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Abstract

We determine when two almost automorphisms of a regular tree are conjugate. This is done by combining the classification of conjugacy classes in the automorphism group of a level-homogeneous tree by Gawron, Nekrashevych and Sushchansky and the solution of the conjugacy problem in Thompson’s V by Belk and Matucci. We also analyze dynamics of tree almost automorphisms.

1 Introduction

When are two elements of a group conjugate? Solving this question is a fundamental step in understanding a group. A classical framework in which this question is addressed is the following setup. Given a finite group presentation $G = \langle S \mid R \rangle$, is there an algorithm that decides for two words with letters in $S$ whether they are conjugate or not? The answer is known to be “yes” for Gromov hyperbolic groups, braid groups and others; but also many groups with unsolvable conjugacy problem are known.

In the current work we are looking at one of the most important examples in the theory of totally disconnected, locally compact groups, namely the almost automorphism group of a regular tree. We will give a precise definition of this group later. Roughly, its elements are equivalence classes of isomorphisms between subforests with finite complement. The almost automorphism group of a regular tree was originally defined by Neretin [12] who studied its unitary representations. What makes it special is that it is the first known example of a simple, locally compact group not containing any lattices [9] [2]. This result was recently strengthened by Zheng [14], who showed that it is the first locally compact and compactly generated, non-discrete group not admitting any non-trivial IRS.
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Let \( T_{d,k} \) be a quasi-regular tree such that all but one vertices have valency \( d + 1 \geq 3 \) and the remaining vertex has valency \( k \geq 1 \). Let \( \text{AAut}(T_{d,k}) \) be its almost automorphisms group. There are two subgroups which are of specific importance. The first is the automorphism group \( \text{Aut}(T_{d,k}) \) of \( T_{d,k} \), which is open in \( \text{AAut}(T_{d,k}) \). The second is the Higman–Thompson group \( V_{d,k} \), which is a countable dense subgroup \( \text{AAut}(T_{d,k}) \). For both of these groups, conjugacy classes have been fully described. We combine two different approaches. The first is the solution of conjugacy in \( \text{Aut}(T_{d,k}) \) via orbital types by Gawron, Nekrashevych and Sushchansky [7], the second is the solution of conjugacy in Thompson’s \( V \) via abstract strand diagrams by Belk and Matucci [3]. We make heavy use of the notions of revealing pairs and rollings by Brin [4] and Salazar-Diaz [13].

Closely related to conjugacy is dynamics. Namely, if \( G \) is a group acting on a topological space \( X \) and \( g, h \in G \) are conjugate via an element \( a \in G \) then the two dynamical systems \((X, g)\) and \((X, h)\) are topologically conjugate. In particular \( a \) maps \( g\)-attracting points to \( h\)-attracting points, \( g\)-wandering points to \( h\)-wandering points, and so on. Recall that a wandering point is a point having a neighbourhood \( U \) which is disjoint from \( g^n(U) \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). For \( G = \text{AAut}(T) \) and \( X = \partial T \) the set of wandering points \( \text{Wan}(g) \) of every element \( g \) is open and its closure is clopen and \( g\)-invariant. We can therefore write \( g \) as a product \( g = g_e g_h \), where \( g_h|_{\text{Wan}(g)} := g|_{\text{Wan}(g)} \) and \( g_h|_{\partial T \setminus \text{Wan}(g)} := \text{id} \). A crucial observation is that determining whether \( g \) and \( h \) are conjugate can be reduced to separately checking whether \( g_h \) and \( h_h \) respectively \( g_e \) and \( h_e \) are conjugate, see Proposition 3.9. This leaves us with two problems: Solving conjugacy for elements which do not have any wandering points, so-called elliptic elements, and elements which act trivially outside the closure of the wandering points, we call them hyperbolic. Le Boudec and Wesolek [11] previously divided tree almost automorphisms into elliptic elements and translations. What we call hyperbolic is a special case of their translations.

For a forest automorphism, we construct a labelled forest that we call orbital type since it is nothing else than the orbital type by Gawron, Nekrashevych and Sushchansky for a forest automorphism instead of a tree automorphism. Let \( F \) be a subforest of \( \text{AAut}(T_{d,k}) \) with finite complement. The orbital type of a forest automorphism \( \varphi \in \text{Aut}(F) \) is the quotient forest \( \langle \varphi \rangle \setminus F \), where each vertex in the quotient is labelled by the cardinality of its pre-image under the quotient map \( F \to \langle \varphi \rangle \setminus F \). Elliptic elements can be represented by forest automorphisms, see Lemma 4.1, and we show that two elliptic elements \( g \) and \( h \) are conjugate if and only if the orbital types of such representatives are the same after removing a finite subgraph, see Theorem 4.9.

For a hyperbolic element, we show that it is conjugate to a sufficiently close element in the Higman–Thompson group \( V_{d,k} \). What “sufficiently” means in this context leads us to the notion of revealing pairs by Brin [4]. Having reduced ourselves to \( V_{d,k} \) allows us to apply the results by Belk–Matucci. They associate a diagram, called reduced closed abstract strand diagram (reduced CASD), to a Higman–Thompson element and prove that conjugacy is completely determined.
by this diagram. A CASD consists of three objects: a finite directed graph $D$ of a
specific form, a cohomology class in $H^1(D, \mathbb{Z})$, and for every vertex a cyclic order
on the edges adjacent to it. We prove that if two Higman–Thompson elements
are close enough to one another, their reduced CASDs differ only in these cyclic
orders; and two hyperbolic elements in $\text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$ are conjugate if and only if
sufficiently close Higman–Thompson elements have diagrams differing only in
these cyclic orders, see Theorem 5.1. We also explain how to read the dynamics
of an element off its diagram. As an application we determine which hyperbolic
elements are conjugate to a translation in $\text{Aut}(T)$; and we show that an almost
automorphism has open conjugacy class if and only if the set of wandering points
is dense in $\partial T$.
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2 Preliminaries

2.1 Trees and their almost automorphisms
All graphs in the current work will be directed. In addition, all trees come with
a root, which enables us to talk about children, descendants and ancestors of
vertices. Unless explicitly mentioned otherwise, edges in a tree point away from
the root. This For a tree $T$ we denote its set of vertices by $\text{Vert}(T)$ and its
set of edges by $\text{Edge}(T)$. Most of the time we will talk about the $(d, k)$-quasi
regular rooted tree $T_{d,k}$, whose root has $k$ children and all other vertices have $d$
children. We write $T_d := T_{d,d}$.

A caret in a tree $T$ is a finite subtree consisting of a vertex, the edges
connecting it to its children and the children, see Figure 1.

```
  / \      
 /   \     
/     \     
```

Figure 1: The thick lines indicate a caret.

A subtree of $T$ will be called complete if it is a union of carets. Unless
we explicitly state otherwise we will assume that complete subtrees contain
the root. When we form differences of complete trees, we always mean caret
subtraction. This means that for subtrees $T'$ and $T$ of a tree $T$ the difference
$T' \setminus T$ consists of all carets of $T'$ which are not in $T$. In particular, if $T$ is a
finite complete subtree of $T$, then $T \cap (\partial T \setminus T) =: \mathcal{L} T$ is the set of leaves of $T$. The maximal subtrees of $T^\prime \setminus T$ we call components.

Let $T$ be an infinite tree. The boundary of $T$, denoted $\partial T$, is as usual defined as the set of all infinite directed paths starting at $x$. Let $T$ be an infinite tree and $x$ a vertex of $T$. We denote by $T_x$ the subtree of $T$ the vertices of which are all descendants of $x$. Its boundary $\partial T_x$ can be seen as a subset of $\partial T$ in an obvious way, and all subsets of $\partial T$ of the form $\partial T_y$ are a basis of the topology of $\partial T$. We call such a basic open set a ball as a reference to the balls in the usual metric on $\partial T$.

We denote the automorphism group of a tree $T$ by $\text{Aut}(T)$, and for a finite subtree $T$ of $T$ we write $\text{Fix}(T)$ for the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(T)$ which fixes $T$ pointwise.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $T$ be an infinite tree without leaves and without isolated points in the boundary. An almost automorphism of $T$ is the equivalence class of a forest isomorphisms $\varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2$, where $T_1$ and $T_2$ are complete finite subtrees of $T$, and the equivalence relation is given by identifying two forest isomorphisms that agree outside of a finite set.

![Figure 2: A representative of a tree almost automorphism.](image)

We refer to [10] for a more detailed introduction to almost automorphisms. The product of two almost automorphisms is formed by composing two representatives which can be composed as forest isomorphisms. Such representatives can always be found since for every almost automorphism $g$ and every large enough finite complete subtree $T$ there exist finite complete subtrees $T'$ and $T''$ and representatives $\varphi': T \setminus T' \to T \setminus T''$ and $\varphi'': T \setminus T'' \to T \setminus T'$ for $g$. The set of all almost automorphisms then is a group denoted $\text{AAut}(T)$. Every tree automorphism has an obvious interpretation as tree almost automorphism and it is not hard to see that with this interpretation $\text{Aut}(T) \leq \text{AAut}(T)$.

This inclusion is used to define a group topology on $\text{AAut}(T)$; we simple take $\{\text{Fix}(T) \mid T \subset T$ finite subtree$\}$ as basis of identity neighbourhoods. Clearly $\text{Aut}(T)$ is an open subgroup of $\text{AAut}(T)$.

**Remark 2.2.** Let $T$ and $T'$ be trees such that there exist finite complete subtrees $T \subset T$ and $T' \subset T'$ and a forest isomorphism $\theta: T \setminus T \to T' \setminus T'$. Then $\theta$ induces an isomorphism $\text{AAut}(T) \to \text{AAut}(T')$.

We now turn our attention to a special subgroup of $\text{AAut}(T)$. A plane order of $T$ is a collection of total orders $\{<_x \mid x \in \text{Vert}(T)\}$, where $<_x$ is a total order.
on the children of $x$. An almost automorphism is called locally order-preserving if it has a representative $\varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2$ which maps the children of $x$ order-preservingly to the children of $\varphi(x)$ for every vertex $x$ of $T \setminus T_1$. This representative is then called plane order preserving.

**Definition 2.3.** The Higman-Thompson group $V_{d,k}$ is the subgroup of $\text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$ consisting of all locally order-preserving almost automorphisms.

It is not difficult to see that $V_{d,k}$ is dense in $\text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$. For more information about Higman-Thompson groups, which are interesting far beyond being dense in $\text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$, consult [8], [5] or [6].

**Translating boundary balls.** Let $T = T_{d,k}$. The group $\text{AAut}(T)$ acts on $\partial T$ in an obvious way. Recall that a boundary ball is a subset of the form $\partial T_x \subset \partial T$. Every boundary ball is the disjoint union of $d$ smaller boundary balls, replacing $x$ by its children. By induction it is also by the union of $m$ balls, for any $m \equiv 1 \pmod{d - 1}$.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let $T = T_{d,k}$. Then:

1. Let $U \subset \partial T$ be a proper clopen subset. Let $U = B_1 \cup \cdots \cup B_n = C_1 \cup \cdots \cup C_m$ be two partitions of $U$ into boundary balls. Then $n \equiv m \pmod{d - 1}$.

2. Let $U_1, U_2 \subset \partial T$ be proper clopen subsets which can be partitioned into $n, m$ boundary balls respectively. Let $W$ be a proper clopen subset of $\partial T \setminus (U_1 \cup U_2)$. Then, there exists $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ fixing $W$ with $gU = W$ if and only if $n \equiv m \pmod{d - 1}$.

**Proof.** For the first statement, it is enough to prove if $C_1, \ldots, C_m$ is a refinement of the partition $B_1, \ldots, B_n$, since any two partitions into ball have a common refinement. Now it suffices to prove it in the case $n = 1$. Let $x$ be the vertex with $B_1 = \partial T_x \ x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be the vertices with $C_i = \partial T_{x_i}$. Observe that $m$ is the number of leaves of the complete finite subtree with root $x$ and leaves $x_1, \ldots, m$. But such a subtree only exists if $m \equiv 1 \pmod{d - 1}$.

For the second statement, we first prove the "only if"-direction. Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ with $gU = W$. We can partition $U$ into balls small enough that their image under $g$ is still a ball. This proves a stronger statement, namely $U$ and $W$ have to be able to be partitioned into the same number of balls.

For the "if"-direction, first form two partitions $P_1$ and $P_2$ of $\partial T$ into balls all contained in $U$, $W$ or $\partial T \setminus (U_1 \cup W)$ such that each $P_i$ partitions $U_i$ with $n_i$ many balls. Now observe that if $n_2 \geq n_1$, we can refine the partition of $U_1$ such that it has the same number of balls as the partition of $U_2$, same with $\partial T \setminus (U_1 \cap W)$. The refinements of $P_1$ and $P_2$ have the same number of balls outside of $W$ and we are done.

\qed
2.2 Tree pairs

Historically tree pairs were considered before tree almost automorphisms. Here the point of tree pairs is to consider the finite subtrees that were cut out in order to form an almost automorphism instead of considering its complement.

**Definition 2.5.** A tree pair consists of two finite complete subtrees $T_1$ and $T_2$ of $\mathcal{T}$ together with a bijection $\kappa: \mathcal{L}T_1 \to \mathcal{L}T_2$ between the leaves. We denote it by $[\kappa, T_1, T_2]$.

**Remark 2.6.** Let $T_1$ and $T_2$ be two complete finite subtrees of $\mathcal{T}$. There are three different kinds of leaves of $T_1$, namely

1. leaves of $T_1$ which are also leaves of $T_2$, these are called neutral leaves.
2. leaves of $T_1$ which are interior vertices of $T_2$. They are roots of components of $T_2 \setminus T_1$; and
3. leaves of $T_1$ which do not belong to $T_2$ at all. They are leaves of components of $T_1 \setminus T_2$.

An analogous statement holds for leaves of $T_2$.

We will often consider $\kappa$-orbits in the leaves of $T_1$ and $T_2$.

**Definition 2.7.** Let $P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2]$ be a tree pair. Let $x_0, \ldots, x_n \in \mathcal{L}T_1 \cup \mathcal{L}T_2$. We call $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ a maximal chain of $P$ if it is an orbit under the partial action of $\kappa$. In other words $x_i = \kappa(x_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and either

1. $x_0 \notin \mathcal{L}T_2$ and $x_n \notin \mathcal{L}T_1$; or
2. $\kappa(x_n) = x_0$.

We call the maximal chain

1. an attractor chain, and $x_n$ an attractor of period $n$, if $x_0$ is an ancestor of $x_n$;
2. a repeller chain, and $x_0$ a repeller of period $n$, if $x_n$ is an ancestor of $x_0$;
3. a periodic chain and each of $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ a periodic leaf if $x_0 = \kappa(x_n)$; and
4. a wandering chain, and $x_0$ a source and $x_n$ its corresponding sink, if $x_0 \notin T_2$ and $x_n \notin T_1$.

In Definition 2.7 we did not give a name to maximal chains which start at a root of a component and end in a vertex which is not their descendant or vice versa. This is because we prefer to consider tree pairs which do not have these kinds of maximal chains.

**Definition 2.8.** Let $P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2]$ be a tree pair. It is called a revealing pair if
1. every component of \( T_1 \setminus T_2 \) contains a (unique) repeller; and
2. every component of \( T_2 \setminus T_1 \) contains a (unique) attractor.

**Remark 2.9.** It is not hard to see that a tree pair is a revealing pair if it has only attractor, repeller, periodic and wandering chains. In particular, all leaves of \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) fall into exactly one of the four classes

1. forward orbit of a repeller
2. backward orbit of an attractor
3. forward orbit of a source
4. periodic leaf.

Clearly every tree almost automorphism defines many tree pairs.

**Definition 2.10.** Let \( g \in \text{AAut}(T) \). Let \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be complete finite subtrees of \( T \) such that there exists a forest isomorphism \( \varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2 \) representing \( g \). Then we denote the restriction of \( \varphi \) to the leaves of \( T_1 \) by \( g := \varphi|_{LT_1}: LT_1 \to LT_2 \), and the tree pair \([g, T_1, T_2]\) we call a *tree pair associated to* \( g \).

It is an easy exercise to show that \([g, T_1, T_2]\) depends, as the notation suggests, really only on \( g \) and the trees \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \), but not on \( \varphi \).

We can also define almost automorphisms from tree pairs. Since there is more choice involved, we will take the Higman–Thompson element.

**Definition 2.11.** Let \( P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2] \) be a tree pair. The almost automorphism induced by \( P \) is the Higman–Thompson element represented by the unique plane order preserving forest isomorphism \( \varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2 \) such that \( \varphi|_{LT_1} = \kappa \).

Let \( g \in \text{AAut}(T) \) and \( \varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2 \) a forest isomorphism representing \( g \). Let \( x \in LT_1 \) and let \( T \) be a complete finite subtree rooted at \( x \). It is obvious how to enlarge \( T_1 \) with \( T \) to get a tree pair for \( g \), namely simply take the tree pair \([g, T_1 \cup T, T_2 \cup \varphi(T)]\), where \( g \) is the restriction of \( \varphi \) to the leaves of \( T_1 \cup T \).

Now if we consider a maximal chain \((x_0, \ldots, x_n)\), it can be useful to enlarge the tree pair in such a way that a pre-determined tree is attached to \( x_0 \), but no components are added under \( x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1} \in LT_1 \cap LT_2 \). This leads us to the following notion introduced by Salazar-Diaz [13], Definition 22.

**Definition 2.12.** Let \( g \in \text{AAut}(T) \), let \( \varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2 \) be a representative of \( g \) and let \( P := [g, T_1, T_2] \) be a tree pair for \( g \). Let \((x_0, \ldots, x_n)\) be a maximal chain of \( P \).

The **forward** \( g \)-rolling of \( P \) with a complete finite subtree \( T \) rooted at \( x_0 \) along \((x_0, \ldots, x_n)\) is the tree pair \([g, T_1 \cup T \cup \varphi(T) \cup \cdots \cup \varphi^{n-1}(T), T_2 \cup T \cup \varphi(T) \cup \cdots \cup \varphi^{n}(T)]\).

The **backward** \( g \)-rolling of \( P \) with a complete finite subtree \( T \) rooted at \( x_n \) along \((x_0, \ldots, x_n)\) is the tree pair \([g, T_1 \cup \varphi^{-1}(T) \cup \cdots \cup \varphi^{-n}(T), T_2 \cup T \cup \varphi^{-1}(T) \cup \cdots \cup \varphi^{-(n-1)}(T)]\).
An example of a forward rolling is given in Figure 3. By convention, if we do not specify the direction of the rolling, we mean a forward rolling except in the case of an attracting chain.

Rollings are useful tools to produce revealing pairs. For example, using the correct trees, one can produce new revealing pairs from old ones.

**Definition 2.13.** Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ and $P = [g, T_1, T_2]$ a revealing pair for $g$. Let $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ be a maximal chain. A cancelling tree for $g$ at $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ is a tree $T$ such that the $g$-rolling of $P$ along $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ with $T$ is again a revealing pair.

The existence of cancelling trees was proven by Salazar-Diaz (see Definition 20 and Claim 7 in [13]). For a wandering chain, any tree is a cancelling tree. For a repelling chain, an example of a cancelling tree is the component of the repeller, for an attracting chain, the component of the attractor. For a periodic chain, an example is a caret.

We now show how to use rollings to produce revealing pairs from arbitrary tree pairs. The existence of revealing pairs was proved by Brin in [4], Argument 10.7. However, Brin’s proof is non-constructive. As our algorithm to classify conjugacy in $\text{AAut}(T)$ requires revealing pairs for elements of $\text{AAut}(T)$, we include here a new proof, which is constructive.

**Lemma 2.14 (Constructing a revealing pair).** Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ and let $[g, T_1, T_2]$ be a tree pair for $g$. Then there exist finite complete subtrees $T_1^+$ and $T_2^+$ of $T$ with $T_i^+ \supset T_i$, such that $[g, T_1^+, T_2^+]$ is a revealing pair for $g$.

**Proof.** For a tree pair $R = [g, S_1, S_2]$ representing $g$ we call a component of $S_1 \setminus S_2$ a fake repelling component of $R$ if it does not contain a repeller, and a component of $S_2 \setminus S_1$ will be called a fake attracting component if it does not contain an attractor. Clearly we have a revealing pair if and only if there are
no fake components. The idea of the proof is simply to do rollings with fake components until no fake components are left.

**Claim 1:** Let $A$ be a fake repelling component. Let $x_0$ be the root of $A$ and $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ its maximal chain. Let $Q$ be the forward $g$-rolling of $A$ along $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$. Then, either $Q$ has strictly less fake repelling components than $P$, or the total number of carets involved in fake repelling components of $Q$ is strictly less than in $P$. The analog statement holds with fake attracting components.

**Claim 2:** Assume that $T_2 \setminus T_1$ does not have any fake attracting components. Let $B$ be a fake attracting component of $T_1 \setminus T_2$. Let $x_n$ be the root of $B$ and $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$ its maximal chain. Let $Q$ be the backward $g$-rolling of $B$ along $(x_0, \ldots, x_n)$. Then $Q$ does not have any fake repelling components.

The lemma clearly follows from these two claims. We do rollings with fake repelling components until none are left, by Claim 1 this is a finite process. Then we do rollings with fake attracting components until none are left. By Claim 2 we will not create any new fake repelling components, and by Claim 1 it is again a finite process.

**Proof of Claim 1:** It suffices to prove the statement for repelling components since the case of attracting components works completely analogously. Let $Q := [g, T_1', T_2']$, and let $\varphi: T' \setminus T_1 \rightarrow T' \setminus T_2$ denote a representative of $g$. All components of $T_2 \setminus T_1$ except $A$ remain untouched by the rolling. The component $A$ is no longer a component after the rolling as $A$ appears in $T_2'$ as well. The glued copies of $A$ rooted in the neutral leaves $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}$ were added in both $T_1$ and $T_2$ and so they have no contribution to the set of components of $T_2' \setminus T_1'$. It remains to look at the tree $\varphi^n(A)$ glued at $x_n$. Because the chain is maximal the vertex $x_n$ is not a leaf of $T_1$. Hence, $x_n$ either does not belong to $T_1$ at all or it is an inner vertex of $T_1$. In the first case $\varphi^n(A)$ was glued to a component of $T_2 \setminus T_1$ not equal to $A$, and it has no influence on whether it was a redundant component or not, since it was not glued to a vertex in the forward orbit of the root of that component. Hence, the number of redundant components strictly decreased. In the second case, since $x_n$ is an inner vertex of $T_1$, possible new components in $T_2' \setminus T_1'$ have in total less carets than $A$.

**Proof of Claim 2:** It is only possible that the $g$-rolling produces fake repelling components if $x_0$ is an inner leaf of $T_2$. But this means that $x_0$ is a root of a component of $T_2 \setminus T_1$, and by construction this component has to be a fake repelling component since $x_0$ can not be in the backward orbit of an attractor.

2.3 Strand diagrams

Belk and Matucci used strand diagrams to solve conjugacy in Thompson’s $V$. We follow their approach here and refer to their paper [3] for more information and background. Like them we use the slightly unusual notion of a ”topological graph”: We allow connected components that do not have any vertices at all and call them ”free loops”.

\[9\]
Definition 2.15. Let $D$ be a directed graph. A split in $D$ is a vertex with exactly one incoming and at least two outgoing edges. A merge in $D$ is a vertex with exactly one outgoing and at least two incoming edges.

Definition 2.16. A closed abstract strand diagram (CASD) of degree $d$ consists of the following:

- a finite directed graph $D$ such that every vertex is a split with $d$ outgoing or a merge with $d$ incoming vertices.
- a map $r$, called rotation system, defined on the set of vertices of $D$ that gives a total order on the outgoing edges of every split and the incoming edges of every sink.
- a cohomology class, called cutting class, $c \in H^1(D, \mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 2.17. Recall the classical fact that there is a natural bijection between $H^1(D, \mathbb{Z})$ and homotopy classes of continuous maps of a geometric realization of $D$ to $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. The reason is that the punctured plane is an Eilenberg–MacLane space of type $K(\mathbb{Z}, 1)$. This allows us to do drawings of CASDs that have all the information about rotation systems and cutting classes.

Let $(D, r, c)$ be a CASD and $D'$ a directed graph isomorphic to $D$. A graph isomorphism $F: D \to D'$ clearly induces a rotation system $r_F$ and a cutting class $c_F$ on $D'$.

Definition 2.18. Let $(D, r, c)$ and $(D', r', c')$ be two CASDs. An isomorphism between them is a graph isomorphism $F: D \to D'$ such that $r' = r_F$ and $c' = c_F$.

Belk and Matucci defined several operations on CASDs, called Type I, Type II and Type III reductions. The reductions induce an equivalence relation on diagrams, namely: two diagrams are equivalent if they can be reduced to the same diagrams. In the present work we will not need the third kind, but we introduce it for completeness. Also, we introduce a more general version of Type I reductions that we call Type $I^*$.

Definition 2.19. Let $(D, r, c)$ be a CASD and let $\gamma$ be a representative for $c$. A Type $I^*$ reduction is the following operation on a CASD. Assume there are edges $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ such that $o(e_1) = \cdots = o(e_d) =: s$ is a split and $t(e_1) = \cdots = t(e_d) =: m$ is a merge. Assume further that for one and hence all representatives $c$ of the cohomology class we have $\gamma(e_i) = \gamma(e_j)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq d$. Then we delete the edges $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ and obtain a new edge $e$ by melting together the incoming edge $e_s$ of $s$ and the outgoing edge $e_m$ of $m$. The rotation system of the new diagram is obvious, $e$ simply takes the place of $e_m$ and $e_s$ if they were part of a total order. The new cutting class is obtained by setting $\gamma(e) := \gamma(e_s) + \gamma(e_m) + \gamma(e_1)$ and leaving $\gamma$ unchanged in the rest of the diagram.

A Type $I$ reduction is a Type $I^*$ reduction in the case where the order of the outgoing edges from the split is the same as the order they have when coming in to the merge. That is $r(s) = r(m): \{e_1, \ldots, e_d\} \to \{1, \ldots, d\}$.
A Type II reduction is the following operation on a CASD. Let \( e \) be an edge in \( D \) such that \( o(e) \) is a split \( s \) and \( t(e) \) is a merge \( m \). First we erase \( e \) including its endpoints from the diagram. Then for \( i = 1, \ldots, d \) we create a new edge \( e^i \) by melting together the \( i \)th incoming edge \( e^i_s \) of \( s \) with the \( i \)th outgoing edge \( e^i_m \) of \( m \). The new rotation system is obvious: The new edge \( e^i \) simply takes the place of \( e^i_s \) or \( e^i_m \) in a potential total order they might have been part of. The cutting class is given by assigning to the new edges the value \( \gamma(e^i) := \gamma(e) + \gamma(e^i_s) + \gamma(e^i_m) \) and leaving \( \gamma \) unchanged on the rest of the diagram.

A Type III reduction is the following operation on a CASD. If there are \( d \) free loops \( e_1, \ldots, e_d \) such that \( \gamma(e_1) = \cdots = \gamma(e_d) \), then we erase \( e_2, \ldots, e_d \) and restrict \( \gamma \) in the obvious way. Since there are no splits or merges involved in this operation, there is nothing to say about the rotation system.

The different reduction Types are illustrated in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: Reductions of Types I, I*, II and III for \( d = 3 \), and of Type III for \( d = 2 \).](image)

We now introduce three different notions of reduced CASDs.

**Definition 2.20.** A CASD is called **II-reduced** if no Type II reduction can be done on it, i.e. if there is no edge \( e \) that is the outgoing edge of a merge and the incoming edge of a split.

A CASD is called **reduced** if no Type I, Type II or Type III reduction can be done on it.

A CASD is called ***-reduced** if no Type I*, Type II or Type III reduction can be done on it.

Regarding the structure of reduced CASDs Belk and Matucci showed the following.

**Proposition 2.21 ([3], Proposition 4.1).** Let \( (D,c,r) \) be a reduced CASD. Let \( L \) be a directed loop in \( D \). Then \( c(L) > 0 \) and \( L \) satisfies one of the following.
1. Every vertex in $L$ is a split.

2. Every vertex in $L$ is a merge.

3. $L$ is a free loop, i.e., it contains no vertices.

Moreover, all directed loops in $D$ are disjoint.

The reason why we do not bother about Type III reductions is that they only deal with free loops. Free loops represent periodic behaviour, and the periodic behaviour in the group $\text{AAut}(T)$ is much more complicated than the one in $V$, and so these reductions do not help to analyze the $\text{AAut}(T)$ case.

Belk and Matucci showed that the reduction process, using reductions of Types I, II and III is well-defined, in the sense that the reduced form of a diagram does not depend on the order of reductions (Proposition 2.3 in [3]). It is interesting to note the following.

**Lemma 2.22.** Let $D$ be a II-reduced CASD. Suppose we perform a Type I$^*$ reduction on $D$. Then the resulting diagram is still II reduced.

It follows that for a general CASD, the following process results in a (I$^*$-)reduced diagram. First perform Type II reductions on the diagram until it is II-reduced, then perform on it I$^*$ reductions until it is not possible anymore to do a Type I$^*$ reduction, and lastly perform Type III reductions until none are possible anymore.

**Proof.** Let $s$ be the split and $m$ the merge that vanished in the Type I$^*$ reduction. Let $e_s$ be the edge ending at $s$ and $e_m$ be the edge starting at $m$, and denote by $a = o(e_s)$ and $b = t(e_m)$. Note that $a$ is a split and $b$ a merge because $D$ is II-reduced. This means that the new edge connecting $a$ to $b$ that we have after the Type I$^*$ reduction can not be Type II reduced. But since the rest of the diagram is unchanged, this implies the first claim.

The second part of the lemma follows directly from the first. □

The next few paragraphs deal with the question when an isomorphism between CASDs survives a Type II reduction. This will play a crucial role in the proof of Lemma 5.7.

**Definition 2.23.** Let $(D, c, r)$ a CASD. A sub-diagram of $D$ is called an hourglass if it consists of the following:

- $T_1$ is a complete tree all of whose inner vertices are merges. In particular, all of its maximal directed paths end in a vertex $r_1$.

- $T_2$ is a complete tree which is the mirrored copy of $T_1$ in the sense that the directions of all edges are reversed, but the rotation system is unchanged. In particular, all inner vertices of $T_2$ are splits, and all maximal directed paths start in a vertex $r_2$.

- A directed edge going from $r_1$ to $r_2$.
Two vertices $x_1 \in T_1, x_2 \in T_2$ in an hourglass are called *correlated*, if $x_2$ is the image of $x_1$ under the direction-reversing identification of $T_1$ with $T_2$. Note that in particular it follows that $x_1$ is merge and $x_2$ is a split.

The simplest example of an hourglass is a merge which is followed by a split, which is exactly the situation when we can perform a Type II reduction. The point of an hourglass is that we can make it vanish by repeatedly executing Type II reductions.

**Definition 2.24.** Let $H$ be an hourglass in a CASD with merge tree $T_1$ and split tree $T_2$. A *Type II reduction of $H$* is the following operation. First, delete the interior of $H$. Then connect every leaf of $T_1$ to its correlated leaf of $T_2$. Equivalently, perform repeatedly Type II reduction on all edges in $H$, until all its interior is gone.

![Type II reduction of an hourglass](image)

**Figure 5:** Type II reduction of an hourglass.

**Definition 2.25.** Two CASDs $(D, c, r)$ and $(D', c', r')$ are said to be *isomorphic up to rotation* if there exists a graph isomorphism $F : D \rightarrow D'$ such that $c' = c_F$.

Being isomorphic up to rotation is not preserved under Type II reductions in general. The problem is that if a Type II reduction melts together two edges $e, f$ in $D$, there is no reason why $F(e)$ and $F(f)$ would be melted together as well.
It is too strong to ask that $F$ does not do anything to the rotation system at the different endpoints of an edge connecting a merge to a split; it suffices to require that $F$ messes up both total orders by the same permutation.

**Definition 2.26.** Let $(D, c, r)$ and $(D', c', r')$ be two CASDs and let $F: D \rightarrow D'$ be a graph isomorphism. Let $H \subset D$ be an hourglass. Then we say that $F$ respects $H$ if for all correlated inner vertices $x, y$ of $H$ there exists a $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(d)$ such that $r_F(x) = r(x) \circ \sigma$ and $r_F(y) = r(y) \circ \sigma$.

Note that if $F$ respects $H$ then $F(H)$ is an hourglass in $D'$ and $x, y$ are correlated vertices if and only if $F(x)$ and $F(y)$ are.

**Lemma 2.27.** Let $(D, c, r)$ and $(D', c', r')$ be two CASDs which are isomorphic up to rotation via $F: D \rightarrow D'$. Let $H$ be an hourglass in $D$ and assume that $F$ respects $H$. Then, after performing the Type II reduction of $H$ and $F(H)$, the diagrams are still isomorphic up to rotation via an isomorphism induced by $F$.

Figure 6 illustrates an isomorphism up to rotation which does not respect hourglasses. As a consequence, the reduced diagrams are not isomorphic up to rotation. Indeed, they admit different number of connected components.

**Proof of Lemma 2.27.** Suppose first that a Type II reduction is done on an edge $e = (m, s)$. Respecting the rotation system at $(m, s)$ means that after the Type II reduction, if edges $e_{m}^{i}$ (ending at $m$) and $e_{s}^{i}$ (starting at $s$) melted to one edge,
then also $F(e_m'_{\lambda})$ and $F(e_s')$ melted to one edge. This shows the first statement. We abuse notation and denote by $F$ also the new isomorphism.

For the "consequently" statement we use induction. Let $e = (m, s)$ be any edge subjected to a Type II reduction in $D$, and let $D_e$ denote the diagram $D$ after performing the Type II reduction at $e$. Let $e' = F(e)$ be the corresponding edge in $D'$ and let $D'_e$ denote $D'$ after performing a Type II reduction at $e'$. The sub-diagram contains only $m, s$ and the edge $e$ between them is itself an hourglass, and so $F$ respects the rotation system at $(m, s)$ by assumption. It follows from the first part of the Lemma that $D_e$ and $D'_e$ are still isomorphic up to rotation. Furthermore, the preimage of every correlated pair in $D_e$ is a correlated pair in $D$. It follows that for every correlated pair $(\overline{\varpi}, \overline{\varphi})$ in $D_e$, $F$ respects the rotation system at their preimages $(x, y)$ in $D$. Since the rotation system is kept when doing the Type II reduction, $F$ also respects the rotation system at $(\overline{\varpi}, \overline{\varphi})$ in $D_e$. Finally, we get that $D_e$ and $D'_e$ still satisfy the conditions of the Lemma, and so by induction one can keep going until the diagrams are Type II reduced.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 2.28.** Let $(D, c, r)$ and $(D', c', r')$ be two CASDs which are isomorphic up to rotation via a graph isomorphism $F : D \to D'$, and suppose $F$ respects all hourglasses in $D$. Assume that after performing the Type II reductions of all these hourglasses the diagrams are II-reduced. Then the *-reductions of $D$ and $D'$ are isomorphic up to rotations.

**Proof.** Let $\hat{D}, \hat{D}'$ denote the Type II reductions of $D, D'$ respectively. By Lemma 2.27, $\hat{D}$ and $\hat{D}'$ are isomorphic up to rotation. Type I* reductions do not depend on the rotation system, and do not affect it. It follows that the isomorphism between $\hat{D}$ and $\hat{D}'$ descents to an isomorphism between their *-reductions, preserving the cutting classes.

\[ \square \]

### 2.3.1 From tree pairs to strand diagrams and back

Every tree pair gives rise to a closed abstract strand diagram.

**Definition 2.29.** Let $P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2]$ be a tree pair. The basic closed abstract strand diagram for $P$ is the diagram constructed as follows:

1. Draw a copy of $T_1$ and direct all edges to point away from the root $r_1$. Keep the order of the outgoing edges in every vertex.
2. Draw a copy of $T_2$ and direct all edges to point toward the root $r_2$. Keep the order of the incoming edges in every vertex.
3. Identify each leaf $x$ of $T_1$ with the leaf $\kappa(x)$ of $T_2$. In particular, the edge ending at $x$ and the one starting at $\kappa(x)$ become a single edge.
4. Put an edge $e$ with $o(e) = r_2$ and $t(e) = r_1$. 
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5. Define a cutting class $[\gamma]$ of the diagram constructed so far by $\gamma(e) := 1$ and $\gamma(e') = 0$ for all other edges.

6. Note that $e$ together with the two copies of $T_1 \cap T_2$ form an hourglass; do a Type II - reduction on it.

![Diagram of a revealing pair and its basic CASD]

Figure 7: The basic CASD for a tree pair.

An example for a tree pair and its basic CASD is shown in Figure 7. Basic CASDs behave nicely with respect to revealing pairs.

**Lemma 2.30.** A basic CASD of a revealing pair is II-reduced.

**Proof.** Let $D$ be the basic CASD of the revealing pair $P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2]$. Let $m$ be a merge in $D$ and $e$ its outgoing edge. Since $m$ is a merge and $P$ is a revealing pair $m$ has to be the root of an attracting component $A$ in $T_2$. Its correlated vertex in $T_1$ is clearly also $m$. But $m \in T_1$ was connected to $\kappa(m) \in T_2$, the correlated vertex of which was $\kappa(m) \in T_1$, and so on. It follows that $e$ is an incoming edge of a merge in $A$, so no Type II reduction can be done on it. □

Belk and Matucci introduced CASDs in order to classify conjugacy classes in Thompson’s group $V = V_{2,2}$. They proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.31** ([3], Proposition 2.3, Theorem 2.15). Let $v, w \in V$. Let $P = [\overline{v}, T_1, T_2]$ and $Q = [\overline{w}, T_3, T_4]$ be tree pairs for $v$ and $w$ and form their basic CASDs. Perform Type I, II and III reductions on them until they are reduced. Let $(D, r, c)$ and $(D', r', c')$ be the reduced diagrams.

1. The reduced CASDs $(D, r, c)$ and $(D', r', c')$ depend only on $v$ and $w$, but not on $P$ and $Q$ or the order of reductions.
2. The elements $v$ and $w$ are conjugate in $V$ if and only if $(D, r, c)$ and $(D', r', c')$ are isomorphic.

The reason why Type I* is problematic in $V$ is explained in the following figure.

![Figure 8: The bottom image corresponds to an element of order 2 in $V$, the right one to the identity.](image)

There is nothing special about $V_{2,2}$, the proofs work for all $V_{d,k}$.

Going the other direction, we now identify which CASDs come from tree pairs.

**Definition 2.32.** Let $D$ be a CASD of degree $d$. A cutting class of $D$ is $k$-admissible if it has a representative which takes only non-negative values, gives a positive value to every directed cycle, and the sum of the values of all edges is of the form $k + l(d - 1)$ for an integer $l \geq 0$. Such a representative will be called admissible.

Note that the cutting class of the CASD constructed in Definition 2.29 is $k$-admissible, and that $k$-admissibility is preserved under reductions. To construct a tree pair out of a reduced CASD with admissible cutting class, we have to modify the admissible representative to a specific form.

**Lemma 2.33.** Let $c$ be a $k$-admissible cutting class on a reduced CASD. Then, $c$ has an admissible representative which non-zero only on exactly one edge of each split loop, exactly one edge of each merge loop and edges connecting splits with merges.

**Proof.** Observe that the following elements define trivial cohomology classes. First, let $e$ followed by $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ be a split. Then, a function which maps $e$ to $a$ and $e_1, \ldots, e_d$ to $-a$ and is zero everywhere else is a coboundary, because clearly
it evaluates zero along every directed loop. Moreover the sum of its value on all edges is $a - da$, in particular it is divisible by $d - 1$. The analog statement holds for merges.

![Figure 9: Part of a representative of the trivial cohomology class.](image)

Let $\gamma$ be an admissible representative of $c$. Note that all split and merge loops are disjoint from one another. Using the above observation, we can first modify $\gamma$ such that for every split and merge loop there is just one edge with non-zero value. It is illustrated in Figure 10. Clearly, this modifications do not destroy admissibility.

![Figure 10: Modifying the cohomology class representative between splits and merges.](image)

Then we can modify it further such that, outside of the split and merge loops, the incoming edge for every split and the outgoing edge for every merge have value 0, as illustrated in Figure 11.

![Figure 11: Modifying the cohomology class representative along a loop.](image)
We are left with modifying $\gamma$ such that the total sum of all values on all edges is at least $d - 1$. Note that this is already the case if the CASD has only free loops since the value of $\gamma$ is then completely determined by $c$. Hence we can assume that the diagram has at least one merge loop $M$. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ be the edges between going from a split to a merge such that the unique maximal path starting at $f_i$ eventually lies in $M$. This path is unique because it only consists of merges. Note that adding the same value to $\gamma(f_1), \ldots, \gamma(f_m)$ does not change the cohomology class, since every undirected loop containing one $f_i$ has to pass by an even number of them.

Now we are done.

Proposition 2.34. Let $(D, r, c)$ be a reduced CASD with admissible cutting class. Then, there exists a revealing pair $P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2]$ such that $(D, r, c)$ is the basic CASD for $P$.

Moreover, $P$ can be chosen such that every merge loop of $D$ with $a$ merges and cutting class value $\mu$ corresponds to an attracting point in $P$ with attracting length $a$ and period $\mu$. Similarly every split loop of $D$ with $r$ splits and cutting class value $\nu$ corresponds to a repelling point in $P$ with repelling length $r$ and period $\nu$. Every free loop of $D$ with cutting class $\omega$ corresponds to a periodic maximal chain in $P$ of length $\omega$.

Proof. Fix a representative $\gamma$ of the cutting class as in Lemma 2.33.

Cut every edge $e$ exactly $\gamma(e)$-many times. Denote the cut points in $D$ by $p_1, \ldots, p_n$. Note that $n = k + n'(d - 1)$ for some $n' \geq 0$ because $k \leq d - 1$. For a cut point $p$ let $p^-$ and $p^+$ denote the copies of $p$ in the new diagram, such that $p^-$ is always the origin and $p^+$ the terminus of an edge. We denote this new diagram by $D'$.
Let $T \subset \mathcal{T}$ be a finite complete tree with $n$ leaves. Note that such a tree exists because of the possible values $n$ can attain. Denote the leaves of $T$ by $p_1, \ldots, p_n$.

Let $T^-$ be a copy of $T$ in which all edges are directed away from the root. Similarly let $T^+$ be a copy of $T$ in which all edges are directed towards the root.

Glue $D'$ to $T^-$ and $T^+$ by identifying each $p_i^-$ with the $p_i$ in $T^-$ and each $p_i^+$ with the $p_i$ in $T^+$. In particular, for each gluing point $q$, the edge ending at $q$ and the edge starting from $q$ are merged to the same edge. We obtain a connected directed graph $G$. 
Observe that every maximal directed path in $G$ starts at the root of $T^-$ and ends in the root of $T^-$, and there is precisely one edge on it that lies between a split and a merge. Cut every edge of $G$ connecting a split to a merge, let $q_1, \ldots, q_m$ be the cutting points.

Now we have two connected components $T_1$ and $T_2$ with the property that all inner vertices of $T_1$ except the root of $T^- \subset T$ are splits and all inner vertices of $T_2$ except the root of $T^+ \subset T$ are merges. Every cut point $q_i$ is split to a leaf $q^-_i$ of $T_1$ and a leaf $q^+_i$ of $T_2$. 
Define $\kappa : \mathcal{L}T_1 \to \mathcal{L}T_2$ by $\kappa(q^-) := q^+$. The plane order on $T_1$ and $T_2$ is inherited from $T$ and $r$.

Claim 1: $T_i$ are trees.

Observe that $T_1$ consists of all paths in $G$ that start in the root of $T^+$ and end in a cut point $q$. Therefore $T_1$ is connected. To show that it does not have any loops, note that every undirected loop has splits and merges, which is not possible in $T_1$. Therefore a loop in $T_1$ would have to be a split loop. But this is impossible since no edge in a split loop can lie on a path from the root to a leaf. A similar argument works for $T_2$.

Claim 2: $T = T_1 \cap T_2$.

The inclusion $\subseteq$ is obvious. If this inclusion is strict, there has to be leaf $p \in \mathcal{L}T$ that is an inner point of $T_1 \cap T_2$. But then the edge in $D'$ starting in $p^-$ ends in a split while the edge ending in $p^+$ starts by a merge. This cannot happen by Proposition 2.21.

Claim 3: $(D, r, c)$ is the basic CASD of $[\kappa, T_1, T_2]$.

This follows directly from the construction. Note that nowhere in the process did we modify $r$.

Claim 4: The tree pair $[\kappa, T_1, T_2]$ is a revealing pair.

Note that a component of $T_2 \setminus T_1$ is isomorphic as plane ordered tree to a connected component of $D'$ that has only merges, and following the orbit of the root is the same as travelling along the corresponding directed cycle in $D$.

The last part follows directly from the construction.

3 Elliptic-hyperbolic decomposition

Le Boudec and Wesolek divide tree almost automorphisms into elliptic elements and translations, mimicking the division in $\text{Aut}(T)$, see Section 3 in [11]. However, while translations in $\text{Aut}(T)$ act on $\partial T$ as one might expect from the term - there is one attracting point, one repelling point, and all the mass travels from the repelling to the attracting point - things in $\text{AAut}(T)$ are more complicated. A translation can have several attracting and repelling points in the boundary, each with a different translation length. Those points may not even be fixed, but could have finite orbits. Mass around one repelling point can distribute
itself to several attracting points. And on top of that, some balls might even
give the impression that we are not dealing with a translation at all, returning
to themselves again and again. In this section we try to shed light on the pos-
sible dynamic behaviour of tree almost automorphisms. We define a notion of
hyperbolic elements in $\text{AAut}(T)$, which will be a subclass of Le Boudec’s and
Wesolek’s translations. They will be those translations that show only trivial
elliptic behaviour. We show that every element $g$ admits a unique decomposi-
tion $g = g_e g_h$ into an elliptic element $g_e$ and a hyperbolic element $g_h$ having
disjoint supports. In the end of the section we also prove that for two elements
to be conjugate, it is enough if both of their factors are conjugate.

### 3.1 Dynamic characterization of boundary points

For a tree almost automorphism $g$ we examine the different kinds of boundary
points with respect to the dynamics of $g$.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $\eta \in \partial T$ and $g \in \text{AAut}$. Then, we call $\eta$

(a) an *attracting point* for $g$ if for every neighborhood $B$ of $\eta$ there exists a
neighbourhood $U \subseteq B$ of $\eta$ and an integer $n > 0$ such that $g^n(U) \subseteq U$.

(b) a *repelling point* for $g$ if for every neighborhood $B$ of $\eta$ there exists a
neighbourhood $U \subseteq B$ of $\eta$ and an integer $n > 0$ such that $g^n(U) \supseteq U$.

(c) a *stable point* for $g$ if for every neighborhood $B$ of $\eta$ there exists a neigh-
bourhood $U \subseteq B$ of $\eta$ and an integer $n > 0$ such that $g^n(U) = U$.

(d) a *wandering point* for $g$ if there exists a neighborhood $U$ of $\eta$ such that
$g^n(U) \cap U = \emptyset$ for every $n > 0$.

We denote the sets of attracting, repelling, stable and wandering points for $g$
by $\text{Att}(g)$, $\text{Rep}(g)$, $\text{St}(g)$ and $\text{Wan}(g)$.

**Remark 3.2.** It is obvious from the definition that $\text{Att}(g) = \text{Att}(g^k)$, $\text{Rep}(g) = 
\text{Rep}(g^k)$ and $\text{Att}(g) = \text{Rep}(g^{-k})$ for all $k > 0$. Also we can easily see that
$\text{Wan}(g) = \text{Wan}(g^k)$ and $\text{St}(g) = \text{St}(g^k)$ for all integers $k \neq 0$.

We show that the possibilities from Definition 3.1 are mutually exclusive and
cover the whole boundary.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ and $\eta \in \partial T$. Then, $\eta$ is either attracting,
repelling, wandering or stable for $g$, and these possibilities are mutually exclud-
ing. Furthermore, $\text{Att}(g)$ and $\text{Rep}(g)$ are finite, $\text{Wan}(g)$ is open, and $\text{St}(g)$ is
clopen. Consequently $\text{Wan}(g) = \text{Wan}(g) \cup \text{Att}(g) \cup \text{Rep}(g)$.

This proposition follows directly from the following lemma connecting the
different points of the boundary to revealing pairs. Recall the relevant terms
given in Definition 2.7.
Lemma 3.4. Let \( g \in \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \) and let \([g, T_1, T_2]\) be a revealing pair for \( g \). Let \( \varphi : \mathcal{T} \setminus T_1 \to \mathcal{T} \setminus T_2 \) be the corresponding representative for \( g \). Let \( v \) be a leaf of \( T_1 \).

1. If \( v \) is in the forward orbit of a source, then \( \partial T_v \subset \text{Wan}(g) \).

2. If \( v \) is a periodic leaf, then \( \partial T_v \subset \text{St}(g) \).

3. If \( v \) is in the backward orbit of an attractor, then \( \partial T_v \) contains exactly one attracting point \( \eta \), and \( \partial T_v \setminus \{\eta\} \subset \text{Wan}(g) \).

   More precisely, let \( m \) be the period of the attractor. Then \( \eta \) is the boundary point defined by the sequence \( (\varphi^{km}.v)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \).

4. If \( v \) is in the forward orbit of a repeller, then \( \partial T_v \) contains exactly one repelling point \( \eta \), and \( \partial T_v \setminus \{\eta\} \subset \text{Wan}(g) \).

   More precisely, let \( m \) be the period of the repeller. Then \( \eta \) is the boundary point defined by the sequence \( (\varphi^{-km}.v)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \).

Proof. The first and second statements are obvious from the definitions. The last statement is equivalent to the third after replacing \( g \) with \( g^{-1} \) because of Remark 3.2.

To prove the third statement, observe that \( \partial T_v \supseteq \varphi^m(\partial T_v) = \partial T_{\varphi^m v} \supseteq \varphi^{2m}(\partial T_v) = \partial T_{\varphi^{2m} v} \supseteq \ldots \) and \( \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \varphi^{mk}(\partial T_v) = \{\eta\} \). Moreover every neighbourhood of \( \eta \) contains \( \varphi^{mk}(\partial T_v) \) for large enough \( k \). Therefore \( \eta \) is indeed an attracting point. On the other hand, let \( \xi \neq \eta \) be an element of \( \partial T_v \). Then, there exists a \( n > 0 \) such that \( \xi \notin \varphi^{nm}(\partial T_v) \). Let \( U = \partial T_v \setminus \varphi^{nm}(\partial T_v) \). Note that \( \varphi^k(U) \) is disjoint from \( \partial T_v \) if \( m \) does not divide \( k \) and is contained in \( \varphi^{nm}(\partial T_v) \) if \( m \) does divide \( k \). This shows that \( \xi \) is indeed a wandering point. \( \square \)

This lemma also shows that the following are well-defined.

**Definition 3.5.** Let \( g \in \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \). Let \( \eta \) be an attracting point of \( g \). With the notations as in Item 3 we call \( m \) the period of \( \eta \) and \( \text{dist}(v, \varphi^m v) \) the attracting length of \( \eta \). The repelling length and period of a repeller are defined in a similar fashion.

### 3.2 Dynamic characterization of almost automorphisms

Now we classify tree almost automorphisms according to their dynamic behaviour. The classification works in such a way that every ball that is moved by the almost automorphism can tell which of the two classes the almost automorphism falls into.

**Definition 3.6.** We call \( g \in \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \) elliptic if \( \text{St}(g) = \partial \mathcal{T} \). This coincides with Definition 1.1 in [11]. We call \( g \in \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \) hyperbolic if it is not the identity and \( g|_{\text{St}(g)} = \text{id} \). Denote by \( \mathcal{E} \) and \( \mathcal{H} \) the sets of all elliptic and hyperbolic elements in \( \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \), respectively.

Note that \( \mathcal{E} \) is a clopen subset of \( \text{AAut}(\mathcal{T}) \) and \( \mathcal{H} \) is closed, but not open.
Remark 3.7. Clearly the classes $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are invariant under conjugation in $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$.

**Definition 3.8.** Let $g \in \mathrm{AAut}(T)$. There exist unique elements $g_e \in \mathcal{E}$ and $g_h \in \mathcal{H}$ with disjoint support such that $g = g_eg_h = g_hg_e$. We call $g = g_e g_h$ the **elliptic-hyperbolic (EH) decomposition** of $g$.

Note that $\mathrm{Supp}(g_e) = \partial(g) \cap \mathrm{Supp}(g)$ and $\mathrm{Supp}(g_h) = \overline{\mathrm{Wan}(g)}$. The next lemma shows that the conjugacy problem on $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$ can be reduced to each of the classes $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{H}$ separately.

**Proposition 3.9.** Let $g, f \in \mathrm{AAut}(T)$ and let $g = g_eg_h$ and $f = f_ef_h$ be their EH decomposition. Then $g, f$ are conjugate in $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$ if and only if

1. $g_e$ is conjugate to $f_e$ and $g_h$ is conjugate to $f_h$; and
2. either $\mathrm{Supp}(f) = \mathrm{Supp}(g) = \partial T$, or both $\mathrm{Supp}(f) \neq \partial T$, $\mathrm{Supp}(g) \neq \partial T$.

**Proof.** The “only if” direction is obvious because $(a f a^{-1})_e = a f_a a^{-1}$ and $(a f_a a^{-1})_h = a f_h a^{-1}$.

For the “if” direction, let $a, b \in \mathrm{AAut}(T)$ be such that $a f_a a^{-1} = g_e$ and $b f_b b^{-1} = g_h$. Denote $A := \mathrm{Supp}(f_e)$, $B := \partial \mathrm{Supp}(f_h)$, $C := \mathrm{Supp}(f)_e$ and $A' := \partial \mathrm{Supp}(g_e)$, $B' := \partial \mathrm{Supp}(g_h)$, $C' := \mathrm{Supp}(g)_e$. Note that by Proposition 3.3 we have that $A \cup B \cup C = A' \cup B' \cup C' = \partial T$ are both disjoint unions of clopen sets. Furthermore, we have $a(A) = A'$ and $b(B) = B'$.

We first construct an element $a'$ with $a' f_e a'^{-1} = g_e$ and $a'(B) = B'$. By assumption, we have that either $C = C' = \emptyset$, or both $C$ and $C'$ are non-empty. In the first case, it follows immediately that $a(B) = a(A)^c = A'^c = B'$. In the second case, since $B' \subset A'^c$ and $a^{-1}(A')^c = A^c$, we have that both $B$ and $a^{-1}(B')$ are proper subsets of $A'$. By Lemma 2.4 the sets $B$ and $a^{-1}(B')$ consist of the same number of disjoint balls (mod $d - 1$), since $a^{-1} b(B) = a^{-1}(B')$. Again by Lemma 2.4, there exists an element $c \in \mathrm{AAut}(T)$ such that $c|_A = id$ and $c(B) = B'$. Note that $\partial \mathrm{Supp}(c)$ is disjoint from $\partial \mathrm{Supp}(f_e)$ is $A$ and so $c$ and $f_e$ commute. Defining $a' = ac^{-1}$, we have that $a' f_e a'^{-1} = g_e$, and moreover $a'(B) = B'$.

We now have that $a'(A) = A'$, $a'(B) = B'$ and it follows that also $a'(C) = C'$. Since also $b(B) = B'$ it follows that the following element of $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$ is well defined: $c' = \begin{cases} a' & A \cup C \\ b & B \end{cases}$

We claim that $g = c' f c'^{-1}$. Indeed, let $\eta \in \partial T$. If $\eta \in C'$ then $c'^{-1} \eta = c^{-1} \eta \in C$ and so $c' f c'^{-1} \eta = \eta = g \eta$. If $\eta \in A'$ then $c'^{-1} \eta = a'^{-1} \eta \in A$ and so $c' f c'^{-1} \eta = a f_a a^{-1} \eta = g_e \eta = g \eta$. Lastly if $\eta \in B'$ then $(c' f c'^{-1})^{-1} \eta = b^{-1} \eta \in B$ and so $c' f c'^{-1} \eta = b f_b b^{-1} \eta = g_h \eta = g \eta$.

\[ \square \]

**Remark 3.10.** There is nothing special about $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$, elliptic or hyperbolic elements in the preceding lemma. The only thing we used is that $\mathrm{AAut}(T)$ is a topological full group, which admits a unique decomposition of each element.
into two factors with disjoint clopen supports from disjoint conjugacy invariant sets.

4 Elliptic elements

Let $g$ be an elliptic element in $\text{Aut}(T)$. The dynamics of $g$ is described by a labelled graph, called the orbital type of $g$. The orbital type is invariant under conjugation. In fact, conjugacy classes of elliptic elements in $\text{Aut}(T)$ are classified by the orbital types: two elliptic elements $g, g' \in \text{Aut}(T)$ are conjugate in $\text{Aut}(T)$ if and only if they admit the same orbital type.

In this section, we define the boundary orbital type of an elliptic element in $\text{AAut}(T)$. This will be an equivalence class of the orbital type of a forest isomorphism defining the elliptic element. Further, we show that two elliptic elements in $\text{AAut}(T)$ are conjugate if and only if they admit the same boundary orbital type.

Le Boudec and Wesolek give the following four characterisations of elliptic elements.

**Lemma 4.1** ([11], Proposition 3.5). Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$. The following are equivalent.

1. There is a finite complete subtree $T$ of $T$ such that $g$ has tree pair $[\overline{g}, T, T]$.
2. Some power of $g$ is a tree automorphism of $T$ fixing the root.
3. The subgroup $\langle g \rangle$ of $\text{AAut}(T)$ is compact.
4. The element $g$ is not a translation, i.e. there does not exist any ball $B$ and any $n \geq 1$ such that $g^n(B) \not\subseteq B$.

In this subsection we extend the classical orbital type of elliptic tree automorphisms to elliptic forest automorphisms.

**Definition 4.2.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a forest. A labelling of $\mathcal{F}$ is a map $l: V(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined on the vertices of $\mathcal{F}$, and the pair $(\mathcal{F}, l)$ is called a labelled forest.

A forest isomorphism $f: \mathcal{F}_1 \to \mathcal{F}_2$ between two labelled forests $(\mathcal{F}_1, l_1), (\mathcal{F}_2, l_2)$ is called an isomorphism of labelled forests if $l_2(f(v)) = l_1(v)$ for every $v \in V(\mathcal{F}_1)$.

**Definition 4.3** (Orbital type). Let $T \subset \mathcal{T}_{d,k}$ be a finite subtree, and let $\varphi$ be an automorphism of the rooted forest $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}_{d,k} \setminus T$. Then, the orbital type of $\varphi$ is the labelled forest $\text{OT}(\varphi) := (\overline{\mathcal{F}}, l)$, where $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = (\varphi) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ is the quotient graph and the labelling map $l: V(\overline{\mathcal{F}}) \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ is defined by sending each equivalence class $[v] \in V(\overline{\mathcal{F}})$ with $v \in V(\mathcal{F})$ to its cardinality.
(a) a forest automorphism

(b) its orbital type

Figure 18: Representative of an elliptic element and its orbital type.

In case \( F = T \) is a level homogeneous tree \( \varphi \in \operatorname{Aut}(T) \), Definition 4.3 coincides with the definition given in Gawron, Nekrashevych and Sushchansky [7]. They give a complete characterisation when two elliptic tree automorphisms are conjugate.

**Theorem 4.4** ([7], Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 5.1). Let \( F = T \) be a level homogeneous tree, and let \( \varphi, \varphi' \in \operatorname{Aut}(T) \) two elliptic elements. Then \( \varphi \) and \( \varphi' \) are conjugate in \( \operatorname{Aut}(T) \) if and only if \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) = \operatorname{OT}(\varphi') \).

The following lemma follows immediately from the definitions.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( F \) be a forest and let \( \varphi: F \to F \) be an automorphism of \( F \). Suppose that \( i: F \to F' \) is a forest isomorphism. Then \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) = \operatorname{OT}(i \circ \varphi \circ i^{-1}) \).

As a corollary we gain the perhaps surprising fact that the orbital type of a forest automorphism contains information about the number of trees in the forest.

**Corollary 4.6.** Suppose \( \varphi: T \setminus T \to T \setminus T \) and \( \varphi': T \setminus T' \to T \setminus T' \) are forest isomorphisms with the same orbital type. Then \( |\mathcal{L}(T)| = |\mathcal{L}(T')| \).

**Proof.** Let \( \varphi: T \setminus T \to T \setminus T \) be an automorphism of the forest \( F = T \setminus T \) and consider the labelled graph of orbits \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) \). For a vertex \( v \in F \) denote by \( \bar{v} \) its image in \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) \). Every root of \( F \) (namely, every leaf of \( T \)) is mapped to a vertex in \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) \) whose label is minimal in its connected component. Moreover, if \( r \) is a root of \( F \) then there are exactly \( l(\bar{r}) \) roots of \( F \) which are mapped to \( \bar{r} \). It follows that \( |\mathcal{L}(T)| = \sum_{C} \min\{l(\bar{v})| \bar{v} \in C\} \), where the sum runs over all connected components of \( \operatorname{OT}(\varphi) \). \( \square \)

**Definition 4.7.** Let \( (F_1, l_1), (F_2, l_2) \) be two labelled forests. We call them **boundary equivalent** if there exist finite subgraphs \( F_i \subset F_i, i = 1, 2 \) s.t \( F_1 \setminus F_i \) and \( F_2 \setminus F_2 \), equipped with the restrictions of \( l_1, l_2 \), are isomorphic as labelled forests. Let \( T \subset T_{d,k} \) be a finite subtree, and let \( \varphi \) be an automorphism of
the rooted forest $T_{d,k} \setminus T$. We define the boundary orbital type of $\varphi$, denoted $\text{BOT}(\varphi)$, to be the boundary equivalence class of $\text{OT}(\varphi)$.

Let $T$ be a tree and let $g \in \text{AAut}(T)$ be an elliptic element. If $\varphi : T \setminus T' \rightarrow T \setminus T$ and $\varphi' : T \setminus T' \rightarrow T \setminus T'$ are two forest automorphisms representing $g$, then both $\varphi, \varphi'$ are defined on $T \setminus (T \cup T')$ and equal there, and so $\text{BOT}(\varphi) = \text{BOT}(\varphi')$. It follows that the following is well-defined.

**Definition 4.8 (Boundary orbital type).** The boundary orbital type of an elliptic tree almost automorphism $g$, denoted $\text{BOT}(g)$, is defined to be the boundary orbital type of one of its representatives.

We show that the boundary orbital type completely characterizes conjugacy of elliptic elements.

**Theorem 4.9.** Let $g, g' \in \text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$ be two elliptic elements, with boundary orbital types $\text{BOT}(g), \text{BOT}(g')$ respectively. Then $g, g'$ are conjugate in $\text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$ if and only if $\text{BOT}(g) = \text{BOT}(g')$.

**Proof.** First we show the "only if"-direction.

Let $g' = fgf^{-1}$. Let $\psi : T \setminus T \rightarrow T \setminus T$ and $\varphi : T \setminus T_1 \rightarrow T \setminus T_2$ be forest isomorphisms representing $g$ and $f$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $T_1 = T$, otherwise, enlarge $T$ to contain $T_1$ and then enlarge $T_1$ to be equal to $T$. We therefore have that $\varphi : T \setminus T \rightarrow T \setminus T_2$ is an isomorphism of forests, and therefore by Lemma 4.5, $\text{OT}(\psi) = \text{OT}(\varphi \psi \varphi^{-1})$. It follows that $\text{BOT}(g) = \text{BOT}(fgf^{-1})$.

Now we show the "if"-direction.

**Step 1:** There exist forest isomorphisms $\varphi : T \setminus T \rightarrow T \setminus T$, $\varphi' : T \setminus T' \rightarrow T \setminus T'$ representing $g$ and $g'$ s.t $\text{OT}(\varphi) = \text{OT}(\varphi')$.

Let $\varphi_0 : T \setminus T \rightarrow T \setminus T$, $\varphi_0 : T \setminus T' \rightarrow T \setminus T'$ be forest isomorphisms representing $g$ and $g'$. Since $\text{BOT}(g) = \text{BOT}(g')$ there exist finite subgraphs $D \subset \text{OT}(\varphi_0)$ and $D' \subset \text{OT}(\varphi_0')$ such that $\text{OT}(\varphi_0) \setminus D$ and $\text{OT}(\varphi_0') \setminus D'$ are isomorphic as labelled graphs.

Note that $\hat{D}$ (respectively, $\hat{D}'$) is a union of rooted trees, and its preimage $D \subset T \setminus T$ (resp. $D' \subset T \setminus T'$) is a union of rooted trees with roots in $\mathcal{L}(T)$ (resp. $\mathcal{L}(T')$). In particular, $T \cup D$ (resp. $T' \cup D'$) is a finite subtree of $T$. Let $\varphi$ denote the restriction of $\varphi_0$ to the forest $T \setminus (T \cup D)$, and similarly $\varphi'$ the restriction of $\varphi_0'$ to $T \setminus (T' \cup D')$. Then indeed $\varphi$ and $\psi$ represent $g$ and $g'$, and clearly $\text{OT}(\varphi) = \text{OT}(\varphi')$.

**Step 2:** After conjugating $g'$, we can assume that $T = T'$.

By the previous step we know that $\text{OT}(\varphi) = \text{OT}(\varphi')$. Corollary 4.6 implies that $T$ and $T'$ have the same number of leaves and therefore there is a forest isomorphism $\psi : T \setminus T' \rightarrow T \setminus T$. Then $\psi \varphi \psi^{-1}$ is an automorphism of $T \setminus T$.

**Step 3:** The forest isomorphisms $\varphi$ and $\varphi'$ are conjugate by an automorphism of the forest $T \setminus T$.

Let $m := |\mathcal{L}(T)|$. Let $p_T : T_{d,k} \rightarrow T_{d,m}$ be the map that contracts all the inner vertices of $T$ and the edges connecting them to a point. Define $i_T(\varphi) := p_T \varphi_0 p_T^{-1}$ and $i_T(\varphi') := p_T \varphi_0' p_T^{-1}$. These are automorphisms of the forest $T_{d,m} \setminus p_T(T)$.
Let $r$ denote the root of $T_{d,m}$. As $p_T(T) = B_1(r)$ is the 1-ball around $r$, we have that both $i_T(\varphi)$ and $i_T(\varphi')$ extend to elements in $\text{Aut}(T_{d,m})$, by sending $r$ to itself. Denote their extensions by $\varphi_1, \varphi'_1$ respectively. Clearly we have $\text{OT}(\varphi_1) = \text{OT}(\varphi'_1)$. By Theorem 4.4 there exists $\psi_1 \in \text{Aut}(T_{d,m})$ s.t $\psi_1 \varphi_1 \psi_1^{-1} = \varphi'_1$. Let $\psi_0$ be the restriction of $\psi_1$ to $T_{d,m} \setminus B_1(r) = T_{d,m} \setminus p_T(T)$ and denote by $\psi = p_T^{-1} \psi_0 p_T$ the corresponding automorphism of $T \setminus T$. Then $\psi \varphi \psi^{-1} = \varphi'$.

This concludes the proof of the theorem. \hfill \Box

## 5 Hyperbolic elements

In this section $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{d,k}$ again denotes the tree such that the root has valency $k \geq 1$ and all other vertices have valency $d+1 \geq 3$. We prove that two hyperbolic elements are conjugate if and only if the *-reduced CASDs of sufficiently close Higman–Thompson elements differ only in the rotation system.

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.1.** Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{d,k}$. Let $g, h$ be hyperbolic tree almost automorphisms of $\mathcal{T}$. Then, $g$ and $h$ are conjugate if and only if their *-reduced CASDs from a revealing pair differ only in the rotation system.

### 5.1 Passing to Higman-Thompson elements

The first step in the proof of Theorem 5.1 is to show that a hyperbolic almost automorphism and a sufficiently close Higman–Thompson element are conjugate.

Let $x$ be a vertex in $\mathcal{T}$ which is not the root. Recall that $\mathcal{T}_x$ is the subtree of $\mathcal{T}$ which is rooted in $x$. It is a $d$-regular rooted tree. For two vertices $x, y \in \mathcal{T}$ the plane order of $\mathcal{T}$ induces a unique plane order preserving isomorphism $j_{x,y}: \mathcal{T}_x \to \mathcal{T}_y$. In particular, if $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{T}_x)$ then $\alpha^{j_{x,y}} = j_{x,y} \alpha j_{y,x} \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{T}_y)$.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $x, y$ be vertices in $\mathcal{T}$ such that $y$ is a descendant of $x$, and let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{T}_x)$. Then there exists a unique element $\beta \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{T}_x)$ such that

1. $\beta|_{\mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y} = \alpha|_{\mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y}$ and
2. $\beta|_{\mathcal{T}_y} = \alpha|_{\mathcal{T}_y} \circ \beta^{j_{x,y}}$.

**Proof.** Note first that indeed $\alpha|_{\mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y}: \mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y \to \mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y(\alpha(y))$ and $\alpha|_{\mathcal{T}_y} \circ \beta^{j_{x,y}}: \mathcal{T}_y \to \mathcal{T}_y(\alpha(y))$ for every $\beta \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{T}_y)$, so these two conditions indeed define an automorphism of $\mathcal{T}_x$.

We construct $\beta$ by a recursive process, and uniqueness will become clear along the way. Let $\mathcal{T}^0$ denote $\mathcal{T}_x \setminus \mathcal{T}_y$, and denote further $\mathcal{T}^n := j_{x,y}(\mathcal{T}^{n-1}) \setminus \mathcal{T}^{n-1}_{j_{x,y}}(x)$ for $n \geq 1$. Observe that $\bigcup \text{Edge}(\mathcal{T}^n) = \text{Edge}(\mathcal{T})$ is a disjoint union.

To satisfy Requirement 1, we must set $\beta$ on $\mathcal{T}^0$ as $\beta|_{\mathcal{T}^0} := \alpha|_{\mathcal{T}^0}$. Let now $n \geq 1$ and assume that $\beta|_{\mathcal{T}^{n-1}}$ is already a tree isomorphism satisfying Requirements 1 and 2 wherever it makes sense. Observe that $\mathcal{T}^n \subset \mathcal{T}_y$. By
Requirement 2 we must have $\beta|_{T^n} := \alpha j_{x,y} \beta j_{y,x} |_{T^n}$, but since $j_{y,x}(T^n) = T^{n-1}$ and $\beta|_{T^{n-1}}$ is already set, the restriction $\beta|_{T^n}$ is hereby defined.

It remains to prove that $\beta|_{[g,h,T]}$ is a tree isomorphism. To show this we have to check that the vertex $j^{n-1}_{x,y}(x)$ is mapped to the same vertex as root of $T^n$ and as leaf of $T^{n-1}$. But this is true because $\beta|_{T^n}(j^{n-1}_{x,y}(x)) = \alpha j_{x,y} \beta j_{y,x}(j^{n-1}_{x,y}(x)) = \alpha j_{x,y} \beta(j^{n-2}_{x,y}(x)) = \beta|_{T^{n-1}}(j^{n-1}_{x,y}(x))$.

**Proposition 5.3.** Let $g,h \in \text{AAut}(T)$ be two hyperbolic elements which admit the same revealing pair $[g,T_1,T_2] = [h,T_1,T_2]$. Then there exists $b \in \text{Fix}(T_1)$ such that $g = b h b^{-1}$.

Equivalently, if $v$ is the Higman–Thompson element induced by a revealing pair $[k,T_1,T_2]$ and if $a \in \text{Fix}(T_1 \cap T_2)$ acts trivially on $\text{St}(v)$, then there exists $b \in \text{Fix}(T_1)$ such that $av = bvb^{-1}$.

**Proof.** We prove the proposition by constructing a possible $b \in \text{Fix}(T_1)$ explicitly. Let $\varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2$ be a representative for $av$. Note that it is enough to define $b|_{T_T} \in \text{Aut}(T_T)$ for every $x \in LT_1$. By Remark 2.9, the set $LT_1$ is partitioned into four types of vertices: backward orbits of attractors, forward orbits of repellers and cyclic orbits. For every tree automorphism $\delta$ fixing a vertex $x$ we abbreviate $\delta_x := \delta|_{T_x} \in \text{Aut}(T_x)$.

For every maximal attractor chain $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ with attractor $x_n$ we define $b_{x_0}, \ldots, b_{x_{n-1}}$ in the following way. Observe that $x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1} \in T_1 \cap T_2$ and so they are fixed by $a$, and $x_n$ is a descendant of $x_0$. By Proposition 5.2 there exists a unique element $\beta \in \text{Aut}(T_{x_0})$ satisfying the two equations

\[ \beta|_{T_{x_0} \setminus T_{x_n}} = a|_{T_{x_0} \setminus T_{x_n}} \quad (A_1) \]

\[ \beta_{x_n} = a_{x_{n-1}}^{-1} \cdots a_{x_1}^{-1} \beta_{x_0} \quad (A_2) \]

Set $b_{x_0} := \beta$ and further

\[ b_{x_{i+1}} := a_{x_{i+1}} b_{x_i}^j \quad (A_3) \]

for all $i = 0, \ldots, n-2$.

Next we deal with leaves belonging to wandering chains. For every wandering maximal chain $s_0, \ldots, s_n$ we define $b_{s_0}, \ldots, b_{s_n}$ in the following way. Note that $s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1} \in T_1 \cap T_2$ and so they are fixed by $a$. Since $s_n$ is a sink, it belongs to a component $M$ of $T_2 \setminus T_1$. Denote the root of $M$ by $s^M$. Since $[g,T_1,T_2]$ is revealing, $s^M$ is the last vertex in an attractor chain, and therefore we have already defined $b_{s^M}$ in the previous step. Since $s_n$ is a descendant of $s^M$, also $b_{s_n}$ is already defined. Set inductively

\[ b_{s_i} = (a_{s_{i+1}}^{-1} b_{s_{i+1}}) b_{s_{i+1}}^{-1} \quad (S_i) \]

for $i = n-1, \ldots, 0$. Do this for every wandering chain.

Next we come to repeller chains. For every repeller maximal chain $r_0, \ldots, r_n$ we define $b_{r_0}, \ldots, b_{r_{n-1}}$ in the following way. Denote by $S$ the component of
Theorem 5.2 contains a unique element $\beta \in \text{Aut}(T_{r_0})$ fixing all leaves of $S$ and such that

$$\beta_s := b_s \quad s \in LS \setminus \{r_0\} \quad (R^1)$$

$$\beta r_0 := (a^{-1}_{x_1})^{r_1}r_0 \cdots (a^{-1}_{x_n})^{r_n}r_0 \beta^{r_n}r_0. \quad (R^2)$$

Set $b_0 := \beta r_0$. Define $b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}$ inductively by

$$b_{r_{i+1}} := a_{r_{i+1}} b_{r_i}^{r_{i+1}+1} \quad (R_i)$$

for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 2$. We do not need to set the value for $b_{r_n}$ as $r_n \notin LT_1$.

Lastly we deal with periodic chains. For every periodic maximal chain $c_0, \ldots, c_n$ set

$$b_{c_i} = id_{\tau_{c_i}} \quad (C_i)$$

for all $i = 0, \ldots, c_n$. This completes the definition of $b \in \text{Fix}(T_1)$.

We are left with verifying that $av = ba^{-1}$. Since $\{\partial T_i\}_{x \in LT_1}$ form a cover of $\partial T$, it is enough to verify that

$$a_{\varphi(x)}v_x = b_{\varphi(x)}v_x b_x^{-1}$$

holds for every $x \in LT_1$. Furthermore, for every $x \in LT_1$ the element $v_x$ preserves the plane order of $T_x$. It follows that $v_x = j_{x,\varphi(x)}$ and so it is enough to show that

$$a_{\varphi(x)}j_{x,\varphi(x)} = b_{\varphi(x)}j_{x,\varphi(x)} b_x^{-1}. \quad (I_x)$$

Indeed, suppose that $x_0, \ldots, x_n$ is an attractor chain. For $x = x_i$ with $i = 0, \ldots, n - 2$ Equation $I_x$ is simply a reformulation of Equation $A_i$. For $x_{n-1}$, observe that by Equation $A^2$ we have

$$b_{x_n} = a_{x_n} a_{x_{n-1}} \cdots a_{x_{1}} b_{x_0}^{x_0}. \quad (A_n)$$

Plugging in repeatedly Equation $A_i$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 2$, we replace each of $a_{x_1}, a_{x_2}, \ldots, a_{x_{n-1}}$ and get

$$b_{x_n} = a_{x_n} j_{x_{n-1}, x_n} b_{x_{n-1}} j_{x_n, x_{n-1}}$$

as required in Equation $I_x$ for $x = x_{n-1}$. Next, suppose $s_0, \ldots, s_n$ is a wandering chain, then for all $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, $x = s_i$, $I_x$ follows directly from $S_i$. Now, suppose $r_0, \ldots, r_n$ is a repelling chain. For $x = r_i$ with $i = 0, \ldots, n - 2$, Equation $I_x$ is satisfied by Equation $R_i$. We still need to verify Equation $I_x$ for $x = r_{n-1}$. Let $S$ be the component of $T_1 \setminus T_2$ containing $r_0$. The root of $S$ is $r_n$. Consider the element $\beta \in \text{Aut}(T_{r_0})$ from the construction of $b_{r_0}$. Both $b_{r_n}$ and $\beta$ fix the component $S$ pointwise. For all leaves $s \in LS \setminus \{r_0\}$ Equation $R^1$ implies $\beta_s = b_s$, and $\beta r_0 = b r_0$ by the definition of $b_{r_0}$. It follows that $\beta = b_{r_n}$. Then by Equation $R^2$ we have

$$a_{r_n} = b_{r_n} j_{r_0, r_n} b_{r_0}^{-1} (a_{r_1}^{-1})^{r_1}r_0 \cdots (a_{r_{n-1}}^{-1})^{r_{n-1}}r_1 j_{r_{n-1}, r_n}.$$
Plugging in repeatedly Equation $R_i$ for $i = 0, \dots, n - 2$, we replace each of $a_{r_1}, \dots, a_{r_{n-1}}$ and get

$$a_{r_n} = b_{r_n} f_{r_{n-1}} r_n b_{r_{n-1}} f_{r_n} r_{n-1},$$

and so Equation $I_x$ is satisfied for $x = r_{n-1}$ as required. Lastly, suppose $c_0, \dots, c_n$ is a periodic chain. Then $b_{c_i} = id_{T_i}$ for each $i = 0, \dots, n$ by Equation $C_i$, and $a_{c_i} = id_{T_i}$ by the assumption that $a$ acts trivially on $St(v)$. It follows that Equation $I_x$ is trivially satisfied for $x = c_0, \dots, c_n$.

**Corollary 5.4.** An almost automorphism has open conjugacy class if and only if it is hyperbolic with full support.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let $v \in V_{d,k}$ be induced by a tree pair $[\pi, T_1, T_2]$ and let $a, b \in \text{Fix}(T_1 \cap T_2)$ be such that $bva \in V_{d,k}$. Then, there exist $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in V_{d,k} \cap \text{Fix}(T_1 \cap T_2)$ such that $bv = \tilde{b} \phi \tilde{a}$. Furthermore $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{b}$ can be chosen such that $\text{Supp}(\tilde{a}) \supseteq \text{Supp}(a)$ and $\text{Supp}(\tilde{b}) \supseteq \text{Supp}(b)$.

**Proof.** Since $bva \in V_{d,k}$ there exist finite complete subtrees $T_i^+$ containing $T_i$ such that $[bva, a^{-1}(T_i^+), b(T_i^+)]$ is a tree pair representation for $bva$. Let $\tilde{a}$ be induced by the tree pair $[\pi, a^{-1}(T_i^+), T_i^+]$ and $\tilde{b}$ by the tree pair $[\tilde{b}, T_2^+, b(T_2^+)]$. Note that $[\pi, T_1^+, T_2^+]$ induces $v$. Then, clearly both $bva$ and $bv\tilde{a}$ have tree pair representation $[bva, a^{-1}(T_i^+), b(T_i^+)]$, so they have to be the same element of $V_{d,k}$.

Note that $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{b}$ were constructed such that $\text{Supp}(\tilde{a}) \supseteq \text{Supp}(a)$ and $\text{Supp}(\tilde{b}) \supseteq \text{Supp}(b)$. 

**Remark 5.6.** Note that it is in general not true that if $a = b$ then also $\tilde{a}$ can be chosen to equal $\tilde{b}$. Otherwise Proposition 5.3 would contradict Theorem 2.31 by Belk and Matucci, as one can easily convince oneself by the following example given in Figure 19.
In the current subsection we complete the proof of Theorem 5.1. For the following lemma, recall that a Higman–Thompson element \( v \) is induced by a tree pair \( P = [\kappa, T_1, T_2] \) if it is represented by the unique plane order preserving forest isomorphism \( \varphi: T \setminus T_1 \to T \setminus T_2 \) with \( \varphi|_{CT_1} = \kappa \). This is a stronger condition than to simply say that \( P \) is a tree pair for \( v \).

**Lemma 5.7.** Let \( v \in V_{d,k} \) be a hyperbolic element and let \( P = [v, T_1, T_2] \) be a revealing tree pair inducing \( v \). Let \( a, b \in \text{Fix}(T_1 \cap T_2) \) act trivially on \( \text{St}(v) \), and suppose that \( bva^{-1} \in V_{d,k} \). Let \( Q \) be a tree pair inducing \( bva^{-1} \). Then, the *-reduced CASDs of \( P \) and \( Q \) are isomorphic up to rotation.

**Proof.** First recall from Theorem 2.31 that the reduced CASDs of \( P \) and \( Q \) only depend on \( v \) and \( avb^{-1} \).

By Lemma 5.5 we can assume that \( a, b \in V_{d,k} \). We further assume first that \( a = \text{id} \). The case \( b = \text{id} \) and \( a \neq \text{id} \) will work completely analogously, and clearly the lemma follows from putting together those two cases.

In the rest of the proof we will simply say *isomorphism* between CASDs to mean an isomorphism up to rotation which respects all hourglasses.

Consider the tree pair \( P_{b\gamma_2} = [b\gamma, T_1, b(T_2)] \). Note that it is revealing, and that it induces the element \( b_{T_2}v \). Clearly \( b \) induces an isomorphism between the basic CASDs \( D \) of \( P \) and \( D_{b\gamma_2} \) of \( P_{b\gamma_2} \). Since \( P \) is a revealing pair, \( D \) and
Let \( D_{br_2v} \) are II-reduced by Lemma 2.30. We can apply Corollary 2.28 to conclude that the \(*\)-reduced CASDs of \( P \) and \( P_{br_2v} \) differ only in the rotation system.

Let now \( S \) be a cancelling tree for \( P \) and let \( P^1 \) be a rolling with \( S \). As usual when we say we perform a rolling we mean a forward rolling except in the case of a maximal attractor chain.

Denote by \( b^T \) the element induced by \( [b,T_2,b(T_2)] \). Then \( b^{-1}b = b^T \in \text{Fix}(T_2) \). Note that \( b^T(S) \) is a cancelling tree for \( P_{br_2v} \), and let \( P_{b^T}^1 \) denote the corresponding rolling. We can now replace \( v \) by \( br_2v \) and \( b \) by \( b^T \) and repeat the above argument to show that the \(*\)-reductions of the basic CASDs generated by \( P^1 \) and \( P_{b^T}^1 \) differ only in the rotation system.

We continue enlarging \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) in this way until we get a revealing pair \([v,T_1^+,T_2^+]\) big enough such that \( bv \) is induced by the tree pair \([bv,T_1^+,b(T_2^+)]\). Then we are done.

\[\]

**Proposition 5.8.** Let \( D_1,D_2 \) be two reduced CASDs which are isomorphic up to rotation, and such that they both admit a \( k \)-admissible cutting class. Then there exist revealing tree pairs \( P_i = [\kappa_i,T_i^1,T_i^2] \) for \( i = 1,2 \) such that \( D_i \) is the basic CASD of \( P_i \) and such that the Higman–Thompson elements \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) induced by \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) satisfy \( v_2 = av_1 \) with \( a \in \text{Fix}(T_1^i \cap T_2^i) \).

In particular, \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) are conjugate.

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.34, there exist tree pairs \( P_i = [\kappa_i,T_i^1,T_i^2] \), \( i = 1,2 \), such that \( D_i \) is the basic CASD for \( P_i \). For \( i = 1,2 \) the vertices in the intersection \( T_1^i \cap T_2^i \) are not seen in the reduced diagram \( D_i \). However, the isomorphism between \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) implies that \( |\mathcal{L}(T_1^1 \cap T_2^1)| = |\mathcal{L}(T_1^2 \cap T_2^2)| \). Let \( P_2' \) be the tree pair achieved by replacing \( T_1^2 \cap T_2^2 \) in \( P_2 \) by \( T_1^1 \cap T_2^1 \). As the hourglass corresponding to \( T_1^1 \cap T_2^1 \) is anyway subject to a Type II reduction, \( P_2' \) has the same basic CASD as \( P_2 \). It follows that without loss of generality we can assume that \( P_2 = P_2' \), namely, that \( T_1^1 \cap T_2^1 = T_1^2 \cap T_2^2 \). Without loss of generality we can assume further that the CASDs generated by the tree pairs \( P_1,P_2 \) are Type I reduced.

Extend the isomorphism between \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) to an isomorphism between the tree pairs \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \), which maps \( T_1^i \cap T_2^i \) identically on \( T_1^1 \cap T_2^1 \). Let \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) be the Higman-Thompson elements induced by \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) respectively. The isomorphism between \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) can be realized as the multiplication of \( v_1 \) by an element \( a \in T_1^1 \cap T_2^1 \), and so the first part of the Proposition is proved.

For the "in particular" part, recall that by Proposition 5.3, \( av_1 \) and \( v_1 \) are conjugate.

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** By Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.7 we can assume that \( g \) and \( h \) are elements of \( V_{d,k} \) without changing conjugacy classes or rotation systems of CASDs.

We first prove the "if"-direction. Let \( D,D' \) be the reduced CASDs of \( g,h \) and assume that \( D \) and \( D' \) are isomorphic up to rotation. By Proposition 5.8 there exist conjugate elements \( v,v' \) with CASDs \( D,D' \). By Belk–Matucci Theorem 2.31, \( v \) is conjugate to \( g \) and \( v' \) to \( h \). Thus \( g \) and \( h \) are conjugate.
Now we proof the "only if"-direction. Let $g, h$ be conjugate. Let $D, D'$ be their $^*$-reduced CADs from revealing pairs. By Proposition 5.8 there exist elements $v, v'$ in $V_{d,k}$ that have $^*$-reduced CASDs $D$ and $D'$, and such that they differ only by an element in the fixator of the intersection of the trees of a revealing pair. By Lemma 5.7 this implies that $D$ and $D'$ are isomorphic up to rotation.

Remark 5.9. This gives us the following algorithm to determine the conjugacy class of a hyperbolic element.

1. Find a revealing pair representing $h$ (see Lemma 2.14).
2. Form the basic CASD for the revealing pair (see Section 2.3.1).
3. $^*$-reduce the CASD and forget the rotation system.

We expect that the first step could be omitted by doing reductions similar to those considered by Aroca (see Definitions 3.9 and 3.10 in [1]), but we decided not to pursue this idea further.

5.3 Applications

In this section we explain how to read off dynamics from a $^*$-reduced CASD. This is a generalization of Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3 in [3]. In addition we investigate when a hyperbolic element can be conjugated into $\text{Aut}(T)$.

Theorem 5.10. Let $g \in \text{AAut}(T_{d,k})$ and let $(D, r, c)$ be the $^*$-reduced CASD of a revealing pair for $g$.

1. Every merge loop $\mu$ with $n$ merges corresponds to an attracting point of attracting length $n$ and period $c(\mu)$.
2. Every split loop $\sigma$ with $n'$ splits corresponds to a repelling point of repelling length $n'$ and period $c(\sigma)$.
3. Every connected component of $D$ corresponds to a clopen invariant set in $\partial T$.
4. Let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ be the free loops in $D$, then the number of balls $\text{St}(g)$ can be partitioned into is congruent to $c(\lambda_1) + \cdots + c(\lambda_n) \mod d - 1$.

Proof. Clearly the theorem is true for the element $h$ constructed from $D$ in the proof of Proposition 2.34, and since $gh$ is conjugate to $h$ by Theorem 5.1, we are done.

Note also that the subgraphs connecting split loops to merge loops indicate how wandering points are travelling from the repelling to the attracting points.

The following corollary is easy to see from the classical fact that translations in a regular tree are conjugate if and only if their translation lengths agree.
Corollary 5.11. Let $T = T_{d,d+1}$. A hyperbolic element in $\text{AAut}(T)$ is conjugate to a translation of translation length $n$ in $\text{Aut}(T)$ if and only if it consists of one split loop $(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ with $t(e_n) = o(e_1)$, one merge loop $(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ with $t(e_n) = o(f_1)$, and for every split $o(e_i)$ in the split loop all outgoing edges except $t(e_i)$ end in $o(f_i)$.

Figure 20: CASD for a length 5 translation in $\text{Aut}(T)$.

A possible counterpart of this theorem for elliptic elements seems to be more involved.
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