

# AUTOMORPHISMS OF GROUPS AND A HIGHER RANK JSJ DECOMPOSITION I: RAAGS AND A HIGHER RANK MAKANIN-RAZBOROV DIAGRAM

Z. SELA<sup>1,2</sup>

*Dedicated to Thomas Delzant on his 60th birthday*

The JSJ decomposition encodes the automorphisms and the virtually cyclic splittings of a hyperbolic group. For general finitely presented groups, the JSJ decomposition encodes only their splittings.

In this sequence of papers we study the automorphisms of a hierarchically hyperbolic group that satisfies some weak acylindricity conditions. To study these automorphisms we construct an object that can be viewed as a higher rank JSJ decomposition.

In the first paper we demonstrate our construction in the case of a right angled Artin group. For studying automorphisms of a general HHG we construct what we view as a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram, which is the first step in the construction of the higher rank JSJ.

The (canonical) JSJ decomposition of a torsion-free hyperbolic group was originally constructed to generalize the solution of the isomorphism problem from rigid torsion-free hyperbolic groups to all torsion-free hyperbolic groups. Such a generalization required an understanding and techniques to handle both automorphisms and splittings of such groups, and both are encoded by the JSJ decomposition ([Se3],[Le]).

The construction of the JSJ was later generalized to general finitely presented groups (see [Gu-Le]). In this general setting, the JSJ encodes all the splittings of a f.p. group over a given family of subgroups (in a rather subtle way), but it is far from encoding the automorphism group nor the dynamics of individual automorphisms.

In this sequence of papers we use some of the JSJ concepts, to study automorphisms of hierarchically hyperbolic groups. Hierarchically hyperbolic groups and spaces were defined by Behrstock, Hagen and Sisto [BHS1]. The definition axiomatizes the hierarchical structure of the mapping class groups, that was defined and studied in the work of Masur and Minsky [Ma-Mi]. Automorphisms of families of HHG were studied earlier by Fioravanti [Fi], and by Casals-Ruiz, Hagen and Kazachkov ([Ca-Ka],[CHK]).

To study the automorphism group and the dynamics of individual automorphisms of an HHG, we look at the action of some characteristic finite index subgroup of the HHG on the projection spaces that are part of the HHG structure. We

---

<sup>1</sup>Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel.

<sup>2</sup>Partially supported by an Israel academy of sciences fellowship.

further associate a virtually abelian decomposition of some quotient of the finite index characteristic subgroup of the HHG with each orbit of a projection space under the action of the finite index subgroup. The (finite) collection of virtually abelian decompositions that we construct can be viewed as a higher rank JSJ decomposition of the HHG.

The finite collection of decompositions encodes the dynamics of individual automorphisms, and can be used to study the algebraic structure of the (outer) automorphism group of the HHG. To construct the virtually abelian decompositions, we borrow techniques that were previously used to study sets of solutions to system of equations (varieties) over certain families of groups (e.g. [Se1], [Ja-Se], [Re-We] and [Gr-Hu]), together with basic tools that were used in the study of the first order theory of the free group (that appear in [Se2] and [Se4]).

To be able to apply these techniques and constructions we require that the action of the set stabilizers of each projection space on the projection space is *weakly acylindrical* (definition 3.1). This is a coarse form of an acylindrical action of a set stabilizer modulo the point stabilizer of the space. We further require that the HHG has a finite index subgroup, for which the projection spaces in each orbit of the finite index subgroup are transverse. This is known to be true for the mapping class groups [BBF].

In the first two sections of the paper we motivate and demonstrate our approach by examining automorphisms of right angled Artin groups, based on works of Charney-Crisp-Vogtmann ([CCV] and [CV]), and Duncan-Kazachkov-Remeslennikov [DKR]. With each RAAG we associate a finite collection of graphs of groups and trees that are associated with them, on which the RAAG acts weakly acylindrically. Furthermore, the automorphism group of the RAAG preserves free products that are associated with the graphs of groups, so it is not difficult to read from these graphs and trees the structure of the higher rank JSJ decomposition (we do not present these last constructions in this paper).

In the last two sections we construct what we view as a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram that is associated with a general HHG that satisfies our additional assumptions. The construction of the higher rank diagram is not canonical. It is based on a compactness argument, and follows the steps of the construction of such diagrams in [Ja-Se], [Re-We] and [Gr-Hu].

The diagram that we construct is not canonical but it is universal. Every automorphism of the HHG factors through at least one of its (cover) resolutions. The existence of the higher rank diagram is the basis for the construction of the higher rank JSJ in the next paper. In section 3 we construct a higher rank diagram in case the HHG is a product of hyperbolic spaces, and in section 4 we generalize the construction to HHG that satisfy our assumptions.

This whole project started as an attempt to answer a question of Eliyahu Rips on the structure of the automorphism groups of cubulated groups, and their connection to automorphisms of low dimensional manifolds, along the line of the JSJ decomposition of a hyperbolic group. It is also a late answer to a question of Ruth Charney on the possibility to encode the automorphisms of a RAAG by a JSJ decomposition. I am indebted to both of them.

## §1. 2-dimensional RAAGs

Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite simple graph, and let  $A_\Gamma$  be the right-angled Artin group that is

associated with  $\Gamma$ .  $A_\Gamma$  is said to be 2-dimensional, if  $\Gamma$  has no triangles (cf. [CCV]).

$A_\Gamma$  is freely indecomposable if and only if  $\Gamma$  is disconnected. The decomposition that we introduce does not give any new insight in studying freely decomposable groups. Hence, for the rest of this section we will assume that the graph  $\Gamma$  is connected, and to avoid trivialities we also assume that  $\Gamma$  contains at least 3 vertices.

In [CCV] the outer automorphism group of a 2-dimensional RAAG  $A_\Gamma$  is studied by mapping a finite index subgroup of it into the direct sum of outer automorphisms of maximal *joins*. Joins  $U * V$  are complete bi-partite graphs on the set of vertices  $U$  and  $V$ . This map gives a bound on the virtual cohomological dimension of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ , and enabled the authors to construct an outer space on which a finite index subgroup of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  acts.

We are interested in the specific description of the group  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ . We will associate a (canonical) *flags hypergraph* with  $\Gamma$ , that is related to the set of maximal joins that is studied in [CCV], but our point of view is somewhat different. We look at RAAGs as an example, or a motivation, for the general definition of a higher rank JSJ decomposition. And we view the flags hypergraph as encoding the higher rank JSJ decomposition of a 2-dimensional RAAG, that will give us the description of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ . In the next section we generalize the construction of the flags hypergraph to include all RAAGs and not just the 2-dimensional ones.

Following [CCV] we let  $v \in \Gamma$  be a vertex, and denote  $lk(v)$  the *link* of  $v$ , and  $st(v)$  the *star* of  $v$ . Following [CV] on the set of vertices of  $\Gamma$  we define a partial order. We say that  $u \leq v$ ,  $u, v \in \Gamma$ , if  $lk(u) \subset st(v)$ . With the partial order we naturally associate an equivalence relation, and denote the class of  $u \in \Gamma$  by  $[u]$ .

The results of [CCV] are obtained by studying the maximal equivalence classes w.r.t. the above partial order. To get the hypergraph we are looking for, and obtain the structure of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ , we need to look at all the equivalence classes and not only the maximal ones.

**Definition 1.1.** *With the finite simple graph  $\Gamma$ , we associate a hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , with a grading of the vertices and the hyperedges. The vertices of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  are the vertices of  $\Gamma$ . We start the construction of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  with the collection of the maximal equivalence classes with respect to the partial order that was defined on the vertices of  $\Gamma$ . We view each maximal equivalence class as a hyperedge of level 1, and each vertex in a maximal equivalence class as a vertex of level 1.*

*In the second step we add all the equivalence classes that are maximal if we take out the maximal equivalence classes. Given such an equivalence class  $[u]$ , we define a hyperedge of level 2, that contains all hyperedges (and the vertices) of level 1 that represent classes that are bigger than  $[u]$ , in addition to the vertices in the class  $[u]$ , that we define to be vertices of level 2. Note that the class  $[u]$  itself is not a hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ .*

*We continue iteratively. At step  $k$ , we look at all the classes  $[v]$  that are maximal after we took out all the classes of levels up to  $k - 1$ . With each such class  $[v]$  we associate a hyperedge of level  $k$ . This hyperedge contains all the hyperedges of level less than  $k$ , such that all the classes in these hyperedges are bigger than  $[v]$ , and all the vertices in  $[v]$ . The vertices in  $[v]$  are defined to be of level  $k$  as well.*

*Since the graph  $\Gamma$  is finite, the procedure for the construction of the hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  terminates after a finite time. We call  $\Delta_\Gamma$  the flags hypergraph of the 2-dimensional right angled Artin group  $A_\Gamma$ .*

We say that a hyperedge is a hyperedge with roots, if there are generators in the hyperedge that correspond to roots (valence 1 vertices) in  $\Gamma$ . In that case the hyperedge must be maximal, and the roots have to be the highest level vertices in the hyperedge.

With the flags hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  of a 2-dimensional RAAG one can naturally associate groups of automorphisms.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite graph, and suppose that  $\Gamma$  is connected with no triangles. Let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. On the hyperedges and vertices of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  there is a natural grading - their level. We start with hyperedges of level 1 in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ .

Let  $[u]$  be an equivalence class of vertices of level 1 in  $\Gamma$  (note that  $[u]$  is a hyperedge of level 1 in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ ). With  $[u]$  we associate a group of automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that is generated by:

- (1) the automorphism group of the free group that is generated by the vertices in  $[u]$ ,  $\text{Aut}(A_{[u]})$ . Each such automorphism extends to an automorphism of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining it to be the identity on all the generators that are not in  $[u]$ .
- (2) We look at the complement of the star of  $[u]$ ,  $st([u])$ , in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[u]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[u]}$  be the connected components of that complement that are not single vertices. We join to automorphisms of type (1) the automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that are obtained by conjugating each of the subgroups,  $A_{\Gamma_i^{[u]}}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , by elements from  $A_{[u]}$ . Note that these are particular automorphisms of the free product:

$$A_{[u]} * A_{\Gamma_1^{[u]}} * \dots * A_{\Gamma_m^{[u]}}$$

that extend naturally to automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining them to be the identity on the generators that are connected to  $[u]$ , and on generators that are single vertices in their connected component in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ .

We continue iteratively to all the hyperedges without roots. Let  $E_k$  be a hyperedge without roots of level  $k$  in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ . Suppose that we added groups of automorphisms that are associated with all the hyperedges of levels up to level  $k - 1$  that are contained in  $E_k$ .

The hyperedge  $E_k$  contains hyperedges of lower level and an equivalence class  $[v]$  of vertices of level  $k$  (where the vertices in  $[v]$  are not roots). Let  $A_{E_k}$  be the free group that is generated by the generators that are associated with vertices in the hyperedge  $E_k$ . Then  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]}$ , where  $A_{[v]}$  is the free group that is generated by generators that are associated with the vertices in  $[v]$ , and  $B$  is the free group that is generated by the generators that are associated with all the vertices of lower level in  $E_k$ . With the hyper edge  $E_k$  we add the group of automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that is constructed as follows.

- (1) We look at generators in the complement of the star of  $[v]$ ,  $st([v])$ , in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus st([v])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[v]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[v]}$  be the connected components of that complement that are not single vertices. Some of these components contain vertices of lower levels in the hyperedge  $E_k$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_r$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq m$ , be the non-empty subsets of vertices of lower level in  $E_k$  that are contained in distinct connected components. Then:  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]} = B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , where  $B_i$  is the free group generated by  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

We first add all the automorphism of the free product (which is a free group):  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]} = B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , that conjugate the subgroups  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  (elementwise). The generators of the free factor  $A_{[v]}$  are considered as free generators of the free product.

- (2) For each connected component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , that contains one of the sets  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , we conjugate the whole group that is associated with component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$  by the element that conjugates  $B_i$ .

Every other component,  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ , that does not contain vertices from the hyperedge  $E_k$ , and is not a single vertex, is conjugated by an arbitrary element from the group  $A_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with roots. In that case it has to be a maximal hyperedge. Let  $[v]$  be the equivalence class of the roots in the hyperedge, that have to be the vertices with the maximal level,  $k$ . Let  $u$  be the vertex to which the roots are connected in  $\Gamma$ . Since the RAAG is 2-dimensional,  $[u]$  contains only the vertex  $u$ .

Let  $B$  be the group that is generated by the rest of the generators in  $E_k$ , i.e., those that are not in  $[v]$  nor  $[u]$ . Since they are in  $E_k$ , and the generators that are associated with the minimal vertices  $[v]$  commute with  $u$ , all the generators in  $E_k$  have to commute with  $u$ . Hence,  $A_{E_k} = \langle u \rangle \oplus (B * A_{[v]})$ . In that case we add automorphisms as follows.

- (1) We start by adding automorphisms similar to the ones that were added for hyperedges that do not contain roots. We look at generators in the complement of the star of  $[v]$ ,  $st([v])$ , in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus st([v])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[v]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[v]}$  be the connected components of that complement.

Every such component contains vertices of lower levels in the hyperedge  $E_k$ , and every connected component is not a single vertex. Let  $S_1, \dots, S_m$ , be the non-empty subsets of vertices of lower level in  $E_k$  that are contained in distinct connected components. Then:

$$A_{E_k} = \langle u \rangle \oplus (B * A_{[v]}) = \langle u \rangle \oplus (B_1 * \dots * B_m * A_{[v]})$$

where  $B_i$  is the free group generated by  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

We first add all the automorphisms of the free product (which is a free group):  $B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , that conjugate the subgroups  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  (elementwise). The generators of  $A_{[v]}$  are considered to be free generators in this free product.

We extend such an automorphism to an automorphism of  $A_{E_k}$ , by defining it to be the identity on the cyclic subgroup  $\langle u \rangle$ . For each connected component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , we conjugate the whole group that is associated with component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$  by the element that conjugates  $B_i$ .

- (3) We add the transvections of  $[v]$ . i.e., multiplications of the elements of  $[v]$  by powers of  $u$ . This is a free abelian group in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  for each hyperedge with roots.

We denote the group of automorphisms that is generated by the automorphisms that are associated with all the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ ,  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph with no triangles, and let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be

be its flags hypergraph. Then the image of  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  is of finite index in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ .

*Proof:* It is equivalent to show that  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  and the inner automorphisms of  $\Gamma$  generate a finite index subgroup of  $Aut(A_\Gamma)$ . By a theorem of Laurence [La] and Servatius [Ser], there are 5 types of generators of automorphisms of a RAAG (see section 2.2 in [CCV]): inner automorphisms, inversions, partial conjugations, transvections, and symmetries. Symmetries are induced symmetries of the graph  $\Gamma$ , and if we exclude them we get the *pure* automorphism group of a RAAG which is of finite index in  $Aut(A_\Gamma)$ .

Inversions of generators are included in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , as for each generator the corresponding inversion is included in the automorphisms (of a free subgroup) that are associated with the hyperedge in which the corresponding generator is of highest level.

Partial conjugations occur when a star of a vertex separates the graph  $\Gamma$ . In such a case it is possible to conjugate one of the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st(v)$  by the generator  $v$ . If the connected component is not a single vertex, partial conjugations are contained in the groups of automorphisms that we associated with the various hyperedges together with inner automorphisms, when the vertex  $v$  is of highest level. If the connected component is a single vertex  $\hat{v}$ , then such partial conjugations are contained in the groups of automorphisms that we associated with a hyperedge in which  $\hat{v}$  is of highest level.

Transvections occur when there exist two vertices  $v, w \in \Gamma$ , that satisfy:  $lk(w) \subset st(v)$ . In that case we can replace  $w$  by  $vw$ . If  $v$  and  $w$  are not connected by an edge, then  $lk(w) \subset lk(v)$ , so  $[w] \leq [v]$  and  $w$  is not a root connected to  $v$ . Hence,  $v$  and  $w$  must be vertices in a hyperedge in which  $w$  is a vertex of highest level. Therefore, the automorphism group that is associated with this hyperedge contains the relevant transvection.

Suppose that  $v$  and  $w$  are connected by an edge in  $\Gamma$ . Since  $\Gamma$  contains no triangles,  $lk(w) = v$ , and  $w$  is a root in  $\Gamma$ . In that case the centralizer of the hyperedge that contains  $w$  is the cyclic subgroup that is generated by  $v$ . Therefore, the transvections that we added for hyperedges with roots contains the transvection that maps  $w$  to  $vw$ . □

The flags hypergraph encodes the group of automorphisms of a 2-dimensional RAAG. With each hyperedge in the flags hypergraph, and with the automorphisms that are associated with the hyperedge, it is possible to associate an action of the RAAG on a simplicial tree, or a space of actions of the RAAG on real trees.

**Definition 1.4.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph with no triangles, let  $A_\Gamma$  be its associated 2-dimensional RAAG, and let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. With a hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$  that contains no roots we associate an action of  $A_\Gamma$  on a simplicial tree according to the structure of the hyperedge. If the hyperedge contains roots we associate with it two different actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on simplicial trees. The associated actions are not necessarily faithful, and they are all weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1). We list the possible associated graphs of groups, according to the type of the hyperedge.*

- (1) *The graph of groups that is associated with a hyperedge of level 1,  $E_1$ , contains a bouquet of  $s$  loops, where  $s$  is the number of vertices of level 1 in the*

hyperedge. It contains a vertex for each connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, where  $[u]$  is the equivalence class of the vertices of level 1 in the hyperedge. The stabilizer of such a vertex is the group that is associated with the connected component. It contains an additional bouquet of  $t$  loops, where  $t$  is the number of single vertices in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ .

We note that on these loops it is possible to define a natural partial order, that gives a natural grouping to free factors that are associated with them, but mostly for presentation purposes we chose to omit it.

The edge groups in the graph of groups are all trivial. The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the associated graph of groups is normally generated by the generators in  $lk([u])$ .

- (2) The graph of groups that is associated with a hyperedge of higher level without roots,  $E_k$ , is similar. It contains a bouquet of  $s$  loops, where  $s$  is the number of vertices in the hyperedge, that are of the same level as the level of the the hyperedge, i.e., the highest level vertices in the hyperedge (there exists at least one such vertex).

It contains a vertex for each connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, where  $[u]$  is the equivalence class of the highest level vertices in the hyperedge. The stabilizer of such a vertex is the group that is associated with the connected component. It contains an additional bouquet of  $t$  loops, where  $t$  is the number of single vertices in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ .

As in (1) the edge groups in the graph of groups are all trivial. The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the associated graph of groups is normally generated by the generators in  $lk([u])$ .

- (3) With a hyperedge with roots we associate two simplicial trees, hence, two graphs of groups. The first graph of groups is the same as in (1) and (2). It contains  $s$  loops, where  $s$  is the number of root vertices in the hyperedge. The vertices are groups that are associated with connected components in the complement of the star of these roots. The edge groups are all trivial, and the kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the graph is the normal closure of the cyclic group that is generated by the vertex to which the roots are connected in  $\Gamma$ .

In addition we add a graph of groups that encodes the transvections that are associated with a hyperedge with roots. Let  $u$  be the vertex to which the roots in the hyperedge are connected. The second graph contains a vertex that is stabilized by  $\langle u \rangle$ . It contains a second vertex that is stabilized by an abelian group that is generated by  $\langle u \rangle$  and additional  $s$  generators that are associated with the  $s$  roots in the hyperedge. The edge group is  $\langle u \rangle$ . Hence, the graph of groups is not reduced, and is supposed to encode the transvections that are associated with the hyperedge.

The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the second graph of groups is normally generated by the generators that are not one of the roots in the hyperedge nor  $u$ , and the commutators between the roots and between the roots and the generator  $u$ .

With each of the graphs of groups that we associated with the flags hypergraph, there is an associated action of the RAAG  $A_\Gamma$  on a tree. The action is not faithful

in general, but it is weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1).

**Lemma 1.5.** *With the assumptions and notation of definition 1.4, with every graph of groups decomposition that is associated with a hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , the flags hypergraph of  $A_\Gamma$ , there is an associated weakly acylindrical action of  $A_\Gamma$  on a tree.*

*Proof:* The graphs of groups of the first type that are associated with the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$  have trivial edge stabilizers. Hence, their fundamental groups act acylindrically on them. The fundamental groups of these graphs of groups are quotients of  $A_\Gamma$ . Therefore, the actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on these trees are weakly acylindrical.

The graphs of groups of the second type, that are associated with hyperedges with roots are not reduced. The fundamental group of these graphs of groups are free abelian, and the edge group is cyclic. With every such graph of groups we can associate a simplicial action of their fundamental group on a real line. The cyclic edge group acts faithfully and simplicially on the real line. The kernel of the action is the free abelian group that is generated by the generators that are added to the edge group to generate the vertex group.

The free abelian fundamental group of such a graph of groups is a quotient of  $A_\Gamma$ . Since the action of the fundamental group is simplicial, the action on  $A_\Gamma$  on the line via the quotient map is weakly acylindrical.

□

The trees that are associated with the various hyperedges in the flags hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , that admit a weakly acylindrical action of  $A_\Gamma$ , are constructed to study the structure of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ , and as a motivation for the general construction of a higher rank JSJ decomposition. To connect between the trees we constructed and the structure of  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  we further prove that the automorphism group  $A_1(\Gamma)$  preserve the free product structure that is associated with the graphs of groups of the first type that are associated with the hyperedges.

Let  $Out_1(A_\Gamma)$  be the image of  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ . We prove that every class of automorphisms in  $Out_1(A_\Gamma)$  restricts to outer automorphisms of the fundamental groups of the graphs of groups of the first type that are associated with the various hyperedges that are encoded by these graphs of groups.

**Proposition 1.6.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph with no triangles, let  $A_\Gamma$  be its associated 2-dimensional RAAG, and let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. With the hyperedges of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  we have associated graphs of groups of one or two types.*

*Let  $E_k$  be a hyperedge of level  $k$  in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , and let  $\tau \in Out_1(A_\Gamma)$ . Then  $\tau$  restricts to an outer automorphism of the fundamental group of the graph of groups of the first type that is associated with  $E_k$ , and its restriction is encoded by this graph of groups.*

*Proof:* We start with hyperedges of level 1,  $E_1$ . Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices (of level 1) in  $E_1$ . Then  $[u] * lk([u])$  is a maximal join. By proposition 3.2 in [CCV] the pure automorphism group of  $A_\Gamma$  preserves the conjugacy class of every maximal join.

Suppose first that  $E_1$  contains more than a single vertex.  $E_1$  is of level 1, hence,  $lk([u])$  contains more than a single vertex as well, unless  $\Gamma$  contains a single edge, in which case the claim is trivial. By proposition 3.2 in [CCV],  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , that is a subgroup of the pure automorphism group, preserves the conjugacy classes of both

$\langle [u] \rangle$  and  $\langle lk([u]) \rangle$ . Hence, given an automorphism  $\tau \in Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , we can compose it with an inner automorphism, and assume that it preserves the subgroup  $\langle [u] \rangle$ .

We need to prove the existence of a restriction for all the generators of the pure automorphism group of  $A_\Gamma$ , and to guarantee that the restriction of a composition is a composition of the restrictions.

Let  $\Theta_{E_1}$  be the graph of groups that is associated with  $E_1$  in definition 1.4, and let  $G_{E_1}$  be its fundamental group. Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  that are encoded by the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . If  $v \in [u]$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , i.e., it may conjugate by  $v^{\pm 1}$  some of the factors and leave others unchanged. Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk([u])$  act trivially on  $G_{E_1}$ , since these generators are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ .

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in  $E_1$ ,  $s$  must be in  $E_1$  as well, since otherwise  $s > v$  for  $v \in E_1$ , and the vertices in  $E_1$  are maximal. Such a transvection restricts to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

If  $v \in lk[u]$ , then  $v$  must be a vertex that is connected only to vertices in  $E_1$ . Hence, in this case  $s \in lk([u])$  as well, so the normal closure of  $lk([u])$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ , and it doesn't have an effect on compositions with other automorphisms.

If  $v$  is in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, then either  $s$  is in the same component, or  $s$  is in  $lk([u])$ . Elements in  $lk([u])$  are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ . A transvection within a component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  clearly extends to an automorphism of a free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Finally  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $E_1$  contains a single vertex  $u$ . If  $\Gamma$  does not have a single edge,  $lk(u)$  contains more than a single vertex. By proposition 3.2 in [CCV],  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserves the conjugacy class of  $\langle u \rangle$ , and the conjugacy class of  $\langle u, lk(u) \rangle$ . Hence, we may assume that the automorphism  $\tau \in Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserves the subgroup  $\langle u \rangle$ .

Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . A partial conjugation in  $u$  preserves the normal closure of  $\langle lk(u) \rangle$  and the free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk(u)$  do not affect  $G_{E_1}$  (this changes after compositions with transvections and we refer to that in the sequel).

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  and in  $lk(u)$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms that do not change the normal closure of  $lk(u)$ , that restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ .  $v$  can not be  $u$ , since  $u$  is maximal. If  $v \in lk(u)$ , then  $v$  must be a vertex that is connected only to  $u$ , i.e., it is a root of  $u$ . Hence, in this case  $s \in lk([u])$  or  $s = u$ . If  $s \in lk(u)$  then  $\langle lk(u) \rangle$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ . If  $s = u$  then  $v \in lk(u)$  is mapped to  $uv$ . This does not affect  $G_{E_1}$ , but compositions with partial conjugations in  $v$  may conjugate some connected factors of  $\Gamma \setminus st(v)$  by powers of  $u$  in  $G_{E_1}$ . Such automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  are obtained anyway by partial conjugations in  $u$ .

If  $v$  is in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st(u)$  that is not a single vertex, then either  $s$  is in the same component, or  $s$  is in  $lk(u)$ , and  $lk(s)$  is not only  $u$ . Elements in  $lk(u)$  are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ . A transvection within a component of  $\Gamma \setminus st(u)$  clearly extends to an automorphism of a free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Finally  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that for some  $k > 1$ ,  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with no roots. Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices of level  $k$  in  $E_k$ . Then the vertices in  $E_k$  together with  $lk([u])$  are a maximal join, so the maximal join is preserved by  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  ([CCV], proposition 3.2). Furthermore,  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with no roots, so the conjugacy class of the free group that is generated by the generators that belong to  $E_k$  is preserved by  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ .

Let  $\Theta_{E_k}$  be the graph of groups that is associated with  $E_k$  in definition 1.4, and let  $G_{E_k}$  be its fundamental group. The graph  $\Theta_{E_k}$  contains several vertex groups that contain generators that are associated with vertices in  $E_k$ , and vertex groups that do not contain vertices in  $E_k$ . It contains loops that are associated with vertices in  $[u]$ , and loops that are associated with connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that contain single vertices.

Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_k}$  that are encoded by the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in [u]$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ , i.e., it may conjugate by  $v^{\pm 1}$  some of the factors and leave others unchanged. Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk([u])$  act trivially on  $G_{E_k}$ , since these generators are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_k}$ .

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that does not contain vertices from  $E_k$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that contains vertices from  $E_k$  that are not in  $[u]$ . Then a partial conjugation in this vertex may act as an automorphism on the group that is associated with its connected component. It may conjugate some of the elements in  $[u]$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in one of the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, then  $s$  must be from the same component or from  $lk([u])$ . Hence, such a transvection preserves  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in [u]$  then  $s$  has to be from  $E_k$ . Such a transvection is an automorphism

that preserves the free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

If  $v \in lk[u]$ , then  $v$  must be a vertex that is connected only to vertices in  $E_k$ . Hence, in this case  $s \in lk([u])$  as well, so the normal closure of  $lk([u])$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ , and it doesn't have an effect on compositions with other automorphisms.

Finally,  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with roots. Let  $[r]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices of level  $k$  in  $E_k$ , i.e., the roots in  $E_k$ . Let  $u$  be the vertex to which the roots are connected ( $\langle u \rangle$  is the center of the subgroup that is generated by the generators in  $E_k$ ). Let  $\Theta_{E_k}$  be the graph of groups of the first type that is associated with  $E_k$  in definition 1.4, and let  $G_{E_k}$  be its fundamental group. The graph  $\Theta_{E_k}$  contains several vertex groups that do all contain generators that are associated with vertices in  $E_k$ , and loops that are associated with the roots.

Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_k}$  that are encoded by the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in [r]$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . Partial conjugations by  $u$  act trivially on  $G_{E_k}$ , since  $u$  is mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([r])$ . A partial conjugation in this vertex may act as an automorphism on the group that is associated with its connected component. It may conjugate some roots and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in one of the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([r])$ , then  $s$  must be from the same component or it is  $u$ . Hence, such a transvection preserves  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

$v$  can not be  $u$ , unless  $\Gamma$  has a single edge. Finally,  $v$  can be one of the roots, in which case  $s$  is the vertex  $u$ . Such a transvection acts as the identity on  $G_{E_k}$  since  $u$  is mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_k}$ . □

We have associated one or two graphs of groups decompositions with each hyperedge in the flags hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  (definition 1.4). In lemma 1.5 we proved that  $A_\Gamma$  acts weakly acylindrically on each of the Bass-Serre trees that are associated with the graphs of groups that are associated with the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ .

The actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on each of these Bass-Serre trees can be twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ . By proposition 1.6 the automorphisms in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserve the free product structure that is associated with each of the graphs of groups that are associated with the trees. Hence, it is not difficult to analyze the structure of the trees that are obtained as limit of actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on one of the Bass-Serre trees when they are twisted by a sequence of automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ .

With each such convergent sequence one can associate an abelian decomposition of a limit group over  $A_\Gamma$ . Among these limit groups and their abelian decompositions there exists a maximal object. We view the collection of maximal objects (limit groups and their abelian decompositions) that are associated with the collection of trees that are associated with all the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , as a higher rank JSJ decomposition of  $A_\Gamma$ .

In the next section we generalize the construction to all RAAGs, and in sections 3-4 we construct a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram, which is the first step in constructing a higher rank JSJ decomposition for HHGs that satisfy some additional assumptions (that hold for RAAGs and the mapping class groups).

## §2. General RAAGs

In the previous section we have associated a flags hypergraph with a 2-dimensional RAAG, and one or two graphs of groups with each hyperedge. The actions of the 2-dimensional RAAG on each of the Bass-Serre trees that are associated with the graphs of groups were shown to be weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1). This is the basic setting for the construction of the higher rank JSJ decomposition that is presented in the sequel.

In this section we modify the construction for 2-dimensional RAAGs, and associate a flags hypergraph with a general RAAG. We further associate one or two graphs of groups with each hyperedge, and prove that the actions of the RAAG on each of the associated Bass-Serre trees are weakly acylindrical.

We note that our results for RAAGs are based on the works of Charney-Vogtmann [CV] and Duncan-Kazachkov-Remeslennikov [DKR]. We mainly present their results in a different way, that demonstrates our approach to the construction of the higher rank JSJ decomposition for more general HHGs in the sequel.

Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite simple graph. If  $\Gamma$  is disconnected then  $A_\Gamma$  is freely decomposable, and we associate a flags hypergraph with each connected component of  $\Gamma$ . Hence, we may assume that  $\Gamma$  is connected for the construction of the flags hypergraph.

Following [CV], on the set of vertices of  $\Gamma$  we define a partial order, that was used in dimension 2. Given  $u, v \in \Gamma$ , we say that  $u \leq v$  if  $lk(u) \subset st(v)$ . In [CV] it is proved that this is a partial order. With the partial order one can naturally associate an equivalence classes of vertices, that we denote  $[u]$ . In [CV] it is also proved that  $A_{[u]}$  is either free or free abelian, i.e., that either the vertices in  $[u]$  form a clique or they form an anti-clique (there is no edge between any two of them).

As in the 2-dimensional case, from the partially ordered set of equivalence classes of vertices in  $\Gamma$ , we can construct the flags hypergraph,  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , that is associated with a general RAAG  $A_\Gamma$ .

**Definition 2.1.** *As in the 2-dimensional case, the vertices in the hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  are the vertices of the graph  $\Gamma$ . We start the construction of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  with the collection of the maximal equivalence classes with respect to the partial order that was defined on the vertices of  $\Gamma$ . We view each maximal equivalence class as a hyperedge of level 1, and each vertex in a maximal equivalence class as a vertex of level 1.*

*We continue the construction precisely as we did in the 2-dimensional case. At step  $k$ , we look at all the classes  $[v]$  that are maximal after we took out all the classes of level up to  $k - 1$ . With each such class  $[v]$  we associate a hyperedge of level  $k$ . This hyperedge contains all the hyperedges of level less than  $k$ , such that all the classes in these hyperedges are bigger than  $[v]$ , and all the vertices in  $[v]$ . The vertices in  $[v]$  are defined to be of level  $k$  as well. Since  $\Gamma$  is finite, the construction of the hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  terminates after finitely many steps.*

*We say that a hyperedge  $E_k$  of level  $k \geq 2$  is centerless if its highest level vertices*

centralize vertices in  $E_k$  only if they are in their class. In that case:  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]}$ , where  $[v]$  is the equivalence class of the highest level vertices in  $E_k$ , and  $B$  is the subgroup generated by the complement of  $[v]$  in  $E_k$ .

A hyperedge  $E_k$  of level  $k \geq 2$  that is not centerless must have a non-trivial center. If  $[v]$  is the class of the highest level vertices in  $E_k$ , then the center of  $E_k$  is a free abelian group that is generated by all the vertices in the complement of  $[v]$  in  $E_k$  that commute with the vertices in  $[v]$ . In that case  $E_k = Ab \oplus (B * A_{[v]})$ , where  $Ab$  is in the center of  $E_k$ , and  $B$  is the (possibly trivial) subgroup that is generated by all the generators in  $E_k$  that are not in  $[v]$  and not in  $Ab$ . Note that in case  $B$  is trivial and  $A_{[v]}$  is free abelian,  $A_{E_k}$  is abelian. Otherwise,  $Ab$  is the center of  $A_{E_k}$ . We say that such a hyperedge is a hyperedge with center.

As in the 2-dimensional case, with the flags hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  we can associate finitely many groups of automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite graph. If  $\Gamma$  is disconnected,  $A_\Gamma$  is freely decomposable. In that case, we associate a group of automorphism with each connected component, and then add the automorphisms of the corresponding free product. Hence, we assume that  $\Gamma$  is connected.

Let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. We add automorphisms for each hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , according to their natural grading - their levels. On the vertices of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  there is a natural grading - their levels. We start with hyperedges of level 1 in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ .

Let  $[u]$  be an equivalence class of vertices of level 1 in  $\Gamma$  (note that  $[u]$  is a hyperedge of level 1 in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ ). By [CV]  $A_{[u]}$  is either free or free abelian with a free (abelian) basis, the generators that are associated with the vertices in  $[u]$ . With  $[u]$  we associate a group of automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that depends if  $[u]$  is free or free abelian, and is similar to the automorphisms that were added in the top level in the 2-dimensional case. The group of automorphisms that we add for hyperedges of level 1 are generated by:

- (1) In case  $A_{[u]}$  is free, the automorphism group of the free group that is generated by the vertices in  $[u]$ ,  $\text{Aut}(A_{[u]})$ . In case  $A_{[u]}$  is free abelian, its automorphism group (isomorphic to  $GL(n, Z)$ ). Each such automorphism extends to an automorphism of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining it to be the identity on all the generators that are not in  $[u]$ .
- (2) We look at the complement of the star of  $[u]$  in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus \text{st}([u])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[u]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[u]}$  be the connected components of that complement that are not single vertices. We join to automorphisms of type (1) the automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that are obtained by conjugating each of the subgroups,  $A_{\Gamma_i^{[u]}}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , by elements from  $A_{[u]}$ . Note that these are particular automorphisms of the free product:

$$A_{[u]} * A_{\Gamma_1^{[u]}} * \dots * A_{\Gamma_m^{[u]}}$$

that extend naturally to automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining them to be the identity on the generators that are connected to  $[u]$ , and on generators that are roots that are connected to vertices in  $lk([u])$ .

We continue to the higher level hyperedges in a similar way to what we did in the 2-dimensional case. Let  $E_k$  be a centerless hyperedge of level  $k$  in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ . The hyperedge  $E_k$  contains vertices of lower level and an equivalence class  $[v]$  of vertices

of level  $k$ .  $A_{[v]}$  is either a clique or an anti clique, and the vertices in  $[v]$  do not commute with any vertex that is in the complement of  $[v]$  in  $E_k$ .

Recall that in the centerless case,  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]}$ , where  $A_{[v]}$  is either free or free abelian, and  $B$  is the group that is generated by the generators that are associated with all the vertices of lower level in  $E_k$ . With the hyperedge  $E_k$  we add the group of automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  that is constructed as follows.

- (1) We look at generators in the complement of the star of  $[v]$ ,  $st([v])$ , in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus st([v])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[v]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[v]}$  be the connected components of that complement that are not single vertices. Some of these components contain vertices of lower levels in the hyperedge  $E_k$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_r$ ,  $1 \leq r \leq m$ , be the non-empty subsets of vertices of lower level in  $E_k$  that are contained in distinct connected components. Then:  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]} = B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , where  $B_i$  is the group that is generated by  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

If  $A_{[v]}$  is free we first add all the automorphisms of the free product:  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]} = B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , that conjugate the subgroups  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  (elementwise). The generators of the free factor  $A_{[v]}$  are considered as free generators of the free product.

If  $A_{[v]}$  is free abelian we first add all the automorphisms of the free product:  $A_{E_k} = B * A_{[v]} = B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , that conjugate the subgroups  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  (elementwise), and restrict to automorphisms of  $A_{[v]}$ , i.e., to elements in the general linear group that is isomorphic to the automorphism group of  $A_{[v]}$ .

- (2) For each connected component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , that contains one of the sets  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , we conjugate the whole group that is associated with component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$  by the element that conjugates  $B_i$ .

Every other component,  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ , that does not contain vertices from the hyperedge  $E_k$ , and is not a single vertex (i.e., a root), is conjugated by an arbitrary element from the group  $A_{E_k}$ .

The particular automorphisms that we constructed are automorphisms of the free product:

$$A_{[v]} * A_{\Gamma_1^{[v]}} * \dots * A_{\Gamma_m^{[v]}}$$

that extend naturally to automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining them to be the identity on the generators that are in  $lk([v])$ , and on vertices in connected components of a single vertex in  $\Gamma \setminus st([v])$ .

Suppose that  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with center. Let  $[v]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices with highest level in  $E_k$ . Recall that in the presence of a center:  $E_k = Ab \oplus (B * A_{[v]})$ , where  $Ab$  is in the center, and  $B$  is the (possibly trivial) subgroup generated by all the generators in  $E_k$  that are in the complement of  $[v]$  and the vertices that commute with the vertices in  $[v]$ . In that case we add automorphisms as follows.

- (1) We start by adding automorphisms similar to the ones that were added for centerless hyperedges. We look at generators in the complement of the star of  $[v]$ ,  $st([v])$ , in  $\Gamma$ :  $\Gamma \setminus st([v])$ . Let  $\Gamma_1^{[v]}, \dots, \Gamma_m^{[v]}$  be the connected components of that complement that are not single vertices.

Some of these components may contain vertices of lower levels in the hyperedge  $E_k$ . Let  $S_1, \dots, S_r$ , be the non-empty subsets of vertices of lower

level in  $E_k$  that are contained in distinct connected components (If  $B$  is trivial then there are no such subsets of vertices). Then:

$$A_{E_k} = Ab \oplus (B * A_{[v]}) = Ab \oplus (B_1 * \dots * B_m * A_{[v]})$$

where  $B_i$  is the group generated by  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

We first add all the automorphism of the free product:  $B_1 * \dots * B_r * A_{[v]}$ , that conjugate the subgroups  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$  (elementwise). If  $A_{[v]}$  is free then the automorphisms of the free product regard the generators of  $A_{[v]}$  as free generators. If  $A_{[v]}$  is non-cyclic free abelian, then the automorphisms of the free product regard  $A_{[v]}$  as a factor, and we add the automorphism group of  $A_{[v]}$  which is isomorphic to the general linear group. We extend such an automorphism to an automorphism of  $A_{E_k}$ , by defining it to be the identity on the abelian subgroup  $Ab$ .

- (2) As in the case of a centerless hyperedge, for each connected component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , that contains one of the sets  $S_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , we conjugate the whole group that is associated with a component  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$  by the element that conjugates  $B_i$ .

Every other component,  $\Gamma_j^{[v]}$ , that does not contain vertices from the hyperedge  $E_k$ , is conjugated by an arbitrary element from the group  $A_{E_k}$ .

The particular automorphisms that we constructed are automorphisms of the free product:

$$A_{[v]} * A_{\Gamma_1^{[v]}} * \dots * A_{\Gamma_m^{[v]}}$$

that extend naturally to automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  by defining them to be the identity on the generators that are in  $lk([v])$ , and on generators that are roots that are connected to vertices in  $lk([v])$ .

- (3) We add the transvections of  $[v]$ . i.e., multiplications of the elements of  $[v]$  by elements from the free abelian group  $Ab$ , that extend to  $A_\Gamma$  by defining them to be identity on all the generators that are not in  $Ab$  nor in  $[v]$ . This is a free abelian group in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  for each hyperedge with center.

We denote the group of automorphisms that is generated by the automorphisms that are associated with all the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ ,  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph. Then the image of  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$  is of finite index in  $Out(A_\Gamma)$ .*

*Proof:* The proof is similar to the proof of theorem 1.3. Recall that by [La] and [Ser] it suffices to show that the group of automorphisms that is generated by  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  and the inner automorphisms of  $A_\Gamma$  contains all the inversions, partial conjugations and transvections of  $A_\Gamma$ .

Inversions of generators are included in the automorphisms of the first type that are associated with the various hyperedges. Partial conjugations occur when a star of a vertex separates the graph  $\Gamma$ . They are also contained in the automorphisms of the first type that are associated with the hyperedges.

Transvections occur when there exists two vertices  $v, w \in \Gamma$ , that satisfy:  $lk(w) \subset st(v)$ . In that case we can replace  $w$  by  $vw$ . If  $v$  and  $w$  are not connected by an edge, then  $lk(w) \subset lk(v)$ , so  $[w] \leq [v]$ . Hence,  $v$  and  $w$  must be vertices in a hyperedge

in which  $w$  is a vertex of highest level. If  $[v] = [w]$  the transvections are included in the automorphisms of the free group  $A_{[v]}$  that are included in the automorphisms of the hyperedge that contains  $[v]$  as vertices of highest level. If  $[v] > [w]$  then  $[w]$  must be an anti-clique and transvections are included with automorphisms of the free product  $B * A_{[w]}$  that is associated with the hyperedge (if it is centerless or not).

Suppose that  $v$  and  $w$  are connected by an edge in  $\Gamma$ . Again  $[v] \geq [w]$ , so  $[v]$  is contained in the hyperedge  $E_k$  that contains  $[w]$  as vertices of highest level. If  $[v] = [w]$ , then  $A_{[v]}$  is a free abelian group and the transvection is included in the general linear group that is associated with  $A_{[v]}$  and with the hyperedge  $E_k$ .

Suppose that  $[v] > [w]$ . In that case  $[v]$  is a clique,  $E_k$  has center, and  $A_{[v]}$  is contained in  $Ab$  that is contained in the center of  $E_k$ . In that case the transvection is contained in the transvections that are associated with the hyperedge  $E_k$  that has center. □

If a RAAG is freely decomposable, its flags hypergraph is composed from the flags hypergraphs of its factors, and its automorphism group is obtained from the automorphism groups of the factors by adding automorphisms of a free product.

As in the 2-dimensional case, the flags hypergraph encodes the group of automorphisms of a general RAAG. Generalizing what we did in the 2-dimensional case, with each hyperedge in the flags hypergraph, and with the automorphisms that are associated with the hyperedge, it is possible to associate one or two actions of the RAAG on simplicial trees, or on a space of actions on real trees.

**Definition 2.4.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph, let  $A_\Gamma$  be its associated RAAG, and let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. As in the 2-dimensional case, with a hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$  we associate an action of  $A_\Gamma$  on one or two simplicial trees according to the structure of the hyperedge. The associated actions are not faithful in general, and they are all weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1). We list the possible associated graphs of groups.*

- (1) *The graph of groups that is associated with a hyperedge of level 1 can be one of two possibilities. If the group that is generated by the generators of level 1 is free, then the graph of groups is similar to the one that was constructed in the 2-dimensional case for level 1 hyperedges.*

*It contains a bouquet of  $s$  loops, where  $s$  is the number of vertices of level 1 in the hyperedge. It contains a vertex for each connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, where  $[u]$  is the equivalence class of the vertices of level 1 in the hyperedge. The stabilizer of such a vertex is the group that is associated with the connected component. It contains additional  $t$  loops that are associated with the connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that are single vertices.*

*The edge groups in the graph of groups are all trivial. The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the associated graph of groups is normally generated by the generators in  $lk([u])$ .*

*Suppose that  $[u]$ , the equivalence class of level 1, forms a clique with more than one vertex. In that case the graph of groups contains a vertex group  $A_{[u]}$ , which is free abelian, and vertex groups that are associated with the connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ , that are not single vertices. It*

contains additional  $t$  loops that are associated with the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that are single vertices. The edge groups are all trivial. The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the associated graph of groups is normally generated by the generators in  $lk([u])$ .

- (2) The graph of groups that is associated with a centerless hyperedge of higher level is similar. Let  $[u]$  be the highest level vertices in the hyperedge. If  $A_{[u]}$  is free, then the graph of groups contains a bouquet of  $s$  loops, where  $s$  is the number of vertices in  $[u]$ . It also contains vertices for each of the connected components of  $st([u])$  in  $\Gamma$  that are not single vertices, where the corresponding vertex group is the group that is associated with such a connected component. It contains another  $t$  loops, where  $t$  is the number of connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that are single vertices. All the edge groups are trivial, and the kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the graph of groups is identical to the one in part (1).

If  $A_{[u]}$  is non-cyclic free abelian, the bouquet of circles is replaced by a vertex with the free abelian group  $A_{[u]}$  as a vertex group.

- (3) Suppose that a hyperedge of level more than 1 has center. Let  $[u]$  be the highest level vertices in  $E_k$ . We look at the vertices in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . With this collection of vertices, and their connected components, together with the vertices in  $[u]$ , we associate a similar graph of groups that we associated with a centerless hyperedge, depending on whether the vertices of highest level in the hyperedge form a clique or not.

All the edge groups in the constructed graph of groups are trivial. The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the constructed graph of groups is normally generated by the vertices in  $lk([u])$ . The constructed graph of groups is the graph of groups of the first type that is associated with the hyperedge with center  $E_k$ .

In addition, we associate with such a hyperedge a second graph of groups that encodes its transvections. Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the highest level vertices in the hyperedge. The graph of groups has a vertex that is stabilized by the abelian group  $Ab$  (which is in the center of the hyperedge), and this also the edge group (the graph of groups is not reduced). It has another abelian vertex group that is stabilized by  $Ab$  and additional  $s$  generators, where  $s$  is the number of elements in  $[u]$ . The kernel of the map from  $A_\Gamma$  to the fundamental group of the graph of groups is normally generated by all the generators that are associated with vertices in the complement of  $[u]$  and the vertices that are in the center of the hyperedge, and the commutators between the generators in  $A_{[u]}$

As in the case of 2-dimensional RAAGs, with each of the graphs of groups that we associated with the flags hypergraph, there is an associated action of the RAAG  $A_\Gamma$  on a tree or on a product of trees. The action on the trees is not faithful in general, but it is weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1).

**Lemma 2.5.** *With the assumptions and notation of definition 2.4, with every graph of groups decomposition that is associated with a hyperedge in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , the flags hypergraph of  $A_\Gamma$ , there are associated weakly acylindrical actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on one or more trees.*

*Proof:* As in the 2-dimensional case, the graphs of groups of the first type that are associated with the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$  have trivial edge stabilizers. Hence,  $A_\Gamma$  act on them weakly acylindrically.

The graphs of groups of the second type, that are associated with hyperedges with center, are not reduced. The center of the hyperedge,  $Ab$ , which is a free abelian group, is one vertex group and the edge group in such a graph of groups. The second vertex group is free abelian and is generated by  $Ab$  and  $s$  additional (free) generators that are associated with the vertices of highest level in the hyperedge.

Let  $\ell$  be the rank of center  $Ab$  of such a hyperedge (with center). With a graph of groups of the second type we associate  $\ell$  trees that are all lines, on which  $A_\Gamma$  acts simplicially. Let  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell$  be free generators of the free abelian center  $Ab$ . Given  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , we associate an action of  $A_\Gamma$  on a line, where  $\langle a_i \rangle$  acts simplicially, and all the other standard generators of the RAAG act trivially. Such a simplicial action of  $A_\Gamma$  is clearly weakly acylindrical. □

Note that transvections that are associated with a graph of groups of the second type, map each of the  $s$  additional generators that are associated with vertices of highest level in a hyperedge with center, and are included in the second vertex group in the associated graph of groups of the second type, to an element in the center  $Ab$ . Hence, the images under transvections of the  $s$  additional generators act accordingly on the  $\ell$  associated lines.

As in the case of 2-dimensional RAAGs, our next step is to prove that every class of automorphisms in  $Out_1(A_\Gamma)$  restricts to outer automorphisms of the fundamental groups of the graphs of groups of the first type that are associated with the various hyperedges that are encoded by these graphs of groups. This is important for understanding the structure of the higher rank JSJ decomposition that is associated with a RAAG, that is obtained from convergent sequences of actions of the RAAG on the trees that we constructed, where the actions are twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ .

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite connected graph, let  $A_\Gamma$  be its associated RAAG, and let  $\Delta_\Gamma$  be its flags hypergraph. With the hyperedges of  $\Delta_\Gamma$  we have associated graphs of groups of one or two types.*

*Let  $E_k$  be a hyperedge of level  $k$  in  $\Delta_\Gamma$ , and let  $\tau \in Out_1(A_\Gamma)$ . Then  $\tau$  restricts to an outer automorphism of the fundamental group of the graph of groups of the first type that is associated with  $E_k$ , and its restriction is encoded by this graph of groups.*

*Proof:* The proof is similar to the proof of proposition 1.6. We start with hyperedges of level 1,  $E_1$ . Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices (of level 1) in  $E_1$ .

By proposition 3.2 in [CV], automorphisms in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserve the conjugacy class of  $A_{[u]}$ . Hence, given an automorphism  $\tau \in Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , we can compose it with an inner automorphism, and assume that it preserves the subgroup  $\langle [u] \rangle$ .

Suppose first that  $E_1$  contains more than a single vertex and is not a clique.  $E_1$  is of level 1, hence,  $lk([u])$  contains more than a single vertex as well, unless  $\Gamma$  contains a single edge, in which case the claim is trivial.

Let  $\Theta_{E_1}$  be the graph of groups that is associated with  $E_1$  in definition 2.4, and let  $G_{E_1}$  be its fundamental group. Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms that

are associated with  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . If  $v \in [u]$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk([u])$  act trivially on  $G_{E_1}$ , since these generators are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ .

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in  $E_1$ ,  $s$  must be in  $E_1$  as well since vertices in  $E_1$  are maximal. Hence, the transvection is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . If  $v \in lk[u]$ ,  $s$  must be in  $lk([u])$  as well, so the normal closure of  $lk([u])$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ , and it doesn't have an effect on compositions with other automorphisms.

If  $v$  is in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, then either  $s$  is in the same component, or  $s$  is in  $lk([u])$ . Elements in  $lk([u])$  are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ . A transvection within a component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  clearly extends to an automorphism of a free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Finally  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $E_1$  contains a single vertex  $u$  or it is a clique. If  $\Gamma$  does not have a single edge,  $lk(u)$  contains more than a single vertex. By proposition 3.2 in [CV],  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , preserves the conjugacy class of  $\langle u \rangle$ , and the conjugacy class of  $\langle u, lk(u) \rangle$ . Hence, we may assume that the automorphism  $\tau \in Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserves the subgroup  $\langle u \rangle$ .

Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . A partial conjugation in  $u$  preserves the normal closure of  $\langle lk(u) \rangle$  and the free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk(u)$  do not affect  $G_{E_1}$  (this changes after compositions with transvections and we refer to that in the sequel).

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  and in  $lk(u)$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms that do not change the normal closure of  $lk(u)$ , that restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in  $[u]$ ,  $s$  must be in  $[u]$  as well, since  $[u]$  is maximal, so such transvections are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Suppose that  $v \in lk(u)$  and  $v$  is connected only to vertices in  $[u]$  and in  $lk(u)$ . In this case  $s \in lk([u])$  or  $s \in [u]$ . If  $s \in lk(u)$  then  $lk((u))$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ . If  $s \in [u]$  then  $v \in lk(u)$  is mapped to  $uv$ . This does not affect  $G_{E_1}$ , but compositions with partial conjugations in  $v$  may conjugate some connected factors of  $\Gamma \setminus st(v)$  by elements in  $\langle u \rangle$  in  $G_{E_1}$ . Such automorphisms of  $G_{E_1}$  are obtained anyway by partial conjugations in elements from  $[u]$ .

Suppose that  $v \in lk(u)$  and  $v$  is connected to vertices that are not in  $[u]$  nor in  $lk(u)$ . In this case  $s \in lk([u])$ , and  $s$  must be also connected to vertices that are not in  $[u]$  nor in  $lk([u])$ . Hence, such a transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ .

If  $v$  is in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st(u)$  that is not a single vertex, then either

$s$  is in the same component, or  $s$  is in  $lk((u))$  and  $s$  is connected to vertices that are not in  $[u]$  nor in  $lk([u])$ . Such elements in  $lk(u)$  are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_1}$ . A transvection within a component of  $\Gamma \setminus st(u)$  clearly extends to an automorphism of a free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ . Finally  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_1}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_1}$ .

Suppose that for some  $k > 1$ ,  $E_k$  is a centerless hyperedge. Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices of level  $k$  in  $E_k$ . By the analysis of the restriction of a general automorphism to the group that is associated with such a hyperedge, the group that is associated with a centerless hyperedge,  $B * A_{[u]}$ , is mapped to a conjugate by every automorphism in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  (cf. the proof of proposition 3.2 in [CV]).

Let  $\Theta_{E_k}$  be the graph of groups that is associated with  $E_k$  in definition 1.4, and let  $G_{E_k}$  be its fundamental group. Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_k}$  that are encoded by the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in E_k$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ , i.e., it may conjugate by  $v^{\pm 1}$  some of the factors and leave others unchanged. Partial conjugations by elements in  $lk([u])$  act trivially on  $G_{E_k}$ , since these generators are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_k}$ .

If  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that does not contain vertices from  $E_k$ , then a partial conjugation in this vertex may conjugate  $\langle [u] \rangle$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that contains vertices from  $E_k$  that are not in  $[u]$ . Then a partial conjugation in this vertex may act as an automorphism on the group that is associated with its connect component. It may conjugate some of the elements in  $[u]$  and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is in one of the connected components of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, then  $s$  must be from the same component or from  $lk([u])$ . Hence, such a transvection preserves  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in [u]$  then  $s$  has to be from  $E_k$ . Such a transvection is an automorphism that preserves the free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

If  $v \in lk[u]$ , then  $v$  must be a vertex that is connected only to vertices in  $E_k$  and  $lk([u])$ . Hence, in this case  $s \in lk([u])$  as well, so the normal closure of  $lk([u])$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_1}$ , and it doesn't have an effect on compositions with other automorphisms.

Finally,  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $E_k$  is a hyperedge with center. Let  $[u]$  be the equivalence class of the vertices of level  $k$  in  $E_k$ , i.e., the highest level vertices in  $E_k$ . Let  $\Theta_{E_k}$  be the graph of groups of the first type that is associated with  $E_k$  in definition 2.4, and let  $G_{E_k}$  be its fundamental group.

Inversions clearly restrict to automorphisms of  $G_{E_k}$  that are encoded by the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . If  $v \in [u]$ , then any partial conjugation in  $v$  preserves the free product in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . Partial conjugations by vertices in  $E_k$  that are not in the center, preserve the free product that is associated with  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . Partial conjugations by vertices in  $lk([u])$  act trivially on  $G_{E_k}$ , since they are mapped to the identity in  $G_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $v$  is a vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . A partial conjugation in this vertex may act as an automorphism on the group that is associated with its connected component. It may conjugate some elements in  $[u]$ , and possibly few other factors that are associated with connected components in  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  by  $v^{\pm 1}$ , and leave other such factors unchanged. These are automorphisms of free products that are encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

Suppose that  $s$  and  $v$  are vertices, and a transvection sends  $v$  to  $sv$ . If  $v$  is from a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$  that is not a single vertex, then  $s$  must be from the same component or from  $lk([u])$ . In both cases such a transvection restricts to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

If  $v \in [u]$  then  $s$  has to be from  $E_k$ . Such a transvection is an automorphism that preserves the free product that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ .

If  $v \in lk[u]$ , then  $v$  must be a vertex that is connected only to vertices in  $E_k$  and  $lk([u])$ . Hence, in this case  $s \in lk([u])$  as well, so the normal closure of  $lk([u])$  does not change, and this transvection does not affect the group  $G_{E_k}$ , and it doesn't have an effect on compositions with other automorphisms.

Finally,  $v$  can be the single vertex in a connected component of  $\Gamma \setminus st([u])$ . Such a vertex is represented by a loop in  $\Theta_{E_k}$ , so any transvection that sends  $v$  to  $sv$  for some  $s$ , extends to an automorphism that is encoded by  $\Theta_{E_k}$ . □

As for 2-dimensional RAAGs, we have associated one or two graphs of groups decompositions with each hyperedge in the flags hypergraph  $\Delta_\Gamma$  (definition 2.4), and proved that  $A_\Gamma$  acts weakly acylindrically on each of the trees that are associated with the graphs of groups that are associated with the hyperedges in  $\Delta_\Gamma$  (lemma 2.5).

The actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on each of these trees can be twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ . By proposition 2.6 the automorphisms in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  preserve the free product structure that is associated with each of the graphs of groups of the first type (Bess-Serre trees). Hence, it is not difficult to analyze the structure of the trees that are obtained as limit of actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on one of the Bass-Serre trees when they are twisted by a sequence of automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ . The trees that are associated with graphs of groups of the second type are lines, and it is easy to analyze how automorphisms in  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$  twist these actions.

Maximal decompositions that one obtains from convergent sequences of actions of  $A_\Gamma$  on the trees that we constructed, where the actions are twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut_1(A_\Gamma)$ , form the higher rank JSJ decomposition of the RAAG. This may serve as a motivation or an example for the construction of a higher rank JSJ decomposition for more general HHGs.

### §3. A higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram of a product

In the first two sections we associated a flags hypergraph with every RAAG, associated actions of the RAAG on one or two simplicial trees with each hyperedge

in the flags hypergraph, and, hence, obtained an action of the RAAG products of these simplicial trees.

We further proved that a natural finite index subgroup of the automorphism group of the RAAG, the one that excludes the symmetries of the defining graph, is encoded by the trees that we constructed.

In the sequel we generalize these constructions to obtain what we view as a higher rank JSJ decomposition of an HHG that satisfy some further natural assumptions (that hold in the case of the mapping class group). In this paper we construct the first step in the construction of the higher rank JSJ decomposition, what we view as a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram.

For presentation purposes we first construct such a higher rank MR diagram in case the HHS space is quasi-isometric to a product of (finitely many) unbounded hyperbolic spaces, and consider more general HHG in the next section.

Let  $X$  be a HHS on which a f.g. group  $G$  acts isometrically, properly discontinuously and cocompactly. Suppose that the top dimensional hyperbolic space that is associated with the HHS structure  $X$  is bounded, and it dominates a (maximal) collection of orthogonal subspaces  $V_1 \perp \dots \perp V_m$ , where with each of the  $V_j$ 's there is an associated unbounded hyperbolic space,  $CV_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . We further assume that  $S$ , the top complexity subspace, and  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ , are the only subspaces that are associated with the HHS  $X$ .

In [BHS1] it is proved that a proper co-compact action of a group on a HHS  $X$  guarantees that the action of the group on the hyperbolic space  $CS$  that is associated with the highest complexity space  $S$  of  $X$  is acylindrical (Corollary 14.4 in [BHS1]). This is an important property of the action when  $CS$  is not a bounded space.

Acylindricity plays an essential role in our construction of a higher rank JSJ decomposition of an HHG. In the construction we will need a weaker form of acylindricity in the action on (unbounded) hyperbolic projection spaces that are associated with the HHS, and not just with the highest level one. Unfortunately, such weak acylindricity is not part of the definition of an HHS and it doesn't always hold (e.g., the Burger-Mozes groups [Bu-Mo]). Hence, we need to add it as an assumption.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $X$  be a metric space and let  $G$  act isometrically on  $X$ . We say that  $G$  acts weakly acylindrically on  $X$  if there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exist  $R, N > 0$ , so that for every  $x, y \in X$ ,  $d_X(x, y) > R$ , there exist at most  $N$  elements:  $g_1, \dots, g_k \in G$ ,  $k \leq N$ , so that if  $d_X(x, gx) < \epsilon$  and  $d_X(y, gy) < \epsilon$ , then  $g = g_j u$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , and for every  $z \in X$ ,  $d_X(z, uz) < \delta$ .*

Note that the weak form of acylindricity that we will assume (definition 3.1) is a coarsification of the WWPD condition of Bestvina, Bromberg and Fujiwara [BBF].

**Definition 3.2.** *Let  $X$  be a HHS that has a top dimensional bounded projection space, and a finite collection of orthogonal projection spaces  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  that are dominated by  $S$ , and these are the only projection spaces of the HHS  $X$ . i.e.,  $X$  is quasi-isometric to a product of hyperbolic spaces. Suppose that  $G$  acts on  $X$  properly discontinuously and cocompactly.*

Recall that  $G$  permutes the projection spaces  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ . We say that  $G$  acts strongly acylindrically on  $X$ , if:

- (1) for every projection space  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , that is not quasi-isometric to a real line, the (set) stabilizer of  $V_j$  in  $G$ ,  $\text{stab}(V_j)$ , acts weakly acylindrically (definition 3.1) on  $V_j$ .
- (2) if  $V_j$  is quasi-isometric to a real line, the set stabilizer of  $V_j$  modulo the kernel of the action of the set stabilizer on  $V_j$ , acts acylindrically on  $V_j$ .

By our assumptions,  $G$  permutes the subspaces  $V_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Hence, there exists a subgroup of finite index,  $\hat{H}$ , that fixes these hyperbolic spaces. We take  $H$  to be the intersection of all the subgroups in  $G$  that have the same index as  $\hat{H}$ . By our assumptions  $H$  acts weakly acylindrically on each of the hyperbolic spaces  $V_j$ , and  $\text{Aut}(G)$  acts on  $H$ .

In order to construct a higher rank JSJ decomposition for  $G$ , we start by viewing automorphisms of  $G$  as homomorphisms, or rather as quasimorphisms, and associate a (finite) higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram with  $\text{Aut}(G)$ . Once we have a finite MR diagram, we use the properties of automorphisms, and in particular the ability to compose them, in order to construct the higher rank JSJ decomposition.

We look at all the sequences of automorphisms:  $\{\varphi_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  in  $\text{Aut}(G)$  that are distinct in  $\text{Out}(H)$ .

We fix a generating set  $h_1, \dots, h_\ell$  of  $H$ . Given an automorphism  $\varphi_n$ , for each index  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , there exists a point  $x_n^j \in V_j$ , for which:

$$\max_i d_{V_j}(x_n^j, \varphi_n(h_i)(x_n^j)) < 1 + \inf_{x \in V_j} \max_i d_{V_j}(x, \varphi_n(h_i)(x)).$$

By the properties of HHS, since the spaces  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  are orthogonal, there exists a constant  $c > 0$ , and for each index  $n$  a point  $x_n \in X$ , that for each index  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $x_n$  projects to a point that is in a  $c$  neighborhood of  $x_n^j$  in  $V_j$ .

Since  $H$  acts cocompactly on  $X$ , by composing each of the automorphisms in the sequence with an inner automorphism (that depends on the index  $n$ ), we may assume that for all  $n$ :  $x_n = x_0$ , some fixed point in  $X$ .

Since the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$  are distinct in  $\text{Out}(H)$ , there must exist at least one index  $j$ , for which the sequence:  $\max_i d_{V_j}(\pi_{V_j}(x_0), \varphi_n(h_i)(\pi_{V_j}(x_0)))$  is unbounded. Hence, we can extract a subsequence of the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , for which these stretching constants increase to infinity for some  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . Following [Gr-Hu] we call such a sequence a *divergent* sequence.

We fixed a sequence of automorphisms in  $\text{Aut}(G)$  that are distinct in  $\text{Out}(H)$ . We pass to a subsequence for which for some (non-empty set of) indices  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , the projection of the sequence to  $V_j$  is divergent, and for the other indices  $j$ , the sequence is bounded. i.e., for the last indices  $j$ :  $\max_i d_{V_j}(\pi_{V_j}(x_0), \varphi_n(h_i)(\pi_{V_j}(x_0)))$  is bounded.

We look at those indices for which the sequence is divergent, and fix such an index  $j$ . We can extract a subsequence for which the actions of  $H$  on the hyperbolic space  $V_j$ , twisted by the subsequence of automorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , converges after rescaling to a faithful action of a limit group  $L$  on a real tree  $Y$  (the notion of a convergent subsequence of a divergent sequence is somewhat problematic, but we preferred to keep the existing terminology).

It is important to note that limit groups over free groups, that were obtained from sequences of homomorphisms from a given f.g. group into a free group, were defined

in two equivalent ways. The first uses Gromov-Hausdorff convergence into actions on real trees, and the stable kernel is then the normal subgroup that acts trivially on the limit tree. The second definition uses algebraic convergence, i.e., sequences in which every element of the domain is either stably trivial (i.e., mapped to the identity by all except for finitely many homomorphisms), or stably non-trivial. In the second case the stable kernel is the collection of stably trivial elements.

The two definitions are identical in studying limit groups over free or torsion-free hyperbolic groups, but they are distinct in our setting. Since we study automorphisms, the algebraic definition of a limit group forces all the limit groups to be isomorphic to the original group (automorphisms are injective so the algebraic stable kernel is trivial). However, when we use Gromov-Hausdorff convergence to define limit groups (of projections of divergent sequences), the stable kernel are those elements that act trivially on the limit (real) trees, and these are not trivial in general. Hence, in order to be able to apply the limit group machinery, in the sequel we will always use the geometric definition of limit groups (Gromov-Hausdorff convergence and the associated stable kernel).

Since the original action of  $H$  on  $V_j$  was assumed weakly acylindrical, the action of the limit group  $L$  on the limit tree  $Y$  can be analyzed using the results of [Gu]. Applying the work of [Gr-Hu] (theorems 5.15 and 5.20 in [Gr-Hu]), since  $L$  was constructed from a divergent sequence,  $L$  has a non-trivial virtually abelian JSJ decomposition.

With the convergent subsequence of automorphisms, for which the sequence of actions converges into the limit group  $L$ , we want to associate not just a JSJ decomposition, but also a *resolution*. i.e., a finite descending chain of (strict and proper) epimorphisms of limit groups, such that the sequence of homomorphisms that are associated with the terminal limit group in the descending sequence are uniformly bounded, i.e., do not have a divergent subsequence.

To get such a resolution, and afterwards use these resolutions to construct a Makanin-Razborov diagram, we use the techniques that appear in [Ja-Se] to construct a Makanin-Razborov diagram over free products, together with arguments that are used and appear in [Gr-Hu] for acylindrical actions. Note that some of the main results of [Gr-Hu] are not applicable in our setup, since they extensively use the equationally Noetherian assumption that we chose to omit.

To construct a resolution, we start with a divergent sequence of automorphisms,  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , for which the actions of  $H$  on  $V_j$ , twisted by  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , converges into an action of a limit group  $L$  on a real tree  $Y$ . Let  $\eta : H \rightarrow L$  be the canonical quotient map. We say that an element  $u \in L$  is elliptic, if for some (hence, any)  $h \in H$  for which  $\eta(h) = u$ , there exists some index  $n_h$ , such that for all  $n > n_h$ ,  $\varphi_n(h)$  is elliptic (when acting on  $V_j$ ). We say that an element  $u \in L$  is non-elliptic if there exists  $n_h$  such that for all  $n > n_h$ ,  $\varphi_n(h)$  is loxodromic.

We say that an element  $u \in L$  is *bounded* if for some (hence, any) element  $h \in H$  for which  $\eta(h) = u$ , the traces of the sequence of elements,  $\{\varphi_n(h)\}$ , when acting on  $V_j$ , are bounded. That is:  $\min_{x \in V_j} d_{V_j}(\varphi_n(h)(x), x)$  is a bounded sequence. Note that the actual bound may depend on the choice of the element  $h$  for which  $\eta(h) = u$ , but not the boundedness of the corresponding sequences. Note that every elliptic element is bounded.

Given a divergent sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , we apply the diagonal argument and pass to a subsequence for which an element  $u \in L$  is either:

- (1) elliptic.
- (2) bounded and non-elliptic.
- (3)  $u \in L$  is not bounded, and for every  $h \in H$  for which  $\eta(h) = u$ , the sequence  $\varphi_n(h)$  has no subsequence with bounded traces.

We pass to a subsequence of the original sequence of automorphisms,  $\{\varphi_n\}$ , that satisfies the above trichotomy. We denote the collection of bounded elements in  $L$  by  $B_L$ , and the collection of elliptic elements by  $E_L$  (note that these are subsets and not subgroups in general).

With the action of  $L$  on the limit tree  $Y$  we associate a decomposition (graph of groups) of  $L$ ,  $\Delta_L$ , using the analysis of the action as it appears in [Gu] (see theorem 5.1 in [Gu]). Since we assumed that the action of  $H$  on each of the subspaces  $V_j$  is weakly acylindrical, lemma 4.7 in [Gr-Hu] proves that the stabilizers of tripods in  $Y$  are uniformly finite, and the stabilizers of non-degenerate segments in  $Y$  are uniformly finite by abelian. Hence,  $\Delta_L$  is a JSJ like decomposition, that contains uniformly finite, and uniformly finite by abelian edge groups, and vertex groups that are either:

- (1) rigid
- (2) uniformly finite by abelian
- (3) 2-orbifold by uniformly finite (QH)

We continue by associating a modular group of automorphisms of  $L$  with the decomposition  $\Delta_L$ , as it appears in section 5.4 of [Gr-Hu]. We replace the limit group  $L$ , that may not be f.p. by a sequence of f.p. covers  $\{M_i\}$  that converge to  $L$ , and have decompositions (graph of groups) with a similar structure as  $\Delta_L$ , their vertex groups are f.p. and edge groups are f.p. and uniformly finite by abelian. The QH vertex groups that appear in this sequence of decompositions are isomorphic to the QH vertex groups in  $\Delta_L$ . Such a sequence of covers is built and presented in lemma 6.1 in [Re-We] and lemma 6.3 in [Gr-Hu].

Since the limit group  $L$  may be not f.p. the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$  of  $H$  may not factor through the limit group  $L$ , i.e., in general it is impossible to associate with them quasimorphisms from  $L$  to  $Isom(V_j)$ . However, a suffix of the sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  can be viewed as quasimorphisms of an increasing sequence of the sequence of f.p. covers  $\{M_i\}$ . i.e., with an automorphism:  $\varphi_n \in Aut(G)$  there is an associated quasimorphism:  $\hat{\varphi}_n : M_{i(n)} \rightarrow Isom(V_j)$ , and the sequence of indices  $\{i(n)\}$  grows to  $\infty$ . These quasimorphisms can be shortened by automorphisms from the modular group of  $L$ , that lift to automorphisms from the modular groups of the covers  $\{M_i\}$ .

We denote the shortened quasimorphisms  $\psi_n = \varphi_n \circ f_n$ , where  $f_n$  is a shortening automorphism from the modular group of  $M_{i(n)}$ . If the sequence  $\{\psi_n\}$  is a divergent sequence, then a subsequence of the quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_n\}$  converges to an action of a limit group  $L_2$  on a real tree  $Y_2$ , where  $L_2$  is a quotient of the limit group  $L$ .

Let  $\Delta_{L_2}$  be the virtually abelian decomposition that is associated with the action of  $L_2$  on  $Y_2$ . If  $L_2$  is a proper quotient of  $L_1$ , we continue to the next step, precisely as we did in the construction of the action of  $L_2$  on  $Y_2$ , starting with the action of  $L$  on  $Y$ . Since the action of  $L_2$  on  $Y_2$  was obtained from shortening the quasimorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$  using the modular automorphisms that are associated with  $\Delta_L$ , if  $L_1$  is isomorphic to  $L_2$ ,  $\Delta_{L_2}$  contains virtually abelian decompositions that do not appear in  $\Delta_L$ . i.e., the virtually abelian decomposition in  $\Delta_{L_2}$  give decompositions of rigid vertex groups in  $\Delta_L$  that are compatible with  $\Delta_L$ , or it gives virtually abelian decompositions that are hyperbolic w.r.t.  $\Delta_L$ .

In both cases it is possible to construct a JSJ type refinement of both  $\Delta_L$  and  $\Delta_{L_2}$ ,  $\Delta_{L_2}^2$ , from which it is possible to extract both decompositions. Since  $\Delta_{L_2}^2$  is a proper refinement of  $\Delta_L$ , the modular group that is associated with it is strictly bigger than the modular group that is associated with  $\Delta_L$ . Hence, we can now repeat the construction of the action of  $L_2$  on  $Y_2$ , by shortening with automorphisms from the bigger modular group that is associated with  $\Delta_{L_2}^2$ .

As long as the shortening quotients are isomorphic to the limit group  $L$ , we get a sequence of proper refinements of the associated virtually abelian decompositions.

**Lemma 3.3.** *A sequence of proper refinements of the virtually abelian decompositions of the limit group  $L$  terminates after finitely many times.*

*Proof:* With the limit group  $L$  we associate its JSJ decomposition, and the associated modular group. We proceed to a shortening quotient, that has to be either a proper quotient of  $L$ , or a non-divergent limit group. In case it is a divergent limit group we proceed iteratively. By theorem 6.8 in [Gr-Hu] any such sequence of proper quotients of limit groups (s resolution) terminates after finitely many steps.

By lemma 6.2 in [Gr-Hu] a non-elliptic virtually abelian subgroup in a non-divergent limit group is virtually cyclic (uniformly finite by cyclic). Hence, any non-elliptic virtually abelian subgroup in the limit group  $L$  is f.g. uniformly finite by abelian.

The iterative process starts with a limit group  $L$  and a virtually abelian decomposition  $\Delta_L$  and iteratively properly refines it. Since any non-elliptic virtually abelian vertex group and edge group is f.g. the edge groups in the abelian decompositions of  $L$  that are constructed along the iterative process, can be changed (unfolded) only finitely many times along the process.

By proposition 5.14 in [Gr-Hu], the abelian decompositions that are constructed along the process are all  $(2, c)$ -acylindrical (see [Gu-Le] proposition 7.12). Hence, By acylindrical accessibility (see [We1]), there is a bound on the topological complexity of the orbifolds that are associated with the QH vertex groups in the constructed decompositions, and on the number of edges in these decompositions. The bound on the combinatorial complexities of the constructed abelian decompositions, together with the finiteness of the numbers of unfoldings for each edge, prove that the refinement procedure terminates after finitely many steps. □

By lemma 3.3, after finitely many steps, the iterative procedure replaces the limit group  $L$  with a proper quotient. By theorem 6.8 in [Gr-Hu] every sequence of proper quotients of limit groups terminates after finitely many steps. Hence, after finitely many steps the original sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  is replaced by iteratively shortened sequence that is uniformly bounded, and the limit group  $L$  is replaced by a non-divergent limit group. Altogether, we get a sequence of quotients:

$$H \rightarrow L \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow L_3 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_f$$

Note that some of the epimorphisms in this sequence are isomorphisms, and some are proper quotients, and the terminal limit group  $L_f$  is a non-divergent limit group. Also, note that since we gradually enlarged the modular group in case the epimorphisms are isomorphisms, the resolution that we obtained is not a strict resolution (see definition 5.9 in [Sel]). In particular, it may be that rigid

vertex groups, and even edge groups are not mapped isomorphically by proper epimorphisms.

Lemma 3.3 starts with a sequence of automorphisms of  $H$ , for which the sequence of actions of  $H$  on the hyperbolic space  $V_j$  is divergent for some  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , and constructs from a subsequence of the original sequence a finite resolution, that terminates with a limit group in which all the elements in the terminal limit group are bounded. We repeat the same construction for all the indices  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , for which the sequence of actions of  $H$  on  $V_j$  twisted by the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_n\}$  is divergent, and for each such  $V_j$  we pass to a further subsequence and construct a resolution.

Let:

$$L_1 \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_f$$

be a resolution  $Res_j$  that is constructed from a divergent sequence of automorphisms of the group  $H$  (a characteristic finite index subgroup in the HHG  $G$ ), and its associated twisted actions of  $H$  on the hyperbolic space  $V_j$ . With each limit group  $L_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq f - 1$  there is an associated abelian decomposition,  $\Delta_{L_i}$ .

The resolution is not a strict resolution, because we gradually refined the abelian decompositions, and increased the modular groups, when the epimorphisms in the resolution are in fact isomorphisms. Hence, we modify the resolution to get a strict resolution with which we can associate a completion according to the construction that appears in section 1 of [Se2].

Starting with the given resolution, we keep only those limit groups for which the epimorphisms that is going out from them is a proper epimorphism, together with the terminal limit group  $L_f$ . The abelian decomposition that is associated with each of the limit groups that we kept is the abelian decomposition that is associated with them in the original resolution. The epimorphisms between successive limit groups in the new resolution are compositions of successive epimorphisms in the original resolution. i.e., from the original resolution we get a new resolution of the form:

$$L_{i(1)} \rightarrow L_{i(2)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_{i(t-1)} \rightarrow L_f$$

Where all the epimorphisms are proper, except perhaps the terminal epimorphism.

The new resolution is strict by construction (see section 5 in [Se1]). Hence, we can associate with it a completion, in the way it is constructed in section 1 in [Se2]. The completion starts with the terminal limit group  $L_f$ , and adds abelian or QH vertex groups according to the abelian decompositions that are associated with the limit groups along the resolution, from bottom to top. The limit groups  $L_{i(1)}, \dots, L_{i(t)}$ , where  $i(t) = f$ , are all naturally and canonically embedded into the completion, by construction. We denote the completion,  $Comp(Res)$ .

Since the terminal limit group  $L_f$  may be infinitely presented, so is the completion  $Comp(Res)$ . In case the completion is not f.p. it is not guaranteed that a subsequence of the sequence  $\{\varphi_n\}$  extends to a sequence of quasimorphisms of the completion,  $Comp(Res)$ . To guarantee the existence of such a subsequence that does extend, we will need to modify the resolution, or its completion, and replace it by a f.p. *cover*.

**Definition 3.4.** *Let  $L_1 \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_t$  be a resolution (with proper epimorphisms, except perhaps the last one) that is constructed from either a divergent or*

a bounded sequence of automorphisms of the group  $H$  on one of the spaces  $V_j$  (in case the sequence is bounded the resolution has length 1, no quotient maps). We say that a resolution:  $M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow M_t$  is a cover of the given resolution if:

- (1)  $M_t$  is f.p. and there is an epimorphism  $\eta : H \rightarrow M_1$ .
- (2) there is an epimorphism  $\eta_i : M_i \rightarrow L_i$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq t$ .
- (3) the epimorphisms of the two resolutions together with the epimorphisms  $\eta_i$  between their groups form commutative diagrams.
- (4) each of the groups  $M_i$  is equipped with a virtually abelian decomposition. This decomposition is a lifting of the virtually abelian decomposition of the corresponding limit group  $L_i$  in the original resolution. i.e., the maps  $\eta_i$  map the edge groups and the virtually abelian and QH vertex groups in the abelian decompositions of the groups  $M_i$  isomorphically onto the edge groups and the virtually abelian and QH vertex groups in the virtually abelian decompositions of the limit groups  $L_i$ . Every rigid vertex group in the virtually abelian decompositions of the  $M_i$ 's is mapped epimorphically onto a rigid vertex group in the virtually abelian decomposition of the limit groups  $L_i$ , by the epimorphisms  $\eta_i$ .
- (5) the cover resolution is a strict resolution with respect to the abelian decompositions that are associated with each of the  $M_i$  (see section 5 in [Se1] for the notion of a strict resolution).

Note that since a cover resolution is strict it has a completion. Because the terminal group in a cover is f.p. and all the edge groups are f.p. (they are virtually f.g. abelian), the completion of a cover has to be f.p. as well.

Following the procedures that appear in the proofs of theorems 24 and 25 in [Ja-Se], we replace the terminal limit group of the resolution,  $L_f$ , with a f.p. approximation. The replacement guarantees that the new completion (obtained by replacing the terminal limit group) is f.p. and that the QH vertex groups and virtually abelian edge and vertex groups that appear in the abelian decompositions that are associated with the limit groups along the original resolution remain unchanged in the new cover.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Every resolution  $L_1 \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_t$  has a cover.*

*Proof:* Identical to the proofs of theorems 24 and 25 in [Ja-Se]. □

Replacing a completion of a resolution by a cover implies that a tail of the sequence of automorphisms that were used to construct the resolution factor through the (completion of the) cover, as a sequence of quasimorphisms. Note that by our (geometric) definition of a limit group, saying that an automorphism or a homomorphism factors through a limit group, does not mean that a relation is mapped to the identity by the homomorphism, but rather that a relation is mapped by the homomorphism to an element that shifts every point in the target hyperbolic space a distance that is bounded by  $\delta$ . Hence, the (completions of the) cover resolutions that we construct do not really encode homomorphisms that factor through them, but rather quasimorphisms of the limit groups (quotients of  $H$ ) that appear along the cover resolution.

Given a divergent sequence, we replace each of the resolutions  $Res_j$ , that were

associated with the sequence and each of the spaces  $V_j$ , by a cover. Hence, the finite collection of resolutions that is associated with a divergent sequence, and with the spaces  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ , is replaced by a finite collection of covers.

In a similar way to what is proved in [Ja-Se] for homomorphisms into free products, we will prove in the sequel that finitely many f.p. covers of (finite) collections of completions suffice to encode all the possible actions of  $H$  on the spaces  $V_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , when twisted by automorphisms. Hence, we will be able to associate what we view as a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram with these actions.

We fix a finite generating set of the f.p. group  $H$ . We start with all the possible finite collections of  $m$  resolutions that are constructed from sequences of divergent or of bounded sequences of automorphisms and the corresponding twisted actions of the subgroup  $H$  on all the spaces  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . From a subsequence of such a convergent sequence it is possible to construct a collection of  $m$  resolutions (one for each of the spaces  $V_j$ ) of the form:

$$L_1 \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow L_t$$

where the terminal group is further equipped with a bound on the stretching factors of images of the fixed set of generators for all the uniformly bounded quasimorphisms that were constructed from the given convergent subsequence of automorphisms. Clearly, we may assume that this bound on the stretching factors is a positive integer.

With each collection of  $m$  resolutions we associate their (non-canonical) covers with the same bounds on the stretching factors of images of the fixed generators under quasimorphisms of their terminal limit groups. Since the completion of a cover is f.p. and the groups in the resolution are f.g. and the virtually abelian decompositions are along f.p. edge groups, the set of (completions of) covers that are decorated by the abelian decompositions and the terminal (positive integers) uniform bounds on stretching factors is countable.

We order the countable set of finite collections of cover resolutions. If the first  $r$  collections of  $m$  covers do not encode the entire set of actions of  $H$  on the spaces  $V_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ , twisted by automorphisms, we chose an automorphism  $\varphi_r$ , for which the associated actions on the spaces  $V_j$  do not factor through the first  $r$  collections of  $m$  covers.

If no finite subset of collections of  $m$  covers suffice, we get an infinite sequence of automorphisms,  $\{\varphi_r\}$ . Given this sequence, we can pass to a subsequence, from which it is possible to construct a collection of  $m$  resolutions that are associated with the twisted actions on each of the spaces  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

This collection of  $m$  resolutions has a cover that appears in the list of covers. Hence, the actions of  $H$  that are associated with a subsequence of the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_r\}$  factor through this collection of  $m$  covers. This collection of  $m$  covers appears in some place  $r_0$  in the list of collection of covers. The actions of  $H$  via the automorphisms  $\varphi_r$  were assumed not to factor through the first  $r$  covers in the list. Hence, for  $r > r_0$  automorphisms  $\varphi_r$  that belong to the convergent subsequence factor through a collection of covers that appeared previously in the list, a contradiction to the choice of these automorphisms.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let  $G$  act properly, cocompactly and strongly acylindrically on a*

*HHS  $X$ . Suppose that the top complexity hyperbolic space  $S$  that is associated with  $X$  is bounded, and the top dimensional space  $S$  dominates a (maximal) collection of orthogonal hyperbolic spaces:  $V_1 \perp \dots \perp V_m$ . We further assume that  $S$ , the top complexity subspace, and  $V_1, \dots, V_m$ , are the only spaces that are associated with the HHS  $X$ .*

*Then there exist finitely many collections of  $m$  cover resolutions, such that the action of a (fixed) finite index characteristic subgroup  $H < G$  on the spaces  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , twisted by any automorphisms in  $\text{Aut}(G)$ , factor through at least one of the collections of  $m$  covers. Every cover resolution terminates with a f.p. limit group and a positive integer, such that all the quasimorphisms from the terminal limit group to the action on  $V_j$ , that are associated with automorphisms and factor through the cover resolution, have stretching factors (of images of a fixed set of generators) that are bounded by this positive integer.*

*Furthermore, if  $\text{Out}(G)$  is infinite, then for at least one index  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , at least one of the cover resolutions has at least two steps (i.e., the cover resolution is non-trivial).*

Theorem 3.6 associates a finite set of collections of  $m$  cover resolutions with the action of  $\text{Aut}(G)$  on  $H$ , in case the space  $X$  is quasi-isometric to a product of finitely many hyperbolic spaces. We call this finite set of  $m$  cover resolutions, a *higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram* that is associated with the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(G)$ . Note that in general the higher rank diagram is not canonical.

#### §4. A higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram of some HHG

In the first two sections we associated a flags hypergraph with every RAAG, associated one or two actions of the RAAG on a simplicial tree with each hyperedge in the flags hypergraph, and, hence, obtained an action of the RAAG on a product of simplicial trees.

In the previous section we studied the automorphism group of a group that acts properly discontinuously and cocompactly on a product of hyperbolic spaces, assuming that the action is strongly acylindrical, i.e., that the induced action on each of the factors is weakly acylindrical (see definitions 3.1 and 3.2). We showed that with such a cocompact action on a product of hyperbolic spaces, it is possible to associate a (non-canonical) higher Makanin-Razborov diagram, that includes finitely many collections of  $m$  resolutions, where  $m$  is the number of factors that are associated with the projection space.

The higher rank MR diagram encodes all the automorphisms in some finite index subgroup of the automorphism group of a group that acts on a product, and its existence is the first step in the construction of a higher rank JSJ decomposition.

In this section we use the techniques that appear in the previous section to generalize the construction of the higher rank MR diagram from discrete cocompact actions on products of hyperbolic spaces to hierarchically hyperbolic groups (HHG) (see [BHS1], [BHS2], [S] for the definition and basic properties of HHG). To be able to apply the techniques that were used in the case of a product, we further assume that there exists a finite index subgroup of the HHG, for which the projection spaces in an orbit of the subgroup are transverse. This was proved to be true for the mapping class group by Bestvina-Bromberg-Fujiwara ([BBF], 5.8). To apply the techniques we further assume some weak acylindricity conditions of the actions on

the projection spaces, that suffice to guarantee that the actions of the finite index subgroup on trees, that is obtained from associated projection complexes ([BBF], [BBFS]) are weakly acylindrical. Again, it is possible to choose such sufficient assumptions that hold in the case of (HHS that are associated with) mapping class groups.

Let  $G$  be an HHG, that acts cocompactly on a HHS  $X$ . Suppose that there exists a finite index subgroup  $H < G$ , such that the projection spaces of the HHS  $X$  in each of the (finitely many) orbits under the action of  $H$ , are transverse (which means that they are not orthogonal). Let  $m$  be the number of orbits of projection spaces in  $X$  under the action of  $H$  (the number of orbits of projection spaces is assumed to be finite for an HHG).

Let  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  be representatives from the distinct orbits of projection spaces in  $X$  under the action of  $H$ . Then the distinct spaces in each orbit:  $H(V_j) = \{hV_j \mid h \in H\}$  are transverse. From each transverse collection,  $H(V_j)$ , we construct a projection complex and a quasi-tree of hyperbolic metric spaces using the constructions of Bestvina-Bromberg-Fujiwara [BBF] (see also [BBFS]).

[BBF] starts with a collection of metric spaces that they denote  $\mathbf{Y}$ , and with a constant  $\theta > 0$ , such that for every  $Y \in \mathbf{Y}$  there is a function:

$$d_Y^\pi : (\mathbf{Y} \setminus Y) \times (\mathbf{Y} \setminus Y) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

that has the following properties for all the metric spaces  $X, Y, Z, W \in \mathbf{Y}$ :

- (PC0)  $d_Y^\pi(Z, Z) < \theta$ .
- (PC1)  $d_Y^\pi(X, Z) = d_Y^\pi(Z, X)$ .
- (PC2)  $d_Y^\pi(X, Z) + d_Y^\pi(Z, W) \geq d_Y^\pi(X, W)$ .
- (PC3)  $\min(d_Y^\pi(X, Z), d_Z^\pi(X, Y)) \leq \theta$ .
- (PC4) for all  $X, Z \in \mathbf{Y}$ ,  $\#\{Y \mid d_Y^\pi(X, Z) > \theta\}$  is finite.

(see section 3.1 in [BBF]). We assumed that each distinct pair of metric spaces from the collection  $H(V_j)$  is transverse. We refer to definition 1.1 of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces (HHS) in [BHS2]. Given Two transverse projection spaces  $X, Y$  of an HHS  $X$ , there is a projection set  $\rho_Y^X \subset Y$  of uniformly bounded diameter  $\kappa_0$ , and we can assume  $\theta > \kappa_0$ .

On the set  $H(V_j)$  of transverse projection spaces there are naturally defined pseudo metrics:

$$d_Y^\pi(X, Z) = \text{diam}_Y(\rho_Y^X \cup \rho_Y^Z).$$

The definition immediately implies (PC0)-(PC2). (PC3) is a special case of ([BHS2],1.8), and (PC4) follows from the distance formula for HHS ([BHS2],4.5), which is a generalization of Masur-Minsky distance formula for the mapping class groups.

Theorem 4.1 in [BBFS] proves that by replacing the constant  $\theta$  with  $11\theta$  it is possible to replace the pseudo-metrics  $d_Y^\pi$  with pseudo-metrics  $d_Y$  that satisfy the axioms (SP1)-(SP5) of [BBFS]. These include the axiom:

(SP3) if  $d_Y(X, z) > \theta$  then  $d_Z(X, W) = d_Z(Y, W)$  for all  $W \in \mathbf{Y} \setminus \{Z\}$ .

The properties (SP1)-(SP5) will allow us to work with the tools and the conclusions of [BBFS], and in particular with their *standard paths* in projection complexes (lemma 3.1 in [BBFS]). Standard paths are helpful in analyzing projection complexes and in particular in proving acylindrical properties of a group action on these complexes (e.g., theorems 3.9 and 6.4 in [BBFS]).

After modifying the pseudometric to satisfy properties (SP1)-(SP5) in [BBFS], let  $K > 3\theta$ . With an orbit  $H(V_j)$  we associate the projection complex  $P_K^j$  (see section 3 in [BBF] or [BBFS]). The following guarantees weak acylindricity of the action of  $H$  on  $P_K^j$ .

**Proposition 4.1 (cf. ([BBFS],3.9)).** *Let  $K > 3\theta$ . Suppose that there exist some positive integers  $r, b$ , such that the stabilizer of a standard path of length  $r$  in  $P_K^j$  has a finite index subgroup of index at most  $b$ , for which every element in the finite index subgroup quasi-stabilizes (pointwise) each of the projection spaces in the orbit  $H(V_j)$ . Then  $H$  acts on  $P_K^j$  weakly acylindrically (definition 3.1).*

*Proof:* Identical to the proof of theorem 3.9 in [BBFS]. □

The weakly acylindrical actions of the finite index subgroup  $H$  on the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , enable us to apply the techniques that were used in the case of a product in the previous section. Hence, with these  $m$  weakly acylindrical actions we can associate a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram that encodes the automorphisms in  $Aut(G)$ .

**Theorem 4.2 (cf. Theorem 3.6).** *Let  $G$  act properly and cocompactly on a HHS  $X$ . Suppose that there exists a finite index subgroup  $H < G$  for which there are finitely many orbits of projection spaces of  $X$  under the action of  $H$  (i.e.,  $H$  and  $G$  are HHG), and that the projection spaces in each orbit of  $H$ ,  $HV_j$ , are transverse. Let  $m$  be the number of orbits of projection spaces under the action of  $H$ .*

*Using [BBF] and [BBFS], from the action of  $H$  on each orbit of projection spaces,  $HV_j$ , it is possible to construct an action of  $H$  on a projection complex,  $P_K^j$ . Suppose further that there exist some positive integers  $r, b$ , such that the stabilizer of a standard path (see [BBFS] for this notion) of length  $r$  in the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , has a finite index subgroup of index at most  $b$ , for which every element in the finite index subgroup stabilizes each of the projection spaces in the orbit  $H(V_j)$ .*

*Then there exist finitely many collections of  $m$  cover resolutions, such that the action of  $H$  on the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , twisted by any automorphisms in  $Aut(G)$ , factor through at least one of the collections of  $m$  covers. Every cover resolution terminates with a f.p. limit group and a positive integer, such that all the quasimorphisms from the terminal limit group to the action on  $P_K^j$ , that are associated with automorphisms and factor through the cover resolution, have stretching factors (of images of a fixed set of generators) that are bounded by this positive integer.*

*Proof:* Identical to the proof of theorem 3.6. □

Theorem 4.2 associates a finite set of collections of  $m$  cover resolutions with the action of  $Aut(G)$  on  $H$ , that are constructed from the twisted actions of  $H$  on the projection complexes that are associated with the orbits of projection spaces under the action of  $H$ .

The terminal limit groups in these cover resolutions have uniformly bounded stretching factors when acting on the projection complexes. However, these bounds

are not sufficient to bound the action on the HHS space  $X$ . In particular, these collections may have all single levels and still  $Out(G)$  may be infinite.

To extract further information on  $Aut(G)$  we can either start with the actions of  $H$  on the quasi-trees of metric spaces that were constructed in [BBF], instead of starting with the actions on the projection complexes, or continue with the terminal limit groups in the  $m$ -collections of cover resolutions that were constructed from the projection complexes in theorem 4.2, and analyze their actions on the product of quasi-trees of metric spaces of [BBF] and [BBFS]. We start with the first option.

**Theorem 4.3 (cf. Theorems 3.6 and 4.2).** *Let  $G$  act properly and cocompactly on a HHS  $X$ . Suppose that there exists a finite index subgroup  $H < G$  for which there are finitely many orbits of projection spaces of  $X$  under the action of  $H$  (i.e.,  $H$  and  $G$  are HHG), and that the projection spaces in each orbit of  $H$ ,  $HV_j$ , are transverse. Let  $m$  be the number of orbits of projection spaces under the action of  $H$ .*

*With the action of  $H$  on  $X$  it is possible to construct  $m$  actions of  $H$  on quasi-trees of hyperbolic metric spaces (the projection spaces of  $X$  in an orbit of  $H$ ),  $C_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , according to [BBF] and [BBFS]. Suppose that the actions of  $H$  on these  $m$  quasi-trees of metric spaces are weakly acylindrical (definition 3.1).*

*Then there exist finitely many collections of  $m$  cover resolutions, such that the actions of  $H$  on the  $m$  quasi-trees of metric spaces twisted by any automorphism in  $Aut(G)$ , factor through at least one of the collections of  $m$  covers. The terminal limit group in each cover resolution acts uniformly boundedly on the associated quasi-tree of metric spaces.*

*Every action of  $H$  on the collection of  $m$  quasi-trees,  $C_K^j$ , that is twisted by an automorphism from  $Aut(G)$ , factors through at least one of the  $m$ -collections of cover resolutions. If  $Out(G)$  is infinite, then at least one of the  $m$ -collections contains a cover resolution with at least two levels.*

*Proof:* Identical to the proof of theorem 3.6. □

Theorem 4.3 assumes that the actions of  $H$  on the  $m$  quasi-trees of metric spaces that were constructed from the action of  $H$  on  $X$  are weakly acylindrical. It is possible to somewhat relax the conditions on the action of  $H$  on  $X$ , and associate a different type of a higher rank diagram with the action. Each resolution in the  $m$  collections in the diagram starts with a resolution that is obtained from the action of  $H$  on the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ , and continues with finitely many resolutions of (possibly infinitely generated) set stabilizers of spaces that are in the orbit of the projection spaces  $V_j$ .

**Theorem 4.4 (cf. Theorem 4.3).** *Under the assumptions of theorem 4.2, suppose that in addition the set stabilizer in  $H$  of each projection space  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , acts weakly acylindrically on  $V_j$ .*

*With the actions of  $H$  on  $X$  twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut(G)$  it is possible to associate a collection of  $m$  pairs of resolutions. The first resolution in each pair, is a resolution of the ambient group  $H$ , and it encodes actions of  $H$  twisted by automorphisms from  $Aut(G)$ , on the associated projection complex  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .*

*The second part in each pair contains finitely many resolutions of the intersec-*

tions between the terminal limit group of the first resolution in a pair and the set stabilizers of finitely many spaces in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , of the HHS  $X$ . The second part resolutions encode the actions of these set stabilizers on the spaces that they stabilize in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ .

If the second resolutions in all the collections of  $m$  pairs have at most two levels, then there exists a finite collection of  $m$  pairs of cover resolutions, such that every action of  $H$  on the HHS  $X$ , that is obtained from the original action by twisting it with an automorphism from  $\text{Aut}(G)$ , is encoded by at least one of the collections of  $m$  pairs of cover resolutions.

If  $\text{Out}(G)$  is infinite, then at least one of the collections of  $m$  pairs contains a pair in which at least one of the resolutions from the pair has at least two levels.

*Proof:* We start with a sequence of automorphisms,  $\{\varphi_s\}$ , in  $\text{Aut}(G)$ . Following [BBF], from actions of  $H$  on the orbits of the projection spaces,  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , it is possible to construct  $m$  projection complexes,  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

We start with the actions of  $H$  on the  $m$  projection complexes,  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , twisted by the sequence of automorphisms,  $\{\varphi_s\}$ . By our assumptions the actions of  $H$  on the complexes  $P_K^j$  are weakly acylindrical. Hence, we can apply the construction that was used in the proof of theorem 3.6, pass to a subsequence of the automorphisms  $\{\varphi_s\}$ , and construct  $m$  resolutions that terminate in limit groups, such that with each terminal limit group there is an associated graph of groups. Each edge group in this graph of groups has a finite stabilizer, each vertex group is therefore f.g., and there are uniform bounds on the stretching factors of the traces of images of a fixed set of generators of each vertex group under the sequence of quasimorphisms that are associated with each terminal limit group.

Let  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , be the sequences of quasimorphisms that converge into the terminal limit groups  $L_t^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , in the  $m$  resolutions that were constructed from the twisted actions on the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .

By [BBF], from the action of  $H$  on the orbits of the projection spaces,  $V_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , it is also possible to construct  $m$  quasi-trees of metric spaces that we denote  $C_K^j$ , in which the (unbounded) hyperbolic projection spaces  $V_j$  are embedded. The sequences of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  were obtained from twisted actions of  $H$  on the projection complexes  $P_K^j$ , but they can be viewed as quasimorphisms into the isometry groups of the quasitrees of metric spaces  $C_K^j$  (since  $H$  acts on  $C_K^j$ , and unless  $P_K^j$  or  $V_j$  are bounded, the coarse pointwise stabilizer of the action of  $H$  on  $P_K^j$  is the coarse pointwise stabilizer of the action of  $H$  on  $C_K^j$ ).

We continue in parallel with each of the (finitely many) f.g. vertex groups in the terminal graph of groups decomposition that is associated with a terminal limit group  $L_t^j$ , and with a f.g. preimage of such vertex group in  $H$ . To save notation we will continue to denote such a vertex group  $L_t^j$ , and the f.g. preimage  $H$ .

The uniform bounds on the stretching factors of the sequences of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  (restricted to elements in the f.g. preimages of the bounded vertex groups  $L_t^j$ ), when viewed as quasimorphisms into the isometry group of the projection complexes, guarantee that for each of the associated quasimorphisms into the isometry groups of the quasi-trees of metric spaces,  $C_K^j$ , the paths that connect the basepoint to its image by the fixed set of generators of  $H$  (under the action of the quasimorphisms), are supported by boundedly many projection spaces in the quasitrees  $C_K^j$ .

If the stretching factors of the quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , viewed as quasimorphisms into the isometry group of the quasitree of metric spaces  $C_K^j$ , are not bounded, we can pass to a subsequence that converges into an action of the terminal vertex group  $L_t^j$  on a real tree  $Y_j$ . However, to construct resolutions, and the Makanin-Razborov diagram, we need to analyze not the action of  $L_t^j$  on the tree  $Y_j$ , but rather the actions of the finitely many set stabilizers of spaces in the orbits of the projection space  $V_j$ , on these spaces.

Note that these set stabilizers need not be f.g. but they are f.g. relative to finitely many bounded subgroups. To start the analysis of these set stabilizers, and prove their relative finite generation we start with the construction of the following graph of groups.

**Proposition 4.5.** *It is possible to pass to a further subsequence of quasimorphisms, that we still denote  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , into the isometry group of the quasitrees of metric spaces,  $C_K^j$ , and associate a finite bipartite graph of group decomposition  $\Theta_j$  with the limit group  $L_t^j$ , for every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ .*

*For each  $j$ , a subset of vertex groups in  $\Theta_j$  are set stabilizers of spaces in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ ,  $W_t^{j,f}$ . For every finite collection of elements,  $F_i$ , in a vertex group that is not stabilized by one of the set stabilizers,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , there is some constant  $b_{F_i}$ , such that for every quasimorphism from the subsequence, there exists a point  $p_{F_i}$  in a some space in the orbit of  $V_j$  (that depends on the quasimorphism), that is moved a distance bounded by no more than  $b_{F_i}$  by the images (under the quasimorphisms) of all the elements in the finite set  $F_i$ .*

*Furthermore, each set stabilizer,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , is generated by the edge groups that are connected to the vertex that it stabilizes,  $\{E^{j,e}\}$ , together with finitely many elements.*

*Proof:* By our assumptions, if we fix a generating set  $h_1, \dots, h_\ell$  of  $H$ , then there exists some point  $p_0$  in the projection complex  $P_K^j$  that is moved a universally bounded distance by all the elements  $\psi_s^j(h_i)$ . By conjugating the quasimorphisms, we may assume that  $p_0$  is some fixed point in  $V_j$ . By the universal bound on the stretching factors of the actions on  $P_K^j$ , each of the segments  $[p_0, \psi_s^j(h_i)(p_0)]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , is supported on boundedly many (embeddings of) spaces in the orbit of  $V_j$  in the quasi-tree of metric spaces  $C_K^j$ .

By passing to a further subsequence of quasimorphisms, we gradually construct a simplicial bipartite tree  $T$  on which the limit group  $L_t^j$  acts. We start with the union of the collection of paths  $[p_0, \psi_s^j(h_i)(p_0)]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ , in  $C_K^j$ .

We denote on each of these paths points in which the path moves from a subsegment of length bigger than  $2K$  in a projection space in the orbit of  $V_j$  to a subsegment of length bigger than  $2K$  in another space in the orbit of  $V_j$ . By passing to a subsequence of quasimorphisms, we may assume that the combinatorial places of the points on the union on these paths is identical for the entire subsequence.

If there exist points that we marked on the union of paths  $[p_0, \psi_s^j(h_i)(p_0)]$  for which there exists a subsequence such that these points remain in a bounded distance in  $C_K^j$  under the images of the quasimorphisms in the entire subsequence, we pass to that subsequence, and consider them to be in the same equivalence class.

With the union of paths  $[p_0, \psi_s^j(h_i)(p_0)]$  we further associate a finite combinatorial tree. The vertices are the equivalence classes of points that we marked on the paths, and vertices for each of the projection spaces that contain at least one unbounded edge. We connect a vertex that is associated with a projection space to the vertex that is associated with an equivalence class that contains a marked point in this projection space.

We continue by adding all the paths from  $p_0$  to the images of elements (under the sequence of quasimorphisms) of length 2 in  $H$ , i.e., to images of elements of the form  $h_{i_1}h_{i_2}$ . We mark points, pass to subsequences, and define equivalence classes of points and vertices in exactly the same way as we did with the paths in the ball of radius 1.

We continue iteratively, each time looking at all the paths from  $p_0$  to images under the sequence of quasimorphisms of elements of the ball of radius  $m$  in the Cayley graph of  $L_t^j$ , w.r.t. the fixed set of generators. At each step we pass to a subsequence of the quasimorphisms, such that the combinatorial position of the points that we mark, and the collection of bounded and unbounded segments will agree with the subsequence.

Finally, by taking a diagonal subsequence, we associate a simplicial tree,  $T_j$ , with the action of  $L_t^j$  on  $C_K^j$ . The tree is bipartite, and contains vertices that are associated with projection spaces that contain unbounded segments, and vertices that are associated with equivalence classes of points that mark the transition between such projection spaces. Since  $L_t^j$  is f.g. and the segments  $[p_0, \psi_s^j(h_i)(p_0)]$  are supported on boundedly many projection spaces in  $C_j^k$ , the graph of groups decomposition that is associated with the action of  $L_t^j$  of  $T_j$  is bipartite and finite, and we denote it  $\Theta_j$ .

By construction, all the vertex groups in  $\Theta_j$  that are associated with equivalence classes of points that mark the transition from one projection space to another are bounded. Since the graph is bipartite, all the edge groups in  $\Theta_j$  are connected to such vertex groups. Hence, all the edge groups in  $\Theta_j$ , that we denote  $E^{j,e}$ , are bounded subgroups.

Since  $L_t^j$  is f.g. each vertex groups in  $\Theta_j$  is generated by (finitely many) edge groups that are connected to it, in addition to finitely many elements. In particular, this is true for the vertices that stabilize projection spaces in  $\Theta_j$ , that we denote  $W_t^{j,f}$ , and the conclusions of the proposition follow. □

In the sequel we study resolutions of the set stabilizers  $W_t^{j,f}$  and not of the f.g. limit groups  $L_t^j$ . These set stabilizers need not be f.g. but proposition 4.5 proves that they are f.g. relative to finitely many bounded subgroups. This relative f.g. and the assumption that the ambient group  $H$  acts weakly acylindrically on every projection space  $V_j$  suffice in order to apply the techniques of [Gu] and [Gr-Hu] to analyze the (superstable) actions of the set stabilizers  $W_t^{j,f}$  on real trees, when these real trees are obtained as limits of their actions on spaces in the orbits of the projection spaces  $V_j$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** *With the assumptions of theorem 4.4 and proposition 4.5, at least one of the following holds:*

- (1) *there exists a subsequence of the quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  for which the traces*

of each element in  $W_t^{j,f}$  are bounded. In this case there exists a bounded subsequence, that we still denote,  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , for which there exist points  $p_s$ , such that for every element  $h \in H$ , which is in the preimage of  $W_t^{j,f}$ , there is a bound on the distances:  $d_{V_j}(p_s, \psi_s^j(h)(p_s))$ . Note that the bounds depend on the element  $h$ , but not on the index  $s$ .

- (2) the sequence  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  contains a subsequence (still denoted  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ ), that converges into a non-trivial action of  $W_t^{j,f}$  on some real tree  $Y_{j,f}$  in which the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are elliptic.

*Proof:* The lemma is a natural generalization of Paulin's theorem [Pa], to countable groups that are generated by finitely many bounded subgroups in addition to finitely many elements.

Suppose that there exists a subsequence of the quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  for which the traces of all the elements are bounded. We still denote the subsequence  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ . By proposition 4.5, a set stabilizer  $W_t^{j,f}$  is generated by finitely many subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in addition to finitely many elements. Furthermore, for each subgroup  $E^{j,e}$  there are points  $p_{e,s}$ , such that the images of each element in  $E^{j,e}$ , under the subsequence  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , move them a bounded distance, where the bound depends only on the specific element in the preimage of  $E^{j,e}$  and not on the index  $s$ .

If there are no subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ , or if they are all f.g.,  $W_t^{j,f}$  is f.g. and the conclusion of part (1) follows by the same argument that given an action of a f.g. group on a tree, if every element in a f.g. group has a fixed point, the whole group has a fixed point.

Suppose that there is at least one non-f.g. subgroup  $E^{j,e}$ , that we denote  $E^{j,1}$ . Let  $E^{j,1}$  and  $E^{j,2}$  be two elliptic subgroups. There exist pairs of points:  $(p_{s,1}, p_{s,2})$  such that images of elements in the preimage of  $E^{j,1}$  (under the sequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ ) move the points  $p_{s,1}$  a bounded amount (where the bounds depend on the element and not on the index  $s$ ). Similarly, the images of elements in the preimage of  $E^{j,2}$  move the points  $p_{s,2}$  a bounded amount.

If there exists a sequence of indices for which the distances between  $p_{s,1}$  and  $p_{s,2}$  are bounded, then we pass to this subsequence, and images (under quasimorphisms in the subsequence) of elements in the preimage of the subgroup that is generated by  $E^{j,1}$  and  $E^{j,2}$  move the points  $p_{s,1}$  a bounded amount.

Suppose that the distances between  $p_{s,1}$  and  $p_{s,2}$  are not bounded. We look at two sequences of f.g. subgroups,  $H_n^1$  and  $H_n^2$ , in the preimages of  $E^{j,1}$  and  $E^{j,2}$  in correspondence, such that  $H_n^i < H_{n+1}^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and the sequence of f.g. subgroups  $H_n^1$  and  $H_n^2$  approximate the preimages (i.e., their corresponding unions are the entire preimages). We fix finite generating sets of each of the subgroups  $H_n^1$  and  $H_n^2$ , and assume that the fixed generating set of  $H_n^i$  is a subset of the fixed generating of  $H_{n+1}^i$ , for  $i = 1, 2$  and every index  $n$ .

For each index  $s$  we look a geodesic path between  $p_{s,1}$  and  $p_{s,2}$ . For each pair of indices  $n, s$ , we define a subset  $B_{n,s}^1$  to be a subset of the geodesic path between  $p_{s,1}$  and  $p_{s,2}$ , that contain all the points that move by the images of each element  $h_1$  from the fixed set of generators of  $H_n^1$ , under the sequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , a distance that is bounded by the bound on  $d_{V_j}(p_{s,1}, \psi_s^j(h_1)(p_{s,1}))$  plus  $10\delta_j$  (where  $\delta_j$  is the hyperbolicity constant of  $V_j$ ). Similarly, we define  $B_{n,s}^2$  as a subset of the geodesic between  $p_{s,1}$  and  $p_{s,2}$ , as sets of points with similar bounds on the distances that they are moved by the fixed set of generators of the subgroups  $H_n^2$ .

Note that  $p_{s,i} \in B_{n,s}^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since the fixed set of generators of  $H_n^i$  is contained in the fixed set of generators of  $H_{n+1}^i$ ,  $B_{n+1,s}^i \subset B_{n,s}^i$ . Note that  $p_{s,i} \in B_{n,s}^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . If there exists some index  $n_0$ , for which the sequence of distances between  $B_{n_0,s}^1$  and  $B_{n_0,s}^2$  is not bounded, then there exists an element  $h$  in the preimage of the subgroup that is generated by  $E^{j,1}$  and  $E^{j,2}$ , for which the traces of the images  $\{\psi_s^j(h)\}$  are unbounded.

Therefore, under the assumptions of part (1), for every index  $n$ , the distances between the sets  $B_{n,s}^1$  and  $B_{n,s}^2$  are bounded. We fix an index  $s$ . If for some index  $n_0$ ,  $B_{n_0,s}^1$  and  $B_{n_0,s}^2$  have empty intersection, we pick a point  $p_{s,3}$  to be a point on the geodesic from  $p_{s,1}$  to  $p_{s,2}$  that is not in the union of  $B_{n_0,s}^i$ .

If for every index  $n$ ,  $B_{n,s}^1$  intersects non-trivially  $B_{n,s}^2$ , we pick  $p_{s,3}$  to be a point in the (non-empty) intersection of  $\cap B_{n,s}^1$  and  $\cap B_{n,s}^2$ .

Since the distances between  $B_{n,s}^1$  and  $B_{n,s}^2$  are bounded, and  $B_{n+1,s}^i \subset B_{n,s}^i$ , the images of every element  $h$  in the subgroup that is generated by  $E^{j,1}$  and  $E^{j,2}$  under the sequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , move  $p_{s,3}$  a bounded distance, where the bound depends on the element  $h$  and not on the index  $s$ .

So far we proved that under the assumptions of part (1) of the lemma, for every pair of elliptic subgroups,  $E^{j,e_1}$  and  $E^{j,e_2}$ , there exists a point  $p_s$  that moves a bounded distance by the images of every given element in the preimages of the subgroup that is generated by the two elliptic subgroups. Continuing inductively, there exists a point (still denoted  $p_s$ ) that is moved a bounded distance by the images of every given element in the preimage of the subgroup that is generated by all the (finitely many) elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ .

By proposition 4.5, the set stabilizer  $W_t^{j,f}$  is generated by finitely many elliptic subgroups,  $E^{j,e}$ , in addition to finitely many elements. By the assumptions of part (1) there is a bound on the traces of each fixed element under the sequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ . Hence, the subgroup that is generated by any given element in  $W_t^{j,f}$  can be viewed as an elliptic subgroup as well. Therefore,  $W_t^{j,f}$  is generated by finitely many elliptic subgroup, so for each  $s$  and every element  $h$  in the preimage of  $W_t^{j,f}$ , there is a bound on the distance that the images  $\{\psi_s^j(h)\}$  move the point  $p_s$ , and the conclusion of part (1) follows.

To prove part (2) suppose that there exists an element  $u$  in the preimage of  $W_t^{j,f}$ , for which the sequence of traces of the elements  $\{\psi_s^j(u)\}$  is unbounded. In this case we pass to a subsequence for which the sequence of traces of the elements  $\{\psi_s^j(u)\}$  does not have a bounded subsequence, and add the image of the element  $u$  to the generating set of  $W_t^{j,f}$ .

The set stabilizer  $W_t^{j,f}$  is obtained as a limit from a sequence of quasimorphisms. We set  $K_t^{j,f}$  to be the normal subgroup of  $W_t^{j,f}$  that act stably quasi-trivially on the projection space  $V_j$ , and set  $Q_t^{j,f}$  to be the quotient:  $W_t^{j,f}/K_t^{j,f}$ . In studying a limit action of  $W_t^{j,f}$ , we actually studying the limit action of the (limit) quotient  $Q_t^{j,f}$ .

If there are elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in  $W_t^{j,f}$  with a f.g. image in  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , we fix finite generating sets of their images in  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , and add them to the fixed generating set of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ . Hence,  $Q_t^{j,f}$  is generated by finitely many infinitely generated elliptic subgroups, which are the images (under the quotient map) of some elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ , in addition to finitely many elements, and the image of the element  $u$ , for

which the sequence of traces of  $\{\psi_s^j(u)\}$  has no bounded subsequence.

Note that if there are no elliptic subgroups, or if the images of all the elliptic subgroups in  $Q_t^{j,f}$  are f.g., then the conclusion of part (2) of the lemma follows from Paulin's theorem [Pa]. Hence, we assume that there is at least one elliptic subgroup with a non-f.g. image in  $Q_t^{j,f}$ .

For each index  $s$ , let  $A_s(u)$  be an axis of the loxodromic element  $\psi_s^j(u)$ . Let  $p_{s,e}$  be points that are moved a bounded distance by the image of each element in the preimage of  $E^{j,e}$ , under the sequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ . Given a point  $p_{s,e}$ , we set  $b_{s,e}$  to be one of the closest points to  $p_{s,e}$  in  $A_s(u)$ .

For each index  $s$ , we look at the convex hull of the points  $b_{s,e}$  in the axis  $A_s(u)$ . We set  $b_s$  to be a point in a bounded distance from the middle of the convex hull in  $A_s(u)$ .  $b_s$  will serve as a basepoint for the iterative construction of the limit tree.

The elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ , with non-f.g. image in  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , are countable and so are their preimages. We fix a sequence of f.g. approximations for the preimages of the elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ , that we denote  $\{H_n^e\}$ . We assume that for each  $e$ ,  $H_n^e < H_{n+1}^e$ . Furthermore, we fix finite generating sets of each of the approximating subgroups  $H_n^e$ , and assume that the finite generating set of  $H_n^e$  is contained in the finite generating set of  $H_{n+1}^e$ .

We start with the finite generating sets of the subgroups  $H_1^e$ , and the additional finitely many generators, that include the element  $u$ . We look at the sequence of images of these (finitely many) elements under the sequence of quasimorphisms,  $\{\psi_s^j\}$ , and the image of the basepoints  $\{b_s\}$  under these images. By rescaling so that the maximal distance between  $b_s$  and its images will have length 1, we can pass to a subsequence that converges into a finite tree, of diameter at most 2.

We gradually enlarge the finite generating sets, to include the (prefixed) finite generating sets of the subgroups,  $H_n^e$ . For each  $n$  we further rescale the metric so that the base points  $\{b_s\}$  move a maximal distance 1 by the images of the enlarged finite set of generators, and pass to a subsequence that converges into a finite tree, of diameter at most 2. Note that the tree that was obtained from the sequence at step  $n$  is embedded by homothety into the tree that is obtained in step  $n + 1$ . Also, note that because of our acylindricity assumption the homothety constant of embeddings between consecutive trees can be strictly smaller than 1 only for boundedly many indices  $n$ .

Finally, we take a diagonal sequence of quasimorphisms, and obtain a tree,  $Y_1$ , of diameter at most 2, in which the (infinite) sets of generators of the images of each of the elliptic subgroups,  $E^{j,e}$ , in  $Q_t^{j,f}$  fix points.

Now we gradually add elements that can be presented as words of length 2. First as words of length 2 in the (prefixed) generating set of  $H_1^e$  and the additional finitely many generators, and then gradually adding elements that can be presented as words of length 2 in the prefixed generating sets of  $H_n^e$  and the additional finitely many generating sets. Note that the rescaling of the metric was already done in constructing the tree  $Y_1$ . By passing to another diagonal sequence of quasimorphisms, we get convergence into a tree  $Y_2$ , of diameter at most 4.

We continue iteratively by adding elements that can be presented as words of larger and larger length, and eventually obtain a (diagonal) subsequence of quasimorphisms that converges into an action of the group  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on some real tree  $Y_{j,f}$ . By construction, the images of the elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in  $Q_t^{j,f}$  fix points in  $Y_{j,f}$ . Finally, the action of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on  $Y_{j,f}$  is non-trivial, since either the image of the base

point in  $Y_{j,f}$  is on the axis of the image of  $u$  in  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , of the base point is fixed by the infinite cyclic subgroup that is generated by the image of  $u$ , and the base point is not fixed by either one of the elliptic subgroups,  $E^{j,e}$ , or by one of the additional (finitely many) generators. □

The actions of the quotients of the set stabilizers  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on the trees  $Y_{j,f}$ , that are constructed in lemma 4.6, enable one to apply the techniques of [Gu] and [Gr-Hu] to analyze these actions.

**Lemma 4.7 (cf. [Gu], Main Theorem).** *Either  $Q_t^{j,f}$  splits over the stabilizer of a tripod in  $Y_{j,f}$ , which is a finite (bounded) subgroup, or over the stabilizer of an unstable segment in  $Y_{j,f}$ , that are finite (bounded) subgroups as well, splittings in which all the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are elliptic, or  $Y_{j,f}$  has a decomposition into a graph of actions where each vertex action is either simplicial, axial, or of IET type (see [Gu] for these notions).*

*Proof:* By lemma 4.5 the groups  $Q_t^{j,f}$  are generated by finitely many elliptic subgroups, i.e., subgroups that fix points in the trees  $Y_{j,f}$ , in addition to finitely many elements. Since we assumed that the stabilizer of a projection space  $V_j$  acts weakly acylindrically on  $V_j$ , the stabilizer of an unstable segment in  $Y_{j,f}$  is finite and universally bounded.

Hence, the actions of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on  $Y_{j,f}$  satisfy the assumptions of the main theorem (Theorem 5.1) in [Gu]. The conclusion of this theorem is the conclusion of the lemma. □

By proposition 4.5, for each  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , the set stabilizers,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , are generated by the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  that they include, together with finitely many elements. This enables one to adopt the techniques of Weidmann [We1], and obtain an acylindrical accessibility principle with a family of graph of groups decompositions of the quotients of the set stabilizers,  $Q_t^{j,f}$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *With the notation of lemma 4.5, let  $Q_t^{j,f}$  be the quotient group of the set stabilizer  $W_t^{j,f} < L_t^j$  over its stable coarse pointwise stabilizer of the corresponding space in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ . Then  $Q_t^{j,f}$  satisfies a relative acylindrical accessibility principle.*

*For every two integers,  $(k, c)$ , there exists some bound  $b_{k,c}$ , such that in every  $(k, c)$  acylindrical graph of groups decomposition of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  in which the images of the subgroups,  $\{E_t^{j,e}\}$ , that are contained in  $W_t^{j,f}$ , are elliptic, there are no more than  $b_{k,c}$  edges.*

*Proof:* This is a relative version of [We1], and follows by the same arguments according to [We2]. □

Lemmas 4.7 and 4.8 enable us to associate a canonical graph of groups decomposition with the action of  $W_t^{j,f}$  on  $V_j$ , or rather with the action of a graph of groups decomposition of the quotient  $Q_t^{j,f}$  that is associated with its action on the limit

tree  $Y_{j,f}$ .

**Proposition 4.9.** *With the action of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on the real tree  $Y_{j,f}$  it is possible to canonically associate a graph of groups decomposition  $\Lambda_{j,f}$ . The vertex groups in this graph of groups are point stabilizers, and stabilizers of axial and IET components. The edge groups are stabilizers of stable segments and cyclic extensions of stabilizers of tripods in  $Y_{j,f}$ .*

*Proof:* We start with the action of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  on the real tree  $Y_{j,f}$  according to lemma 4.6. If  $Q_t^{j,f}$  splits over a stabilizer of a tripod, or over the stabilizer of an unstable segment, then  $Q_t^{j,f}$  splits over a finite group. We denote this splitting  $\Theta_1$ .

Because the set stabilizer of a space in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$  acts weakly acylindrically, the order of the finite group over which  $Q_t^{j,f}$  splits, i.e., the edge groups in  $\Theta_1$ , is uniformly bounded (cf. [Gr-Hu]). Furthermore, since the images of the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  fix points in  $Y_{j,f}$ , the images of the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are all elliptic in  $\Theta_1$ .

Since  $Q_t^{j,f}$  is generated by the images of the (finitely many) elliptic subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in addition to finitely many elements, and the edge groups in  $\Theta_1$  are finite, each vertex group in  $\Theta_1$  is generated by finitely many bounded subgroups in addition to finitely many elements.

Now we can restrict the sequence of quasimorphisms to each vertex group in  $\Theta_1$ , pass to a subsequence, and apply lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 to the vertex subgroups. Suppose that at least one of the vertex groups splits over a finite group, that has to be of uniformly bounded order that depends only on the acylindricity constants of the action of set stabilizers in  $H$  on the projection spaces  $V_j$ . In that case we can further refine  $\Theta_1$ , and obtain another splitting of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  with finite (bounded) edge groups with strictly more edges. By the acylindrical accessibility principle that is stated in lemma 4.8, this refinement procedure terminates after finitely many steps.

When the successive refinement of splittings along bounded edge groups terminate, by lemma 4.6 every vertex group in the constructed splitting obtains a (possibly trivial) splitting in which vertex groups are point stabilizers, virtually abelian and QH vertex groups. Edge groups are all virtually abelian. By construction, the images of the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  must be elliptic in the constructed splitting. □

Finally, starting with a subsequence of quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  according to propositions 4.5 and 4.9, and the associated quasi-actions of  $H$  on the quasi-tree  $C_K^j$ , it is possible to modify the techniques that were used in the proof of theorem 3.6, and pass to a convergent subsequence from which it is possible to construct a resolution that terminates with a limit group with bounds on the stretching factors of its associated quasimorphisms.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  be a sequence of quasimorphisms, that were obtained from a sequence of automorphisms  $\{\varphi_s\}$  using a resolution that was constructed from twisted actions of  $H$  on the projection complex  $P_K^j$ . Recall that  $\{\psi_s^j\}$  converges into the limit group,  $L_t^j$ , and there are global bounds on the stretching factors of the quasimorphisms when acting on the projection complex  $P_K^j$ .*

Then it is possible to pass to a subsequence of the quasimorphisms, and when viewed as quasimorphisms into the isometry group of the quasi-tree of metric spaces,  $C_K^j$ , it is possible to associate with the subsequence finitely many (finite) resolutions of the quotients  $Q_t^{j,f}$  of the set stabilizers of spaces in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ ,  $W_t^{j,f}$ .

Furthermore, the resolutions terminate with a terminal limit group, and with a sequence of quasimorphisms that converges into it,  $\{\eta_s^{j,f}\}$ . With the terminal limit group there is an associated finite graph of groups decomposition, in which all the edge groups are finite, and all the vertex groups are bounded.

*Proof:* The proof is essentially identical to the argument that was used in the proof of theorem 3.6 and in section 6 of [Gr-Hu] in the f.g. case.

A set stabilizer of a space in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$ ,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , is a subgroup of the f.g. limit group  $L_t^j$ . We fix a finite generating set of  $L_t^j$ . This allows us to partially order the elements of  $L_t^j$  according to their length in the Cayley graph of  $L_t^j$ , where each equivalence class contains the elements of fixed length in  $L_t^j$ . Hence, each equivalence class is finite.  $W_t^{j,f} < L_t^j$ , so  $W_t^{j,f}$  inherits this partial order. Each equivalence class in  $W_t^{j,f}$  is finite or empty.

We say that a quotient  $LW$  of  $W_t^j$  is a limit group if it is obtained as a limit of a sequence of quasimorphisms of some infinitely generated free group  $F_\infty$  into the isometry group of the projection space  $V_j$ , such that the map:  $F_\infty \rightarrow LW$  factors as:  $F_\infty \rightarrow W_t^{j,f} \rightarrow Q_t^{j,f} \rightarrow LW$ .

Let  $\nu_s^j$  be a convergent sequence of quasimorphisms of  $F_\infty$  into the isometry group of  $V_j$ , and let its limit (group) be  $LW$ . As in the proof of theorem 3.6, we say that an element  $u \in F_\infty$  is bounded, if the traces of the images of  $u$  under the sequence of quasimorphisms are bounded. It is unbounded if the sequence of traces has no bounded subsequence. The image of  $u$  in  $LW$  is called bounded or unbounded, if some preimage of it in  $F_\infty$  is.

As in the proof of theorem 3.6, by passing to a subsequence, we can assume that every element in  $LW$  (and hence in  $F_\infty$  and in  $W_t^{j,f}$  and  $Q_t^{j,f}$ ), is either bounded or unbounded (w.r.t. the subsequence of quasimorphisms). In the rest of the proof we will consider only convergent sequences of quasimorphisms (and their corresponding limit groups) for which the images of elements in the subgroups  $E_t^{j,e} < W_t^{j,f}$ , that were defined in proposition 4.5, are bounded.

We continue by adapting the argument that appears in section 1 in [Ja-Se] and in section 6 in [Gr-Hu]. Suppose that there exists an infinite (properly) descending chain of limit groups:

$$Q_t^{j,f} = LW_0 \rightarrow LW_1 \rightarrow LW_2 \rightarrow LW_3 \rightarrow \dots$$

of limit quotients of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , in which the images of the subgroups  $E_t^{j,e}$  are all bounded, and non-trivial bounded elements in  $LW_d$  are mapped to non-trivial bounded elements in  $LW_{d+1}$ . We further assume that if an element  $u \in F_\infty$  is bounded w.r.t. to the sequence of quasimorphisms that converges to  $LW_d$ , then the global bound on the traces of the images of  $u$  under the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_d$ , is also a global bound on the traces of the images of  $u$  by the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_{d+1}$ .

We fix  $LW_1$  as a proper limit quotient of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , in which the non-trivial bounded elements in  $Q_t^{j,f}$  are mapped to non-trivial bounded elements, and  $LW_1$  can be

extended to an infinite proper descending chain of limit quotients of itself. We further require that global bounds on traces of images of bounded elements in  $F_\infty$  under the quasimorphisms that converge into  $Q_t^{j,f}$  remain global bounds for traces of the same elements under the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_1$ . We pick  $LW_1$  to have the maximum possible elements of length 1 (if there are such in  $W_t^j$ ) that are mapped to the trivial element among such limit quotients of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ .

We continue iteratively as in [Ja-Se] and [Gr-Hu]. We set  $LW_{d+1}$  to be a proper limit quotient of  $LW_d$ , such that the non-trivial bounded elements in  $LW_d$  are mapped to non-trivial bounded elements in  $LW_{d+1}$ , and  $LW_{d+1}$  has an infinite descending chain that satisfies the iterative properties. We further require that global bounds on traces of images of bounded elements in  $F_\infty$  under the quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_d$  remain global bounds for traces of the same elements under the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_{d+1}$ . We pick  $LW_{d+1}$  to have the maximum possible elements of length  $d + 1$  that are mapped to the identity, among all such limit quotients of  $LW_d$ .

We obtained an infinite sequence as above.  $F_\infty$  is a countable group, and we order its elements. For each index  $d$ , we pick a quasimorphism of  $F_\infty$  to  $Isom(C_K^j)$ ,  $\tau_d$ , from the sequence that converges to  $LW_d$ , that maps the first  $d$  elements to trivial, non-trivial, and bounded and unbounded elements, according to their image in  $LW_d$ . If an element among the first  $d$  elements is unbounded, we require that the quasimorphism  $\tau_d$  will send it to an element with trace bigger than  $d$ .

The sequence  $\{\tau_d\}$  subconverges to a limit group  $LW_\infty$ , in which the images of the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are bounded, and  $LW_\infty$  is generated by these (bounded) subgroups in addition to finitely many elements (since it is a quotient of  $W_t^j$ ). By construction  $LW_\infty$  is the direct limit of the sequence of limit groups:  $LW_1 \rightarrow LW_2 \rightarrow \dots$

Following section 1 of [Ja-Se] and section 6 of [Gr-Hu], by further passing to a subsequence of the quasimorphisms,  $\{\tau_d\}$ , we obtain a finite resolution:

$$LW_\infty \rightarrow LW_\infty^1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow LW_\infty^r$$

where  $LW_\infty^r$  is associated with a graph of groups decomposition in which all the edge groups are finite, and the elements in all the vertex groups are bounded.

With each of the limit groups  $LW_\infty^c$  there is an associated (finite) graph of groups decomposition with virtually abelian edge groups in which the images of the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are elliptic (since they are all bounded). Since the actions of the set stabilizers in  $H$  on  $V_j$  are weakly acylindrical, and the elements in the vertex groups in the virtually abelian decomposition that is associated with the terminal limit group  $LW_\infty^r$  are all bounded, the edge groups in all the graphs of groups decompositions that are associated with the limit groups  $LW_\infty^c$  are f.g. virtually abelian.

With  $LW_\infty$  there is an associated finite graph of groups decomposition with f.g. virtually abelian edge groups. Each vertex group in this decomposition is generated by finitely many bounded subgroups together with finitely many elements. Hence, each vertex group inherits a finite decomposition that is inherited from the finite graph of groups decomposition that is associated with  $LW_\infty^1$ . We continue iteratively with vertex groups and the virtually abelian decompositions that are

associated with the limit groups according to the finite resolution. Note that the edge groups in all these graphs of groups decompositions are f.g. virtually abelian.

The images of the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  being bounded and embedded in  $LW_\infty$ , remain elliptic in this finite iterative sequence of virtually abelian graphs of groups decompositions. Since  $LW_\infty$  is generated by the images of the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in addition to finitely many elements, and all the edge groups in the virtually abelian decompositions of  $LW_\infty^c$  are f.p. with all subgroups f.p.,  $LW_\infty$  is generated by finitely many bounded subgroups in addition to finitely many elements and finitely many relations. Furthermore, each of these finitely many bounded subgroups, is generated by finitely many conjugates of images of some of the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$ , together with finitely many elements.

Hence,  $LW_\infty$  is generated by finitely many bounded subgroups, that are images (in fact isomorphic images) of bounded subgroups is some limit group in the first sequence,  $LW_{d_1}$ , in addition to a finite collection of elements and a finite collection of relations. Hence, it follows that for some larger  $d_2$  and all  $d > d_2$ ,  $LW_d$  is a quotient of  $LW_\infty$ . This contradicts the assumptions that the sequence  $LW_1 \rightarrow LW_2 \rightarrow \dots$  is a sequence of proper quotients in which bounded subgroups are embedded, and  $LW_\infty$  is the direct limit of the sequence.

Therefore, every sequence of proper quotients of limit quotients of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ ,  $LW_1 \rightarrow LW_2 \rightarrow \dots$ , in which:

- (i) the images of the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  are bounded.
- (ii) a bounded subgroup in  $LW_d$  is mapped isomorphically into a bounded subgroup in  $LW_{d+1}$ .
- (iii) a bound on the stretching factors of the images of a bounded element under the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_d$ , remains a bound on the stretching factors of the images of that element under the sequence of quasimorphisms that converge into  $LW_{d+1}$ .

terminates after finitely many steps.

Now, let  $\{\psi_t^j\}$  be a sequence of quasimorphisms of  $H$  into the isometry group of  $P_K^j$  that converges into the limit group  $L_t^j$ , such that there exists a global bound on the stretching factors of the images of any given element in a vertex group in the graph of groups that is associated with the terminal limit group  $L_t^j$ , under the sequence  $\{psi_t^j\}$ . We look at  $\{\psi_t^j\}$  as a sequence of quasimorphisms into the quasitree of metric spaces  $C_K^j$ .

By passing to the vertex groups in the terminal graph of groups decomposition of  $L_t^j$ , and to a convergent subsequence, we define the bounded subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  w.r.t. the subsequence of quasimorphisms according to proposition 4.5. We further pass to a subsequence of the sequence of quasimorphisms, and assume that with each set stabilizer of a space in the orbit of the projection space  $V_j$  (that are defined in proposition 4.5),  $W_t^{j,f}$ , it is possible to associate a limit action on some real tree  $Y_{j,f}$  (see lemma 4.6). By construction the subgroups  $E^{j,e}$  in  $W_t^{j,f}$ , that were defined in proposition 4.5, are bounded and, hence, fix points in these limit trees  $Y_{j,f}$ . Furthermore, by proposition 4.9,  $W_t^{j,f}$  inherits a finite graph of groups decomposition from its action on  $Y_{j,f}$ .

Let  $Q_t^{j,f}$  be the quotient of  $W_t^{j,f}$  by the stable quasi point stabilizer of  $V_j$ .  $Q_t^{j,f}$  inherits a virtually abelian decomposition from the finite graph of groups decomposition of  $W_t^{j,f}$ . With the virtually abelian decomposition of  $Q_t^{j,f}$  we can

associate modular groups according to section 5.4 in [Gr-Hu]. We use these modular groups to shorten the quasimorphisms  $\{\psi_t^j\}$ , and pass to a convergent sequence of quasimorphisms, that converges into a quotient of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ .

If the quotient is isomorphic to  $Q_t^{j,f}$  it is possible to further refine the virtually abelian decomposition of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ . By lemma 4.7 such a refinement can occur only finitely many times. Hence, after finitely many such shortenings we get either a proper quotient of  $Q_t^{j,f}$ , or we get to the terminal step of the resolution, in which all the edge groups are finite and all the vertex groups are bounded.

By our previous argument we can pass from a limit group to a proper quotient of it only finitely many times. Hence, after finitely many steps we must get to the final step of the resolution in which all the vertex groups are bounded, and all the edge groups are finite. □

The construction of a resolution in proposition 4.10 enables us to use a similar compactness argument that was used in the proof of theorem 3.6 to complete the proof of theorem 4.4, in case the resolutions of the set stabilizers,  $W_t^j$ , that are constructed in proposition 4.10, do all contain no more than 2 levels.

Starting with a sequence of automorphisms  $\{\varphi_s\}$  from  $Aut(G)$ , it is possible to pass to a subsequence, and from the sequence of actions of  $H$  on the HHS space  $X$ , to construct a collection of  $m$  resolutions.

By proposition 4.10 it is possible to pass to a further subsequence, and associate with the set stabilizers of finitely many spaces in the orbit of  $V_j$ ,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , in vertex subgroups of the terminal limit group of each of the  $m$  resolutions,  $L_t^j$ , an additional resolution.

We assumed that all these resolutions contain at most two levels, so we can use the decompositions that are associated with the set stabilizers  $W_t^{j,f}$ , to further refine the graph of groups decompositions  $\Lambda_j$  that are associated with the terminal limit groups  $L_t^j$ .

The terminal limit group that is associated with this decomposition,  $L_t^j$ , is f.g. since it is a quotient of  $H$ . However, the vertex and edge groups in the decomposition that is associated with it, that was built from the graph of groups decomposition  $\Lambda_j$  from proposition 4.5 and the decompositions of the set stabilizers,  $W_t^{j,f}$ , in proposition 4.10, need not be f.g. Still, since the vertex groups are f.g. relative to the edge groups, it is possible to find f.p. approximation for each such terminal limit group and its decomposition, that extends to a f.p. cover of the entire resolution (following theorems 24 and 25 in [Ja-Se]). The cover is further equipped with bounds on the stretching factors of the generators of each non-QH, non-virtually abelian vertex group in the terminal graph of groups decomposition, and on the stretching factors of the generators of the edge groups.

There are only countably many such completions, so it is possible to order them, and using the compactness argument that was applied in the proof of theorem 3.6, there are finitely many such collections of  $m$  cover resolutions, such that the action of  $H$  twisted by every automorphism from  $Aut(G)$  factors through at least one of the collections of  $m$  resolutions.

The existence of bounds on the stretching factors of the terminal limit groups in the two parts of each cover resolution, together with the properness of the action of  $H$  on the HHS  $X$ , guarantee that if all the cover resolutions in the finite subset of  $m$  collections of cover resolutions have single levels, then  $Out(G)$  has to be finite.

This completes the proof of theorem 4.4.

□

## REFERENCES

- [BBF] M. Bestvina, K. Bromberg and K. Fujiwara, *Constructing group actions on quasi-trees and applications to mapping class groups*, Publ. de l'IHES **122** (2015), 1-64.
- [BBFS] M. Bestvina, K. Bromberg, K. Fujiwara and A. Sisto, *Acylindrical actions on projection complexes*, L'Enseign. Math. **65** (2020), 1-32.
- [BHS1] J. Behrstock, M. Hagen and A. Sisto, *Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces I: curve complexes for cubical groups*, Geometry and Topology **21** (2017), 1731-1804.
- [BHS2] ———, *Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces II: Combination theorems and distance formula*, Pacific jour. of math. **299** (2019), 257-338.
- [Bu-Mo] M. Burger and S. Mozes, *Lattices in products of trees*, Publ. Math. de l'IHES **92** (2000), 151-194.
- [Ca-Ka] M. Casals-Ruiz and I. Kazachkov, *Limit groups over partially commutative groups and group actions on real cubings*, Geom. and Top. **19** (2015), 725-852.
- [CHK] M. Casals-Ruiz, M. Hagen and I. Kazachkov, *Real cubings and asymptotic cones of hierarchically hyperbolic groups*, preprint.
- [CCV] R. Charney, J. Crisp and K. Vogtmann, *Automorphisms of 2-dimensional right-angled Artin groups*, Geometry and Topology **11** (2007), 2227-2264.
- [CV] R. Charney and K. Vogtmann, *Finiteness properties of automorphism groups of right-angled Artin groups*, Bulletin of the LMS **41** (2009), 94-102.
- [DKR] A. Duncan, I. Kazachkov and V. Remeslennikov, *Orthogonal systems of finite graphs*, Sib. Elektron. Mat. Izv. **5** (2008), 151-176.
- [Fi] E. Fioravanti, *On automorphisms and splittings of special groups*, preprint.
- [Gr-Hu] D. Groves and M. Hull, *Homomorphisms to acylindrically hyperbolic groups I: Equationally Noetherian groups and families*, Transactions of the AMS **372** (2019), 7141-7190.
- [Gu] V. Guirardel, *Actions of finitely generated groups on R-trees*, Annals Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **58** (2008), 159-211.
- [Gu-Le] V. Guirardel and G. Levitt, *JSJ decompositions of groups*, Asterisque **395** (2017).
- [Ja-Se] E. Jaligot and Z. Sela, *Makanin-Razborov diagrams over free products*, Illinois jour. of math. **54** (2010), 19-68.

- [La] M. R. Laurence, *A generating set for the automorphism group of a graph group*, Jour. of the LMS (2) **52** (1995), 318-334.
- [Le] G. Levitt, *Automorphisms of hyperbolic groups and graphs of groups*, Geom. Dedicata **114** (2005), 49-70.
- [Ma-Mi] H. A. Masur and Y. N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves II: Hierarchical structure*, GAFA **10** (2000), 902-974.
- [Pa] F. Paulin, *Outer automorphisms of hyperbolic groups and small actions on R-trees*, *Arboreal Group Theory* (ed. R. C. Alperin), 331-343.
- [Re-We] C. Reinfeldt and R. Weidmann, *Makanin-Razborov diagrams for hyperbolic groups*, Annales Math. Blaise Pascal **26** (2019), 119-208.
- [Se1] Z. Sela, *Diophantine geometry over groups I: Makanin-Razborov diagrams*, Publications Mathematique de l'IHES **93** (2001), 31-105.
- [Se2] ———, *Diophantine geometry over groups II: Completions, closures and formal solutions*, Israel jour. of Math. **134** (2003), 173-254.
- [Se3] ———, *Structure and rigidity in (Gromov) hyperbolic groups and discrete groups in rank 1 Lie Groups II*, GAFA **7** (1997), 561-593.
- [Se4] ———, *Diophantine geometry over groups IV: Completions, closures and formal solutions*, Israel jour. of Math. **143** (2004), 1-130.
- [Ser] H. Servatius, *Automorphisms of graph groups*, Jour. of Algebra **126** (1989), 34-60.
- [We1] R. Weidmann, *On accessibility of finitely generated groups*, Quarterly journal of math. **63** (2012), 211-225.
- [We2] ———, *private communication*.