal{S}$ contains finitely many $G$ orbits.
3. For each $W \in \mathcal{S}$ and $g \in G$, there exists an isometry $g_{W}: CW \to C(gW)$ satisfying the following for all $V, W \in \mathcal{S}$ and $g \in G$:
   - For each $h \in G$, $g_{W}(\pi_{W}(h))$ and $\pi_{gW}(gh)$ $E$–coarsely coincide.
that for all \( x, y \)

- If \( V \cap W \) or \( V \subseteq W \), then \( g_W(\rho_W^V) \) and \( \rho_W^{\rho_W^V} \) \( E \)-coarsely coincide.
- If \( V \subseteq W \) and \( p \in CW \), then \( g_W(\rho_W^V(p)) \) and \( \rho_W^{\rho_W^V}(g_W(p)) \) \( E \)-coarsely coincide.

The HHS structure \( S \) satisfying (1) - (3) is called a hierarchically hyperbolic group (HHG) structure on \( G \) and we use \( (G, S) \) to denote a group \( G \) equipped with a specific HHG structure \( S \).

Being a hierarchically hyperbolic group is independent of choice of generating set by virtue of being able to pass the HHG structure through a \( G \)-equivariant quasi-isometry. The reader may find it helpful to note that the conditions in (3) above can be summarized by saying the following two diagrams coarsely commute whenever \( V, U \in S \) are not orthogonal.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G & \xrightarrow{g} & G \\
\downarrow \pi_W & & \downarrow \pi_W \\
CW & \xrightarrow{g_W} & C(gW)
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{ccc}
CV & \xrightarrow{g_V} & C(gV) \\
\downarrow \pi_{CW}^V & & \downarrow \rho_{CW}^{\rho_{CW}^V} \\
CW & \xrightarrow{g} & C(gW)
\end{array}
\]

**Notation 4.3.** When writing distances in \( CW \) for some \( W \in S \), we often simplify the notation by suppressing the projection map \( \pi_W \), that is, given \( x, y \in X \) and \( p \in CW \) we write \( d_W(x, y) \) for \( d_W(\pi_W(x), \pi_W(y)) \) and \( d_W(x, p) \) for \( d_W(\pi_W(x), p) \). Note that when we measure distance between a pair of sets (typically both of bounded diameter) we are taking the minimum distance between the two sets. Given \( A \subseteq X \) and \( W \in S \) we let \( \pi_W(A) \) denote \( \bigcup_{a \in A} \pi_W(a) \).

The guiding philosophy of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces is that one can “pull back” the hyperbolic geometry of the various \( CWs \) to obtain features of negative curvature in the original space. The most prominent example of this philosophy is the following distance formula which allows distances in the main space \( X \) to be approximated by distances in the hyperbolic spaces.

**Theorem 4.4** (The distance formula; [BHSa, Theorem 4.4]). Let \( (X, S) \) be a hierarchically hyperbolic space. Then there exists \( \sigma_0 \) such that for all \( \sigma \geq \sigma_0 \), there exist \( K \geq 1 \), \( L \geq 0 \) so that for all \( x, y \in X \),

\[
d_X(x, y) \overset{K,L}{=} \sum_{U \in S} \|d_U(x, y)\|_\sigma
\]

where \( \|N\|_\sigma = N \) if \( N \geq \sigma \) and 0 otherwise.

Part of the content of Theorem 4.4 is that for any for any pair of points in an HHS, there is only a finite number of domains where that pair of points can have a large projection. More precisely, if \( (X, S) \) is a hierarchically hyperbolic space, then a domain \( W \in S \) is said to be \( \sigma \)-relevant for \( x, y \in X \) if \( d_W(x, y) \geq \sigma \). We denote set of all \( \sigma \)-relevant domains for \( x, y \in X \) by \( \text{Rel}_\sigma(x, y) \). By Theorem 4.4 for all \( \sigma \geq \sigma_0 \), \( \text{Rel}_\sigma(x, y) \) has finite cardinality. The relevant facts about \( \text{Rel}_\sigma(x, y) \) which we will need are summarized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.5** ([BHSa, Lemma 2.2, Proposition 2.8, Lemma 2.14]). Let \( (X, S) \) be a hierarchically hyperbolic space and \( x, y \in X \).

1. There exists \( \chi > 0 \) such that if \( U \subseteq S \) does not contain a pair of transverse domains, then \( |U| \leq \chi \).
2. If \( \sigma \geq 100E \), the set \( \text{Rel}_\sigma(x, y) \) can be partially ordered as follows:
   \[ U \leq V \text{ if } U = V \text{ or } U \cap V \text{ and } d_V(\rho_V^U, y) \leq \kappa_0. \]
Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces contain a particularly nice class of quasi-geodesics, called hierarchy paths. Even when considering a geodesic HHS, it is often preferable to work with hierarchy paths over geodesics.

**Definition 4.6 (Hierarchy path).** For $\lambda \geq 1$, a (not necessarily continuous) path $\gamma: [a, b] \to \mathcal{X}$ is a $\lambda$–hierarchy path if

1. $\gamma$ is a $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic,
2. for each $W \in \mathcal{S}$, the path $\pi_W \circ \gamma$ is a unparameterized $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic.

Recall that a map $f: [a, b] \to X$ is an unparameterized $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic if there exists an increasing function $g: [0, \ell] \to [a, b]$ such that $g(0) = a$, $g(\ell) = b$, and $f \circ g$ is a $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic of $X$.

While not every quasi-geodesic in an HHS is a hierarchy path, every pair of points can be connected by a hierarchy path as the next theorem describes.

**Theorem 4.7 (Existence of hierarchy paths; [BHSa, Theorem 5.4]).** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space. Then there exists $\lambda_0$ so that any $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ are joined by a $\lambda_0$–hierarchy path.

### 4.1. Hierarchical quasiconvexity and gate maps.

In [BHSa], Behrstock-Hagen-Sisto introduced *hierarchical quasiconvexity*, a notion of convexity unique to hierarchically hyperbolic spaces.

**Definition 4.8 (Hierarchical quasiconvexity; [BHSa, Definition 5.1]).** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space. Then $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex for some $k: [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty]$ if the following hold:

1. For all $U \in \mathcal{S}$, the projection $\pi_U(Y)$ is a $k(0)$–geodesically quasiconvex subspace of the $\delta$–hyperbolic space $CU$.
2. For every $\kappa > 0$ and every point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying $d_U(x, Y) \leq \kappa$ for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that $d_{\mathcal{X}}(x, Y) \leq k(\kappa)$.

While hierarchically quasiconvex subsets need not be quasiconvex, they are “quasiconvex with respect to hierarchy paths.” That is, if $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex then any $\lambda$–hierarchy path with endpoints on $Y$ must stay uniformly close to $Y$. The existence of hierarchy paths (Theorem 4.7) therefore ensures that if $Y$ is equipped with the induced metric from $\mathcal{X}$, then $Y$ is also a quasi-geodesic metric space with constants depending only on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ and $k$. In Section 5, we will prove that hierarchically quasiconvex subsets are actually characterized by this “quasiconvexity with respect to hierarchy paths.”

One of the key features of hierarchically quasiconvex subsets is that they are hierarchically hyperbolic spaces with the restriction of the HHIS structure from the ambient space.

**Theorem 4.9 (BHSa, Proposition 5.6)).** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex. Then $(Y, \mathcal{S})$ is a hierarchically hyperbolic space, where $Y$ is equipped with the induced metric from $\mathcal{X}$.

The following lemma is a special case of the powerful realization theorem for hierarchically hyperbolic spaces (see [BHSa, Theorem 3.1]). It is often useful when verifying that a subset is hierarchically quasiconvex.

**Lemma 4.10 (BHSa, Theorem 3.1, Lemma 5.3).** For each $Q$ there exists $\mu$ so that the following holds. Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be such that $\pi_W(Y)$ is $Q$–quasiconvex for each $W \in \mathcal{S}$. Let
x \in \mathcal{X} \text{ and for each } W \in \mathcal{G}, \text{ let } p_W \in \pi_W(Y) \text{ satisfy } d_Y(x, p_W) \leq d_W(x, Y) + 1. \text{ Then there exists } p \in \mathcal{X} \text{ such that } d_W(p, p_W) \leq \mu \text{ for all } W \in \mathcal{G}.

Given a subset \( Y \subseteq \mathcal{X} \), there exists a \textit{hierarchically quasiconvex hull} of \( Y \) which can be thought of as the coarsely smallest hierarchically quasiconvex subset of \( \mathcal{X} \) containing \( Y \).

**Definition 4.11** (Hierarchically quasiconvex hull). For each set \( Y \subseteq \mathcal{X} \) and \( W \in \mathcal{G} \), let \( \text{hull}_{CW}(Y) \) denote the convex hull of \( \pi_W(Y) \) in \( CW \). Given \( \theta \geq 0 \), let \( H_\theta(Y) \) be the set of all \( p \in \mathcal{X} \) so that, for each \( W \in \mathcal{G} \), the set \( \pi_W(p) \) lies at distance at most \( \theta \) from \( \text{hull}_{CW}(Y) \). Note that \( Y \subseteq H_0(Y) \).

**Lemma 4.12** ([BHSa] Lemma 6.2). Let \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})\) be an HHS. There exists \( \theta_0 \) so that for each \( \theta \geq \theta_0 \) there exists \( k : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) such that for each \( Y \subseteq \mathcal{X} \), the hull \( H_\theta(Y) \) is \( k \)-hierarchically quasiconvex.

In Section [5] we strengthen the analogy between hierarchically quasiconvex hulls and convex hulls in hyperbolic spaces, by showing that \( H_\theta(Y) \) can be constructed by iteratively connecting points in \( Y \) by hierarchy paths.

One of the important properties of hierarchically quasiconvex subsets is the existence of a \textit{gate map} which retracts the entire space onto the hierarchically quasiconvex subset. The gate map is a generalization to hierarchically hyperbolic spaces of the closest point projection, \( p \), defined at the end of Section [2].

**Lemma 4.13** (Existence of coarse gates; [BHSa] Lemma 5.5). If \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})\) is a hierarchically hyperbolic space and \( Y \subseteq \mathcal{X} \) is \( k \)-hierarchically quasiconvex and non-empty, then there exists a gate map \( g_Y : \mathcal{X} \to Y \) such that

1. \( g_Y \) is \( (K, K) \)-coarsely Lipschitz;
2. for all \( y \in Y \), \( d_Y(y, g_Y(y)) \leq K \);
3. for all \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( U \in \mathcal{G} \), \( d_U(g_Y(x), \pi_U(Y)(\pi_U(x))) \leq K \);

where \( K \) depends only on \( k \) and \( \mathcal{G} \).

While the gate map need not be the closest point projection, it approximates the closest point projection with a multiplicative and additive error.

**Lemma 4.14** ([BHSb] Lemma 1.26). Let \( Y \) be a \( k \)-hierarchically quasiconvex subset of the HHS \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})\) and \( x \in \mathcal{X} \). If \( y \in Y \) is a point such that \( d_\mathcal{X}(x, y) - 1 \leq d_\mathcal{X}(x, Y) \), then \( d_\mathcal{X}(x, y) \approx d_\mathcal{X}(x, g_Y(x)) \) where the constants depend only on \( x \) and \( k \) and \( \mathcal{G} \).

In the case of hierarchically hyperbolic groups, the gate is also coarsely equivariant.

**Lemma 4.15** (Coarse equivariance of gate maps). Let \((G, \mathcal{G})\) be a hierarchically hyperbolic group and let \( Y \) be a \( k \)-hierarchically quasiconvex subspace of \( G \). There exists \( K \) depending on \((G, \mathcal{G})\) and \( k \) such that for every \( g, x \in G \), we have

\[ d_G(gg_Y(x), g_Y(gx)) \leq K. \]

**Proof.** Since \( G \) acts on the disjoint union of the CW's by isometries, Lemma 4.13 and the definition of HHG provide a uniform bound on \( d_W(\pi_W(gg_Y(x)), \pi_W(g_Y(gx))) \) for all \( W \in \mathcal{G} \), which depends only on \( \mathcal{G}, k \), and the choice of finite generating set for \( G \). The result now follows from the distance formula (Theorem 4.4). \( \square \)

The following lemma explains the nice behavior of the gates of hierarchically quasiconvex sets onto each other. The lemma is stated in slightly more generality than presented in [BHSb], but the more general statement is implicit in the proof of [BHSb] Lemma 1.19. The following notation will simplify the exposition.
Notation 4.16. If $\mathfrak{S}$ is an HHS structure on a metric space $X$ and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}$ we use $\mathcal{H}^\perp$ to denote the set $\{ W \in \mathfrak{S} : \forall H \in \mathcal{H}, H \perp W \}$. In particular, given $U \in \mathfrak{S}$, let $\mathfrak{S}_U^\perp$ be defined as $\{ W \in \mathfrak{S} : U \perp W \}$. Note, if $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{H}^\perp = \mathfrak{S}$ as every domain in $\mathfrak{S}$ would vacuously satisfy the condition of the set.

Theorem 4.17 (The bridge theorem; \cite[Lemma 1.19]{BHSa}). Let $(X, \mathfrak{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $\theta_0$ be as in Lemma 4.12. For every $k$ and $\theta \geq \theta_0$, there exist $k', K_0$ such that for any $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex sets $A, B$, the following hold.

1. $g_A(B)$ is $k'$–hierarchically quasiconvex.
2. The composition $g_A \circ g_B |_{g_A(B)}$ is bounded distance from the identity $g_A(B) \to g_A(B)$.
3. For any $a \in g_A(B), b = g_B(a)$, we have a $(K_0, K_0)$–quasi-isometric embedding $f : g_A(B) \times H_\theta(a, b) \to X$ with image $H_\theta(g_A(B) \cup g_B(A))$, so that $f(g_A(B) \times \{ b \})$ $K_0$–coarsely coincides with $g_B(A)$.

Let $K \geq K_0$ and $\mathcal{H} = \{ U \in \mathfrak{S} : \text{diam}(g_A(B)) > K \}$.
4. For each $p, q \in g_A(B)$ and $t \in H_\theta(a, b)$, we have
   $$\text{Rel}_K(f(p, t), f(q, t)) \subseteq \mathcal{H}.$$ 
5. For each $p \in g_A(B)$ and $t_1, t_2 \in H_\theta(a, b)$, we have
   $$\text{Rel}_K(f(p, t_1), f(p, t_2)) \subseteq \mathcal{H}^\perp.$$ 
6. For each $p \in A, q \in B$ we have
   $$d(p, q) \approx_{K_0, K_0} d(p, g_A(B)) + d(q, g_B(A)) + d(A, B) + d(g_B(A)(p), g_B(A)(q)).$$

We name Theorem 4.17 the bridge theorem as one should think of the set $H_\theta(g_A(B) \cup g_B(A))$ as a “bridge” between $A$ and $B$: in order to efficiently travel between $A$ and $B$ one needs to always traverse this bridge. The bridge theorem, along with the construction of the gate map and hulls produces the following fact about the set $H_\theta(g_A(B) \cup g_B(A))$ which we will need in Section 8.

Lemma 4.18. For every $k$ and $\theta \geq \theta_0$, there exists $K$ such that for any $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex sets $A, B$, the sets $g_B(H_\theta(g_A(B) \cup g_B(A)))$ and $g_B(A)$ $K$–coarsely coincide.

We finish this section by recalling the construction of standard product regions introduced in \cite[Section 13]{BHSa} and studied further in \cite{BHSa}. For what follows, fix a hierarchically hyperbolic space $(X, \mathfrak{S})$.

Definition 4.19 (Nested partial tuple $F_U$). Recall $\mathfrak{S}_U = \{ V \in \mathfrak{S} | V \subseteq U \}$. Define $F_U$ to be the set of tuples in $\prod_{V \in \mathfrak{S}_U} 2^{CV}$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 4.1(5) for all $V, W \in \mathfrak{S}_U$ with $V \perp W$.

Definition 4.20 (Orthogonal partial tuple $E_U$). Recall $\mathfrak{S}_U^\perp = \{ V \in \mathfrak{S} | V \perp U \}$. Define $E_U$ to be the set of tuples in $\prod_{V \in \mathfrak{S}_U^\perp} 2^{CV}$ satisfying the conditions of Definition 4.1(5) for all $V, W \in \mathfrak{S}_U^\perp$ with $V \perp W$.

Definition 4.21 (Product regions in $X$). Let $U \in \mathfrak{S}$. There exists $\mu$ depending only on $\mathfrak{S}$ such that for each $(a_V)_{V \in \mathfrak{S}_U} \in F_U$ and $(b_V)_{V \in \mathfrak{S}_U} \in E_U$, there exists $x \in X$ such that the following hold for each $V \in \mathfrak{S}$:

- If $V \subseteq U$, then $d_V(x, a_V) \leq \mu$.
- If $V \perp U$, then $d_V(x, b_V) \leq \mu$.
- If $V \cap U$ or $U \subseteq V$, then $d_V(x, b^*_V) \leq \mu$.

Thus there is a map $\phi_U : F_U \times E_U \to X$, whose image is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex where $k$ only depends on $\mathfrak{S}$. We call $\phi_U(F_U \times E_U)$ the product region for $U$ and denote it $P_U$. 
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For any $e \in E_U$, $f \in F_U$, the sets $\phi_U(F_U \times \{e\})$ and $\phi_U(\{f\} \times E_U)$ will also be hierarchically quasiconvex, thus $E_U$ and $F_U$ are quasi-geodesic metric spaces when equipped with the subspace metric from $\phi_U(F_U \times \{e\})$ and $\phi_U(\{f\} \times F_U)$. While these metrics depend on the choice of $e$ and $f$, the distance formula (Theorem 4.4) ensures that the different choices are all (uniformly) quasi-isometric.

4.2. **Summary of constants.** Before continuing we summarize the constants associated to the hierarchically hyperbolic space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ that we will utilize frequently.

- $\delta$ is the hyperbolicity constant of $CW$ for each $W \in \mathcal{G}$.
- $\kappa_0$ is the consistency constant from Axiom (5).
- $E$ is the bound on projections in Axioms (1), (5), and (8).
- $\sigma_0$ is the minimal threshold constant from the distance formula (Theorem 4.4).
- $\lambda_0$ is the constant such that any two points in $\mathcal{X}$ can be joined by a $\lambda_0$–hierarchy path (Theorem 4.7).
- $\chi$ is the constant from Proposition 4.5 which bounds the cardinality of any subset of $\mathcal{G}$ that does not contain a pair of transverse domains.
- $\theta_0$ is the constant such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_0$ and $Y \subset \mathcal{X}$, $H_\theta(Y)$ is hierarchically quasiconvex (Lemma 4.12).

We can and shall assume that $E \geq \kappa_0$ and $E \geq \delta$. When we say that a quantity depends on $\mathcal{G}$, we mean that it depends on any of the above constants.

5. **Constructing hulls with hierarchy paths**

In this section we study hierarchically quasiconvex hulls in a hierarchically hyperbolic space. The main result is Theorem 5.2 below which says that the hierarchically quasiconvex hull can be constructed by iteratively connecting points with hierarchy paths. While our motivation for such a construction is to establish that quasiconvex subsets are hierarchically quasiconvex (Proposition 5.7) we believe it will have many other applications. At the end of the section, we give an example of such an application by characterizing hierarchical quasiconvexity in terms of the coarse median structure on a hierarchically hyperbolic space.

**Definition 5.1** (Hierarchy path hull). Let $Y$ be a subset of the hierarchically hyperbolic space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$. Define $P_\lambda^1(Y)$ to be the union of all $\lambda$–hierarchy paths between points in $Y$. Inductively define $P_\lambda^n(Y) = P_\lambda^1(P_\lambda^{n-1}(Y))$ for all integers $n \geq 2$. For all $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $n \geq 1$, $P_\lambda^n(Y) \neq \emptyset$.

**Theorem 5.2** (Constructing hulls using hierarchy paths). Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $N = 2\chi$, where $\chi$ is as in Proposition 4.3. There exist $\theta_0 \geq 0$ and $\lambda_0 \geq \lambda_0$ depending only on $\mathcal{G}$ such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_0$, $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$ and $Y \subset \mathcal{X}$

$$d_{\text{Haus}}(P_\lambda^N(Y), H_\theta(Y)) < D$$

where $D$ depends only on $\theta$, $\lambda$, and $\mathcal{G}$.

In a recent paper, Bowditch independently constructs hulls in coarse medians spaces in a similar manner to the construction in Definition 5.1 [Bow]. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces are one of the primary examples of coarse median spaces and [Bow, Lemma 7.3] establishes a version of Theorem 5.2 for finite subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. At the end of this section we show that Bowditch’s coarse median hull is coarsely equal to the hierarchical quasiconvex hull for any subset of an HHS. This is achieved by using Theorem 5.2 to give a new characterization of the hierarchical quasiconvexity in terms of the coarse median structure on a hierarchically hyperbolic space.

For the remainder of this subsection, let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space and $Y \subset \mathcal{X}$. Recall, there exist $\theta_0$ and $\lambda_0$ such that for all $\theta \geq \theta_0$, $H_\theta(Y)$ is hierarchically quasiconvex. Theorem 5.2 then guarantees the existence of a hierarchy path hull $P_\lambda(Y)$ for any subset of $\mathcal{X}$. This path hull can be constructed by iteratively connecting points with hierarchy paths. While our motivation for such a construction is to establish that quasiconvex subsets are hierarchically quasiconvex (Proposition 5.7) we believe it will have many other applications. At the end of the section, we give an example of such an application by characterizing hierarchical quasiconvexity in terms of the coarse median structure on a hierarchically hyperbolic space.
quasiconvex (Lemma 4.12) and any two points in \( \mathcal{X} \) can be joined by a \( \lambda_0 \)-hierarchy path (Theorem 4.7).

The following lemma can be found in [BHSa, Proposition 6.4.4] and says for sufficiently large \( \theta \), all hierarchically quasiconvex hulls coarsely coincide. We record the proof for completeness.

**Lemma 5.3** ([BHSa, Proposition 6.4.4]). There exists \( \tilde{\theta} \geq \theta_0 \) depending only on \( \mathcal{S} \), such that for all \( \theta_1, \theta_2 \geq \tilde{\theta} \)

\[
d_{\text{Haus}}(H_{\theta_1}(Y), H_{\theta_2}(Y)) \leq D
\]

where \( D \) depends on \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \).

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, assume \( \theta_0 < \tilde{\theta} \leq \theta_1 < \theta_2 \) with \( \tilde{\theta} \) to be determined below. By definition \( H_{\theta_1}(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta_2}(Y) \). Let \( x \in H_{\theta_2}(Y) \). For each \( U \in \mathcal{S} \), \( \pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y)) \) is \( Q \)-quasiconvex, where \( Q \) depends on \( \theta_0 \) and \( \delta \). Let \( y_U \) be the closest point projection of \( \pi_U(x) \)
onto \( \pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y)) \). By Lemma 4.10 there exist \( y \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( \theta' \) depending on \( \theta_0 \) and \( \mathcal{S} \) such that \( d_U(\pi_U(y), y_U) \leq \theta' \). In particular, setting \( \tilde{\theta} = \theta_0 + \theta' \), we have \( y \in H_\tilde{\theta}(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta_2}(Y) \). To bound \( d_X(x, y) \), we will uniformly bound \( d_U(x, y_U) \) in terms of \( \theta_2 \) for every \( U \in \mathcal{S} \); the bound on \( d_X(x, y) \) will then follow from the distance formula (Theorem 1.4). By the definition of \( y_U \) we have \( d_U(x, y_U) \leq d_U(x, \pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y))) + 1 \). Since \( \pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y)) \) is quasiconvex, contains \( Y \) and is contained in the \( \theta_0 \)-neighborhood of \( \text{hull}_{CU}(Y) \), there exists a \( D' \) depending only on \( \mathcal{S} \) such that \( \text{hull}_{CU}(Y) \subseteq N_{D'}(\pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y))) \). Since \( d_U(x, \text{hull}_{CU}(Y)) \leq \theta_2 \), we have that

\[
d_U(x, y_U) \leq d_U(x, \pi_U(H_{\theta_0}(Y))) + 1 \leq \theta_2 + D' + 1
\]

providing the result. \( \square \)

For the remainder of this section, \( \tilde{\theta} \) will denote the constant from Lemma 5.3.

To prove Theorem 5.2 we shall show for sufficiently large \( \theta \) and \( \lambda \), we can find \( \theta' > \theta \) and \( \lambda' > \lambda \) such that

\[
\mathcal{P}_\lambda^n(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta'}(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad H_\theta(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda'}^n(Y).
\]

Theorem 5.2 will then follow by applying Lemma 5.3. The inclusion \( \mathcal{P}_\lambda^n(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta'}(Y) \) is the following direct consequence of hierarchical quasiconvexity.

**Lemma 5.4.** For each \( \lambda, n \geq 1 \), there exists \( \theta \geq \tilde{\theta} \), such that for any \( Y \in \mathcal{X} \)

\[
\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^n(Y) \subseteq H_\theta(Y).
\]

**Proof.** The \( n = 1 \) case follows directly from the definition of \( H_\theta(Y) \) and hierarchy paths. We can proceed by induction on \( n \) and assume there exists \( \theta' > \tilde{\theta} \) such that \( \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta'}(Y) \).

Let \( x \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^n(Y) \). There exist \( y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(Y) \) such that \( x \) is on a \( \lambda \)-hierarchy path from \( y_1 \) to \( y_2 \). For each \( U \in \mathcal{S} \), \( \pi_U(y_1) \) is within \( \theta' \) of \( \text{hull}_{CU}(Y) \). Therefore, quasiconvexity of \( \text{hull}_{CU}(Y) \) in \( CU \) guarantees there exists a \( \theta \) depending only on \( \lambda \) and \( \theta' \) (which in turn depends on \( n \)) such that \( \pi_U(x) \) is within \( \theta \) of \( \text{hull}_{CU}(Y) \) and thus \( x \in H_\theta(Y) \). \( \square \)

The other inclusion, \( H_\theta(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^n(Y) \), requires two main steps. First, we will prove that for any finite collection of points \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{X} \), \( H_\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) with \( \lambda \) depending on \( n \) and \( \theta \) (Proposition 5.5). Then we will show that if \( x \in H_\theta(Y) \) then, there exists at most \( 2\chi + 1 \) points, \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), in \( Y \) such that \( x \in \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) where \( \lambda \) can be chosen independently of \( x \) and \( Y \) (Lemma 5.6). Since \( \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^n(Y) \) the conclusion follows from the first step.

**Proposition 5.5.** For each \( \theta \geq \tilde{\theta} \) and \( n \geq 2 \), there exists \( \lambda \geq 1 \) such that

\[
H_\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}^{n-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)
\]

for any \( n \) distinct points \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{X} \).
Proof. We shall proceed by induction on $n$. First we will show the base case of $n = 2$

Claim 1 (Base Case). For each $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$ there exists $\lambda \geq 1$ such that

$$H_{\theta}(x, y) \subseteq P^1_{\lambda}(x, y)$$

for each $x, y \in X$.

Proof of Claim 1. Let $z \in H_{\theta}(x, y)$, $\gamma_0 : [a, b] \rightarrow X$ be a $\lambda_0$–hierarchy path from $x$ to $z$ and $\gamma_1 : [b, c] \rightarrow X$ be a $\lambda_0$–hierarchy path from $z$ to $y$. We will show that $\gamma = \gamma_0 * \gamma_1 : [a, c] \rightarrow X$ is a $\lambda$–hierarchy path from $x$ to $y$, where $\lambda$ depends only on $\theta$. By the definition of $H_{\theta}(x, y)$ and hyperbolicity of the $CU$’s we have that $\pi_U(\gamma)$ is an unparameterized $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1)$–quasi-geodesic for each $U \in \mathcal{S}$, where $\lambda_1$ depends only on $\theta$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $\gamma$ is a $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic in $X$, where $\lambda$ depends only on $\theta$. That is, we need to prove for each $t, s \in [a, c]$ we have

$$|t - s| \leq \lambda \gamma d_X(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)).$$

Since $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma_1$ are both $(\lambda_0, \lambda_0)$–quasi-geodesics, we can restrict ourselves to the case where $t \in [a, b]$ and $s \in (b, c]$.

Therefore we have

$$d_X(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) \leq d_X(\gamma(t), \gamma(b)) + d_X(\gamma(b), \gamma(s))$$

$$\leq \lambda_0(|t - b| + |b - s|) + 2\lambda_0.$$

To establish the other inequality, we utilize the distance formula (Theorem 4.4). Let $u = \gamma(t)$ and $v = \gamma(s)$. Since $\pi_U(\gamma)$ is a uniform unparameterized quasi-geodesic for each $U \in \mathcal{S}$, we have that

$$d_U(u, z) + d_U(z, v) \leq d_U(u, v)$$

where $K \geq 1$ depends only on $\theta$. While it may appear intuitive that this immediately implies $\gamma$ is a quasi-geodesic, the distance formula does not “distribute” over addition. Thus a precise proof requires careful bookkeeping with the threshold constants from the distance formula.

Let $\sigma_0$ be the minimum threshold provided by the distance formula (Theorem 4.4) and $\sigma = 5K^4\sigma_0$. We are going to prove that there exists $K'$ depending only on $\theta$ and $\sigma_0$ such that for each $U \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\left\{ d_U(u, v) \right\}_\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2K} \left( \left\{ d_U(u, z) \right\}_{K \sigma + K} + \left\{ d_U(z, v) \right\}_{K \sigma + K} \right). \quad (1)$$

If $d_U(u, v) < \sigma$, then

$$\max\{d_U(u, z), d_U(z, v)\} \leq d_U(u, z) + d_U(z, v)$$

$$\leq K d_U(u, v) + K$$

$$< K \sigma + K.$$

Therefore, $\left\{ d_U(u, z) \right\}_{K \sigma + K} = \left\{ d_U(z, v) \right\}_{K \sigma + K} = 0$ and Inequality (1) holds. Now suppose $d_U(u, v) \geq \sigma$. This ensures that at least one of $d_U(u, z)$ or $d_U(v, z)$ is greater than $2K^2$. 

Without loss of generality, suppose \( d_U(u, z) > 2K^2 \). Thus \( d_U(u, z) - K^2 > \frac{1}{2} d_U(u, z) \) and we have
\[
\|d_U(u, v)\|_\sigma \geq \frac{1}{K} d_U(u, z) + \frac{1}{K} d_U(z, v) - K \\
\geq \frac{1}{K} (d_U(u, z) - K^2) + \frac{1}{K} d_U(z, v) \\
\geq \frac{1}{2K} d_U(u, z) + \frac{1}{2K} d_U(z, v) \\
\geq \frac{1}{2K} \|d_U(u, z)\|_{K_\sigma + K} + \frac{1}{2K} \|d_U(z, v)\|_{K_\sigma + K}.
\]

Since Inequality (1) holds, the distance formula (Theorem 4.4) now produces a constant \( C \) depending ultimately only on \( \theta \) such that
\[
d_X(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{C} (d_X(u, z) + d_X(z, v)) - C.
\]
However, \( \gamma_0 \) and \( \gamma_1 \) are \( (\lambda_0, \lambda_0) \)-quasi-geodesics, thus we have
\[
d_X(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{C} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_0} |t - b| - \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{\lambda_0} |b - s| - \lambda_0 \right) - C \geq \frac{1}{C\lambda_0} |t - s| - \frac{2\lambda_0 + C^2}{C}.
\]
By choosing \( \lambda_2 \) large enough we have:
\[
d_X(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_2} |t - s| - \lambda_2.
\]
Therefore, \( \gamma \) is a \( \lambda \)-hierarchy path from \( x \) to \( y \), where \( \lambda = \max\{2\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \) and \( z \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^1(x, y) \) finishing the proof of Claim 1.

We now show the key fact for the inductive step, that the hull of \( n \) points can be obtained by taking the hull on \( n - 1 \) points, and then considering all the hierarchy paths between this smaller hull and the remaining point.

**Claim 2.** Let \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{X} \), for \( n \geq 2 \). If \( x \in H_\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) where \( \theta \geq \overline{\theta} \), then there exist \( \theta' \) and \( \lambda \) depending on \( \theta \) and \( y \in H_{\theta'}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \) such that \( x \) is on a \( \lambda \)-hierarchy path from \( x_n \) to \( y \).

**Proof of Claim 2** For \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), let \( A_i = \{x_1, \ldots, x_i\} \). For each \( U \in \mathcal{S} \), \( \pi_U(H_\theta(A_{n-1})) \) is \( Q \)-quasiconvex where \( Q \) depends only on \( \theta \). Let \( y_U \) be the closest point projection of \( \pi_U(x) \) to \( \pi_U(H_\theta(A_{n-1})) \), \( z_U \) be a point on \( \text{hull}_{CU}(A_n) \) within \( \theta \) of \( \pi_U(x) \), and \( z_U' \) be the closest point projection of \( z_U \) to \( \pi_U(H_\theta(A_{n-1})) \). By Lemma 4.10, there exist \( y \in \mathcal{X} \) and a constant \( \theta' \) depending on \( \theta \) and \( \delta \) such that \( d_U(\pi_U(y), y_U) \leq \theta' \). Further we can assume \( \theta' \) is large enough so that the following hold:

1. \( \theta' > \theta + \delta + Q(1, 0) + 1 \)
2. \( y \in H_{\theta'}(A_{n-1}) \)
3. For all \( v, w \in CU \), if \( d_U(v, w) < d_U(v, H_{\theta}(A_{n-1})) \), then the closest point projection of \( v \\) and \( w \) to \( \pi_U(H_{\theta}(A_{n-1})) \) are no more than \( \theta' \) apart.

For each \( U \in \mathcal{S} \), let \( \gamma_U \) be a \( CU \) geodesic from \( \pi_U(x_n) \) to \( \pi_U(y) \). We will show that \( d_U(x_n, \gamma_U) \) is uniformly bounded for each \( U \in \mathcal{S} \). If \( d_U(y_U, z_U) \leq 5\theta' \), then \( d_U(x, y_U) \leq 6\theta' \) which implies \( d_U(x, \gamma_U) \leq 7\theta' \). Otherwise \( d_U(y_U, z_U) > 5\theta' \) implies that \( d_U(x, H_{\theta}(A_{n-1})) > d_U(x, z_U) \) and thus \( d_U(y_U, z_U') \leq \theta' \) by (3). This implies that \( d_U(z_U, H_{\theta}(A_{n-1})) > 3\theta' \). Since \( z_U \in \text{hull}_{CU}(A_n) \) and \( z_U \notin H_{\theta}(A_{n-1}) \), there exist \( D \geq 0 \) depending only on \( \theta \) and \( x_U \in \pi_U(A_{n-1}) \) such that \( z_U \) is within \( D \) of any \( CU \) geodesic from \( \pi_U(x_n) \) to \( x_U \). Further by increasing \( \theta' \), we can assume \( D < \theta' \). Take a geodesic triangle with endpoints \( \pi_U(x_n) \),
that if $\gamma_U$ there exists $\theta'$ depending ultimately only on $\theta$, such that $d_U(x, \gamma_U) \leq \theta'$ for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$. Therefore $x \in H_{\theta'}(x, y)$ and the statement in Claim 2 follows from Claim 1.

We now finish the proof of Proposition 5.5. Let $x \in H_\theta(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Claim 2 shows that there exist a $\lambda' \geq 1$ and $\theta' \geq \theta$ such that $x$ is on a $\lambda'$-hierarchy path from $x_n$ to a point in $H_{\theta'}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})$. By induction, there exists $\lambda \geq \lambda'$ such that $H_{\theta'}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda'}^{-2}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ and therefore $x \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^{-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Armed with Proposition 5.5, the next step is to prove a version of Carathéodory’s Theorem for HHSs. That is, any point in the hull of $Y$ is also in the hull of only a (uniformly) finite number of points in $Y$. This will allow us to promote Proposition 5.5 to any subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space.

**Lemma 5.6.** Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $\theta \geq \theta'$, and $\chi$ be as in Proposition 4.5. For each $x \in H_\theta(Y)$, there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_{\ell+1} \in Y$, where $1 \leq \ell \leq 2\chi$, and $\theta'$ depending only on $\theta$ such that $x \in H_{\theta'}(x_1, \ldots, x_{\ell+1})$.

**Proof.** Let $K = 100(E + \kappa_0 + \theta)$. If for all $y \in Y$, $\text{Rel}_K(x, y) = \emptyset$, then $x \in H_K(y)$ for each $y \in Y$. Thus we can assume there is $y \in Y$ such that $\text{Rel}_K(x, y) \neq \emptyset$.

As in Proposition 4.5 we can partition $\text{Rel}_K(x, y)$ in subsets $U_1, \ldots, U_n$ where $n \leq \chi$. Further for each $i$, all the elements of $U_i$ are pairwise transverse and are totally ordered with respect to the order: $U \subseteq V$ if $d_U(V, \lambda V) \leq \kappa_0$. Let $U_1 < \cdots < U_{\chi+1}$ be the distinct domains in $U_i$. Now for each $i$, there exist $a_i, b_i \in Y$ such that $\pi_{U_{i+1}}(x) \subseteq \theta$ of the $CU_i$-geodesic between $a_i$ and $b_i$. If $a_i$ and $b_i$ project $2\kappa_0 + E$ close to $y$ in $CU_i$, then $d_{U_{i+1}}(x, y) \leq \theta + 4\kappa_0 + 3E$ which contradicts $U_{i+1} \in \text{Rel}_K(x, y)$. Thus without loss of generality, $d_{U_1}(a_i, b_i) > 2\kappa_0 + E$ and in particular $d_{U_{i+1}}(a_i, b_i) > \kappa_0$ for all $j > 1$. The total order on $U_i$ and the consistency axioms (Axiom 5) therefore ensures that $d_{U_{i+1}}(x, a_i) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E$ for all $1 < j \leq k_i$. Thus for each $U_{i+1}$, $x$ projects $\theta + 2\kappa_0 + E$ close to the $CU_i$-geodesic between $a_i$ and $b_i$ and $x \in H_{2\kappa_0+E}(y, a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$.

We can now finish the proof of Theorem 5.2.

**Proof of Theorem 5.2.** Recall, we need to show that for all sufficiently large $\theta$ and $\lambda$, $H_\theta(Y)$ coarsely coincides with $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y)$ where $N = 2\chi$. First we will show that for all $\theta' \geq \theta$, there exists $\lambda \geq 1$ such that $H_{\theta'}(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y)$.

Let $x \in H_{\theta}(Y)$ and let $x_1, \ldots, x_{\ell+1}$ be the finite number of points in $Y$ provided by Lemma 5.6. By Proposition 5.5, there exists $\lambda$ depending on $\theta$ such that $x \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_{\ell+1}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y)$. Thus $H_{\theta'}(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y)$.

Now, fix $\bar{\lambda} \geq \lambda_0$ such that $H_{\bar{\theta}}(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\bar{\lambda}}(Y)$. If $\theta' \geq \bar{\theta}$ and $\lambda \geq \bar{\lambda}$, then by Lemma 5.4, there exists $\theta' > \bar{\theta}$ such that $H_{\theta'}(Y) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda(Y) \subseteq H_{\theta'}(Y)$.

The conclusion now follows by Lemma 5.3.

The primary use of Theorem 5.2 in this paper is the following proof that hierarchically quasiconvex subsets are exactly the subsets that are “quasiconvex with respect to hierarchy paths.” From this it immediately follows that all quasiconvex subsets are hierarchically quasiconvex.

**Proposition 5.7.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space. A subset $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is $k$-hierarchically quasiconvex if and only if there exists a function $R: [1, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that if $\gamma$ is a $\lambda$-hierarchy path with endpoints on $Y$, then $\gamma \subseteq N_{R(\lambda)}(Y)$ where $k$ and $R$
each determines the other. In particular, if $Y$ is $Q$–quasiconvex, then $Y$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex where $k$ is determined by $Q$.

**Proof.** The proof of the forward implication follows directly from the definition of hierarchical quasiconvexity and hierarchy path. Assume there exists a function $R: [1, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ such that if $\gamma$ is a $\lambda$–hierarchy path with endpoints on $Y$, then $\gamma \subseteq N_{R(\lambda)}(Y)$. The first condition of hierarchical quasiconvexity now follows from the existence of hierarchy paths (Theorem 4.7), the coarse Lipschitzness of the projection maps (Axiom 1) and the hyperbolicity of the $CU$’s. For the second condition, observe that the hypothesis implies there exists a bound on the Hausdorff distance between $Y$ and $P_\lambda^X(Y)$ depending only on $R$, $n$, and $\lambda$. Thus by Theorem 5.2, for each $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$, there exists $D_\theta$ such that $d_{Haus}(H_\theta(Y), Y) \leq D_\theta$. Let $\kappa > 0$ and $x \in X$ such that $d_U(x, Y) \leq \kappa$ for all $U \in \Sigma$. Thus $x \in H_\theta(Y)$ for each $\theta \geq \kappa + \bar{\theta}$. Let $k(\kappa) = D_{\bar{\theta} + \kappa}$, then $d_X(x, Y) \leq k(\kappa)$ and $Y$ is hierarchically quasiconvex. □

**Remark 5.8.** If $X$ is a hyperbolic space, there exists many HHS structures on $X$ (see [Spr]). In this case Proposition 5.7 recovers [Spr, Proposition 3.5] which states that a subset $Y \subseteq X$ is quasiconvex if and only if $Y$ is hierarchical quasiconvex in any of the HHS structures on $X$.

5.1. Hulls and coarse medians. We now take a small detour from the main thrust of the paper to highlight an application of Theorem 5.2 and discuss the relation of our work in this section to the hulls in coarse median spaces constructed in [Bow].

In [Bow13], Bowditch axiomatized the notion of a coarse center of three points in a metric space and defined coarse median spaces as metric spaces where every triple of points has such a coarse center. In [BHSa, Theorem 7.3], Behrstock-Hagen-Sisto proved that all hierarchically hyperbolic spaces are coarse median spaces. The first step is the following lemma which defines the coarse center of a triple of points in an HHS.

**Lemma 5.9** (See proof of [BHSa, Theorem 7.3]). Let $(X, \Sigma)$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space. There exist $\mu > 0$ and a map $\mathfrak{m}: X \times X \times X \to X$ with the property that for every $(x, y, z) \in X^3$ and $U \in \Sigma$, the projection $\pi_U(\mathfrak{m}(x, y, z))$ is within $\mu$ of all three sides of any $CU$ triangle with vertices $\pi_U(x), \pi_U(y), \pi_U(z)$.

We call the point $\mathfrak{m}(x, y, z)$ the coarse center of $x$, $y$, and $z$. There is a natural notion of convexity for coarse median spaces, which we formulate in the hierarchically hyperbolic setting as follows.

**Definition 5.10** (Coarse median quasiconvexity). Let $(X, \Sigma)$ be an HHS. A subset $Y$ of $X$ is said to be $Q$–median quasiconvex if for every $y, y' \in Y$ and $x \in X$ we have $\mathfrak{m}(y, y', x) \in N_Q(Y)$.

Behrstock-Hagen-Sisto showed that a hierarchically quasiconvex subset is median quasiconvex in [BHSa, Proposition 7.12]. Using Theorem 5.2 we establish the converse.

**Proposition 5.11.** Let $(X, \Sigma)$ be an HHS and $Y \subseteq X$. $Y$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex if and only if $Y$ is $Q$–median quasiconvex where $k$ and $Q$ each determines the other.

**Proof.** Let $Y$ be a $Q$–median quasiconvex subset of the HHS $(X, \Sigma)$ and $\gamma$ be a $\lambda$–hierarchy path with endpoints $y_1, y_2 \in Y$. If $x \in \gamma$, then $d_U(x, \mathfrak{m}(y_1, y_2, x))$ is uniformly bounded in terms of $\lambda$ and $\Sigma$ for each $U \in \Sigma$. By the distance formula (Theorem 1.4), $d_X(x, \mathfrak{m}(y_1, y_2, x))$ is also uniformly bounded. Since $Y$ is median quasiconvex, this implies that there exist $R(\lambda)$ such that $d_X(x, Y) \leq R(\lambda)$. In particular, $\gamma \subseteq N_{R(\lambda)}(Y)$ and $Y$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex, with $k$ determined by $Q$, by Proposition 5.7. □

If $Y \subseteq X$, let $M(Y)$ denote the coarse median hull defined in [Bow, Proposition 6.2]. Proposition 5.11 implies the following corollary which extends [Bow, Lemma 7.3] in the special case of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces.
Corollary 5.12. Let \((X, \mathcal{S})\) be an HHS and \(Y \subseteq X\). For each \(\theta \geq \theta_0\), there exists \(D\) depending only on \(\theta\) and \(\mathcal{S}\) such that

\[
d_{\text{Haus}}(H_\theta(Y), M(Y)) \leq D.
\]

Proof. Let \(Y \subseteq X\) and \(\theta \geq \theta_0\). By Proposition 5.11, \(H_\theta(Y)\) is \(Q_1\)-median quasiconvex for some \(Q_1\) depending on \(\theta\) and \(\mathcal{S}\). By [Bow, Proposition 6.2] \(M(Y)\) is \(Q_2\)-median quasiconvex, where \(Q_2\) depends only on \(\mathcal{S}\), and there exists \(D_1\) depending on \(\theta\) such that \(M(Y) \subseteq N_{D_1}(H_\theta(Y))\). By Proposition 5.11, \(M(Y)\) is \(k\)-hierarchically quasiconvex where \(k\) depends only on \(\mathcal{S}\). By the second condition in Definition 4.8, there exists \(D_2\) depending on \(\theta\) and \(\mathcal{S}\) such that \(H_\theta(Y) \subseteq N_{D_2}(M(Y))\). \(\square\)

6. Characterization of quasiconvex subsets in HHSs

We now turn our attention to the main objective of this paper, characterizing the quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. From now on we shall restrict our attention to HHSs with the bounded domain dichotomy; a minor regularity condition satisfied by all HHGs as well as Teichmüller space with either the Weil-Petersson or Teichmüller metric and the fundamental groups of 3–manifolds without Nil or Sol components.

Definition 6.1 (Bounded domain dichotomy). A hierarchically hyperbolic space \((X, \mathcal{S})\) has the \(B\)-bounded domain dichotomy if there exists \(B > 0\) such that for all \(U \in \mathcal{S}\), if \(\text{diam}(CU) > B\), then \(\text{diam}(CU) = \infty\).

The key to characterizing the quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces is to determine what the projection of a quasiconvex subset to each of the associated hyperbolic spaces looks like. The property that characterizes the projection of quasiconvex subsets is the following orthogonal projection dichotomy.

Definition 6.2 (Orthogonal projection dichotomy). A subset \(Y\) of an HHS \((X, \mathcal{S})\) has the \(B\)-orthogonal projection dichotomy if there exists \(B > 0\) such that for all \(U, V \in \mathcal{S}\) with \(U \perp V\), if \(\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B\) then \(CV \subseteq N_B(\pi_V(Y))\).

From now on, when we consider an HHS with the \(B_0\)-bounded domain dichotomy and a subspace with the \(B\)-orthogonal projection dichotomy, we will assume that \(B \geq B_0\).

We can now state our characterization of quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces with the bounded domain dichotomy.

Theorem 6.3 (Characterization of quasiconvexity). Let \((X, \mathcal{S})\) be a hierarchically hyperbolic space with the bounded dichotomy and let \(Y\) be a subset of \(X\). Then the following are equivalent:

1. \(Y\) is an \((A, D)\)-contracting subset.
2. The lower relative divergence of \(X\) with respect to \(Y\) is at least quadratic.
3. The lower relative divergence of \(X\) with respect to \(Y\) is completely superlinear.
4. \(Y\) is \(Q\)-quasiconvex.
5. \(Y\) is \(k\)-hierarchically quasiconvex and has the \(B\)-orthogonal projection dichotomy.

Moreover, the pair \((A, D)\) in part 1, the quasiconvex gauge \(Q\) in part 4, and the pair \((k, B)\) in part 5 each determines the other two.

The work in Section 3 showed that the implications

\[
(1) \implies (2) \implies (3) \implies (4)
\]

hold in any quasi-geodesic space and that the pair \((A, D)\) determines \(Q\). Further Proposition 5.7 showed that every \(Q\)-quasiconvex subset of a hierarchically hyperbolic space is \(k\)-hierarchically quasiconvex with \(Q\) determining \(k\). Thus in the next two subsections, we only need to prove the following:
• If $Y$ is $Q$–quasiconvex, then there exists $B > 0$ determined by $Q$ such that $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy (Section [6.1]).

• If $Y$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex and has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy, then $Y$ is $(A, D)$–contracting where $(A, D)$ is determined by $(k, B)$ (Section [6.2]).

Before beginning the proof, we record of the following corollary to Theorem [6.3] that allows us to characterize stable embeddings.

**Corollary 6.4.** Let $(X, \mathcal{S})$ be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and let $i : Y \to X$ be a quasi-isometric embedding from a uniform quasi-geodesic space $Y$ to $X$. The following are equivalent:

1. $i$ is a stable embedding.
2. $Z = i(Y)$ is hierarchically quasiconvex and there exists a $B > 0$ such that for all $U, V \in \mathcal{S}$ with $U \perp V$, if $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Z)) > B$, then $\text{diam}(CV) < B$.

**Proof.** By [BHSa, Corollary 2.16], an HHS $(Z, \mathfrak{T})$ is hyperbolic if and only if there exists a $B > 0$ such that for all $U, V \in \mathcal{S}$ with $U \perp V$, either $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Z)) < B$ or $\text{diam}(\pi_V(Z)) < B$. By Proposition [6.3], $i$ is a stable embedding if and only if the image $Z = i(Y)$ is quasiconvex in $X$ and hyperbolic. Therefore, the equivalence follows from these observations and the fact that hierarchically quasiconvex subsets inherit the hierarchy structure from the ambient space as described in [BHSa, Proposition 5.6].

Corollary [6.4] should be compared with [ABD, Corollary 6.2]. If $(X, \mathcal{G})$ has extra assumption of unbounded products required in [ABD, Corollary 6.2], then Corollary [6.4] can be immediately improved to [ABD, Corollary 6.2]. However many naturally occurring HHS structures do not have unbounded products and thus Corollary [6.4] is a strict expansion of [ABD, Corollary 6.2].

### 6.1. Quasiconvex subsets have the orthogonal projection dichotomy

In this subsection, we provide the implication (4) to (5) in Theorem [6.3]. Our focus will be on studying the following set of domains.

**Definition 6.5.** Define $\mathcal{S}^\ast$ to be the set of domains $U \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\text{diam}(CU) = \infty$ and there exists $V \in \mathcal{S}^\perp_U$ such that $\text{diam}(CV) = \infty$.

For each $U \in \mathcal{S}^\ast$ we have that both factors of the product region $P_U$ have infinite diameter. In particular, if $\mathcal{S}^\ast = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{S}$ has the bounded domain dichotomy, then $(X, \mathcal{S})$ is hyperbolic by [BHSa, Corollary 2.16]. Thus the intuition for restricting our attention to these domains is that the domains in $\mathcal{S}^\ast$ are the source of non-hyperbolic behavior in $(X, \mathcal{S})$.

The crucial step to proving quasiconvex subsets have the orthogonal projection dichotomy is the following proposition which establishes a sort of orthogonal projection dichotomy for the product regions of domains in $\mathcal{S}^\ast$.

**Proposition 6.6.** Let $(X, \mathcal{S})$ be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and $Y \subseteq X$ be a $Q$–quasiconvex subset. There is a constant $B_0 > 0$ depending on $\mathcal{S}$ and $Q$ such that for all $B \geq B_0$ and $U \in \mathcal{S}^\ast$ we have

$$\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B \implies P_U \subseteq N_B(\mathcal{G}_{P_U}(Y)).$$

Since $U$ is in $\mathcal{S}^\ast$, the product region $P_U$ coarsely coincides with the product of two infinite diameter metric spaces. The proof of Proposition [6.6] is therefore motivated by the situation described in Figure [3]. Namely, if $Y$ is a subset of the product of two infinite-diameter metric spaces, then either $Y$ coarsely coincide with the whole product or there exists a quasi-geodesic $\gamma$ with endpoints on $Y$ and fixed constants such that there are points of $\gamma$
whose distance to \( Y \) is comparable to \( \text{diam}(Y) \). Thus if \( Y \) is \( Q \)-quasiconvex, then either \( Y \) has bounded diameter or it coarsely covers the entire product.

**Figure 3.** In \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) (equipped with the \( \ell_1 \)-metric) consider \( Y \) to be the \( x \)-axis. Let \( \gamma \) be the \((3,0)\)-quasi-geodesic consisting of three sides of a square with the fourth side on \( Y \). While the quasi-geodesic constants do no change, increasing the distance between the endpoints of \( \gamma \) produces points of \( \gamma \) arbitrarily far away from \( Y \).

In Proposition \([6.10]\) we prove that a similar situation holds for \( \mathbf{P}_U \). Indeed, if \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) \) is sufficiently large and \( Y \) does not coarsely coincide with \( \mathbf{P}_U \), then we can find a uniform constant quasi-geodesic with endpoints on \( \mathbf{gP}_U(Y) \) that contains points relatively far from \( \mathbf{gP}_U(Y) \).

To finish the proof of Proposition \([6.6]\), we must promote this statement on \( \mathbf{gP}_U(Y) \) to a statement on \( Y \). Specifically, we show that we can realize every quasi-geodesic of \( \mathbf{P}_U \) with endpoints on \( \mathbf{gP}_U(Y) \) as a segment of a quasi-geodesic with endpoints on \( Y \), while maintaining uniform quasi-geodesic constants (Lemma \([6.13]\)). This yields a quasi-geodesic with endpoints on \( Y \) that contains a point \( x \) of \( \mathbf{P}_U \) such that \( d_X(x, \mathbf{gP}_U(Y)) \) is comparable with \( \text{diam}(\mathbf{gP}_U(Y)) \). If \( Y \) is quasiconvex, the bridge theorem (Theorem \([4.17]\)) implies that \( d_X(x, \mathbf{gP}_U(Y)) \) also provides a lower bound on the distance between \( x \) and \( Y \). However, since \( Y \) is quasiconvex, the distance between \( x \) and \( Y \) is uniformly bounded. Hence, if \( Y \) does not coarsely cover \( \mathbf{P}_U \), we obtain that \( \mathbf{gP}_U(Y) \) must have bounded diameter which contradicts the assumption on \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) \).

We begin by describing a particularly nice class of paths in product spaces and show that they are quasi-geodesics (Lemma \([6.8]\)).

**Definition 6.7** (Spiral path). Let \( X \) and \( Y \) be \((K,L)\)-quasi geodesic metric spaces, and let \( Z = X \times Y \) be equipped with the \( \ell_1 \)-metric. A spiral path \( \gamma \) in \( Z \) is the concatenation \( \gamma = \gamma_1 \ast \cdots \ast \gamma_n \) of \((K,L)\)-quasi-geodesic of \( Z \) satisfying the following.

- Every \( \gamma_i \) is of the form \( \eta \times c_{y_0} \) or \( c_{x_0} \times \delta \) where \( \eta \) (resp. \( \delta \)) is a \((K,L)\)-quasi-geodesic of \( X \) (resp. \( Y \)) and \( c_{x_0} \) (resp. \( c_{y_0} \)) is the constant function with value \( x_0 \in X \) (resp. \( y_0 \in Y \)).
- For every \( i \), the quasi-geodesics \( \gamma_i \) and \( \gamma_{i+1} \) are constant on different components of \( Z = X \times Y \).

A spiral path \( \gamma = \gamma_1 \ast \cdots \ast \gamma_n \) has slope \( N \) if for every \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\} \) we have:

\[
d(\gamma^+_i, \gamma^-_{i+1}) \geq Nd(\gamma^+_i, \gamma^-_i),
\]

where \( \gamma^+_j \) are the endpoints of \( \gamma_j \). Note that the distance between the endpoints of \( \gamma_n \) can be arbitrary.

**Lemma 6.8** (Spiral paths are quasi-geodesics). For each \( K \geq 1 \), \( L \geq 0 \) there are constants \( K', L' \) such that the following holds. Let \( X, Y \) be \((K,L)\)-quasi-geodesic metric space, and let \( \gamma = \gamma_1 \ast \cdots \ast \gamma_n \) be a spiral path of slope \( N > 4K^2 \) in \( Z = X \times Y \), such that the endpoints of \( \gamma_1 \) are at least \( 3K^2L + 1 \) far apart. Then \( \gamma \) is a \((K',L')\)-quasi-geodesic of \( X \times Y \).
The following proof is essentially the same as showing the logarithmic spiral in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) is a quasi-geodesic. However as we were not able to find a sufficient reference in the literature, we have included it in the interest of completeness.

**Proof.** Let \( \gamma = \gamma_1 \ast \cdots \ast \gamma_n : [a_0, a_n] \to Z \) be spiral path of slope \( N > 4K^2 \) and let \( a_1 < \cdots < a_n \) be points in \( [a_0, a_n] \) such that \( \gamma_i = \gamma |_{[a_{i-1}, a_i]} \).

Let \( t_1, t_2 \in [a_0, a_n] \). We claim that

\[
d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) \leq (K + 1)|t_2 - t_1| + 2L. \tag{1}
\]

Each \( \gamma_i \) is a \((K, L)\)-quasi-geodesic of \( Z \) for each \( i \), we only need to consider the case where \( t_1 \in [a_k, a_{k+1}] \) and \( t_2 \in [a_j, a_{j+1}] \) with \( j - k \geq 1 \). By the choice on the distance between endpoints of \( \gamma_1 \) and the slope \( N \) we have \( d(\gamma(a_{i-1}), \gamma(a_i)) > 3K^2L + 1 \) which implies that \( |a_i - a_{i-1}| > L \). Therefore,

\[
|t_2 - t_1| \geq |a_j - a_{k+1}| \geq (j - k - 1)L.
\]

Since each \( \gamma_i \) is \((K, L)\)-quasi-geodesic we have

\[
d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) \leq K|t_2 - t_1| + (j - k + 1)L \\
\leq (K + 1)|t_2 - t_1| + 2L.
\]

The remainder of the proof will show \( |t_2 - t_1| \leq d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(t_2)) \).

For every \( i \), \( \gamma_i \ast \gamma_{i+1} \) is a \((K, 2L)\)-quasi-geodesic of \( Z \), so we only need to consider the case where \( t_1 \in [a_k, a_{k+1}] \) and \( t_2 \in [a_j, a_{j+1}] \) with \( j - k \geq 2 \) as shown below.

We encourage the reader to refer to the above diagram as they follow the reminder of the proof.

By the triangle inequality we have

\[
d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_1)) \geq d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) - d(\gamma(a_{j-1}), \gamma(t_1)). \tag{2}
\]

The remainder of the proof has two parts. First we show that, \( d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) \) is much larger than \( d(\gamma(a_{j-1}), \gamma(t_1)) \) so that

\[
d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_1)) \geq d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) \geq |t_2 - a_{j-1}|.
\]

We then finish by showing that \( |t_2 - a_{j-1}| \geq |t_2 - t_1| \).

To simplify notation let \( \ell(\gamma_i) = d(\gamma(a_{i-1}), \gamma(a_i)) \). The slope condition then says \( \frac{1}{N} \ell(\gamma_i) > \ell(\gamma_{i-1}) \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). Since \( N > 4K^2 \), we can iteratively apply the slope condition to get

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \ell(\gamma_i) \leq \left( \frac{1}{N^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{N} + 1 \right) \ell(\gamma_{j-1}) \leq 2\ell(\gamma_{j-1}) \leq \frac{2}{N} \ell(\gamma_j). \tag{3}
\]
From the triangle inequality and the fact \(|a_{k+1} - t_1| \leq |a_{k+1} - a_k|\) we have
\[
d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(a_{j-1})) \leq d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(a_{k+1})) + \sum_{i=k+2}^{j-1} \ell(\gamma_i)
\]
\[
\leq K|a_{k+1} - a_k| + L + \sum_{i=k+2}^{j-1} \ell(\gamma_i)
\]
\[
\leq K(K\ell(\gamma_{k+1}) + KL) + L + \sum_{i=k+2}^{j-1} \ell(\gamma_i)
\]
\[
\leq K^2 \left( \sum_{i=k+1}^{j-1} \ell(\gamma_i) \right) + 2K^2L.
\]

Then by applying Inequality (3) we have
\[
d(\gamma(t_1), \gamma(a_{j-1})) \leq \left( \frac{2K^2}{N} \right) \ell(\gamma_j) + 2K^2L \leq \frac{1}{2} d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) + 2K^2L.
\]

Substituting this into Inequality (2) produces
\[
d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_1)) \geq \frac{1}{2} d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) - 2K^2L.
\]

We can then use the fact that \(\gamma_j * \gamma_{j+1}\) is a \((K, 2L)\)-quasi-geodesic to obtain
\[
d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_1)) \geq \frac{1}{2} d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(a_{j-1})) - 2K^2L
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{K}|t_2 - a_{j-1}| - 2L \right) - 2K^2L
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{2K}|t_2 - a_{j-1}| - 3K^2L.
\]

We now show that \(|t_2 - a_{j-1}| \geq |t_2 - t_1|\) which completes the proof by Inequality (4).

Since we required that \(\ell(\gamma_1) > 3K^2L + 1\) and \(N > 4K^2\), for each \(i\) we have \(\frac{1}{K}|a_i - a_{i-1}| > 2L\), which implies
\[
\ell(\gamma_i) \geq \frac{1}{K}|a_i - a_{i-1}| - L > \frac{1}{2K}|a_i - a_{i-1}|.
\]

In particular, using Inequality (3) we obtain:
\[
\frac{2}{N} (K|a_j - a_{j-1}| + L) \geq \frac{2}{N} \ell(\gamma_j)
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \ell(\gamma_i)
\]
\[
\geq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{2K}|a_i - a_{i-1}|
\]
\[
\geq \frac{1}{2K}|a_{j-1} - t_1|.
\]

Hence we have
\[
|a_{j-1} - t_1| \leq \frac{4K^2}{N}|a_j - a_{j-1}| + \frac{4KL}{N} \leq |a_j - a_{j-1}| + L
\]
and we can conclude
\[ |t_2 - t_1| = |t_2 - a_j| + |a_j - a_{j-1}| + |a_{j-1} - t_1| \]
\[ \leq |t_2 - a_j| + 2|a_j - a_{j-1}| + L \]
\[ \leq 3|t_2 - a_{j-1}| + L. \]

Combining this with Inequality \([1]\) and Inequality \([4]\), we obtain that there are constants \(K'\) and \(L'\) depending on \(K\) and \(L\) such that
\[ \frac{1}{K'}(t_2 - t_1) - L' \leq d(\gamma(t_2), \gamma(t_1)) \leq K'(t_2 - t_1) + L'. \]

\[ \square \]

For the remainder of this section \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})\) will be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and \(\mathcal{G}^*\) is as in Definition \(6.5\). Recall that for each \(U \in \mathcal{G}\), the space \(\mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) consists of tuples \(a = (a_V)\), where \(V \in \mathcal{G}_U \cup \mathcal{G}_U^\perp\), and that \(\mathbf{P}_U\) is defined as the image of \(\phi_U : \mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U \to \mathcal{X}\). By restricting to a choice of factor, we can endow \(\mathbf{F}_U\) and \(\mathbf{E}_U\) with the subspace metric of their images under \(\phi_U\). While this relies on the choice of factor, the distance formula (Theorem \(4.4\)) says any two choices result in uniformly quasi-isometric metric spaces. Given \(a, b \in \mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) we use \(d_V(a, b)\) to denote \(d_V(a_V, b_V)\), where \(V \in \mathcal{G}_U \cup \mathcal{G}_U^\perp\). If \(U \in \mathcal{G}^*\), then both \(\mathbf{F}_U\) and \(\mathbf{E}_U\) are infinite diameter and so we can apply Lemma \(6.8\) to build the desired quasi-geodesic in \(\mathbf{P}_U\) based on \(\mathfrak{g}_U(Y)\).

**Proposition 6.9.** Let \(Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}\). There exist constants \(L', r_0\) and functions \(f, g, h : [r_0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)\), all depending only on \(\mathcal{G}\), such that \(f(r), g(r), h(r) \to \infty\) as \(r \to \infty\) and the following holds: for each \(U \in \mathcal{G}^*\) and each \(r \geq r_0\), if the \(r\)-neighborhood of \(\phi_U^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}_U(Y))\) does not cover \(\mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) and diam\((\pi_U(Y)) > f(r)\), then there exists a \((L', L')\)-quasi-geodesic \(\eta\) with endpoints \(a, b \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}_U(Y))\) such that \(\eta\) is not contained in the \(g(r)\)-neighborhood of \(\phi_U^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}_U(Y))\) and \(d_U(a, b) > h(r)\).

**Proof.** Our approach is to construct a spiral path of sufficient slope in \(\mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) and then apply Lemma \(6.8\) to conclude it is a quasi-geodesic. Let \(d(\cdot, \cdot)\) denote the \(l_1\)-distance in \(\mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) and fix the following constants which depend only on \(\mathcal{G}\):

- \(L\) such that \(\mathbf{F}_U\) and \(\mathbf{E}_U\) are \((L, L)\)-quasi geodesic spaces.
- \(K\) such that \(\pi_U\) is \((K, K)\)-coarsely Lipschitz.
- \(N = 4L^2 + 1\) will be the slope of the spiral path we construct.

Let \(r > 10L^3 + 6\) and \(A = \phi_U^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}_U(Y))\). Suppose that the \(r\)-neighborhood of \(A\) does not cover \(\mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\). Thus there exists a point \(z = (x_1, y_1) \in \mathbf{F}_U \times \mathbf{E}_U\) such that \(r \leq d(z, A) \leq r + 2L\). Let \(a = (x_2, y_2)\) be a point of \(A\) such that \(d(z, a) - 1 \leq d(z, A)\). We have
\[ \min\{d_{\mathbf{F}_U}(x_1, x_2), d_{\mathbf{E}_U}(y_1, y_2)\} \leq \frac{r + 2L + 1}{2}. \]

There are two cases depending on which of the two factors realizes the minimum.

- **If** \(d_{\mathbf{F}_U}(x_1, x_2)\) **realizes the minimum.** In this case let \(z' = (x_2, y_1)\) and \(D_r = \frac{r - 2L - 1}{2}\). Then \(d(z, A) \geq d(z, A) - d(z, z') \geq D_r\) which implies \(d(z', a) > 3L^3 + 1\) because \(r > 10L^3 + 6\).

There exists \(B_r > r\) such that for any pair of points \(u, v\) of \(\mathbf{F}_U\) if \(d_U(u, v) \geq B_r\), then
\[ d_{\mathbf{F}_U}(u, v) \geq 2(r + 2L + 1)N. \]

We shall assume diam\((\pi_U(Y)) > 2B_r\), so there is a point \(a' = (x_3, y_3)\) of \(A\) such that \(d_U(x_2, x_3) \geq B_r\) and \(d_{\mathbf{E}_U}(y_2, y_1)N\). We can now form a spiral path \(\eta\) of slope \(N = 4L^2 + 1\) by connecting each sequential pair of points in the sequence
\[ a = (x_2, y_2) - (x_2, y_1) - (x_3, y_1) - (x_3, y_3) = a' \]
by \((L, L)\)-quasi-geodesics. Since \(d_{\mathbf{E}_U}(y_2, y_1) > 3L^3 + 1\), \(\eta\) satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma \(6.8\) and is therefore an \((L', L')\)-quasi-geodesic for some \(L'\) determined by \(L\).
holds: For each $C$, there exists $L$ such that $d(C, P) < L$. Thus for some $L$, the distance formula makes the map $\phi_U$ realize the minimum. Let $z' = (x_1, y_2)$. As before we have that

$$d(z', \lambda) \geq D_r = \frac{r - 2L - 1}{2}$$

and we can now form a spiral path $\eta$ of slope $N = 4L^2 + 1$ by connecting each sequential pair of points in the sequence $z = (x_1, y_1), z' = (x_2, y_2), \ldots, y_3 = (x_4, y_4)$, where $y_3$ is a point of $E'$. If $\eta$ is at least $2L + 1$, then we get the claim with $r = 2L + 1$ and $h(r) = B_r$.

As before $\eta$ satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma 6.8 and is therefore an $(L', L')$ quasi-geodesic for some $L'$ determined by $L$. The remaining claims follow as in the preceding case. □

The distance formula makes the map $\phi_U : F_U \times E_U \rightarrow X$ a uniform quasi-isometric embedding. Thus $\mathfrak{g}_{P_U}(Y)$ coarsely covers $P_U$ if and only if $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathfrak{g}_{P_U}(Y))$ coarsely covers $F_U \times E_U$. Proposition 6.9 therefore allows us to immediately deduce the following result for $P_U \subseteq X$.

**Proposition 6.10.** Let $Y \subseteq X$. There exist constants $L'$, $r_0$ and functions $f, g, h : [r_0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, all depending only on $\mathfrak{g}$, such that $f(r), g(r), h(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ and the following holds: For each $U \in \mathfrak{g}$ and each $r \geq r_0$, if the $r$-neighborhood of $\mathfrak{g}_{P_U}(Y)$ does not cover...
\( P_U \) and \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > f(r) \), then there exists an \((L', L')\)-quasi-geodesic \( \eta \) with endpoints \( a, b \in g_{P_U}(Y) \) such that:

1. \( \eta \subseteq P_U \),
2. \( \eta \) is not contained in the \( g(r) \)-neighborhood of \( g_{P_U}(Y) \),
3. \( d_U(a, b) > h(r) \).

Proposition 6.10 furnishes a quasi-geodesic \( \eta \) with endpoints on \( g_{P_U}(Y) \) that can be made as far as \( g_{P_U}(Y) \) as desired by increasing \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) \). However, to exploit the fact that \( Y \) is a quasiconvex subset, we need to “promote” \( \eta \) to a quasi-geodesic with endpoints on \( Y \), which we do in Lemma 6.13 after recalling a result we shall need from [BHSa].

**Proposition 6.11** (Active subpaths, [BHSa, Proposition 5.17]). For every \( \lambda \geq 1 \) there exist constants \( D, \nu > 0 \) such that the following hold:

1. \( \alpha \subseteq N_\nu(P_U) \),
2. The diameters of \( \pi_W(\gamma([a, a_1])) \) and \( \pi_W(\gamma([b_1, b])) \) are both bounded by \( \nu \), for all \( W \in S \cup S^U \).

**Remark 6.12.** By (2) of Proposition 6.11 for any point \( p \in \gamma([a, a_1]) \), \( g_{P_U}(x) \) and \( g_{P_U}(p) \) uniformly coarsely coincide. The same holds for \( q \in \gamma([b_1, b]) \) and \( y \).

**Lemma 6.13.** There exists \( D > 0 \) such that if \( x, y \in X \) and \( U \in S \), with \( d_U(x, y) > D \) and \( \eta \) is a \((\lambda, \epsilon)\)-quasi-geodesic contained in \( P_U \) with endpoints \( g_{P_U}(x) \) and \( g_{P_U}(y) \), then there exists a \((\lambda', \epsilon')\)-quasi-geodesic containing \( \eta \) and with endpoints \( x \) and \( y \), where \( \lambda' \) and \( \epsilon' \) depend only on \( \lambda \) and \( \epsilon \).

**Proof.** Let \( D > 0 \) be as in Proposition 6.11 for \( \lambda = \lambda_0 \) and assume \( d_U(x, y) > D \), then for any \( \lambda_0 \)-hierarchy path \( \tilde{\gamma} \) connecting \( x \) and \( y \), there exists an active subpath \( \alpha \) corresponding to \( U \). Let \( x' \) (resp. \( y' \)) be the endpoint of \( \alpha \) closest to \( x \) (resp. \( y \)) and \( x'' = g_{P_U}(x) \) (resp. \( y'' = g_{P_U}(y) \)). If \( \eta : [b, c] \to P_U \) is any \((\lambda, \epsilon)\)-quasi-geodesic in \( P_U \) connecting \( x'' \) and \( y'' \), let \( \gamma \) be the concatenation of \( \tilde{\gamma} - \alpha \), any \( \lambda_0 \)-hierarchy path from \( x' \) to \( x'' \), and any \( \lambda_0 \)-hierarchy path from \( y' \) to \( y'' \). We will show that this path \( \gamma \) is a \((\lambda', \epsilon')\)-quasi-geodesic where the constants depend only on \( \lambda \) and \( \epsilon \).

The distances \( d_X(x', P_U) \) and \( d_Y(y', P_U) \) are uniformly bounded by Proposition 6.11. By Lemma 4.11, the distances \( d_X(x', g_{P_U}(x')) \) and \( d_Y(y', g_{P_U}(y')) \) are uniformly bounded as well. Again by Proposition 6.11, \( g_{P_U}(x) \) coarsely coincides with \( g_{P_U}(x') \) and \( g_{P_U}(y) \) coarsely coincides with \( g_{P_U}(y') \). Thus there exists \( \mu \) depending only on \( S \) such that \( d_X(x', x''), d_X(y', y'') \leq \mu \).

Now, let \( \gamma_x \) (resp. \( \gamma_y \)) be the subset of \( \gamma \) from \( x \) to \( x'' \) (resp. \( y \) to \( y'' \)). Since \( d_X(x', x'') \) and \( d_Y(y', y'') \) are uniformly bounded by \( \mu \), \( \gamma_x \) and \( \gamma_y \) are both uniform quasi-geodesics. By Lemma 4.11 and Proposition 6.11, there exists \( K \geq 1 \) depending on \( \lambda, \epsilon, \) and \( S \) such that the following hold:

- \( d_X(x', x''), d_X(y', y'') \leq K \).
- \( \text{diam}(g_{P_U}(\gamma_x)), \text{diam}(g_{P_U}(\gamma_y)) \leq K \).
- \( \gamma_x, \gamma_y, \eta \) are all \((K, K)\)-quasi-geodesics.
- For all \( p \in P_U \) and \( q \in X \), \( d_X(q, g_{P_U}(q)) \leq Kd_X(p, q) + K \).

Let \( \gamma = \gamma_x * \eta * \gamma_y : [a, d] \to X \) and \( a < b < c < d \) such that \( \gamma|_{[a, b]} = \gamma_x \), \( \gamma|_{[b, c]} = \eta \) and \( \gamma|_{[c, d]} = \gamma_y \). For \( s, t \in [a, d] \), let \( u = \gamma(t), v = \gamma(s) \). We want to show \( |t - s| \approx d_X(u, v) \) for some constants depending only on \( K \). The only interesting cases are when \( u \) and \( v \) are in different components of \( \gamma = \gamma_x * \eta * \gamma_y \), so without loss of generality, we have the following two cases.
Case 1: Assume $t \in [a, b]$ and $s \in [b, c]$. Thus $u \in \gamma_x$ and $v \in \eta$ and we have:

$$d_X(u, v) \leq d_X(u, x''') + d_X(x''', v)$$

$$\leq K|t - b| + K|b - s| + 2K$$

$$\leq K|t - s| + 2K$$

For the inequality $|t - s| \leq d_X(u, v)$, our choice of $K$ provides

$$d_X(u, x''') \leq d_X(u, g_{P_U}(u)) + K \leq Kd_X(u, v) + 2K.$$  

By the triangle inequality $d_X(v, x''') \leq d_X(v, u) + d_X(u, x''')$ and we derive the desired inequality as follows:

$$|t - s| = |t - b| + |b - s|$$

$$\leq Kd_X(u, x''') + Kd_X(v, x''') + 2K$$

$$\leq K^2d_X(u, v) + K(d_X(u, v) + d_X(u, x''')) + 2K^2 + 2K$$

$$\leq K^2d_X(u, v) + Kd_X(u, v) + K^2d_X(u, v) + 4K^2 + 2K$$

$$\leq 3K^2d_X(u, v) + 6K^2$$

Case 2: Assume $t \in [a, b]$ and $s \in [c, d]$ so that $u \in \gamma_x$ and $v \in \gamma_y$. Further we can assume $u, v \in \tilde{\gamma}$, since otherwise the above proof holds by increasing the constants by $4K$.

The inequality $d_X(u, v) \leq |t - s|$ can be established by a nearly identical argument to the previous case. For the inequality $|t - s| \leq d_X(u, v)$ we need to utilize the fact that $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a $(\lambda_0, \lambda_0)$-quasi-geodesic. Thus by increasing $K$ we can ensure that

- $d_X(u, v) \overset{K,K}{\leq} Kd_X(u, x'') + d_X(x'', y') + d_X(y', v)$,
- $d_X(x', y') \overset{1,2K}{\leq} d_X(x'', y'') \overset{K,K}{\leq} |b - c|$,  
- $d_X(u, x') \overset{1,K}{\leq} d_X(u, x'') \overset{K,K}{\leq} |t - b|$,  
- $d_X(v, y') \overset{1,K}{\leq} d_X(v, y'') \overset{K,K}{\leq} |c - s|$.

We then have the following calculation

$$|t - s| = |t - b| + |b - c| + |c - s|$$

$$\leq Kd_X(u, x'') + Kd_X(x'', y'') + Kd_X(y'', v) + 3K$$

$$\leq Kd_X(u, x') + Kd_X(x', y') + Kd_X(y', v) + 7K^2$$

$$\leq K^2d_X(u, v) + 8K^2.$$

\[\square\]

We can now provide the proof of Proposition 6.6.

**Proof of Proposition 6.6.** Let $Y \subseteq X$ be $Q$-quasiconvex and $U \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{diam}(CU) = \infty$ and there exists $V \in \mathcal{G}^U$ with $\text{diam}(CV) = \infty$. Recall our goal is to show that there exists $B$ depending on $\mathcal{G}$ and $Q$ such that if $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B$, then $P_U \subseteq N_B(g_{P_U}(Y))$. Begin by fixing the following constants which all depend only on $\mathcal{G}$ and $Q$:

- $\mu$ such that for all $x \in X$, $d_U(x, g_{P_U}(x)) < \mu$
- $D$, the constant from Proposition 6.13
- $L'$, the quasi-geodesic constant from Proposition 6.10
- $L'$, the quasi-geodesic constant obtained by applying Lemma 6.13 to a $(L', L')$-quasi-geodesic
- $K$, the constant from the bridge theorem (Theorem 4.17) for $Y$ and $P_U$ (recall $Y$ is hierarchically quasiconvex by Proposition 5.7)
Let $f, g, h$ be as in Proposition 6.10 and fix $r$ be large enough that

$$g(r) > 2KQ(\lambda', \lambda') + K^2 + K$$

and $h(r) > D + 2\mu$.

If $P_U \subseteq N_r(\text{gr}_U(Y))$, then we are done. So for the purposes of contradiction, suppose that $P_U \not\subseteq N_r(\text{gr}_U(Y))$ and that $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > f(r)$. Let $\eta$ be the $(L', L')$–quasi-geodesic provided by Proposition 6.10 and let $a_1, b_1 \in \text{gr}_U(Y)$ be the endpoints of $\eta$. Let $a_0, b_0 \in Y$ such that $\text{gr}_U(a_0) = a_1$ and $\text{gr}_U(b_0) = b_1$. Since

$$d_U(a_0, b_0) > d_U(a_1, b_1) - 2\mu > h(r) - 2\mu > D,$$

Lemma 6.13 produces a $(\lambda', \lambda')$–quasi-geodesic $\gamma$ with endpoints $a_0$ and $b_0$ and containing $\eta$ where $\lambda'$ depending ultimately only on $\mathcal{S}$. Since $Y$ is $Q$–quasiconvex, $\gamma \subseteq N_{Q(\lambda', \lambda')}(Y)$. By Proposition 6.10, there exists $x \in \eta$ such that $d_X(x, \text{gr}_U(Y)) > g(r)$. Let $y \in Y$ be such that $d_X(x, y) - 1 \leq d_X(x, Y)$, then by the bridge theorem (Theorem 4.17) we have the following contradiction:

$$Q(\lambda', \lambda') \geq d_X(x, y) - 1$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{K}d_X(x, \text{gr}_U(Y)) - K - 1$$

$$> 2Q(\lambda', \lambda').$$

$\square$

The following proposition uses Proposition 6.6 to finish the proof of the implication from 4 to 5 in Theorem 6.3.

**Proposition 6.14.** If $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ is an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and $Y$ is a $Q$–quasiconvex subset of $\mathcal{X}$, then there exists $B > 0$ depending only on $Q$ and $\mathcal{S}$ such that $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy.

**Proof.** Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be $Q$–quasiconvex and $B' > 0$ be larger than the bounded domain dichotomy constant for $\mathcal{S}$ and the constant $B_0$ from Proposition 6.6. Let $U \in \mathcal{S}$. If $U \not\in \mathcal{S}^*$, then by the bounded domain dichotomy, either $\text{diam}(CU) < B'$ or for all $V \in \mathcal{S}_U^C$, $\text{diam}(CV) < B'$. In either case, the $B'$–orthogonal projection dichotomy is satisfied for $U$. Thus we can assume that $U \in \mathcal{S}^*$, so $\text{diam}(CU) = \infty$ and there exists $V \in \mathcal{S}_U^C$ with $\text{diam}(CV) = \infty$. Suppose $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B'$. By Proposition 6.6, $P_U \subseteq N_{B'}(\text{gr}_U(Y))$. For all $V \in \mathcal{S}_U^C$, $\pi_V(P_U)$ uniformly coarsely covers $CV$, thus there exists $B \geq B'$ depending only on $Q$ and $\mathcal{S}$ such that $CV \subseteq N_B(\pi_V(Y))$. $\square$

6.2. **Contracting subsets in HHSs.** We now finish the proof of Theorem 6.3 by showing that for hierarchically quasiconvex subsets, the orthogonal projection dichotomy implies that the gate map $\text{gr}_Y$ is contracting.

**Proposition 6.15.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic space with the bounded domain dichotomy and $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex. If $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy, then the gate map $\text{gr}_Y : \mathcal{X} \to Y$ is $(A, D)$–contracting, where $A$ and $D$ depend only on $k$, $B$, and $\mathcal{S}$.

**Proof.** The gate map satisfies the first two condition in the definition of a contracting map by Lemma 4.13. It only remains to prove the following:

There exist some $0 < A < 1$ and $D \geq 1$ depending only on $k$, $B$, and $\mathcal{S}$, such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\text{diam}(\text{gr}_Y(B_R(x))) \leq D$ where $R = Ad(x, Y)$.

Fix a point $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $d_X(x_0, Y) \geq C_0$ and let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be any point with $d_X(x_0, x) < C_1d_X(x_0, Y)$ for constants $C_0$ and $C_1$ to be determined below. We will prove that for each
We claim that there is \( V \) such that

Thus by the bounded geodesic image axiom (Axiom 8), the

diam \( d(\gamma, \gamma(x)) \) is uniformly bounded, then the above will follow from the distance formula (Theorem 4.1).

We choose a “large” number \( L \) (we will clarify how large \( L \) is later). Let \( K \geq 1 \) be the coarse equality constant from the distance formula with thresholds \( L \) and \( 2L \). Take \( C_0 > (2K + 1)K \) sufficiently large so there is \( W \in \mathcal{G} \) such that \( d_W(x_0, \gamma(x)) > 2L \). Choose

Thus we can assume that

\( \text{diam}(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(x)) \) is uniformly bounded by a number depending on \( C_0 \) for each \( U \in \mathcal{G} \). Therefore, we can assume that \( d_X(x_0, x) > C_0 \).

We claim that there is \( V \in \mathcal{G} \) such that \( d_V(x_0, \gamma(x)) > d_V(x_0, x) + L \).

Assume for the purposes of contradiction that \( d_W(x_0, \gamma(x)) \leq d_W(x_0, x) + L \) for all \( W \in \mathcal{G} \). Therefore, we have \( \forall W \in \mathcal{G} \) and this implies

\[
\left\{ \left\| d_W(x_0, \gamma(x)) \right\| \right\}_{2L} \leq 2 \left\{ \left\| d_W(x_0, x) \right\| \right\}_{L}
\]

for all \( W \in \mathcal{G} \). Thus,

\[
d_X(x_0, \gamma(x)) \leq K \sum_{W \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \left\| d_W(x_0, \gamma(x)) \right\| \right\}_{2L} + K
\]

\[
\leq 2K \sum_{W \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \left\| d_W(x_0, x) \right\| \right\}_{L} + K
\]

\[
\leq 2K(Kd_X(x_0, x) + K) + K
\]

\[
\leq 2K^2d_X(x_0, x) + (2K + 1)K
\]

\[
\leq 2K^2d_X(x_0, x) + C_0
\]

\[
\leq (2K^2 + 1)d_X(x_0, x)
\]

which contradicts \( C_1 < 1/(2K^2 + 1) \). Therefore, we can fix \( V \in \mathcal{G} \) such that

\[
d_V(x_0, \gamma(x)) > d_V(x_0, x) + L.
\]

The construction of the gate map and the hyperbolicity of \( CV \) ensure that, after enlarging \( L \) and shrinking \( C_1 \) if necessary, \( d_V(\gamma(x_0), \gamma(x)) < r \) where \( r \) depends only on \( k \) and \( \mathcal{G} \). The triangle inequality then gives us

\[
d_V(x_0, \gamma(x)) > L \text{ and } d_V(x, \gamma(x)) > L - r.
\]

Now let \( U \in \mathcal{G} \). If \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) \leq B \), then \( d_U(\gamma(Y), \gamma(x)) \leq B \) and we are done. Thus we can assume that \( \text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B \). If \( U = V \), then the distance \( d_U(\gamma(Y), \gamma(x)) \) is uniformly bounded above by the number \( r \) and we are done. We now consider the other possible cases depending on the relation between \( U \) and \( V \):

**Case 1:** \( V \subseteq U \). If we choose \( L \) greater than \( E + r \), then

\[
d_V(x_0, \gamma(x)) > E \text{ and } d_V(x, \gamma(x)) > E.
\]

Thus by the bounded geodesic image axiom (Axiom 8), the \( CU \) geodesics from \( \pi_U(x_0) \) to \( \pi_U(\gamma(x_0)) \) and from \( \pi_U(x) \) to \( \pi_U(\gamma(x)) \) must intersect \( N_E(\rho_U) \). Therefore, the distance \( d_V(\gamma(Y), \gamma(x)) \) is uniformly bounded due to the hyperbolicity of \( CU \) and the properties of the gate map (Lemma 4.13).

**Case 2:** \( U \subset V \). If some \( CV \) geodesic from \( \pi_V(\gamma(Y)) \) to \( \pi_V(\gamma(Y)) \) stays \( E \)-far from \( \rho_U \), then by the bounded geodesic image axiom (Axiom 8), \( d_V(\gamma(Y), \gamma(x)) \leq E \) and we are done. Therefore, we assume that all \( CV \) geodesics from \( \pi_V(\gamma(Y)) \) to \( \pi_V(\gamma(Y)) \) intersect \( N_E(\rho_U) \). Since \( d_V(x_0, \gamma(x)) > d_V(x_0, x) + L \), if there was also a \( CV \) geodesic
from \( \pi_V(x_0) \) to \( \pi_V(x) \) that intersected \( N_E(\rho_V^U) \) we would have
\[
d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) \geq d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), x_0) - d_V(x_0, \rho_V^U) \\
> d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), x_0) - d_V(x_0, x) - 2E \\
\geq L - 2E.
\]
However, \( d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \varrho_y(x)) \leq r \) which implies \( \pi_V(\varrho_y(x_0)) \) lies in \( N_{E+r}(\rho_V^U) \). Therefore, by assuming \( L > 4E + r \) we can ensure that no \( CV \) geodesic from \( \pi_V(x_0) \) to \( \pi_V(x) \) intersects \( N_E(\rho_V^U) \). Thus \( d_U(x_0, x) < E \) by the bounded geodesic image axiom and it immediately follows that \( d_U(\varrho_y(x_0), \varrho_y(x)) \) is bounded by a constant depending on \( k \) and \( \mathcal{G} \).

**Case 3:** \( U \nparallel V \) and \( V \nparallel U \). Recall that we can assume \( \text{diam}(\pi_V(Y)) > B \). Thus if \( U \perp V \), we have \( CV \subseteq N_B(\pi_V(Y)) \) by the orthogonal projection dichotomy. However \( d_V(x_0, \varrho_y(x_0)) > L \), so by Lemma 4.14 we can choose \( L \) large enough so that \( \pi_V(x_0) \) does not lie in the \( B \)-neighborhood of \( \pi_V(x) \). Thus \( U \) and \( V \) cannot be orthogonal and hence \( U \cap V \).

Now assume \( L > 2\kappa_0 + 3r + 2E + 1 \). Then if \( d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) \leq \kappa_0 + r + E \) we have
\[
d_V(x_0, \rho_V^U) \geq d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), x_0) - d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) - E \\
\geq L - (\kappa_0 + r + E) - E \\
> \kappa_0
\]
and
\[
d_V(x, \rho_V^U) \geq d_V(x, \varrho_y(x_0)) - d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) - E \\
\geq L - (\kappa_0 + r + E) - E \\
> \kappa_0.
\]

Therefore, \( d_U(x_0, \rho_V^U) < \kappa_0 \) and \( d_U(x, \rho_V^U) < \kappa_0 \) by consistency (Axiom 5). This implies that \( d_U(x_0, x) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E \) and thus \( d_U(\varrho_y(x_0), \varrho_y(x)) \) is bounded by a constant depending on \( k \) and \( \mathcal{G} \).

If instead \( d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) > \kappa_0 + r + E \), then \( d_V(\varrho_y(x), \rho_V^U) > \kappa_0 \) since \( d_V(\varrho_y(x_0), \varrho_y(x)) < r \). By consistency \( d_U(\varrho_y(x_0), \rho_V^U) < \kappa_0 \) and \( d_U(\varrho_y(x), \rho_V^U) < \kappa_0 \) which implies that
\[
d_U(\varrho_y(x_0), \varrho_y(x)) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E.
\]

\[\square\]

**Remark 6.16.** Both hypotheses on the subspace in Proposition 6.15 are in fact required. In the standard HHG structure of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \), the subgroup \( \langle (1,0) \rangle \) is hierarchically quasiconvex, but does not satisfy the orthogonal projection dichotomy. On the other hand, the subgroup \( \langle (1,1) \rangle \) has the orthogonal projection dichotomy, but is not hierarchically quasiconvex. Neither of these subsets are quasi-geodesically quasiconvex and thus neither are contracting. Both of the above examples can even be made to be *geodesically* quasiconvex by choosing \{1,0\}, \{(1,1), (0,1)\} to be the generating set for \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \).

### 6.3. A generalization of the bounded geodesic image property

**Proposition 6.17 (Bounded Geodesic Image Property for Hyperbolic Spaces).** Let \( Y \) be a quasiconvex subset of a geodesic \( \delta \)-hyperbolic space \( X \). Then there exists \( r > 0 \) (depending
on $\delta$) such that if $d(\mathbf{p}_Y(x), \mathbf{p}_Y(y)) > r$, then every geodesic connecting $x$ and $y$ must intersect the $r$–neighborhood of $Y$.

In the case of quasiconvex subsets of hierarchically hyperbolic space, we replace the closest point projection with the gate map and geodesics with hierarchy paths. Theorem 6.13 from the introduction will follow as a result of the following proposition which is a version of the active subpath theorem (Proposition 6.11) for quasiconvex subsets.

**Proposition 6.18.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a $Q$–quasiconvex. For all $\lambda \geq 1$, there exist constants $\nu, D$, depending on $\lambda$ and $Q$, so that the following holds for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. If $d_\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{g}_Y(x), \mathbf{g}_Y(y)) > D$ and $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathcal{X}$ is a $\lambda$–hierarchy path joining $x$ and $y$, then there is a subpath $\alpha = \gamma([a, b])$ of $\gamma$ with the following properties:

1. $\alpha \subseteq N_\nu(Y)$.
2. The diameters of $\mathbf{g}_Y(\gamma([a, a_1]))$ and $\mathbf{g}_Y(\gamma([b_1, b]))$ are both bounded by $\nu$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 6.3, $Y$ is hierarchically quasiconvex and has the orthogonal domain dichotomy. In particular, $\pi_U(Y)$ is uniformly quasiconvex in $CU$ for all $U \in \mathcal{G}$. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\gamma$ be a $\lambda$–hierarchy path connecting $x$ and $y$. Since $\gamma$ is a $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic we can choose

$$x = x_0, x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_n = y$$

on $\gamma$ such that the distances between $x_i$ and $x_{i+1}$ are all bounded by $2\lambda$. We will show that there exist $0 \leq i_0 \leq j_0 \leq n$ such that:

- For $i = i_0$ or $i = j_0$, $d_\mathcal{X}(x_i, \mathbf{g}_Y(x_i))$ is bounded by a constant depending only on $Q$, $\lambda$, and $\mathcal{G}$.
- If $s < t < i_0$ or $j_0 < s < t$, then $d_\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{g}_Y(x_s), \mathbf{g}_Y(x_t))$ is bounded by a constant depending only on $Q$, $\lambda$, and $\mathcal{G}$.

Since $Y$ is quasiconvex, once we have shown the above, the proposition will follow with $\alpha$ as the subsegment of $\gamma$ between $x_{i_0}$ and $x_{j_0}$.

For each $U \in \mathcal{G}$, the projection $\pi_U$ is uniformly coarsely Lipschitz, thus there is $\lambda'$ depending on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ and $\lambda$ such that the distances $d_U(x_i, x_{i+1})$ are all bounded above by $\lambda'$.

By the hyperbolicity of each $CU$ and the properties of gate map (Lemma 4.13) there are constants $B$ and $\mu$ depending only on $\mathcal{G}, Q$, and $\lambda$ such that for each $V \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $d_V(\mathbf{g}_V(x), \mathbf{g}_V(y)) > B$ there are $0 \leq I_V < J_V \leq n$ with the following properties:

1. $d_V(x_i, \mathbf{g}_V(x_i)) \leq \mu$ for $I_V \leq i \leq J_V$
2. If $s < t < I_V$ or $J_V < s < t$, then $d_V(\mathbf{g}_V(x_s), \mathbf{g}_V(x_t)) < \mu$.
3. $d_V(x_{I_V}, x_{J_V}) \geq 10D$ where $D = 3(E + \mu + \kappa_0 + \lambda')$

For future convenience, we can and shall assume $B$ is large enough that, $B > E$, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ has the $B$–bounded domain dichotomy, and $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy. By the uniqueness axiom (Axiom 10) there is a constant $K$ depending on $B$ and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ such that if $d_\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{g}_Y(x), \mathbf{g}_Y(y)) > K$, then the set $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_B(\mathbf{g}_Y(x), \mathbf{g}_Y(y))$ is non-empty. Since for each $V \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $d_V(x_{I_V}, x_{J_V}) \geq 10D$ and each distance $d_V(x_i, x_{i+1})$ is bounded above by $\lambda' < D$, there are $I_V < i_V < j_V < J_V$ such that

$$D \leq d_V(x_{I_V}, x_{I_V}) \leq 2D \quad \text{and} \quad D \leq d_V(x_{j_V}, x_{j_V}) \leq 2D.$$ (*)

Let $i_0 = \min_{V \in \mathcal{R}} i_V$ and $j_0 = \max_{V \in \mathcal{R}} j_V$.

We first prove that for each $s, t$ which are both less than $i_0$ or both greater than $j_0$ the distance $d_\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{g}_Y(x_s), \mathbf{g}_Y(x_t))$ is uniformly bounded by some constant depending only on $\mathcal{G}$, $Q$, and $\lambda$. We will provide the proof for the case $s, t$ are both less than $i_0$ and the proof for
the other case is essentially identical. Let $V \in \mathcal{S}$. In the case where $V$ is not an element of $R$, $d_V(y_V(x), y_V(y)) \leq B$ and this implies $\text{diam}(\pi_V(y_V(\gamma)))$ is bounded by a constant that depends only on $B$, $\lambda$, $Q$ and $\mathcal{S}$. In particular, $d_V(y_V(x_s), y_V(x_i))$ is also uniformly bounded by this constant. When $V$ is an element of $R$, then $s$ and $t$ are both less than $i_V$. Therefore by item (2) above and [4.13] we have that $d_V(y_V(x_s), y_V(x_i))$ is bounded by a constant depending only on $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$, and $\lambda$. Thus by the distance formula (Theorem 4.4) the distance $d_V(y_V(x_s), y_V(x_i))$ is bounded by a constant that ultimately depends only on $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$, and $\lambda$.

We now prove that there exists $\nu'$ depending on $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$, and $\lambda$ such that for $i = i_0$ or $i = j_0$

$$d_V(x_i, y_V(x_i)) \leq \nu'.$$

(***)

Again we only give the proof for the case of $i = i_0$ and the argument for the case $i = j_0$ is almost identical. By the distance formula, it is sufficient to check that we can uniformly bound $d_V(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ for each $U \in \mathcal{S}$.

Fix a domain $V \in R$ such that $i = i_0 = i_V$. We shall show $d_U(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$ by examining the four cases for how $U$ can be related to $V$.

**Case 1:** $V \perp U$. Since $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal domain dichotomy,

$V \in R \implies CU \subseteq N_B(\pi_U(Y))$.

Therefore by the properties of the gate map (Lemma [4.13]), we have that $d_V(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ is uniformly bounded.

**Case 2:** $V \cap U$. Suppose $d_V(x_i, \rho_U) > \kappa_0 + \mu + E$, then

$$d_V(y_V(x_i), \rho_U) > \kappa_0$$

and by the consistency axiom (Axiom [5]) and triangle inequality

$$d_V(x_i, y_V(x_i)) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E.$$ 

Now assume that $d_V(x_i, \rho_U) < \kappa_0 + \mu + E$. Since $D > \mu + E + \kappa_0$ and $d_V(x_i, x_{I_V}) \geq D$, $d_V(x_i, x_{J_V}) \geq D$, we have that $x_{I_V}$, $y_V(x_{I_V})$, $x_{J_V}$, and $y_V(x_{J_V})$ all project at least $\kappa_0$ far from $\rho_U$ in $CV$. Therefore by the consistency axiom and triangle inequality

$$d_U(x_{I_V}, y_V(x_{I_V})) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E$$

and

$$d_U(x_{J_V}, y_V(x_{J_V})) \leq 2\kappa_0 + E.$$ 

Thus by the quasiconvexity of $\pi_U(Y)$ in $CU$ and the properties of the gate map, the distance $d_U(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ is bounded by a uniform constant determined by $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$ and $\lambda$.

**Case 3:** $U \subseteq V$. Consider geodesics in $CV$ connecting the projections of the pairs of points $(x_{I_V}, y_V(x_{I_V}))$, $(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ and $(x_{J_V}, y_V(x_{J_V}))$. By the assumptions on $I_V$, $i$ and $J_V$ at most one of those geodesics intersects $N_E(\rho_U)$. If such a geodesic is not the one connecting $\pi_V(x_i)$ and $\pi_V(y_V(x_i))$, then we are done by bounded geodesic image axiom (Axiom [8]). Otherwise, the bounded geodesic image axioms requires that $\pi_V(x_{I_V})$ and $\pi_V(x_{J_V})$ are contained in the $3E$–neighborhood of $\pi_U(Y)$ in $CU$. By the quasiconvexity of $\pi_U(Y)$ in $CU$ and the properties of the gate map, the distance $d_U(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ is thus bounded by a uniform constant determined by $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$ and $\lambda$.

**Case 4:** $V \subseteq U$. Recall that $\pi_U(\gamma)$ is a unparameterized quasi-geodesic in $CU$ and let $\gamma_0$ be the subsegment of $\pi_U(\gamma)$ from $x_{I_V}$ to $x_i$ and $\gamma_1$ be the subsegment from $x_i$ to $x_{J_V}$. By the bounded geodesic image axiom and [5], there exists $E' \geq E$ determined by $\mathcal{S}$, such that both $\gamma_0$ and $\gamma_1$ intersect the $E'$–neighborhood of $\rho_U$. Since $\pi_U(\gamma)$ is a unparameterized $(\lambda, \lambda)$–quasi-geodesic, there exists $R$ depending on $E'$ and $\lambda$ such that $d_U(x_i, \rho_U) \leq R$. If $\alpha$ is some $CU$ geodesic connecting $y_V(x)$ and $y_V(y)$, then $\alpha$ also intersects the $E$–neighborhood of $\rho_U$ by the bounded geodesic image axiom. Therefore by the quasiconvexity of $\pi_U(Y)$ in $CU$ and the properties of the gate map, the distance $d_U(x_i, y_V(x_i))$ is bounded by a uniform constant determined by $\mathcal{S}$, $Q$ and $\lambda$. □
Remark 6.19. If hypotheses of Proposition 6.18 are relaxed by taking $Y$ to be hierarchically quasiconvex instead of quasiconvex, then the proposition would be false. As a counterexample, one can consider $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with the standard HHS structure and let $Y$ be the $x$-axis. As any horizontal line in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is a hierarchy path, for any $D > 0$, there exists a hierarchy path $\gamma$ where both $d_\gamma(\gamma, Y) > D$ and $\text{diam}(g_Y(\gamma)) > D$.

7. Quasiconvex subsets in familiar examples

In this section, we will utilize Theorem 6.3 to give description of the quasiconvex subsets in well studied examples of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. We will begin by briefly discussing the HHS structure for the mapping class group, Teichmüller space, right-angled Artin and Coxeter groups, and graph manifolds. The descriptions are not intended to be self-contained and we will only describe the index set, hyperbolic spaces, and orthogonal and nesting relations for each example. We direct the reader to the provided references for further details.

The Mapping Class Group and Teichmüller Space

Mapping class group \[ \text{MM}00, \text{BHS}a, \] Teichmüller metric \[ \text{Dur}16, \text{Raf}07, \text{EMR}17, \] Weil-Petersson metric \[ \text{Bro}03. \]

Let $S$ be an oriented, connected, finite type surface with genus $g$ and $p$ punctures. The complexity of $S$ is $\xi(S) = 3g - 3 + p$. Assume $\xi(S) \geq 1$ and let $\mathcal{X}$ be either the marking complex or Teichmüller space with the Teichmüller metric for $S$.

- **Index Set:** $\mathcal{S}$ will be the collection of isotopy classes of (non-necessarily connected) essential subsurfaces of $S$ excluding 3–punctured sphere, but including annuli.
- **Hyperbolic Spaces:** For each $U \in \mathcal{S}$, $CU$ will be the curve graph of $U$ with the relevant alternative definition if $U$ is an annulus. $CU$ will be infinite diameter if and only if $U$ is connected
- **Relations:** $U \perp V$ if $U$ and $V$ are disjoint and $U \subseteq V$ if $U$ is nested into $V$. If $U \subseteq V$, then $\rho_U^V$ will be the subset of curves in $CV$ corresponding to $\perp U$.

If $\mathcal{X}$ is the Teichmüller space with the Weil-Petersson metric instead, then the structure is identical, expect that $\mathcal{S}$ will also exclude annular subsurfaces.

RAAGs and RACGs \[ \text{BHS}17b \]

Let $\Gamma$ be a finite simplicial graph and $G_\Gamma$ be the associated right-angled Artin or right-angled Coxeter group. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the Cayley graph of $G_\Gamma$ with the standard presentation. Recall that for an induced subgraph $\Lambda \subseteq \Gamma$, $\text{link}(\Lambda)$ is the subgraph of $\Gamma - \Lambda$ induced by the vertices adjacent to every vertex in $\Lambda$ and $\text{star}(\Lambda) = \text{link}(\Lambda) \cup \Lambda$. If $\Lambda$ is an induced subgraph of $\Gamma$, then $G_\Lambda$ is a subgroup of $G_\Gamma$. We call subgroups of this form the **special subgroups** of $G_\Gamma$. We can now describe the HHG structure on $G_\Gamma$.

- **Index Set:** For $g, h \in G_\Gamma$ and $\Lambda$ a non-empty, induced subgraph of $\Gamma$, define the equivalence relation $gG_\Lambda \sim hG_\Lambda$ if $g^{-1}h \in G_{\text{star}(\Lambda)}$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be defined as $\{gG_\Lambda\}/\sim$.
- **Hyperbolic Spaces:** $C[gG_\Lambda]$ can be obtained by starting with the coset $gG_\Lambda$ and coning off each left coset of the special subgroups contained in $gG_\Lambda$. $C[gG_\Lambda]$ is infinite diameter if and only if $G_\Lambda$ is infinite and $\Lambda$ does not split as a join.
- **Relations:** $[gG_\Lambda'] \subseteq [gG_\Lambda]$ if $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$ and $[gG_\Lambda'] \perp [gG_\Lambda]$ if $\Lambda \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda')$ (and hence $\Lambda' \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda)$). If $[gG_\Lambda] \subseteq [gG_\Lambda]$, then $\rho_{[gG_\Lambda]}^\Lambda$ will be the subset $gG_{\Lambda'}$ in $C[gG_\Lambda]$.

Graph Manifolds \[ \text{BHS}a \]

Let $M$ be a non-geometric graph manifold and $\mathcal{X}$ be the universal cover of $M$. Since the fundamental groups of every graph manifold is quasi-isometric to the fundamental group of a flip graph manifold we will assume $M$ is flip. Let $T$ be Bass-Serre tree for $M$ and $X_v$ be
the subspace of $\mathcal{X}$ corresponding to a vertex $v \in T$. Each $X_v$ is bi-Lipschitz to the product $R_v \times H_v$ where $R_v$ is a copy of the real line and $H_v$ is the universal cover of a hyperbolic surface with totally geodesic boundary. If $v, w$ are adjacent vertices in $T$, then let $\partial_v H_v$ and $\partial_w H_w$ denote the boundary components of $H_v$ and $H_w$ such that $R_v \times \partial_v H_v$ is identified with $R_w \times \partial_w H_w$ in $\mathcal{X}$. Since $M$ is flip, $R_v$ is identified with $\partial_v H_v$. For each $v \in T$, let $\hat{H}_v$ denote the spaced obtained from $H_v$ after coning off each copy of $\partial_w H_v$ for each vertex $w$ adjacent to $v$. We can now define the HHS structure on $\mathcal{X}$.

- **Index Set:** For adjacent vertices $v, w \in T$, define $R_v \sim \partial_v H_w$ then let $\mathcal{S} = \{T, R_v, \partial_v H_w, \hat{H}_w\}$.

- **Hyperbolic Spaces:** Every element of $\mathcal{S}$ is a hyperbolic space, so we have $CU = U$ for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$. The diameter of $CU$ is infinite for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$.

- **Relations:** $T$ is the $\subseteq$–maximal domain and $[\partial_v H_v] \subseteq \hat{H}_v$ for all $w, v$ adjacent in $T$. For adjacent vertices $v, w \in T$, $\rho_T[\partial_v H_v] = \{v, w\} \subset T$ and $\rho_{\hat{H}_v}[\partial_v H_v]$ is the cone point for $\partial_v H_v$ in $\hat{H}_v$. For $v, w$ adjacent in $T$, $[R_v] \perp \hat{H}_v$ and $[R_v] \perp [R_w]$ (recall $[\partial_v H_v] = [R_v]$).

**Remark 7.1.** When the manifold $M$ is flip, the above describes an HHG structure on $\pi_1(M)$. However, if $M$ is not flip, then the quasi-isometry from $\pi_1(M)$ to the fundamental group of the flip graph manifold need not be equivariant and the above will be an HHS, but not an HHG structure on $\pi_1(M)$. See [BHSa, Remark 10.2] for a discussion of the existence of HHG structures on 3–manifold groups.

In the case of right-angled Artin groups with connected defining graphs, Tran and Genevois independently showed that quasiconvex subgroups are either finite index or hyperbolic [Tra, Gen]. The same result is shown for the mapping class group in [Kim] and for certain $CFS$ right-angled Coxeter groups in [NT]. Based on these examples, one may conjecture that for any non-relatively hyperbolic hierarchically hyperbolic space, the quasiconvex subsets are either hyperbolic or coarsely cover the entire space. While [Tra] provides a counterexample to this conjecture in right-angled Coxeter groups, it nevertheless holds in many of the examples described above. In Proposition 7.2 we give sufficient conditions for every quasiconvex subset of an HHS to be either hyperbolic or coarsely covering. We then unite and expand the work of Tran, Genevois, Kim, and Nguyen-Tran by applying Proposition 7.2 to the mapping class group, Teichmüller space, right-angled Artin and Coxeter groups, and graph manifolds in Corollary 7.4.

**Proposition 7.2.** Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy and let $\mathcal{S}^*$ be as defined in Definition 6.5. Assume the following two conditions hold:

1. For all $w \in \mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}^*$ either $CW$ has bounded diameter or the set
   \[ \{\rho_V^w : V \in \mathcal{S}^* \text{ with } V \cap W \text{ or } V \subseteq W\} \]
   uniformly coarsely covers $CW$.

2. For every $U, V \in \mathcal{S}^*$ there exists a sequence $U = U_1, \ldots, U_n = V$ of domains in $\mathcal{S}^*$ with $U_i \perp U_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

Then, if $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is quasiconvex, either $Y$ is hyperbolic or some finite neighborhood of $Y$ covers all of $\mathcal{X}$.

**Proof.** Let $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be $Q$–quasiconvex. By Theorem 6.3 there exists $B$, depending only on $Q$ and $\mathcal{S}$, such that $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy. Further, we can assume $B$ is large enough such that $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})$ satisfies the $B$–bounded domain dichotomy. We will show that if $Y$ is not hyperbolic, then for all $W \in \mathcal{S}$ we have that $CW$ is uniformly coarsely covered by $\pi_W(Y)$. Thus for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ we will have that $d_W(x, g_Y(x))$ is uniformly bounded and therefore $Y$ will coarsely cover $\mathcal{X}$ by the distance formula (Theorem 4.4).
Suppose that $Y$ is not hyperbolic. By Proposition 2.8, the inclusion map $i : Y \hookrightarrow X$ cannot be a stable embedding. Therefore by Corollary 6.4 there exists a domain $U \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\text{diam}(\pi_U(Y)) > B$. First we will show that for any domain $W \in \mathcal{S}^*$, $CW \subseteq N_B(\pi_Y(Y))$.

Let $W \in \mathcal{S}^*$. By hypothesis, there exists a sequence $U = U_1, \ldots, U_n = W$ of domains in $\mathcal{S}^*$ with $U_i \perp U_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Since $Y$ has the $B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy and $\text{diam}(CU_i) = \infty$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have $CU_i \subseteq N_B(\pi_{U_i}(Y))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. In particular, $CW \subseteq N_B(\pi_Y(Y))$.

Now let $W \in \mathcal{S} - \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\text{diam}(CW) = \infty$. We will show that $\pi_Y(Y)$ uniformly coarsely covers $CW$ by showing that for all $V \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\rho_Y^W$ is defined there exists $y \in Y$ such that $\pi_Y(y)$ is uniformly close to $\rho_Y^W$. First suppose $V \in \mathcal{S}^*$ with $V \subseteq W$. By the preceding paragraph, there exist $x, x' \in Y$ such that $d_Y(x, x') > 100E$. If $\gamma$ is a hierarchy path connecting $x$ and $x'$, then $\pi_Y(\gamma)$ is uniformly close to $\rho_Y^W$ by the bounded geodesic image axiom (Axiom 8). Further, since $Y$ is quasiconvex there exists $y \in Y$ such that $d_W(\rho_Y^W, \pi_Y(y)) < B'$ where $B'$ depends only on $Q$ and $\mathcal{S}$. If instead $V \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $V \cap W$, then there exists $y \in Y$ such that $d_Y(y, \rho_Y^V) > \kappa_0$. Thus $d_W(y, \rho_Y^W) \leq \kappa_0$ by the consistency axiom (Axiom 5). Since the set $\{\rho_Y^W : V \in \mathcal{S}^* \text{ with } V \cap W \} \text{ uniformly coarsely covers } CW$ by hypothesis, we have that $\pi_Y(Y)$ uniformly coarsely covers all of $CW$ as well.

Hence we have that for all $W \in \mathcal{S}$, $CW$ is uniformly coarsely covered by $\pi_Y(Y)$ and so $Y$ coarsely covers $X$ be the distance formula. \hfill $\Box$

Before continuing, we will take a brief detour to define a property of graphs that will be relevant to our study of right-angled Coxeter groups. Given a graph $\Gamma$, define $\Gamma^4$ as the graph whose vertices are induced 4–cycles of $\Gamma$. Two vertices in $\Gamma^4$ are adjacent if and only if the corresponding induced 4-cycles in $\Gamma$ have two nonadjacent vertices in common.

**Definition 7.3** (Constructed from squares). A graph $\Gamma$ is $\mathcal{CFS}$ if $\Gamma = \Omega \ast K$, where $K$ is a (possibly empty) clique and $\Omega$ is a non-empty subgraph such that $\Omega^4$ has a connected component $T$ where every vertex of $\Omega$ is contained in a 4–cycle that is a vertex of $T$. If $\Gamma$ is $\mathcal{CFS}$ and $\Omega^4$ is connected, then we say $\Gamma$ is **strongly $\mathcal{CFS}$**. If $\Gamma$ is (strongly) $\mathcal{CFS}$, then by abuse of language we will say that the right-angled Coxeter group $G_\Gamma$ is (strongly) $\mathcal{CFS}$.

See Figure 6 below for examples of $\mathcal{CFS}$ and strongly $\mathcal{CFS}$ graphs.

**Figure 6.** Two graphs $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ are both $\mathcal{CFS}$. However, graph $\Gamma_1$ is graph strongly $\mathcal{CFS}$ but $\Gamma_2$ is not since the red induced 4-cycle in $\Gamma_2$ is not “connected” to any other induced 4-cycle in the graph.
Corollary 7.4. The following HHSs have the property that every quasiconvex subset is
either hyperbolic or coarsely covers the entire space:
(a) The Teichmüller space of a finite type surface with the Teichmüller metric
(b) The Teichmüller space of a finite type surface of complexity at least 6 with the Weil-
Petersson metric
(c) The mapping class group of an orientated, connected, finite type surface
(d) A right-angled Artin group with connected defining graph
(e) A right-angled Coxeter group with strongly CFS defining graph
(f) The fundamental group of a non-geometric graph manifold
In particular, if $H$ is a quasiconvex subgroup in any of the groups (c)-(f), then $H$ is either
stable or finite index.

Proof. All of the above examples have the bounded domain dichotomy. We shall show they
satisfy the two hypotheses of Proposition 7.2.

Mapping class group/Teichmüller metric: If $\xi(S) \leq 1$, then the mapping class group and
Teichmüller space will both be hyperbolic; thus we can assume $\xi(S) \geq 2$. In this case, $\mathcal{G}^*$ is
the set of all connected proper subsurfaces. Thus Hypothesis 1 follows from the fact that
every curve on the surface corresponds to the boundary curve of some connected subsurface.
Given two subsurfaces $U, V$ a sequence satisfying Hypothesis 2 is found by taking a path
in $\mathcal{CS}$ connecting $\partial U$ and $\partial V$.

Weil-Petersson: $\mathcal{G}^*$ is the collection of all connected proper subsurfaces whose complement
contains a subsurface of complexity at least 1. In particular, since the complexity is at least
6, $\mathcal{G}^*$ contains every subsurface of complexity 1. For every connected subsurface $W \notin \mathcal{G}^*$,
every curve on $W$ corresponds to the boundary curve of some complexity 1 subsurface
providing Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 follows from the observations that if $U \subset S$ is a
subsurface of complexity 1 and $\alpha$ is a curve disjoint from $\partial U$, then there exists $V \subset S$, a
subsurface of complexity 1, such that $\alpha \subseteq \partial V$ and $U$ is disjoint from $V$. Thus any path in
$\mathcal{CS}$ can be promoted to a sequence of disjointly subsurfaces in $\mathcal{G}^*$.

RAAGs: $\mathcal{G}^*$ is the collection of $[gG_\Lambda]$ such that there exists $\Delta \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda)$ where $\Lambda$ and
$\Delta$ are both non-empty and not joins. In particular, since $\Gamma$ is connected, $\mathcal{G}^*$ contains all
of the $[gG_\Lambda]$ where $\Lambda$ is a single vertex. Hypothesis 1 follows from the fact that $G_\Lambda$ acts
cocompactly on its Cayley graph and the construction of $C[gG_\Lambda]$. For Hypothesis 2, let
$[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}],[g_2G_{\Lambda_2}] \in \mathcal{G}^*$ and let $m = |g_1^{-1}g_2|$. We shall proceed by induction on $m$. If $m = 0$,
then $g_1 = g_2 = g$ and since $\Gamma$ is connected, there is a sequence of vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ such
that $v_i$ and $v_{i+1}$ are adjacent for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $v_1 \in \text{link}(\Lambda_1)$, $v_n \in \text{link}(\Lambda_2)$. Thus
$[gG_{\Lambda_1}],[gG_{v_1}],\ldots,[gG_{v_n}],[gG_{\Lambda_2}]$ is the required sequence.

If $m > 0$, then there exists $g_3 \in G_\Gamma$ such that $|g_1^{-1}g_3| = m - 1$ and $|g_3^{-1}g_2| = 1$. Let $v$ be the
vertex of $\Gamma$ such that $g_3^{-1}g_2$ is either $v$ or $v^{-1}$. By induction, there exist two sequences
of elements of $\mathcal{G}^*$,

$$[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}] = U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n = [g_3G_v]$$

and

$$[g_2G_v] = V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k = [g_2G_{\Lambda_2}]$$

such that $U_i \perp U_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $V_i \perp V_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Since
$[g_3G_v] = [g_2G_v]$, $[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}] = U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n, V_2, \ldots, V_n = [g_2G_{\Lambda_2}]$
is the required sequence.

RACGs: Since $\Gamma$ is strongly CFS, we can write $\Gamma = \Omega \ast K$ where $K$ is a clique (possibly
empty) and $\Omega$ is a non-empty graph such that $\Omega^4$ is connected and every vertex of $\Omega$ is
contained a 4–cycle that is a vertex of $\Omega^4$. Since $G_\Omega$ is a finite index subgroup of $G_\Gamma$, it
suffices to prove that every quasiconvex subset of $G_\Omega$ is either hyperbolic or coarsely covers
$G_\Omega$. We now prove that the standard HHG structure, $\mathcal{S}$, on $G_\Omega$ satisfies satisfy the two hypotheses of Proposition 7.2. The argument will be similar to the case of right-angled Artin groups above.

We first observe that $\mathcal{S}^*$ is the collection of $[gG_\Lambda]$ such that there exists $\Delta \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda)$ where $\Lambda$ and $\Delta$ both have at least 2 points and they are not joins. In particular, $\mathcal{S}^*$ contains all domains $[gG_{\{a,b\}}]$ where $a$ and $b$ are two non-adjacent vertices of an induced 4-cycle. Hypothesis [1] follows from the fact that $G_\Lambda$ acts cocompactly on its Cayley graph and the construction of $C[gG_\Lambda]$.

For the Hypothesis [2], let $[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}],[g_2G_{\Lambda_2}] \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and let $m = |g_1^{-1}g_2|$. We shall proceed by induction on $m$. We first assume that $m = 0$. Therefore, $g_1 = g_2 = g$. We note that for $i = 0$ or 1 there exists $\Delta_{i} \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda_i)$ where $\Lambda_i$ and $\Delta_i$ both contain at least 2 vertices and are not joins. Therefore, $\text{link}(\Lambda_i)$ contains a pair $(u_i,v_i)$ of two non-adjacent vertices of some induced 4 cycle. Since $\Omega^4$ is connected, there is a sequence of pairs of non-adjacent vertices $(u_1,v_1) = (a_1,b_1), (a_2,b_2), \ldots, (a_n,b_n) = (u_2,v_2)$ such that $a_i$ and $b_i$ are both adjacent to $a_{i+1}$ and $a_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Thus $[gG_{\Lambda_1}], [gG_{\{a_1,b_1\}}], \ldots, [gG_{\{a_n,b_n\}}], [gG_{\Lambda_2}]$ is the required sequence.

If $m > 0$, then there exists $g_3 \in G_\Omega$ such that $|g_1^{-1}g_3| = m - 1$ and $|g_3^{-1}g_2| = 1$. Let $v$ be the vertex of $\Omega$ such that $g_3^{-1}g_2 = v$. Since every vertex of $\Omega$ is contained in a four cycle that is a vertex of $\Omega^4$, there is a vertex $w$ such that $v$ and $w$ are two non-adjacent vertices of an induced 4-cycle. By induction, there exist two sequences of elements of $\mathcal{S}^*$,

$$[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}] = U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n = [g_3G_{\{v,w\}}]$$

and

$$[g_2G_{\{v,w\}}] = V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_k = [g_2G_{\Lambda_2}]$$

such that $U_i \perp U_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $V_i \perp V_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Since $[g_3G_{\{v,w\}}] = [g_2G_{\{v,w\}}]$,

$$[g_1G_{\Lambda_1}] = U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n, V_2, \ldots, V_k = [g_2G_{\Lambda_2}]$$

is the required sequence.

Graph Manifolds: In this case, $\mathcal{S}^* = \mathcal{S} - \{T\}$ and Hypothesis [1] is immediate from the fact that for every vertex $x \in T$, $x \in \rho_{R_x}$ and for every point in $H_x$ is uniformly close to some boundary component $\partial_x H_x$. For Hypothesis [2], consider $U,W \in \mathcal{S}^*$. If $U = [R_u]$ and $W = [R_v]$, let $v_1,\ldots,v_n$ be a sequence of vertices in $T$ such that $v_1$ is adjacent to $u$ and $v_n$ is adjacent to $w$. In this case the sequence $[R_u],[R_{v_1}],\ldots,[R_{v_n}],[R_w]$ satisfies the hypothesis. If $U = [H_u]$ or $W = [H_w]$, the hypothesis is satisfied by adding $[H_u]$ before $[R_u]$ or $[H_w]$ after $[R_w]$ to $[R_u],[R_v],[R_w]$ as needed.

In the setting of 2–dimensional right-angled Coxeter groups, Tran provided a characterization of the special quasiconvex subgroups [Tra]. This characterization was expanded by Geneois to include all right-angled Coxeter groups in [Gen]. We provide a new proof of this characterization using Theorem 6.3.

Theorem 7.5 ([Tra], [Gen]). Let $\Gamma$ be a simplicial graph and $\Delta$ an induced subgraph of $\Gamma$. If $G_\Gamma$ is the right-angled Coxeter group corresponding to $\Gamma$ and $G_\Delta$ is the subgroup generated by the vertices of $\Delta$, then the following conditions are equivalent:

1. The subgroup $G_\Delta$ is quasiconvex in $G_\Gamma$.
2. If $\Delta$ contains two non-adjacent vertices of an induced 4–cycle $\sigma$, then $\Delta$ contains all vertices of $\sigma$.

Proof. Before we begin, we document a few additional facts we will need about the HHG structure on a right-angled Coxeter group. For any induced subgraph $\Lambda$, $P_{[G_\Lambda]}$ is coarsely equal to the subgroup $G_\Lambda \times G_{\text{link}(\Lambda)}$ and $G_\Lambda$ can be coarsely identified with $F_{[G_\Lambda]}$. In
particular, $G_\Lambda$ is hierarchically quasiconvex, $\pi_U(G_\Lambda)$ uniformly coarsely covers $CU$ for $U \subseteq [G_\Lambda]$, and $\pi_V(G_\Lambda)$ is uniformly bounded for all $V \subseteq [G_\Lambda]$. See [BHS17] for full details on the HHG structure on right-angled Coxeter groups.

(1) $\implies$ (2): Assume for a contradiction that $G_\Delta$ is quasiconvex, but there is a 4–cycle $\sigma$ with two pairs of non-adjacent vertices $\{a_1, a_2\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2\}$ such that $\{a_1, a_2\}$ is a subset of $\Delta$ and $\{b_1, b_2\}$ is not. We know that $U = \{G_{\{a_1, a_2\}}\}$ and $\{G_{\{b_1, b_2\}}\} = V$ are orthogonal domains. However, $\pi_U(G_\Delta)$ coarsely covers $CU$, but $\pi_V(G_\Delta)$ has uniformly bounded diameter which contradicts Theorem 6.3.

(2) $\implies$ (1): As $G_\Delta$ is hierarchically quasiconvex, we only need to demonstrate that $G_\Delta$ satisfies the orthogonal projection dichotomy. Let $B$ be a positive number such that $(G_\Gamma, \Theta)$ has the $B$–bounded domain dichotomy, $CW \subseteq N_B(\pi_W(G_\Delta))$ for all $W \subseteq [G_\Delta]$, and $\text{diam}(\pi_U(G_\Delta)) < B$ for all $W \subseteq [G_\Delta]$. If $\text{diam}(\pi_U(G_\Delta)) > B$, then it must be the case $U = [G_\Lambda]$ where $\Lambda \subseteq \Delta$ and $\Lambda$ contains two non-adjacent vertices $s$ and $t$. If $V \in \Theta^+_U$, then $V = [G_{\Lambda'}]$ where $\Lambda' \not\subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda)$ and $\Lambda \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda')$. If $\Lambda'$ is a join or $\Lambda' = \{v\}$, then $\text{diam}(CV) \leq B$ and $CV \subseteq N_B(\pi_V(G_\Delta))$. In the other case, we will show $\Lambda' \subseteq \Delta$.

If $\Lambda'$ is not a join and contains at least two vertices, then for each vertex $v \in \Lambda'$ there exists a vertex $w \in \Lambda'$ that is not adjacent to $v$. Since $\Lambda \subseteq \text{link}(\Lambda')$ the vertices $v, s, w, t$ form a 4–cycle. However, (2) then requires $v, w \in \Delta$. Hence $\Lambda' \subseteq \Delta$ and $V = [G_{\Lambda'}] \subseteq [G_\Delta]$ which implies $CV \subseteq N_B(\pi_V(G_\Delta))$. Thus $G_\Delta$ has the 2$B$–orthogonal projection dichotomy and we are finished by Theorem 6.3. 

7.1. CFS right-angled Coxeter groups. Recently, Behrstock posed the program of classifying all CFS right-angled Coxeter groups up to quasi-isometry and commensurability. This was motivated by the asymptotical prevalence of CFS right-angled Coxeter groups among random right-angled Coxeter groups as well as the fact that being CFS is a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for a right-angled Coxeter group to be quasi-isometric to a right-angled Artin group (see [Beh]).

In [Beh], Behrstock presented the first example of a CFS right-angled Coxeter group that contains a one-ended stable subgroup answering outstanding questions about stable subgroups and quasi-isometries between right-angled Artin groups and right-angled Coxeter groups. Using Theorem 7.5 we can expand Behrstock’s construction to produce CFS right-angled Coxeter, that contain any other right-angled Coxeter group as a quasiconvex subgroup. This shows that there is incredible diversity among the quasi-isometry types of CFS right-angled Coxeter groups.

Proposition 7.6. Any right-angled Coxeter group (resp. hyperbolic right-angled Coxeter group) is an infinite index quasiconvex subgroup (resp. stable subgroup) of a CFS right-angled Coxeter group.

Proof. To prove the proposition we shall utilize a construction of certain CFS graphs described in [Beh]. Let $\Omega_n$ be a graph with $2n$ vertices built in the following inductive way. Let $\Omega_1$ be a pair of vertices $a_1, b_1$ with no edge between them. Given the graph $\Omega_{n-1}$, we obtain the graph $\Omega_n$ by adding a new pair of vertices $a_n, b_n$ to the graph $\Omega_{n-1}$ and adding four new edges, one connecting each of $\{a_{n-1}, b_{n-1}\}$ to each of $\{a_n, b_n\}$. In Figure 7 graph $\Gamma_1$ is exactly $\Omega_{13}$. For each integer $m \geq 2$ there is a sufficiently large $n$ such that the graph $\Omega_n$ contains $m$ vertices whose pairwise distances are at least 3.

Let $G_\Gamma$ be an arbitrary right-angled Coxeter group. We will construct a CFS right-angled Coxeter group $G_\Omega$ that contains $G_\Gamma$ as a quasiconvex subgroup. Let $m$ be a number of vertices of $\Gamma$. Choose a positive integer $n$ sufficient large so the graph $\Omega_n$ contains a set $S$ of $m$ vertices whose pairwise distance is at least 3. We glue the graphs $\Gamma$ and $\Omega_n$ by identifying the vertex set of $\Gamma$ to $S$. Let $\Omega$ be the resulting graph. In Figure 7 graph $\Gamma_2$ is an example.
of graph $\Omega$ when $\Gamma$ is the 5-cycle graph and graph $\Gamma_3$ is another example of graph $\Omega$ when $\Gamma$ is the 4-cycle graph.

The graphs $\Omega$ and $\Omega_n$ have the same vertex set and $\Omega_4^4 \subset \Omega^4$. Thus $\Omega$ is a $\text{CFS}$ graph as $\Omega_n$ is a $\text{CFS}$ graph. Since the distance in $\Omega_n$ between any distinct vertices of $S$ is at least 3, $\Gamma$ is an induced subgraph of $\Omega$ with the property that if $\Gamma$ contains two non-adjacent vertices of an induced 4-cycle $\sigma$, then $\Gamma$ contains all vertices of $\sigma$. Therefore, $G_{\Gamma}$ is a quasiconvex subgroup of $G_{\Omega}$ by Theorem 7.5. If $G_{\Gamma}$ is a hyperbolic group, then it is a stable subgroup of $G_{\Omega}$. $\square$

In light of Proposition 7.6 we believe that quasiconvex subgroups will play an important role in understanding the quasi-isometry classification of $\text{CFS}$ right-angled Coxeter groups. We finish this section by illustrating the results of this section with three $\text{CFS}$ right-angled Coxeter groups whose quasi-isometry types can be distinguished utilizing their quasiconvex subsets.

**Example 7.7.** Let $\Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_2$, and $\Gamma_3$ be graphs as in Figure 7. All of the right-angled Coxeter groups $G_{\Gamma_1}$, $G_{\Gamma_2}$, and $G_{\Gamma_3}$ are $\text{CFS}$, but no pair of them are quasi-isometric. By [NT], $G_{\Gamma_1}$ is quasi-isometric to a right-angled Artin group with connected defining graph. Thus, all of $G_{\Gamma_1}$’s non-coarsely covering quasiconvex subsets are quasi-trees. However, $G_{\Gamma_2}$ contains a one-ended hyperbolic quasiconvex subgroup (induced by the blue 5-cycle) and $G_{\Gamma_3}$ contain a virtually $\mathbb{Z}^2$ quasiconvex subgroup (induced by the red 4-cycle). The table below summarizes some of the differences between $G_{\Gamma_1}$, $G_{\Gamma_2}$, and $G_{\Gamma_3}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$G_{\Gamma_1}$</th>
<th>$G_{\Gamma_2}$</th>
<th>$G_{\Gamma_3}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly $\text{CFS}$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-coarsely covering Quasiconvex Subsets</td>
<td>All quasi-trees</td>
<td>All hyperbolic. Contains a one-ended stable subgroup.</td>
<td>Contains a quasiconvex virtually $\mathbb{Z}^2$ subgroup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse Boundary</td>
<td>Totally disconnected</td>
<td>Contains a circle</td>
<td>Connectivity unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QI to a RAAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. HYPERBOLICALLY EMBEDDED SUBGROUPS OF HHGS

In this section we utilize Theorem 6.3 to prove the following classification of hyperbolically embedded subgroups of hierarchically hyperbolic groups. As our proof does not directly utilize the definition of hyperbolically embedded we shall omit the definition here and direct the curious reader to [DGO17].

Theorem 8.1. Let $G$ be a hierarchically hyperbolic group and let $\{H_i\}$ be a finite collection of subgroups. Then the following are equivalent:

1. The collection $\{H_i\}$ is hyperbolically embedded in $G$.
2. The collection $\{H_i\}$ is almost malnormal and each $H_i$ is quasiconvex.

Figure 7. Three graphs $\Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_2$, and $\Gamma_3$ are all CFS, but no pair of them are quasi-isometric.
Combining work of Dahmani-Guirardel-Osin [DGO17] and Sisto [Sis16] the implication 
\((1) \implies (2)\) holds for all finitely generated groups. To see that the converse does not hold in general, consider a non-virtually cyclic lacunary hyperbolic group \(G\) where every proper subgroup is infinite cyclic and quasiconvex (the existence of such a group is shown in [OOS09, Theorem 1.12]). If \(I\) is a proper subgroup of \(G\), then by [Tra, Theorem 1.2], \(I\) has finite index in its commensurator \(H\). Thus \(H\) is a proper, infinite, almost malnormal, quasiconvex subgroup of \(G\). However, \(H\) cannot be hyperbolically embedded as \(G\) does not contain any non-abelian free subgroups and thus fails to be acylindrically hyperbolic (see [Osi16, DGO17]).

Despite this failure in general, Genevois showed that in the setting of \(\text{CAT}(0)\) cubical groups, \((2)\) does imply \((1)\) ([Gen, Theorem 6.31]). Genevois employs a combination of the Bestvina-Bromberg-Fujiwara construction ([BBF15, Theorems A, B]) with some work of Sisto ([Sis12, Theorems 6.3, 6.4]) that is summarized in the following sufficient conditions for a collection of subgroups to be hyperbolically embedded.

**Theorem 8.2** ([BBF15, Sis12]). Let \(G\) be a finitely generated group and \(Z\) be the collection of all (left) cosets of a finite collection of finitely generated subgroups \(\{H_i\}\) in \(G\). Fix a finite generating set \(S\) for \(G\) such that \(H_i = \langle H_i \cap S \rangle\) for all \(i\). Suppose for every \(Z_1 \neq Z_2 \in Z\) we are given a subset \(\tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) \subseteq Z_1\) and for \(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z\) define \(d_{Z_1}^\tau(Z_1, Z_2) = \text{diam}_{Z_1}(\tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) \cup \tau_{Z_1}(Z_3))\). If there exists \(C > 0\) such that the following hold:

\(\text{(P0)}\) For all \(Z_1 \neq Z_2\), \(\text{diam}(\tau_{Z_1}(Z_2)) \leq C\).

\(\text{(P1)}\) For any triple \(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z\) of distinct elements, at most one of the three numbers \(d_{Z_1}^\tau(Z_2, Z_3), d_{Z_2}^\tau(Z_1, Z_3), d_{Z_3}^\tau(Z_1, Z_2)\) is greater than \(C\).

\(\text{(P2)}\) For any \(Z_1, Z_2 \in Z\), the set

\[\{Z \in Z \mid d_{Z}^\tau(Z_1, Z_2) > C\}\]

is finite.

\(\text{(P3)}\) For all \(g \in G\), \(d_{gZ_1}^\tau(gZ_2, gZ_3) = d_{Z_1}^\tau(Z_2, Z_3)\) for any \(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z\).

Then the collection \(\{H_i\}\) is hyperbolically embedded in \(G\).

As Genevois does in the cubical case, we shall show that an almost malnormal collection of quasiconvex subgroups of an HHG satisfies (P0) - (P3) of Theorem 8.2. The bulk of that work is in Proposition 8.6 which we will state and prove after collecting a few preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 8.3.** Let \(\{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}\) be an almost malnormal collection of subgroups of a finitely generated group \(G\) and \(B \geq 0\). For all \(g_1, g_2 \in G\), if \(g_1H_i \neq g_2H_j\), then \(\text{diam}_G(N_B(g_1H_i) \cap N_B(g_2H_j))\) is finite.

**Proof.** The conclusion follows directly from [Hru10, Proposition 9.4] and the definition of almost malnormal. \(\square\)

The next two lemmas tell us that a hierarchically quasiconvex subset coarsely intersects a quasiconvex subset whenever the image under the gate map is large. Further, the diameter of this coarse intersection is proportional to the diameter of the gate. In addition to being key components in our proof of Theorem 8.1, these lemmas can also be interpreted as additional generalizations of the bounded geodesic image property of quasiconvex subsets of hyperbolic spaces.

**Lemma 8.4.** Let \((\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{S})\) be an HHS with the bounded domain dichotomy, \(A \subseteq \mathcal{X}\) be \(k\)-hierarchically quasiconvex subset and \(Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}\) is \(Q\)-quasiconvex. There exists \(r > 1\) depending on \(Q\) and \(k\) such that if \(\text{diam}_\mathcal{X}(g_Y(A)) > r\), then \(d_\mathcal{X}(a, g_Y(a)) < r\) for each \(a \in g_A(Y)\).
Proof. By Proposition 5.7, there exists $k'$ such that both $A$ and $Y$ are $k'$–hierarchically quasiconvex. Recall that for each point $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $U \in \mathcal{G}$, the distance in $CU$ between $g_Y(x)$ and the closest point projection of $\pi_U(x)$ onto $\pi_U(Y)$ is uniformly bounded by some $\epsilon > 1$. Let $K \geq \epsilon$ be such that $Y$ has the $K$–orthogonal projection dichotomy and that $K$ is larger than the constant from the bridge theorem (Theorem 4.17) determined by $k'$. Define $\mathcal{H} = \{U \in \mathcal{G} : \text{diam}(\pi_U(g_Y(A))) > 2K\}$. By the uniqueness axiom (Axiom 10), there exists $C$ such that if $\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) > C$, then $\mathcal{H} \neq \emptyset$. Assume $\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) > C$ and let $a \in g_A(Y)$. By the bridge theorem, item 3, $\text{Rel}_K(a, g_Y(a)) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Suppose for the purposes of contradiction that $V \in \text{Rel}_K(a, g_Y(a))$. Thus, there must exist $H \in \mathcal{H}$, with $V \perp H$. By Theorem 6.3, $CH \subseteq N_K(\pi_H(Y))$ and $CV \subseteq N_K(\pi_Y(Y))$ which implies that $d_V(a, g_Y(a)) < K + \epsilon < 2K$. However, this contradicts $V \in \text{Rel}_K(a, g_Y(a))$. Hence $\text{Rel}_K(a, g_Y(a)) = \emptyset$ and by the distance formula (Theorem 4.4), there exists $K'$ depending only on $K$ (and thus only on $Q$ and $k_1$) such that $d_X(a, g_Y(a)) < K'$. The conclusion follows by choosing $r = \max\{K', C\}$. □

Lemma 8.5. Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{G})$ be an HHG with the bounded domain dichotomy, $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex subset and $Y \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be $Q$–quasiconvex. There exists $r > 1$ depending on $k$ and $Q$ such that for all $D \geq r$, if $\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) > r$ then there exists $K_1$ depending on $k$, $D$, and $Q$ such that

$$\text{diam}(N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)) \leq \text{diam}(g_Y(A)).$$

Proof. Let $r$ be the constant given by Lemma 8.4 and suppose $\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) > r$. Thus for $D \geq r$, $\text{diam}(N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)) \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 8.4. First consider $x, y \in N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)$. Let $x', y' \in A$ be points such that $d_X(x, x') \leq D$ and $d_X(y, y') \leq D$. By Lemma 4.14 and the fact that $x, y \in N_D(Y)$, there exists $K'$ depending on $Q$ such that

$$d_X(x, g_Y(x')) \leq 4DK'; \quad d_X(y, g_Y(y')) \leq 4DK'.$$

Hence we have

$$d_X(x, y) \leq d_X(g_Y(x'), g_Y(y')) + 8DK'$$

which shows

$$\text{diam}(N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)) \leq \text{diam}(g_Y(A)) + 8DK'.$$

For the inequality $\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) \leq \text{diam}(N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y))$, Lemma 8.4 provides $g_Y(g_A(Y)) \subseteq N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)$ and the bridge theorem (Theorem 4.17) says there exists $K''$ depending on $k$ and $Q$ such that $g_Y(A) \subseteq N_{K''}(g_Y(g_A(Y)))$. Thus we have

$$\text{diam}(g_Y(A)) \leq \text{diam}(g_Y(g_A(Y))) + 2K'' \leq \text{diam}(N_D(A) \cap N_D(Y)) + 2K''$$

and we are finished by choosing $K = \max\{2K'', 6DK' + 3K'\}$. □

We now prove that the cosets of a collection of almost malnormal, quasiconvex subgroups of an HHG satisfy (P0)-(P2) of Theorem 8.2 when $\tau_Z(Z)$ is defined by the gate map. This is the main tool for the proof of Theorem 8.1.

Proposition 8.6. Let $(G, \mathcal{G})$ be an HHG and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ denote the distance in the word metric on $G$ with respect to some fixed finite generating set. If $\{H_1, \ldots, H_n\}$ is a collection of $Q$–quasiconvex, almost malnormal subgroups of $G$ and $Z$ is the collection of all left cosets of the $H_i$, then there exists $C > 0$ such that for all distinct $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z$ we have:

1. $\text{diam}(g_{Z_1}(Z)) \leq C$;
2. if $d(g_{Z_1}(Z_1), g_{Z_2}(Z)) > C$, then $d(g_{Z_1}(Z_1), g_{Z_2}(Z_3)) < C$ and $d(g_{Z_1}(Z_2), g_{Z_1}(Z_3)) < C$;
3. $\{Z \in Z : d(g_{Z}(Z_1), g_{Z}(Z_2)) > C\}$ has only a finite number of elements.
Proof. We will prove each of the three assertions individually. Before beginning, we remind the reader that all hierarchically hyperbolic groups satisfy the bounded domain dichotomy and that every element of $Z$ is $k$–hierarchically quasiconvex for some $k$ depending only on $Q$.

**Assertion (1):** there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\text{diam}(g_{Z_1}(Z_2)) \leq C_1$, for all $Z_1, Z_2 \in Z$.

*Proof.* Let $r > 1$ be the constant from Lemma 8.3 for $Q$ and define

$$F = \{ gH_i \in Z : gH_i \cap B_r(e) \neq \emptyset \}$$

where $B_r(e)$ is the ball of radius $r$ around the identity in $G$. Since $F$ is a finite set, Lemma 8.3 provides a uniform number $D_1$ such that $\text{diam}(N_r(gH_i) \cap N_r(H_j)) \leq D_1$ for any distinct $gH_i, H_j \in F$. By Lemma 8.5, there exists $D_2$ depending on $Q$ such that $\text{diam}(g_{H_i}(gH_i)) \leq D_2$ where $gH_i \neq H_j$ are elements in $F$.

We now prove that there is a uniform constant $C_1$ such that for each pair of distinct cosets $g_1H_i$ and $g_2H_j$ we have

$$\text{diam}(g_{g_1H_i}(g_2H_j)) \leq C_1.$$ 

If $\text{diam}(g_{g_1H_i}(g_2H_j)) \leq r$, then we are done. Otherwise, by Lemma 8.4, there are elements $h_i \in H_i$ and $h_j \in H_j$ such that $d_{g_1}(g_1h_i, g_2h_j) < r$. This implies that $h_i^{-1} g^{-1} g_1 H_i$ is an element in $F$ and $h_i^{-1} g^{-1} g_2 H_j \neq H_i$. Therefore, $\text{diam}(g_{H_i}(h_i^{-1} g^{-1} g_2 H_j)) \leq D_2$. Thus, by the coarse equivariance of the gate maps (Lemma 4.15), the diameter of $g_{g_1H_i}(g_2H_j)$ is bounded above by a uniform number $C_1$. □

**Assertion (2):** there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z$, if $d(g_{Z_3}(Z_1), g_{Z_3}(Z_2)) > C_2$, then

$$d(g_{Z_2}(Z_1), g_{Z_2}(Z_3)) < C_2$$

and

$$d(g_{Z_2}(Z_2), g_{Z_1}(Z_3)) < C_2.$$

*Proof.* Fix $\theta \geq \theta_0$. Let $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 \in Z$ and $B = H_0(g_{Z_2}(Z_1) \cup g_{Z_2}(Z_2))$. We remind the reader that they should view $B$ as a bridge between $Z_1$ and $Z_2$.

Our goal is to show that there exists $b \in B$ such that $d(b, g_{Z_3}(b))$ is uniformly bounded. From this our conclusion will follow from the coarse Lipschitzness of the gate map.

By Assertion (1), $g_{Z_3}(Z_1), g_{Z_3}(Z_2)$ are uniformly coarsely contained in $g_{Z_3}(B)$. Since the gate map is coarsely Lipschitz we have

$$\text{diam}(g_{Z_3}(B)) \geq d(g_{Z_3}(Z_1), g_{Z_3}(Z_2))$$

with constants depending only on $Q$. Let $r$ be the constant from Lemma 8.3 with $A = B$ and $Y = Z_3$ and suppose $d(g_{Z_3}(Z_1), g_{Z_3}(Z_2))$ is large enough that $\text{diam}(g_{Z_3}(B)) > r$. By Lemma 8.4 there exists $b \in B$ such that $d(b, Z_3) < r$.

By Lemma 4.18 we have that $g_{Z_2}(Z_1)$ is uniformly coarsely equal to $g_{Z_2}(B)$ in particular $g_{Z_2}(b)$ is uniformly coarsely contained in $g_{Z_2}(Z_1)$. Since the gate maps are uniformly coarsely Lipschitz and $d(b, Z_3) < r$, we have that $d(g_{Z_2}(Z_3), g_{Z_2}(Z_1)) < C_2$. By switching the roles of $Z_1$ and $Z_2$, we get $d(g_{Z_1}(Z_3), g_{Z_1}(Z_2)) < C_2$. □

**Assertion (3):** there exists $C_3 > 0$ such that for all $Z_1, Z_2 \in Z$, the set $\{Z \in Z : d_{X}(g_{Z}(Z_1), g_{Z}(Z_2)) > C_3\}$ has only a finite number of elements.

*Proof.* Let $Z_1, Z_2 \in Z$. Fix $\theta \geq \theta_0$ and let $B = H_0(g_{Z_2}(Z_1) \cup g_{Z_2}(Z_2))$. By the bridge theorem, we have that $B$ is coarsely equals to the product of $g_{Z_2}(Z_2) \times H_0(a, b)$, where $a \in g_{Z_2}(Z_2)$ and $b = g_{Z_2}(a)$. By Assertion (1), the gate $g_{Z_2}(Z_2)$ has uniformly bounded diameter. By Proposition 5.5, there exists $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$, such that $H_0(a, b)$ is contained in $P_{X}^\lambda(a, b)$, the set of $\lambda$–hierarchy paths between $a$ and $b$. Since the distance between $a$ and $b$ is finite, so is the diameter of $P_{X}^\lambda(a, b)$. Therefore $H_0(a, b)$ has bounded diameter and so does the set $B = H_0(g_{Z_2}(Z_1) \cup g_{Z_2}(Z_2))$. Since $G$ is locally finite, $B$ can contain only a finite number of elements of $G$. □
Let \( r \) be as in Lemma 8.4. Since \( g_{Z_2}(Z_1), g_{Z_1}(Z_2) \subseteq B \), for any \( Z \in \mathcal{Z} \) with \( d(g_{Z}(Z_1), g_{Z}(Z_2)) \) larger than \( r \) we have \( \text{diam}(g_{Z}(B)) > r \). Thus every such \( Z \) intersects the \( r \)-neighborhood of \( B \). By locally finiteness of \( G \), we obtain that \( N_r(B) \) contains a finite number of element of \( G \). Since the elements of \( \mathcal{Z} \) are cosets of finitely many subgroups, every point of \( N_r(B) \) can belong to uniformly finitely many elements of \( \mathcal{Z} \), which concludes the proof of Assertion (3).

Proposition 8.6 now holds by taking \( C = \max\{C_1, C_2, C_3\} \).

We now have all the ingredients needed to give the proof of Theorem 8.1.

**Proof of Theorem 8.1.** Recall, we need to show that if \( G \) is a hierarchically hyperbolic group and \( \{H_i\} \) a finite almost malnormal collection of quasiconvex subgroups, then \( \{H_i\} \) is hyperbolically embedded in \( G \). In particular, we shall show that the left cosets of the \( H_i \)'s satisfy the requirements of Theorem 8.2. Since each \( H_i \) is a quasiconvex subgroup of \( G \), by [Tra15, Theorem 1.2] we have that they are all finitely generated. Let \( S \) be a finite generating set for \( G \), such that for each \( i \), \( H_i \cap S \) generates \( H_i \). As before, let \( \mathcal{Z} \) be the set of all left cosets of \( \{H_i\} \). For every pair of distinct \( Z_1, Z_2 \in \mathcal{Z} \) we want to define a set \( \tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) \) that satisfies (P0) - (P3) of Theorem 8.2. If we define \( \tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) \) as \( g_{Z_1}(Z_2) \), Proposition 8.6 provides that (P0) - (P2) will be satisfied. However, since the gate maps are only coarsely equivariant, condition (P3) may not hold.

Thus, for \( Z_1 \neq Z_2 \) define

\[
\tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) = \bigcup_{g \in G} g^{-1} g_{Z_1}(gZ_2).
\]

By construction we have that \( \tau_{gZ_1}(gZ_2) = g(\tau_{Z_1}(Z_2)) \) and thus (P3) holds. Since \( \tau_{Z_1}(Z_2) \) and \( g_{Z_1}(Z_2) \) uniformly coarsely coincide by the coarse equivariance of the gates maps (Lemma 4.15), (P0) - (P2) are satisfied as a corollary of Proposition 8.6. Hence the collection \( \{H_i\} \) is hyperbolically embedded in \( G \) by Theorem 8.2.

Our method of proof for Theorem 8.1 relies in a fundamental way upon the coarse equivariance of the gate map. If the group \( G \) has an HHIS structure, but not an HHH structure, then the gate map need not be coarsely equivariant. In particular, Theorem 8.1 does not (currently) apply to the fundamental groups of non-flip graph manifolds and thus we have the following interesting case of Question 4.

**Question 6.** If \( M \) is a non-flip graph manifold and \( \{H_i\} \) is a finite, almost malnormal collection of quasiconvex subgroups of \( \pi_1(M) \), is \( \{H_i\} \) hyperbolically embedded in \( \pi_1(M) \)?

**APPENDIX A. SUBSETS WITH ARBITRARY REASONABLE LOWER RELATIVE DIVERSION**

The proposition in this appendix utilizes the notion of asymptotic equivalence between families of functions. We will present the definition in the specific case we need and direct the reader to [Tra15, Section 2] for the more general case.

**Definition A.1.** Let \( f \) and \( g \) be two functions from \( [0, \infty) \) to \( [0, \infty) \). The function \( f \) is dominated by the function \( g \) if there are positive constants \( A, B, C \) and \( D \) such that \( f(r) \leq Ag(Br) + Cr \) for all \( r > D \). Two functions \( f \) and \( g \) are equivalent if \( f \) is dominated by \( g \) and vice versa.

Let \( X \) be a geodesic metric space and \( \{\sigma^n\} = \text{div}(X, Y) \) be the lower relative divergence of \( X \) with respect to some subset \( Y \subseteq X \). We say \( \text{div}(X, Y) \) is equivalent to a function \( f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) if there exist \( L \in (0, 1] \) and positive integer \( M \) such that \( \sigma^n_{Lp} \) is equivalent to \( f \) for all \( \rho \in (0, 1] \) and \( n \geq 2 \).
**Proposition A.2.** Let \( f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty) \) be a non-decreasing function and assume that there is a positive integer \( r_0 \) such that \( f(r) \geq r \) for each \( r > r_0 \). There is a geodesic space \( X \) with a subspace \( Y \) such that the lower relative divergence \( \text{div}(X,Y) \) is equivalent to \( f \).

**Proof.** Let \( Y \) be a ray with initial point \( x_0 \). Let \( (x_i) \) be the sequence of points along \( Y \) such that for each \( i \geq 1 \) the distance \( d_Y(x_{i-1}, x_i) = i \) and we connect each pair \( (x_{i-1}, x_i) \) by a segment \( J_i \) of length \( f(i) \) (see Figure 8). Let \( X \) be the resulting geodesic space and \( \text{div}(X,Y) = \{ \sigma^n_r \} \). We shall show that \( \text{div}(X,Y) \) is equivalent to \( f \).

We first prove that for all \( n \geq 3 \) and \( \rho \in (0, 1] \), \( f \) dominates \( \sigma^n_\rho \) by showing that \( \sigma^n_\rho (r) \leq f((n + 3)r) \) for each \( r > r_0 \). Let \( i_0 \) be a smallest integer that is greater or equal to \((n+2)r\). Let \( x \) and \( y \) be two points in the segment \( J_{i_0} \) such that \( d(x_{i_0-1}, x) = d(x_{i_0}, y) = r \). Both \( x \) and \( y \) belong to \( \partial N_r(Y) \). Moreover, the subpath \( \alpha \) of \( J_{i_0} \) connecting \( x \) and \( y \) lies outside the \( r \)-neighborhood of \( Y \) and the length of \( \alpha \) is exactly \( f(i_0) - 2r \). Therefore, \( d(x, y) = \min\{i_0 + 2r, f(i_0) - 2r\} \). Hence \( d(x, y) \geq nr \) as

\[
 f(i_0) - 2r \geq f((n + 2)r) - 2r \geq (n + 2)r - 2r = nr
\]

and

\[
 i_0 + 2r \geq (n + 4)r \geq nr.
\]

Since \( \alpha \) is the unique path outside the \( pr \)-neighborhood of \( Y \) connecting \( x \) and \( y \) we have

\[
 \sigma^n_\rho (r) \leq d_{pr}(x, y) = f(i_0) - 2r \leq f(i_0).
\]

Since \( i_0 \leq (n + 2)r + 1 \leq (n + 3)r \) and \( f \) is non-decreasing, \( f(i_0) \leq f((n + 3)r) \). Thus, \( \sigma^n_\rho (r) \leq f((n + 3)r) \) which implies that \( \sigma^n_\rho \) is dominated by \( f \).

Now we prove that for all \( n \geq 3 \) and \( \rho \in (0, 1] \), \( \sigma^n_\rho \) dominates \( f \) by showing that \( \sigma^n_\rho (r) \geq f(r) - 2r \) for each \( r > r_0 \). Let \( u \) and \( v \) be an arbitrary points in \( \partial N_r(Y) \) such that \( d(u, v) \geq nr \) and there is a path outside the \( r \)-neighborhood of \( Y \) connecting \( u \) and \( v \). Therefore, \( u \) and \( v \) must lies in some segment \( J_{i_1} \). We can assume that \( d(u, x_{i_1-1}) = d(v, x_{i_1}) = r \). Therefore,

\[
 i_1 \geq d(x_{i_1-1}, x_{i_1}) \geq d(u, v) - 2r \geq nr - 2r \geq r.
\]

This implies that \( f(i_1) \geq f(r) \) since \( f \) is non-decreasing. Since the subpath \( \beta \) of \( J_{i_1} \) connecting \( u \) and \( v \) is the unique path outside the \( pr \)-neighborhood of \( Y \) connecting these points we have

\[
 d_{pr}(u, v) = f(i_1) - 2r \geq f(r) - 2r.
\]

Therefore, \( \sigma^n_\rho (r) \geq f(r) - 2r \) which implies that \( \sigma^n_\rho \) dominates \( f \). Thus, the lower relative divergence \( \text{div}(X,Y) \) is equivalent to \( f \). \( \square \)
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