Bounded geometry in relatively hyperbolic groups

F. Dahmani^{*}, A. Yaman[°]

Abstract: We prove that a group is hyperbolic relative to virtually nilpotent subgroups if and only if there exists a Gromov-hyperbolic metric space with bounded geometry on which it acts as a relatively hyperbolic group. As a consequence we obtain that any group hyperbolic relative to virtually nilpotent subgroups has finite asymptotic dimension. For these groups the Novikov conjecture holds.

0. Introduction

The class of relatively hyperbolic groups is an important class of groups encompassing hyperbolic groups, fundamental groups of geometrically finite orbifolds with pinched negative curvature, groups acting on CAT(0) spaces with isolated flats, and many other examples. It was introduced by M. Gromov in [G1] and developed by B. Bowditch, B. Farb, and other authors (eg: [Bow2],[F]). There is now an interesting and rich literature on the subject.

A finitely generated group Γ is hyperbolic relative to a family of finitely generated subgroups \mathcal{G} if it acts on a proper complete hyperbolic geodesic space X, preserving a family of disjoint horoballs $\{B_p, p \in P\}$, finite up to the action of Γ , such that for all p, the stabiliser of B_p is an element G_p of \mathcal{G} , that acts co-compactly on the horospheres of B_p , and such that the action of Γ is co-compact on the complement of the horoballs (see [Bow2]).

A space X satisfying the conditions of the definition is referred to as an *associated space* to Γ . Geometrically, one should think of the complement of the horoballs as of the cover of the convex core of a geometrically finite hyperbolic manifold (or equivalently of the thick part of the manifold for Margulis decomposition), and of the horoballs as of the covers of the cusps.

In many geometrical examples, the parabolic subgroups of Γ , that is, the elements of the family \mathcal{G} , are virtually nilpotent. The main examples are geometrically finite manifolds with pinched negative curvature (one can also mention limit groups [D2], groups with boundary homeomorphic to a Sierpinski curve or a 2-sphere [D3]). If the curvature is allowed to collapse to $-\infty$, one can obtain other parabolic subgroups (especially non-amenable ones, see [GP] Prop.0.3). The difference between these two cases can be identified.

Let us say that a space X is geometrically bounded if there exists a function $f : \mathbf{R}_+ \to \mathbf{R}_+$ such that, for all R > 0, every ball of radius R can be covered by f(R) balls of radius 1. In some sense, the function f measures the volume of balls. Of course such a function always exists when there is a co-compact action on X.

A difference between a complete simply connected manifold M of pinched negative curvature, and a one M' where the curvature does tend to $-\infty$, is that M is geometrically bounded, whereas the volumes of a sequence of balls of same radius in M' may tend to infinity. This remark generalises.

^{*} The first author aknowledges support of the FIM ETHZ, Zürich.

[°] The second author aknowledges support of the Institute of Mathematics, University of Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms and ETH, Zürich. This work was carried out when the second author was visiting ETH.

Theorem 0.1 Let Γ be a finitely generated group, hyperbolic relative to family \mathcal{G} of finitely generated subgroups. Then, every element of \mathcal{G} is virtually nilpotent if, and only if, there exists a space X associated to Γ that has bounded geometry.

The purpose of this Note is to prove this characterisation, and explain how, in this case, one can deduce short proofs of significant results, that appear to be known only in special cases. Namely we prove that these groups have finite asymptotic dimension, a property with strong consequences. Although this result is probably true in greater generality, the general case certainly requires a more delicate, and may be technical, approach.

The asymptotic dimension of a metric space was introduced by M. Gromov in [G3]. For an introduction, let us cite J. Roe [R], and works of A. Dranishnikov, and G. Bell (for example [DB]). It is noted asdim(X), for a space X, and is defined as follows: it is an integer, and it is less than $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if, and only if, for all d > 0 there exists a uniformly bounded covering U of X with d-multiplicity less than n.

We mean, by uniformly bounded covering, a covering by subsets that have uniformly bounded diameter, and by *d*-multiplicity of a covering, we mean the maximal number n such that each ball of radius d intersects at most n elements of the covering. For the classical examples, the notion gives what is expected, as for example, for Euclidean and hyperbolic spaces, $asdim(\mathbf{R}^n) = asdim(\mathbf{H}^n) = n$.

Corollary 0.2 Let Γ a finitely generated group that is hyperbolic relative to a family of virtually nilpotent groups. Then, the asymptotic dimension of Γ is finite.

Once Theorem 0.1 is established, the Corollary 0.2 follows from the embedding theorem of M. Bonk and O. Schramm [BS], stating, in particular, that any geometrically bounded Gromov-hyperbolic geodesic space is quasi-isometric to some convex subspace of some hyperbolic space $\mathbf{H}^{\mathbf{n}}$. Such a space is known to have asymptotic dimension at most n (see [R] or [G3]). Applying this to the space associated to Γ given by Theorem 0.1, we get that Γ acts properly discontinuously by isometries on a space that has finite asymptotic dimension. Therefore, it has finite asymptotic dimension itself (see Prop. 1 in [DB]).

It has been proved by important results that the notion of asymptotic dimension is relevant to answer non trivial questions, such as coarse Baum-Connes and Novikov conjectures. G. Yu proves in [Yu] the coarse Baum-Connes conjecture for proper metric spaces with finite asymptotic dimension. From his result the strong Novikov conjecture holds for finitely generated groups whose classifying space has the homotopy type of a finite CW-complex and whose asymptotic dimension is finite. Later, in [CG], Carlsson and Goldfarb complete the result of Yu proving the integral Novikov conjecture for the same class of groups. Hence our next corollary is the following.

Corollary 0.3 The Novikov conjecture holds for torsion-free groups hyperbolic relative to families of nilpotent subgroups.

It was shown in [D1] that such groups admit finite classifying spaces.

Let us mention that previous work of B. Goldfarb essentially reduced Corollary 0.3 to certain relatively hyperbolic groups, in [Go].

In order to prove Theorem 0.1, we make use of a certain space X associated Γ , that is constructed by B. Bowditch in [Bow2] when he proves that certain definitions are equivalent. In this model, we first prove, by a growth argument, that, if the horospheres have polynomial growth for their length metric, then the horoballs are geometrically bounded. Then we prove it for the whole space X, using the co-compactness of the action on the complement. The converse is easier, and finds its roots in a claim of M. Gromov [G3-p.150] titled "Generalised and Weakened Margulis Lemma".

We like to thank to Ilya Kapovich for bringing the question to our attention, and for his encouragements.

1. Virtually nilpotency and its equivalent formulations

In this section we give a property, which we prove to be equal to polynomial growth for groups. By a celebrated theorem of M. Gromov in [G2], it is well known that these groups are virtually nilpotent. We will use this property later to prove that some horoballs whose horospheres satisfies this, have bounded geometry.

This property for metric spaces appears already in its form A3 in [G3] in order to give a weak version of Margulis' lemma for simply connected spaces of negative curvature (see Section 6.D in [G3]). Beside this lemma of Gromov we have not found elsewhere a reference for this property as we use it here. On the other hand in [BS], Bonk and Schramm use a condition called "doubling" in order to study the conformal properties of the boundaries of Gromov-hyperbolic space (see Section 9 in [BS]). One can think that our condition in its form A1 is a coarse version of "doubling". However our approach to this property is very different as we apply this property to hyperbolic spaces rather then their boundaries, and it could be confusing to make a parallelism between these properties.

Lemma 1.1 Given a metric space (X, d) the followings are equivalent:

A1) There exist a constant $\mu > 0$, a constant $\epsilon < 1$ and a constant $N = N(\epsilon)$ depending only on ϵ such that for all R with $\epsilon R > \mu$ and for all ball B(R) of diameter R in X one can cover B(R) by at most $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter ϵR .

A2) There exists a constant $\mu > 0$ so that for all $\epsilon < 1$ there exists a constant $N = N(\epsilon)$ depending only on ϵ such that for all R with $\epsilon R > \mu$ and for all ball B(R) of diameter R in X one can cover B(R) by at most $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter ϵR .

A3) There exist a constant $\mu > 0$, a constant $\epsilon < 1$ and $N(\epsilon)$ depending only on ϵ such that for all R with $\epsilon R > \mu$ and for all ball B(R) of diameter R in X, B(R) contains at most $N(\epsilon)$ disjoint balls of diameter ϵR .

Here we use the terminology "ball" to refer to an "open ball". In all the rest of this work this will be taken as a convention and a ball means an open ball, unless otherwise mentioned. Note that if a space satisfies any of the condition above for some μ_0 then it satisfies for all $\mu \ge \mu_0$.

The arguments we give in order to prove Lemma 1.1 are elementary and one can find similar arguments in the literature. In particular the proof of $((3) \Rightarrow (1))$ is reminiscent to the one showing that the growth of the fundamental group of a manifold is controlled by its volume.

Proof. We prove $(A1) \Rightarrow (A2)$, $(A1) \Rightarrow (A3)$ and $(A3) \Rightarrow (A1)$, which is enough as $(A2) \Rightarrow (A1)$ is trivial.

 $(A1) \Rightarrow (A2)$ Assume (A1) is satisfied. Thus there are $\mu_0 > 0$, $\epsilon_0 < 1$ and $N(\epsilon_0) = N_0$ given by the Property (A1). Consider the first integer n with $\epsilon \ge \epsilon_0^{n}$. Set $N(\epsilon) = N_0^{n}$ and $\mu' = \epsilon_0^{-1}\mu$. Now note that for all R with $\epsilon R > \mu'$ one has $\epsilon_0^{n-1}R > \epsilon R \ge \epsilon_0^{-1}\mu$, and so $\epsilon_0^{n}R > \mu$. Thus it is clear that all ball B(R) of diameter R is covered by at most N_0^n balls of radius $\epsilon_0^{n}R$ and by N_0^{n} balls of radius ϵR . This proves the claim since $\frac{\ln\epsilon}{\ln\epsilon_0} \le n \le \frac{\ln\epsilon}{\ln\epsilon_0} + 1$, hence $N(\epsilon) = N_0^{n}$ depends only on ϵ .

 $(A1) \Rightarrow (A3)$ We argue by contradiction and assume that X satisfies (A1) but not (A3). Denote by $\mu_0 > 0$, $\epsilon_0 < 1$ and $N(\epsilon_0) = N_0$ the constant given by the Property (A1). Since X does not satisfy (A3) we know that for μ_0 , ϵ_0 and for a integer $n > N_0$ there exists R_n with $\epsilon_0 R_n > \mu_0$ and a ball $B(R_n)$ of diameter R_n such that $B(R_n)$ contains n disjoint balls of diameter $\epsilon_0 R_n$. On the other hand by Property (1) since $\epsilon_0 R_0 > \mu_0$ we know that the ball $B(R_n)$ is covered by at most N(< n) balls of diameter $\epsilon_0 R_n$. That gives the contradiction.

 $(A3) \Rightarrow (A1)$ We assume that X does not satisfy (A1). We want to prove that it then does not also satisfy (A3). Since X does not satisfy (A1) for all $\mu > 0$ for all $\epsilon < 1$ for for all n there exists a constant D_n and a ball $B(D_n)$ of diameter D_n that cannot be covered by any family of n balls of diameter ϵD_n . Fix an n. Denote the center of $B(D_n)$ by x, and choose a family \mathcal{F} of n balls B_1, \ldots, B_n of diameter ϵD_n and centered at points $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in B(D_n)$. We modify the family F in order to have the points y_i, y_j for $i \neq j$ ϵR -far from each other. In fact if there exists $i \neq j$ with $d(y_i, y_j) \leq \epsilon D_n$, we replace the family \mathcal{F} by $F_1 = F \setminus B_i \cup B'_i$ where B'_i is a ball centered at $y'_i \in B(D_n) \setminus \bigcup_i B_i$. Note that y'_i necessarily exists since $\cup_i B_i$ does not cover $B(D_n)$ and that $d_w(y'_i, y_j) \geq \epsilon D_n$ for all j. We repeat this choice only finitely many times until we obtain $d(y_i, y_j) \geq \epsilon D_n$ for all $i \neq j$.

Now for given $\mu' > 0$ and $\epsilon' < 1$ we set $\mu = 2\mu'/(1+\epsilon)$ and $\epsilon = 2\epsilon'$. thus for these constants $\mu > 0$ and $\epsilon < 1$ and for all n, there exist a constant D_n , a ball $B(D_n)$ of diameter D_n centered at x_n and points $y_1^n, \ldots, y_n^n \in B(D_n)$ such that $d(y_i, y_j) \ge \epsilon D_n$. Now denoting $R_n = D_n(1+\epsilon)$ we see that $\epsilon' R_n > \mu'$. Moreover the ball $B(R_n)$ of diameter R_n and centered at x_n contains n disjoint balls of diameter $\epsilon' R_n$ and centered at points y_i^n . This completes the proof as we have shown that for all $\mu' > 0$, for all $\epsilon' < 1$ for all n there exists R_n with $\epsilon' R_n > \mu'$ and a ball $B(R_n)$ containing n disjoint balls of diameter βR_n .

It is an easy exercise to see that the property A1 is invariant by quasi-isometries. Thus it makes sense to adapt the notion for groups. In this context, the constant μ depends the choice of the generators. Similarly for each ϵ the constant $N(\epsilon)$ depends the choice of the generators as well as ϵ . In fact we will see in the rest of this section that this property for a group is equivalent to "polynomial growth" of the group. We equipped a given group together with a set of generator by its word metric d_w . We denote by gr(R) the cardinality of the ball centered at Id and of diameter R. We recall the definition of polynomial growth for a group.

Definition. A group G has polynomial growth if there exist constants K, p such that for all R one has $gr(R) \leq KR^p$.

A characterisation of groups of polynomial growth is given by Wolf in [W] proving that one can control the growth for such groups from above and below by polynomials. Later by Bass in [Bas] improves this characterisation by showing that the degree of polynomials above and below can be chosen equal. For further details on groups with polynomial growth, in particular for a complete proof of the following theorem, one refers the reader to [W, Bas]). **Theorem 1.2** (H. Bass) A group G has polynomial growth if, and only if, there exist constants K_1, K_2, p such that for all R, one has $K_2R^p \leq gr(R) \leq K_1R^p$.

Let us now give the claim of this section.

Proposition 1.3 A group has polynomial growth if and only if the group satisfies for its word metric one of the properties A1, A2, A3.

Proof. We first prove the left implication. So assume that a group G acts on a space X that is doubling at large scale. Thus there exists for X constants $\mu > 0$, $\epsilon < 1$, and $N = N(\epsilon)$ as in A1. Given R consider the first integer n such that $\epsilon^{n+1}R \leq \mu$. Thus for all $i \leq n$ we have $\epsilon^i R \geq \mu$, and hence by applying A1 recursively we obtain $gr(R) \leq N^n gr(\epsilon^n R)$. This implies $gr(R) \leq K_1 R^n$ where $K_1 = N^n \mu^{-n} gr(\epsilon^{-1}\mu)$.

We prove the other way by using contradiction. So we assume that G has polynomial growth and it is not doubling. Thus using A3 we see that given $\mu > 0$ and $\epsilon < 1$, for all integer n there exist R_n with $\epsilon R_n > \mu$ and a ball $B_n(R_n)$ of diameter R_n in X, B(R) contains n disjoint balls of diameter ϵR . Thus $gr(R_n) \ge n gr(\epsilon R_n)$. Now since G has also polynomial growth we obtain that for all n, $nK_2\epsilon^p(R_n)^p \le K_1(R_n)^p$, hence $n \le K_1/(\epsilon^p K_2)$. That is a contradiction when for large n.

 \diamond

2. Polynomial growth for groups and bounded geometry for horoballs

In this section given a group G we introduce a hyperbolic space $\mathcal{C}(G)$ associated to G such that if the group G has polynomial growth then $\mathcal{C}(G)$ has bounded geometry. It will later play the role of a horoball of a complete geodesic proper space. The construction of such space $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is originally due to Bowditch, who use similar construction in [Bow2] in order to study relatively hyperbolic groups. Let us start by giving the tools and notions we use in the rest of the section.

A spike in the hyperbolic plan \mathbf{H}^2 is a closed region bounded by two asymptotic geodesic rays and horocyclic arc of length 1. More precisely we can define a spike T as the region $[0,1] \times [1,\infty)$ in the upper half model. We write $T_t \subset T$ for the region $[0,1] \times [e^t,\infty)$, (so $T_0 = T$). Note that T_t is the intersection of T with the horodisc that is t-hyperbolic length above from the horocyclic boundary of T.

Let K be a connected graph. We construct a space $\mathcal{C}(K)$ containing K by taking a spike for every edge of K and gluing them together by isometry along the bounding rays, in the pattern prescribed by K. Thus $\mathcal{C}(K)$ is a hyperbolic 2-complex with its metric that we denote by ρ . The 1-skeleton of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ consists of a copy of K and geodesic rays, one for each vertex of K and all are asymptotic.

 $\mathcal{C}(K)$ is a Hausdorff topological space and can be compactified by adding an ideal point a. A neighbourhood basis for a is given as the complement of bounded subsets of $\mathcal{C}(K)$. We note that when K is locally finite graph $\mathcal{C}(K)$ is complete and locally compact. We also observe that $(\mathcal{C}(K), \rho)$ is Gromov-hyperbolic. To see that it is enough to note that if α is a loop in $\mathcal{C}(K)$ then its area is bounded by its length as it bounds a disc conned over the ideal point a. The Gromov boundary $\partial \mathcal{C}(K)$ of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ consists of exactly 1 point identified with a. Moreover $K \subset \mathcal{C}(K)$ is a horosphere based at a bounding the horoball $Hb = \mathcal{C}(K)$. For each $t \geq 0$ we denote by Hb_t the horoball based at a and that is t-hyperbolic distant from K, and by K_t its horocyclic boundary. Hence $Hb_0 = \mathcal{C}(K)$ and $K_0 = K$. Note that K_t with its induced metric is isometric to (K, d_t) where d_t is the metric that associates to each edge of K the length e^{-t} , i.e $d_t = e^{-t}d_0$. Hence d_t will also denote the metric induced on K_t . We note also that Hb_t are convex in $\mathcal{C}(K)$.

Next we give some remarks and notations that are used in proving Proposition 2.1. The remarks given below are elementary for our case and one can find similar result Gromov-hyperbolic spaces (see for example [Bow1]).

There exists constants A, B > 0 and $\alpha, \beta > 0$ depending only on the constant of hyperbolicity of $(\mathcal{C}(K), \rho)$ such that for all $t \ge 0$ and for all $x, y \in K_t$ we have $B \exp(\beta \rho(x, y)) \le d_t(x, y) \le A \exp(\alpha \rho(x, y))$.

For the rest, B(R) denotes an (open) ball of diameter R in $\mathcal{C}(G)$ and for all t, $D_t(R)$ denotes an (open) ball of horospherical diameter R in K_t . Given a ball B, \overline{B} refers to the closure of B. We denote by *Diam* and *diam*_t the diameters respectively in $\mathcal{C}(G)$ and in K_t .

We denote by π_t the orthogonal projection map on K_t . For all $t \ge t' \ge 0$ and for all $x, y \in K_{t'}$ we have $d_{t'}(x, y) = exp(t - t')d_t(\pi_t(x), \pi_t(y))$. Note that the projection map π_t sends the balls of $K_{t'}$ to the balls of K_t . In other words for all R and $t \ge t'$ one has $\pi_t(D_{t'}(R)) = D_t(exp(t' - t)R)$. Moreover $\pi_{t'}^{-1}(\pi_t(D_{t'}(R))) = D_{t'}(R)$.

A band is a region of form $Hb_t \setminus int(Hb_{t'})$ where t' > t. Given two balls $D \subset Hb_t$ and $D' \subset Hb_{t'}$, a cylinder with basis D and D' is the convex closure of D et D' in the band remaining between Hb_t and $Hb_{t'}$.

Let G be a finitely generated group given with a preferred set of generators and let K_G be its associated Cayley graph. We consider the space $\mathcal{C}(K_G) = \mathcal{C}(G)$ the space constructed as above as union of spikes and K_G . Thus $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is complete locally compact Gromov space and all the notation above are valid for this space. Now we can give the main result of this chapter.

Proposition 2.1 G has polynomial growth if and only if $\mathcal{C}(G)$ has bounded geometry.

Below we give only the proof that if G has A2 then $\mathcal{C}(G)$ has bounded geometry. In fact the proof of the other direction is exactly the same proof as in the proof of the of Theorem 0.1 showing that bounded geometry on a horoball implies A1 on G. We also note that in the proof of Theorem 0.1 we only make use of the direction given below.

Proof. It is clear that the group G has polynomial growth if and only its Cayley graph K_G satisfies one of the properties A1, A2, A3 since these two are quasi isometric. Hence we prove the statement for $K_G = K_0$ instead of G.

We take a ball B(R) of diameter R in $\mathcal{C}(G)$. We want to cover B(R) by f(R)-balls of diameter 1 in $\mathcal{C}(G)$, where f(R) depends only on R. We denote by t_{min} the minimal number for which $K_{t_{min}} \cap \overline{B(R)} \neq \emptyset$ and by t_{max} the maximal number for which $K_{t_{max}} \cap \overline{B(R)} \neq \emptyset$. Note that $t_{max} - t_{min} = R$. We consider the smallest cylinder C(R) containing B(R) with basis in $K_{t_{min}}$ and $K_{t_{max}}$. It has diameter R. To cover B(R), it is enough to cover C(R) by f(R)-balls of diameter 1 in $\mathcal{C}(G)$.

We divide the band remaining in between $K_{t_{min}}$ and $K_{t_{max}}$ into 2R bands of wide $\frac{1}{2}$ by considering the horospheres $K_{t_n} = K_{t_{min}+\frac{n}{2}}$ for $n \in \{0, \ldots, 2R\}$. For all n, denote by D_n the intersection of C(R) with K_{t_n} . Observe that this is a ball of diameter less than $Ae^{\alpha R}$ in K_{t_n} . Moreover $diam_0(\pi_0(D_n)) \leq Aexp(\alpha R + t_n)$. We know also that for any ball $D_{t_n}(Be^{\frac{\beta}{2}})$ in K_{t_n} we have $Diam(D_{t_n}(Be^{\frac{\beta}{2}})) \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and its projection on K_0 is ball of diameter $Bexp(\frac{\beta}{2} + t_n)$.

Now K_0 satisfies the property A2. Thus for $\epsilon = Aexp(\alpha R + t_n)/Bexp(\frac{\beta}{2} + t_n) = AB^{-1}exp(\alpha R - \frac{\beta}{2})$ there exists a $N = N(\epsilon)$ depending only on ϵ , and hence only on R, such that $\pi_0(D_n)$ can be covered at most by $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter $Bexp(\frac{\beta}{2} + t_n)$ in K_0 . Finally this gives a covering of D_n at most by $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter $Be^{\frac{\beta}{2}}$ in K_{t_n} after projecting back the covering of $\pi_0(D_n)$ obtained in K_0 onto K_{t_n} .

For a each $n \in \{1, \ldots, 2R\}$, consider the band between K_{t_n} and $K_{t_{n-1}}$ and a family D_n^j , $j \leq N(\epsilon)$, of balls covering D_n in K_{t_n} . Consider the cylinders with basis D_n^j and $\pi_{t_{n-1}}(D_n^j)$. We see that these cylinders covers the band between K_{t_n} and $K_{t_{n-1}}$ and there are at most $N(\epsilon)$ of them. Moreover in $\mathcal{C}(G)$ the diameter and the hight of each of these cylinders is less than 1/2, hence they all lies in balls of diameter 1. Thus we obtain a covering of the band between K_{t_n} and $K_{t_{n-1}}$ by at most $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter 1 in $\mathcal{C}(G)$. This gives us the required covering of C(R), and hence of B(R), by at most $2RN(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter 1 in $\mathcal{C}(G)$. Hence by setting $f(R) = 2RN(\epsilon) = 2RN(R)$ we have the result.

 \diamond

3. Proof of Theorem 0.1

In this part we give the proof of Theorem 0.1. We refer intensively to a work of Bowditch ([Bow2]) where he gives a combinatoric characterisation of relative hyperbolicity and use his constructions and results from this work. Therefore it would be useful to consult as well his work to complete our work.

We recall now some of the results and constructions given by Bowditch in [Bow2]. Given a group Γ hyperbolic relative to the family \mathcal{G} and a space X associated to Γ , he shows that there is a family of disjoint Γ -invariant, quasi-convex horoballs H_p based at parabolic points $p \in \partial X$ with following properties

 \star there is only finitely many orbits of horoballs,

★ the quotient of an horosphere based at p (i.e the frontier in X of an horoball based at p) by the stabiliser of p in Γ is compact, and

* the quotient of $X \setminus \bigcup_n \operatorname{Int}(H_p)$ by Γ is compact.

The proof of these statement can be found in [Bow2] Chapter 6 under Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.13. Moreover he proves that there exists an other associated space to Γ where the horoballs can be chosen to be isometric to the space $\mathcal{C}(G)$ where G is a maximal parabolic subgroup in \mathcal{G} ([Bow2] Chapter 3, Lemma 3.7 and Theorem 3.8). Recall that $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is the space constructed in part 2 from a finitely generated group G by adding spikes to its Cayley graph. We will refer for the rest this particular space as Bowditch's space. In general a space X associated to a relatively hyperbolic group Γ is very different from Bowditch's space. The horoballs in two spaces associated to a relatively hyperbolic group are generally not quasi-isometric.

Proof. (of Theorem 0.1) We first prove if the parabolic subgroups are virtually nilpotent then there exists a space X of bounded geometry and associated to a relatively hyperbolic group Γ . In fact it suffice to take X to be the Bowditch's space. As Γ acts on $X \setminus \bigcup_p intH_p$ cocompactly X has bounded geometry if and only if horoball in X has uniformly bounded geometry. On the other hand since there are only finitely many orbits of horoballs it suffices to show this for only finitely many horoballs. Moreover since each horoball H_p can be chosen isometric to a $\mathcal{C}(G)$ where G is the stabiliser of p in Γ , we see by Proposition 2.1 that $\mathcal{C}(G)$ has bounded geometry if and only if G has polynomial growth, and hence is virtually nilpotent.

Given a relatively hyperbolic group Γ we assume that there exists a space X of bounded geometry associated to Γ . Denote its metric by ρ . We considers a family of disjoint Γ -invariant, quasi-convex horoballs H_p based at parabolic points with the above properties. By assumption each horoball H_p has bounded geometry. We also know that the quotient of horosphere $fr(H_p)$ based at p by the stabiliser G_p of p is compact, hence G_p is quasi-isometric to the horosphere $fr(H_p)$. Thus to show that G_p has polynomial growth is the same as showing that $fr(H_p)$ satisfies the condition A1 of Part 1.

For all large t, we can choose another family of disjoint Γ -invariant, quasi-convex horoballs H'_p based at parabolic points such that $H'_p \subset H_p$ and $\rho(fr(H_p), fr(H'_p)) = t$. We see that for all big t such choice is possible and H'_p has the same properties as H_p . We denote the metrics on $fr(H_p)$ and $fr(H'_p)$ induced from the path-metric on $X \setminus \bigcup_p int(H_p)$ and on $X \setminus \bigcup_p int(H'_p)$ respectively by d and d'. By Gromov-hyperbolicity of X, there are constants $A \geq B, \alpha \geq \beta$ depending only on the constant of hyperbolicity of X such that $B \exp(\beta \rho(x', y')) \leq d'(x', y') \leq A \exp(\alpha \rho(x', y'))$ for $x', y' \in fr(H'_p)$. Moreover there are constants θ, η depending only on the constant of $d'(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})e^{\theta t} - \eta \leq d(x, y) \leq d'(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})e^{\theta t} + \eta$, where \tilde{x} denotes a point on H'_p that realises the distance of x to H'_p (see for reference [Bow1]). We call such a point as a projection of x on H'_p . Note that the projection is not well defined, i.e there is not necessarily a unique closest point to x on H'_p . However all projection points remain η -bounded from each other.

Given ϵ and R, we choose a constant $t \ge 0$ such that $\epsilon R \ge Ae^{\alpha}e^{\theta t} + \eta$ and a constant L such that $e^{\beta L} \ge (\epsilon B)^{-1}(Ae^{\alpha} + \eta(\epsilon + 1))$ where $A, B, \alpha, \beta, \theta, \eta$ are the constants introduced as above. Note that for such choice of L one has $R \le Be^{\beta L}e^{\theta t} - \eta$. In fact $e^{\beta L} \ge e^{-\theta t}(\epsilon B)^{-1}(Ae^{\alpha}e^{\theta t} + \eta(\epsilon + 1))$. Thus $\epsilon Be^{\beta L}e^{\theta t} - \eta \epsilon \ge Ae^{\alpha}e^{\theta t} + \eta$, which implies,

$$\frac{\epsilon R}{R} \geq \frac{A e^{\alpha} e^{\theta t} + \eta}{B e^{\beta L} e^{\theta t} - \eta}$$

This proves the claim since $\epsilon R \ge A e^{\alpha} e^{\theta t} + \eta$.

Let D(R) be a ball of diameter R in $fr(H_p)$. Observe that there exists a ball B(L) in X such that for all $x, y \in D(R)$ their projections \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} lies in B(L). In fact if $x, y \in D(R)$ then $d'(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq e^{-\theta t}(R + \eta) \leq Be^{\beta L}$ and hence $\rho(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \leq \beta^{-1}ln(B^{-1}d'(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) = L$. Similarly if $\rho(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) \leq 1$, for $x, y \in fr(H_p)$ then we see that x, y lies in ball $D(\epsilon R)$ in $fr(H_p)$, since $d(x, y) \leq Ae^{\alpha}e^{\theta t} + \eta \leq \epsilon R$. Now by assumption of bounded geometry on H_p we can cover B(L) by at most f(L) balls of diameter 1 in X. Remark that here f(L) depends only on L, hence only on ϵ and constant of hyperbolicity of X by its choice. Denote by $\tilde{D}(R)$ the set

in $fr(H'_p)$ consisting of the projections points of D(R). Note also the intersection of the the covering of B(L) with $fr(H'_p)$ gives a covering of $\tilde{D}(R)$ by at most f(L) balls of diameter e^{α} in $fr(H'_p)$. Thus when we project back this covering of $\tilde{D}(R)$ onto $fr(H_p)$ we obtain a covering of D(R) by at most f(L) balls of diameter ϵR . Thus we have shown that for ϵ there exists a $N(\epsilon) = f(L)$ depending only on ϵ such that for all R, any ball of diameter R can be covered by at most $N(\epsilon)$ balls of diameter ϵR , which proves the assertion.

 \diamond

References

[Bas] H. Bass, The degree of polynomial growth of finitely generated nilpotent groups: Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **25** (1972), 603–614.

[BS] M. Bonk, O. Schramm, *Embeddings of Gromov hyperbolic spaces*: Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** no. 2 (2000), 266–306.

[Bow1] B.H. Bowditch, Notes on Gromov's hyperbolicity criterion for path-metric spaces: in "Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint" (ed. E.Ghys, A.Haefliger, A.Verjovsky), World Scientific (1991) 64–167.

[Bow2] B.H. Bowditch, Relatively hyperbolic groups: Preprint, Southampton, 1997

[CG] G. Carlsson, B. Goldfarb, The integral K-theoretic Novikov conjecture for groups with finite asymptotic dimension: Invent. Math. 157 no. 2 (2004) 405–418

[DB] G. Bell, A. Dranishnikov, On asymptotic dimension of groups: Algebr. Geom. Topol. 1 (2001) 57–71 (electronic)

[D1] F. Dahmani *Classifying spaces and boundaries for relatively hyperbolic groups*: Proc. London Math. Soc. **86** (2003) 666-684.

[D2] F. Dahmani *Combination of convergence groups*: Geom. & Topol. **7** (2003) 933–963 (electronic).

[D3] F. Dahmani *Parabolic groups acting on one dimensional compact spaces*: to appear in Internat. J. Alg. Comp. special issue dedicated to R. Grigorchuk's 50th birthday.

[F] B. Farb, *Relatively hyperbolic groups*: Geom. Funct. Anal. 8 no. 5 (1998) 810–840.

[GP] D. Gaboriau, F. Paulin, Sur les immeubles hyperboliques: Geom. Dedi. 88 (2001) 153-197.

[Go] B. Goldfarb, Novikov conjectures and relative hyperbolicity: Math. Scand. 85 (1999), 169-183.

[G1] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*: in "Essays in geometric group theory" Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ. Springer, New York, **8** (1987) 75–263.

[G2] M. Gromov, *Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps*: Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. 53 (1981) 53–73.

[G3] M. Gromov, Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups: Geometric group theory, Vol. 2 (Sussex, 1991), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 182, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[R] J. Roe, *Lectures on coarse geometry*: University Lecture Series, American Mathematical Society, **31** 2003.

[W] J.A. Wolf, Growth of finitely generated solvable groups and curvature of Riemanniann manifolds: J. Differential Geometry **2** (1968) 421–446.

[Yu] G. Yu, The coarse Baum-Connes conjecture for spaces which admit a uniform embedding into Hilbert space: Invent. Math. **139** no. 1 (2000) 201–240.