

Retracts of vertex sets of trees and the almost stability theorem

Warren Dicks and M. J. Dunwoody

September 22, 2018

Abstract

Let G be a group, let T be an (oriented) G -tree with finite edge stabilizers, and let VT denote the vertex set of T . We show that, for each G -retract V' of the G -set VT , there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is V' . This fact leads to various new consequences of the almost stability theorem.

We also give an example of a group G , a G -tree T and a G -retract V' of VT such that no G -tree has vertex set V' .

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 20E08; Secondary: 05C25, 20J05.

Key words. Group-action on a tree, retract of G -set, almost stability theorem.

1 Outline

Throughout the article, let G be a group, and let \mathbb{N} denote the set of finite cardinals, $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. All our G -actions will be on the left.

The following extends Definitions II.1.1 of [3] (where A is assumed to have trivial G -action).

1.1 Definition. Let E and A be G -sets.

Let (E, A) denote the set of all functions from E to A . An element v of (E, A) has the form $v: E \rightarrow A$, $e \mapsto v(e)$. There is a natural G -action on (E, A) such that $(gv)(e) := g(v(g^{-1}e))$ for all $v \in (E, A)$, $g \in G$, $e \in E$.

Two elements v and w of (E, A) are said to be *almost equal* if the set

$$\{e \in E \mid v(e) \neq w(e)\}$$

is finite. Almost equality is an equivalence relation; the equivalence classes are called the *almost equality classes* in (E, A) .

A subset V of (E, A) is said to be *G -stable* if V is closed under the G -action. In general, a G -stable subset is the same as a G -subset. \square

In this article, we wish to strengthen the following result.

1.2 The almost stability theorem [3, Theorem III.8.5]. *If E is a G -set with finite stabilizers, and A is a nonempty set with trivial G -action, and V is a G -stable almost equality class in the G -set (E, A) , then there exists a G -tree with finite edge stabilizers and vertex set V .* \square

In the light of Bass-Serre theory, the almost stability theorem can be thought of as a broad generalization of Stallings' ends theorem.

Let us now recall the notion of a G -retract of a G -set. The following alters Definition III.1.1 of [3] slightly.

1.3 Definition. A G -retract U of a G -set V is a G -subset of V with the property that, for each $w \in V - U$, there exists $u \in U$ such that $G_w \leq G_u$, or, equivalently, with the property that there exists a G -map, called a G -retraction, from V to U which is the identity on U . \square

Chapter IV of [3] collects together a wide variety of consequences of the almost stability theorem 1.2. In some of these applications, the conclusions assert that certain naturally arising G -sets are G -retracts of vertex sets of G -trees with finite edge stabilizers. This leads to the question of whether or not the class of vertex sets of G -trees with finite edge stabilizers is closed under taking G -retracts. We are now able to answer this in the affirmative; in Section 4 below, we prove that any G -retract of the vertex set of a G -tree with finite edge stabilizers is itself the vertex set of a G -tree with finite edge stabilizers.

In Section 5, we record the resulting generalizations of the almost stability theorem and the applications which are affected. In the most classic example, if G has cohomological dimension one, and $\omega\mathbb{Z}G$ is the augmentation ideal of the group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$, one can deduce that G acts freely on a tree whose vertex set is the G -set $1 + \omega\mathbb{Z}G$, and, hence, G is a free group; this is a slightly more detailed version of a theorem of Stallings and Swan.

In Section 6, we record an even more general form of the almost stability theorem in which the G -action on A need not be trivial.

In Section 7, we construct a group G and a G -retract of a vertex set of a G -tree (with infinite edge stabilizers) that is not itself the vertex set of a G -tree.

2 Operations on trees

Throughout this section we will be working with the following.

2.1 Hypotheses. Let $T = (T, V, E, \iota, \tau)$ be a G -tree, as in [3, Definition I.2.3].

We write $VT = V$ and $ET = E$, and we view the underlying G -set of T as the disjoint union of V and E , written $T = V \vee E$. Here $\iota: E \rightarrow V$ is the *initial vertex* map and $\tau: E \rightarrow V$ is the *terminal vertex* map. \square

We first consider a simple form of retraction, which amplifies Definitions III.7.1 of [3]. Recall that a vertex v of a tree is called a *sink* if every edge of the tree is oriented towards v .

2.2 The compressing lemma. Suppose that Hypotheses 2.1 hold.

Let E' be a G -subset of E such that each component of the subforest $T - E'$ of T has a (unique) sink. Let V' denote the set of sinks of the components of $T - E'$.

Let $i: E' \rightarrow E$ denote the inclusion map, and let $\phi: V \rightarrow V'$ denote the G -retraction which assigns, to each $v \in V$, the sink of the component of $T - E'$ containing v .

Then the G -graph $T' = (T', V', E', \phi \circ \iota \circ i, \phi \circ \tau \circ i)$ is a G -tree.

Let $E'' = E - E'$ and let $V'' = V - V'$. Then $T - E'$ is the G -subforest of T with vertex set V and edge set E'' . For each $v \in V$, $\phi(v)$ is reached in T by starting at v and travelling as far as possible along edges in E'' respecting the orientation. The initial vertex map $\iota: E \rightarrow V$ induces a bijective map $E'' \rightarrow V''$.

We say that T' is obtained from T by *compressing the closures of the elements of E'' to their terminal vertices* or by *compressing the components of $T - E'$ to their sinks*.

In applications, we usually first G -equivariantly reorient T and then, in the resulting tree, compress a G -set of closed edges to their terminal vertices; we then call the combined procedure a G -equivariant compressing operation.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. The map ϕ induces a surjective G -map $T \rightarrow T'$ in which the fibres are the components of $T - E'$. It follows that T' is a G -tree. \square

We now recall the sliding operation of Rips-Sela [8, p. 59] as generalized by Forester [7, Section 3.6]; see also the Type 1 operation of [6, p. 146]. We find it convenient to express the result and the proof in the notation of [3].

2.3 The sliding lemma. *Suppose that Hypotheses 2.1 hold.*

Let e and f be elements of E .

Suppose that $\tau e = \iota f$, $G_e \leq G_f$, and $Gf \cap Ge = \emptyset$.

Let $\tau' : E \rightarrow V$ denote the map given by

$$e' \mapsto \tau'(e') := \begin{cases} \tau(e') & \text{if } e' \in E - Ge, \\ \tau(gf) & \text{if } e' = ge \text{ for some } g \in G, \end{cases}$$

for all $e' \in E$.

Then the G -graph $T' = (T', V, E, \iota, \tau')$ is a G -tree.

Here, we say that T' is obtained from T by G -equivariantly sliding τe along f from ιf to τf .

In applications, we usually first G -equivariantly reorient Ge , or Gf , or both, or neither, and then, in the resulting tree, G -equivariantly slide τe along f from ιf to τf , and then reorient back again. We then call the combined procedure a G -equivariant sliding operation.

Proof of Lemma 2.3. It is clear that T' is a G -graph.

Let X be the G -graph obtained from T by deleting the two edge orbits $Ge \cup Gf$, and then inserting one new vertex orbit Gv and three new edge orbits $Ge' \cup Gf_1 \cup Gf_2$, with $G_{e'} = G_e$, $G_v = G_{f_1} = G_{f_2} = G_f$, and setting

$$\iota(e') = \iota(e), \quad \iota(f_1) = \iota(f) = \tau(e), \quad \iota(f_2) = \tau(e) = \tau(f_1) = v, \quad \tau(f_2) = \tau(f).$$

Thus we are G -equivariantly subdividing f into f_1 and f_2 by adding v , and then sliding τe along f_1 from ιf_1 to $\tau f_1 = v$.

Then T is recovered from X by G -equivariantly compressing the closure of f_1 to $\iota(f_1)$, and renaming f_2 as f , e' as e . Thus X maps onto T with fibres which are trees. It follows that X is a tree; see [3, Proposition III.3.3].

Also T' is recovered from X by G -equivariantly compressing the closure of f_2 to $\iota(f_2)$, and renaming f_1 as f , e' as e . By Lemma 2.2, T' is a tree. \square

3 Filtrations

Throughout this section we will be working with the following.

3.1 Hypotheses. Let $T = (T, V, E, \iota, \tau)$ be a G -tree, let U be a G -retract of the G -set V , and let $W = V - U$. \square

3.2 Conventions. We shall use interval notation for ordinals; for example, if κ is an ordinal, then $[0, \kappa)$ denotes the set of all ordinals α such that $\alpha < \kappa$.

If we have an ordinal κ and a specified map from a set X to $[0, \kappa)$, then we will understand that the following notation applies. Denoting the image of each $x \in X$ by $\text{height}(x) \in [0, \kappa)$, we write, for each $\alpha \in [0, \kappa)$ and each $\beta \in [0, \kappa]$,

$$X[\alpha] := \{x \in X \mid \text{height}(x) = \alpha\} \quad \text{and} \quad X[0, \beta] := \{x \in X \mid \text{height}(x) < \beta\}. \quad \square$$

3.3 Definitions. Suppose that Hypotheses 3.1 hold.

Let $P(T)$ denote the set of paths in T , as in Definitions I.2.3 of [3]. Thus, for each $p \in P(T)$, we have the *initial vertex* of p , denoted ιp , the *terminal vertex* of p , denoted τp , the *set of edges which occur in* p , denoted $E(p) \subseteq E$, the *length* of p , denoted $\text{length}(p) \in \mathbb{N}$, and the *G -stabilizer* of p , denoted $G_p \leq G$.

Let κ be an ordinal and let

$$(3.3.1) \quad T \rightarrow [0, \kappa), \quad x \mapsto \text{height}(x)$$

be a map. Since T is nonempty, κ must be nonzero. As a set, $T = V \cup E$. Thus, for each $\alpha \in [0, \kappa)$, we have $T[\alpha]$, $E[\alpha]$ and $V[\alpha]$, and, for each $\beta \in [0, \kappa]$, we have $T[0, \beta]$, $E[0, \beta]$ and $V[0, \beta]$.

For each $w \in W$, we then define

$$P_T(w) := \{p \in P(T) \mid \iota p = w, G_p = G_w, \text{height}(\tau p) < \text{height}(w), \\ \text{height}(E(p)) \subseteq \{\text{height}(w), \text{height}(w) + 1\}\}.$$

We say that (3.3.1) is a *U -filtration* of T if all of the following hold:

$$(3.3.2) \quad \text{for each } \beta \in [0, \kappa], T[0, \beta] \text{ is a } G\text{-subforest of } T;$$

$$(3.3.3) \quad T[0] = U;$$

$$(3.3.4) \quad \text{for each } \alpha \in [1, \kappa), T[\alpha] \text{ is a } G\text{-finite } G\text{-subset of } T; \text{ and,}$$

$$(3.3.5) \quad \text{for each } w \in W, P_T(w) \text{ is nonempty.} \quad \square$$

3.4 Lemma. *If Hypotheses 3.1 hold, then there exists a U -filtration of T .*

Proof. We shall recursively construct a family $(E[\alpha] \mid \alpha \in [0, \kappa))$ of G -subsets of E , for some nonzero ordinal κ .

We take $E[0] = \emptyset$.

Suppose that γ is a nonzero ordinal, and that we have a family $(E[\alpha] \mid \alpha \in [0, \gamma))$ of G -subsets of E .

For each $\beta \in [0, \gamma]$, we define

$$E[0, \beta] := \bigcup_{\alpha \in [0, \beta)} E[\alpha] \quad \text{and} \quad V[0, \beta] := \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } \beta = 0, \\ U \cup \iota(E[0, \beta)) \cup \tau(E[0, \beta)) & \text{if } \beta > 0. \end{cases}$$

For each $\alpha \in [0, \gamma)$, we define $V[\alpha] := V[0, \alpha + 1] - V[0, \alpha]$. Thus

$$V[0, \beta] = \bigcup_{\alpha \in [0, \beta)} V[\alpha].$$

If $E[0, \gamma) = E$, we take $\kappa = \gamma$ and the construction terminates.

Now suppose that $E[0, \gamma) \subset E$. We shall explain how to choose $E[\gamma]$.

If γ is a limit ordinal or 1, we take $E[\gamma]$ to be an arbitrary single G -orbit in $E - E[0, \gamma)$.

If γ is a successor ordinal greater than 1 then there is a unique $\alpha \in [1, \gamma)$ such that $\gamma = \alpha + 1$, and we want to construct $E[\alpha + 1]$. Notice that $V[0, \alpha]$ is a G -retract of V because $V[0, \alpha]$ contains U . Thus we can G -equivariantly specify, for each $w \in V[\alpha]$, a T -geodesic $p = p(w)$ from w to an element $v = v(w) \in V[0, \alpha]$ fixed by G_w . Since G_w fixes both ends of p , G_w fixes p . Hence we may assume that v is the first, and hence only, vertex of p that lies in $V[0, \alpha]$. Clearly G_p fixes w . Thus $G_w = G_p$. Let $P_{\alpha+1}$ denote the set of edges which occur in the $p(w)$, as w

ranges over $V[\alpha]$. Then $P_{\alpha+1} \subseteq E - E[0, \alpha]$, since each element of $E[0, \alpha]$ has *both* vertices in $V[0, \alpha]$. If $P_{\alpha+1} \subseteq E[\alpha]$, we choose $E[\alpha + 1]$ to be an arbitrary single G -orbit in $E - E[0, \alpha + 1]$. If $P_{\alpha+1} \not\subseteq E[\alpha]$, we take $E[\alpha + 1] = P_{\alpha+1} - E[\alpha]$. This completes the description of the recursive construction.

We now verify that we have a U -filtration of T .

It can be seen that, for each ordinal γ such that $(E[\alpha] \mid \alpha \in [0, \gamma))$ is defined, the $E[\alpha]$, $\alpha \in [1, \gamma)$, are pairwise disjoint, nonempty, G -subsets of E . Hence the cardinal of γ is at most one more than the cardinal of E . Therefore the construction terminates at some stage. This implies that there exists a nonzero ordinal κ such that $E[0, \kappa] = E$. Also $V[0, \kappa] = V$, and $(V[\alpha] \mid \alpha \in [0, \kappa))$ gives a partition of V . Thus we have an implicit map $T \rightarrow [0, \kappa)$ and we denote it by $x \mapsto \text{height}(x)$.

Clearly (3.3.2), (3.3.3) and (3.3.5) hold.

If $\alpha \in [1, \kappa)$ and $E[\alpha]$ is G -finite, then either $E[0, \alpha + 1] = E$ or $V[\alpha]$, $P_{\alpha+1}$ and $E[\alpha + 1]$ are G -finite. It follows, by transfinite induction, that $E[\alpha]$ and $V[\alpha]$ are G -finite for all $\alpha \in [1, \kappa)$. Thus (3.3.4) holds. \square

4 The main result

Let us introduce a technical concept which generalizes that of a finite subgroup.

4.1 Definitions. A subgroup H of G is said to be *G -conjugate incomparable* if, for each $g \in G$, $H^g \subseteq H$ (if and) only if $H^g = H$. This clearly holds if H is finite.

We say that a G -set X has *G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers* if, for each $x \in X$, the G -stabilizer G_x is a G -conjugate-incomparable subgroup, that is, for each $g \in G$, $G_x \subseteq G_{gx}$ (if and) only if $G_x = G_{gx}$. \square

Throughout this section we will be working with the following.

4.2 Hypotheses. Let $T = (T, V, E, \iota, \tau)$ be a G -tree, let U be a G -retract of the G -set V , and let $W = V - U$.

Suppose that the G -set W has G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers.

Let κ be an ordinal and let

$$(4.2.1) \quad \text{height}: V \cup E \rightarrow [0, \kappa), \quad x \mapsto \text{height}(x),$$

be a U -filtration of T . \square

4.3 Definitions. Suppose that Hypotheses 4.2 hold.

Let $w \in W$. Define $d_T(w) := \min\{\text{length}(p) \mid p \in P_T(w)\}$. Then $d_T(w)$ is a positive integer and

$$(4.3.1) \quad d_T(gw) = d_T(w) \text{ for all } g \in G.$$

For v_0, v_1 in V , we say that v_1 is *lower than* v_0 if one of the following holds:

$$(4.3.2) \quad \text{height}(v_0) > \text{height}(v_1);$$

$$(4.3.3) \quad \text{height}(v_0) = \text{height}(v_1) > 0 \text{ and } G_{v_0} < G_{v_1}; \text{ or,}$$

$$(4.3.4) \quad \text{height}(v_0) = \text{height}(v_1) > 0 \text{ and } G_{v_0} = G_{v_1} \text{ and } d_T(v_0) > d_T(v_1).$$

An edge e of T is said to be *problematic* if it joins vertices v_0, v_1 such that $\text{height}(e) = \text{height}(v_1) = \text{height}(v_0) + 1$. Notice that $\text{height}(e)$ is a successor ordinal and that v_0 is lower than v_1 .

For each $v_0 \in W$, there exists a path

$$(4.3.5) \quad v_0, e_1^{\epsilon_1}, v_1, e_2^{\epsilon_2}, v_2, \dots, e_d^{\epsilon_d}, v_d \text{ in } P_T(v_0) \text{ such that } d = d_T(v_0).$$

Here $\text{height}(v_1) \leq \text{height}(v_0) + 1$. We say that v_0 is a *problematic* vertex of T if there exists a path as in (4.3.5) such that $\text{height}(v_1) = \text{height}(v_0) + 1$. In this event $\text{height}(e_1) = \text{height}(v_1)$ and e_1 is a problematic edge of T . \square

4.4 Lemma. *If Hypotheses 4.2 hold, then applying some transfinite sequence of G -equivariant sliding operations to T yields a G -tree $T' = (T', V, E, \iota', \tau')$ such that (4.2.1) is also a U -filtration of T' and T' has no problematic vertices.*

Proof. We shall construct a family of trees

$$(T_\beta = (T_\beta, V, E, \iota_\beta, \tau_\beta) \mid \beta \in [0, \kappa])$$

such that, for each $\beta \in [0, \kappa]$, (4.2.1) is a U -filtration of T_β , and T_β has no problematic vertices in $V[0, \beta)$.

We take $T_0 = T$.

For each successor ordinal $\beta = \alpha + 1 \in [0, \kappa]$, $T_{\alpha+1}$ will be obtained from T_α by altering, if necessary, ι_α and τ_α on $E[\alpha + 1]$, as described below.

For each limit ordinal $\beta \in [0, \kappa]$, we let ι_β be given on $E[\alpha]$ by ι_α , for each $\alpha \in [0, \beta)$, and similarly for τ_β .

Suppose then that $\beta = \alpha + 1 \in [0, \kappa]$, that we have a tree $T_\alpha = (T_\alpha, V, E, \iota_\alpha, \tau_\alpha)$, and that (4.2.1) is a U -filtration of T_α , and that T_α has no problematic vertices in $V[0, \alpha)$.

We now describe a crucial *problem-reducing procedure* that can be applied in the case where there exists some $v_0 \in V[\alpha]$ which is a problematic vertex of T_α .

Let $d = d_{T_\alpha}(v_0)$. Thus, there exists a path

$$v_0, e_1^{\epsilon_1}, v_1, e_2^{\epsilon_2}, v_2, \dots, e_d^{\epsilon_d}, v_d$$

in $P_{T_\alpha}(v_0)$ such that $v_1 \in V[\alpha + 1]$. Hence, $e_1 \in E[\alpha + 1]$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $\epsilon_1 = -1$.

There exists a least $i \in [2, d]$ such that $v_i \in V[0, \alpha + 1)$. Then

$$\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\} \subseteq V[\alpha + 1] \quad \text{and, hence,} \quad \{e_1, \dots, e_i\} \subseteq E[\alpha + 1].$$

We claim that $Ge_1 \cap \bigcup_{j=2}^i Ge_j = \emptyset$. Suppose this fails. Then $e_1 \in \bigcup_{j=2}^i Ge_j$. Here, $v_0 \in \bigcup_{j=1}^i Gv_j$. Since $v_0 \in V[\alpha]$ and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} Gv_j \subseteq V[\alpha + 1]$ we see that $v_0 \in Gv_i$. Hence $v_i \in V[\alpha]$ and, by (4.3.1), $d_{T_\alpha}(v_i) = d_{T_\alpha}(v_0) = d$. But $G_{v_0} = G_p \subseteq G_{v_i}$. Since G_{v_0} is a G -conjugate-incomparable subgroup, $G_{v_0} = G_{v_i}$. It follows that

$$v_i, e_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}}, v_{i+1}, \dots, e_d^{\epsilon_d}, v_d$$

lies in $P_{T_\alpha}(v_i)$. Hence $d_{T_\alpha}(v_i) \leq d - i$, which is a contradiction. This proves the claim.

By Lemma 2.3, we can G -equivariantly slide ιe_1 along $e_2^{\epsilon_2}$ from v_1 to v_2 , and then G -equivariantly slide ιe_1 along $e_3^{\epsilon_3}$ from v_2 to v_3 , and so on, up to v_i . We then get a new G -tree $T_{\alpha,1} = (T_{\alpha,1}, V, E, \iota_{\alpha,1}, \tau_{\alpha,1})$ by G -equivariantly sliding ιe_1 along our path from v_1 to v_i .

Let e'_1 denote e_1 viewed as an edge of $T_{\alpha,1}$. Wherever v_1, e_1, v_0 occurs in a path in T_α , it can be replaced with the sequence

$$v_1, e_2^{\epsilon_2}, v_2, \dots, v_{i-1}, e_i^{\epsilon_i}, v_i, e'_1, v_0$$

to obtain a path in $T_{\alpha,1}$. It is important to note that all the edges involved here lie in $E[\alpha + 1]$. In terms of the free groupoid on $E[\alpha + 1]$, $e_1 = e_2^{\epsilon_2} e_3^{\epsilon_3} \dots e_i^{\epsilon_i} e'_1$, and we are performing the change-of-basis which replaces e_1 with e'_1 .

It is easy to see that (3.3.2)–(3.3.5) then hold for $T_{\alpha,1}$. Thus (4.2.1) is a U -filtration of $T_{\alpha,1}$. Notice that $T_{\alpha,1}$, like T_α , has no problematic vertices in $V[0, \alpha)$. We have reduced the number of G -orbits of problematic edges in $E[\alpha + 1]$.

This completes the description of a problem-reducing procedure.

Since $E[\alpha + 1]$ is G -finite by (3.3.4), on repeating problem-reducing procedures as often as possible, we find some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and a sequence

$$T_\alpha = T_{\alpha,0}, T_{\alpha,1}, \dots, T_{\alpha,m},$$

such that $T_{\alpha,m}$ has no problematic vertices in $V[0, \alpha) \cup V[\alpha] = V[0, \alpha + 1)$. We define $T_{\alpha+1} = (T_{\alpha+1}, V, E, \iota_{\alpha+1}, \tau_{\alpha+1})$ to be $T_{\alpha,m}$. Notice that $\iota_{\alpha+1}$ agrees with ι_α on $E - E[\alpha + 1]$, and similarly for $\tau_{\alpha+1}$.

Continuing this procedure transfinitely, we arrive at a tree T_κ which has no problematic vertices. \square

4.5 Lemma. *If Hypotheses 4.2 hold and T has no problematic vertices, then applying some G -equivariant compressing operation on T yields a G -tree with vertex set U .*

Proof. We claim that any sequence in V is finite if each term is lower than all its predecessors.

Let $\alpha \in [0, \kappa)$.

If v_0, v_1 are elements of the same G -orbit of $V[\alpha]$, then v_1 is not lower than v_0 , that is, (4.3.2)–(4.3.4) all fail; this follows from (4.3.1) and the fact that $V[\alpha]$ has G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers.

Thus, if $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n is a sequence in $V[\alpha]$ such that each term is lower than all its predecessors, then Gv_1, Gv_2, \dots, Gv_n are pairwise disjoint, and n is at most the number of G -orbits in $V[\alpha]$. It follows that any sequence in $V[\alpha]$ is finite if each term is lower than all its predecessors. The claim now follows.

Let us G -equivariantly reorient T so that, for each edge e , ιe is not lower than τe .

Let $v_0 \in W$. Let us G -equivariantly choose a path

$$v_0, e_1^{\epsilon_1}, v_1, e_2^{\epsilon_2}, v_2, \dots, e_d^{\epsilon_d}, v_d$$

in $P_T(v_0)$ such that $d = d_T(v_0)$. Then we call e_1 the *distinguished edge* associated to v_0 , and v_1 the *distinguished neighbour* of v_0 .

Let E'' denote the set of distinguished edges chosen in this way.

Let us consider the above path for v_0 . From Definitions 4.3, we see that, since T has no problematic vertices, $\text{height}(v_0) \geq \text{height}(v_1)$. We claim that v_1 is lower than v_0 . The claim is clear if $\text{height}(v_0) > \text{height}(v_1)$ (in which case, $d = 1$), and we may assume that $\text{height}(v_0) = \text{height}(v_1) (> 0)$. Again, the claim is clear if $G_{v_0} < G_{v_1}$, and we may assume that $G_{v_0} = G_{v_1}$. Here G_{v_1} fixes p , and the path

$$v_1, e_2^{\epsilon_2}, v_2, \dots, e_d^{\epsilon_d}, v_d$$

shows that $d_T(v_1) \leq d - 1 < d = d_T(v_0)$, and the claim is proved. Hence $\epsilon_1 = 1$.

Thus ι induces a bijection $E'' \rightarrow W$.

Moreover, in travelling along the distinguished edge e_1 respecting the orientation, from v_0 to its distinguished neighbour v_1 , we move to a lower vertex.

Thus, starting at any element v of V , after travelling a finite number of steps along distinguished edges respecting the orientation, we arrive at a vertex, denoted $\phi(v)$, with no distinguished neighbours, that is, $\phi(v) \in U$.

By Lemma 2.2, compressing the closures of the distinguished edges to their terminal vertices gives a G -tree with vertex set U and edge set $E - E''$. \square

We now come to our main result. In Section 7, we will see that the G -conjugate-incomparability hypotheses cannot be omitted.

4.6 Theorem. *Let T be a G -tree, and let U be a G -retract of the G -set VT . Suppose that the G -set ET has G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers, or, more generally, that the G -set $VT - U$ has G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers.*

Then applying to T some transfinite sequence of G -equivariant sliding operations followed by some G -equivariant compressing operation yields a G -tree T' such that $VT' = U$.

Here ET' is a G -subset of ET , and there exists a G -set isomorphism

$$ET - ET' \simeq VT - VT' = VT - U.$$

Proof. For each $w \in VT - U$, there exists $u \in U$ such that $G_w \leq G_u$. If e denotes the first edge in the T -geodesic from w to u , then $G_e = G_w$. Thus, if E has G -conjugate-incomparable stabilizers, then the same holds for $VT - U$.

By Lemma 3.4, we may assume that Hypotheses 4.2 hold. By Lemma 4.4, we may assume that T itself has no problematic vertices. Applying Lemma 4.5, we obtain the result; the final assertion follows from Lemma 2.2. \square

We record the special case of Theorem 4.6 that is of interest to us.

4.7 The retraction lemma. *Let T be a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite, and let U be any G -retract of the G -set VT . Then there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set U .* \square

5 The almost stability theorem and applications

We now combine the almost stability theorem 1.2 and the retraction lemma 4.7.

5.1 Theorem. *Let E and A be G -sets such that E has finite stabilizers and A has trivial G -action. If V is a G -retract of a G -stable almost equality class in (E, A) , then there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set V .*

Proof. By the almost stability theorem 1.2, there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the given G -stable almost equality class in (E, A) . By the retraction lemma 4.7, there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is V . \square

We now recall Definitions IV.2.1 and IV.2.2 of [3].

5.2 Definitions. Let M be a G -module, that is, an additive abelian group which is also a G -set such that G acts as group automorphisms on M . Thus a G -module is simply a left module over the integral group ring $\mathbb{Z}G$.

If $d: G \rightarrow M$ is a *derivation*, that is, a map such that $d(xy) = d(x) + xd(y)$ for all $x, y \in G$, then M_d denotes the set M endowed with the G -action

$$G \times M \rightarrow M, \quad (g, m) \mapsto g \cdot m := gm + d(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in G \text{ and all } m \in M.$$

It is straightforward to show that M_d is a G -set. This construction has made other appearances in the literature; see [1, Remarque 4.a.5].

We say that M is an *induced G -module* if there exists an abelian group A such that M is isomorphic, as G -module, to $AG := \mathbb{Z}G \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} A$.

We say that M is a *G -projective G -module* if M is isomorphic, as G -module, to a direct summand of an induced G -module. \square

5.3 Example. If R is any ring and P is a projective left RG -module, then there exists a free left R -module F such that P is isomorphic, as RG -module, to an RG -summand of

$$RG \otimes_R F = \mathbb{Z}G \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R \otimes_R F = \mathbb{Z}G \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} F = FG.$$

Hence P is G -projective. \square

The following generalizes Theorem IV.2.5 and Corollary IV.2.8 of [3].

5.4 Theorem. *If P is a G -projective G -module, and $d: G \rightarrow P$ is a derivation, then there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set P_d .*

Proof. There exists an abelian group A such that P is isomorphic to a G -summand of AG . We view P as a G -submodule of AG . There exists an additive G -retraction $\pi: AG \rightarrow P$.

We view AG as the almost equality class of (G, A) which contains the zero map. Thus AG is a G -submodule of (G, A) , and we have a derivation

$$d: G \rightarrow P \subseteq AG \subseteq (G, A).$$

By a classic result of Hochschild's, there exists $v \in (G, A)$ such that, for all $g \in G$, $d(g) = gv - v$. For example, we can take $v: x \mapsto -(d(x))(x)$, for all $x \in G$. See the proof of Proposition IV.2.3 in [3].

Let $U = v + P$ and $V = v + AG$. Then $U \subseteq V \subseteq (G, A)$, and V is the almost equality class which contains v . Also, U and V are G -stable, since, for each $g \in G$, $gv = v + d(g) \in v + P \subseteq v + AG$. The map

$$V \rightarrow U, \quad v + m \mapsto v + \pi(m), \text{ for all } m \in AG,$$

is a G -retraction, since, for all $m \in AG$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(v + m) = v + gm + d(g) &\mapsto v + \pi(gm + d(g)) = v + g\pi(m) + d(g) \\ &= g(v + \pi(m)). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 5.1, there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set U .

The bijective map $P \rightarrow U$, $p \mapsto v + p$, is an isomorphism of G -sets $P_d \xrightarrow{\sim} U$. Now the result follows. \square

5.5 Remark. Notice that, in Theorem 5.4, the stabilizer of a vertex $p \in P_d$ is precisely the kernel of the derivation

$$d + \text{ad } p: G \rightarrow P, \quad g \mapsto d(g) + gp - p = (g - 1)(v + p). \quad \square$$

The following generalizes Corollary IV.2.10 of [3] and is used in the proof of Lemma 5.16 of [5].

5.6 Corollary. *Let M be a G -module, let P be a G -projective G -submodule of M , and let v be an element of M . If the subset $v + P$ of M is G -stable, then there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set $v + P$.*

Proof. The inner derivation $\text{ad } v: G \rightarrow M$ restricts to a derivation $d: G \rightarrow P$, $g \mapsto gv - v \in P \subseteq M$, for all $g \in G$. The bijective map $P \rightarrow v + P$, $p \mapsto v + p$, is then an isomorphism of G -sets $P_d \xrightarrow{\sim} v + P$. Now the result follows from Theorem 5.4. \square

5.7 Example. Let R be a nonzero associative ring, and let ωRG be the augmentation ideal of the group ring RG .

Notice that, in the (left) G -set RG , both the coset $1 + \omega RG$ and $RG - \{0\}$ are G -stable, and that the G -set $RG - \{0\}$ has finite stabilizers.

If ωRG is projective as left RG -module, then, by Corollary 5.6, there exists a G -tree T with $VT = 1 + \omega RG \subseteq RG - \{0\}$; hence T has finite stabilizers. This sheds some light on the main step in the characterization of groups of cohomological dimension at most one over R . See, for example, [3, Theorem IV.3.13]. \square

6 A more general form

We next want to generalize Theorem 5.1.

The following is similar to Lemma 2.2 of [4], and the proof is straightforward.

6.1 Lemma. *Let E and A be G -sets such that, for each $e \in E$, G_e acts trivially on A .*

Let \bar{A} denote the G -set with the same underlying set as A but with trivial G -action.

Let E_0 be a G -transversal in E .

For each $\phi \in (E, A)$, let $\hat{\phi} \in (E, \bar{A})$ be defined by $\hat{\phi}(ge) = g^{-1} \cdot \phi(ge)$ for all $(g, e) \in G \times E_0$, where \cdot denotes the G action on A .

For each $\psi \in (E, \bar{A})$, let $\tilde{\psi} \in (E, A)$ be defined by $\tilde{\psi}(ge) = g \cdot \psi(ge)$ for all $(g, e) \in G \times E_0$.

Then

$$(E, A) \rightarrow (E, \bar{A}), \quad \phi \mapsto \hat{\phi}, \quad \text{and} \quad (E, \bar{A}) \rightarrow (E, A), \quad \psi \mapsto \tilde{\psi},$$

are mutually inverse isomorphisms of G -sets which preserve almost equality between functions. \square

Combined, Lemma 6.1 and Theorem 5.1 give the most general form that we know of the almost stability theorem.

6.2 Theorem. *Let E and A be G -sets such that, for each $e \in E$, G_e is finite and acts trivially on A . If V is a G -retract of a G -stable almost equality class in (E, A) , then there exists a G -tree whose edge stabilizers are finite and whose vertex set is the G -set V .* \square

For each $e \in E$, if G_e is trivial, then G_e is finite and acts trivially on A . It was this case that was useful in [4].

7 An example

In this section, we shall give an example of a group G and a retract of a vertex set of a G -tree that is not the vertex set of any G -tree.

We shall use two technical lemmas. Recall that, for $x, y \in G$, x^y denotes $y^{-1}xy$.

7.1 Lemma. *Let $G = \langle x, y \mid \quad \rangle$, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $g \in G$.*

- (i) *If $x^{2^n} y^{2^n} x^{2^n} \in \langle x^2, y^2 \rangle^g$, then $n \neq 0$ and $g \in \langle x^2, y^2 \rangle$.*
- (ii) *If $x^{2^n} y^{2^n} x^{2^n} \in \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle^g$, then $n \neq 1$ and $g \in \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle$.*

Proof. Let $T = X(G, \{x, y\})$, the Cayley graph of G with respect to $\{x, y\}$, as in [3, Definitions I.2.1]. Each (oriented) edge of T is labelled x or y .

Let $H \leq G$, and let $w = x^{2^n} y^{2^n} x^{2^n} \in G$. Let $X := H \backslash T$, let $Y := \langle w \rangle \backslash T$, and let $Z := G \backslash T$.

The pullback of the two natural maps $X \rightarrow Z, Y \rightarrow Z$ provides detailed information about all nontrivial subgroups of G of the form $\langle w \rangle \cap H^g$; see [2, p. 380]. However, this pullback can be rather cumbersome and we do not require detailed information. For our purposes, special considerations will suffice, as follows.

Define $g^{-1}X := (H^g) \backslash T$.

There is a graph isomorphism $X \simeq g^{-1}X, Hx \leftrightarrow H^g g^{-1}x$.

The fundamental group of X with basepoint $H1, \pi(X, H1)$, is naturally isomorphic to H , with the elements of H being read off closed paths based at $H1$.

Similarly, H^g is naturally isomorphic to $\pi(g^{-1}X, H^g 1)$, and this in turn is naturally isomorphic to $\pi(X, Hg)$ via the graph isomorphism $g^{-1}X \simeq X$.

Suppose that w lies in H^g . Then w can be read off a closed path in X based at Hg . Since w is a cyclically reduced word, the closed path is cyclically reduced. The smallest subgraph of X which contains all the cyclically reduced closed paths in X is called the *core* of X , denoted $\text{core}(X)$. It follows that the vertex Hg lies in $\text{core}(X)$, and that we can start at Hg , read w and stay inside $\text{core}(X)$.

(i) Suppose that $H = \langle x^2, y^2 \rangle$.

Here $\text{core}(X)$ has vertex set $\{H1, Hx, Hy\}$ and labelled-edge set

$$\{(H1, x, Hx), (Hx, x, Hx^2), (H1, y, Hy), (Hy, y, Hy^2)\}$$

with $Hx^2 = Hy^2 = H1$.

We note that Hxy and Hyx are outside $\text{core}(X)$.

Since $(Hy)x = Hyx$ does not lie in $\text{core}(X)$, we see that $Hg \neq Hy$. Hence, $Hg \in \{H1, Hx\}$.

Notice that $(H1)(xy) = Hxy$ and $(Hx)(xyx) = Hyx$. These lie outside $\text{core}(X)$. Thus $n \neq 0$. Hence, $x^{2^n} \in H$.

Notice that $(Hx)(x^{2^n}y) = Hxy$ lies outside $\text{core}(X)$. Thus $Hg \neq Hx$. Hence, $Hg = H1$, that is, $g \in H$.

This proves (i).

(ii). Suppose that $H = \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle$.

Here $\text{core}(X)$ has vertex set

$$\{H1\} \cup \{Hx^i, Hy^i \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3\}.$$

and labelled-edge set

$$\{(Hx^i, x, Hx^{i+1}), (Hy^i, y, Hy^{i+1}) \mid 0 \leq i \leq 3\} \cup \{(Hx, y, Hxy)\},$$

with $Hx^4 = Hy^4 = H1$ and $Hxy = Hx^3$.

We note that $Hxy^2 = Hx^3y, Hx^2y, Hyx, Hy^2x$ and Hy^3x , all lie outside $\text{core}(X)$.

For any j with $1 \leq j \leq 3$, $(Hy^j)(x) = Hy^jx$ lies outside $\text{core}(X)$. It follows that $Hg \neq Hy^j$. Hence $Hg = Hx^i$ for some i with $0 \leq i \leq 3$.

Notice that $(Hx)(xy) = Hx^2y, (Hx^2)(xy) = Hx^3y$, and $(Hx^3)(xyx) = Hyx$. These all lie outside $\text{core}(X)$. Thus, if $n = 0$, then $Hg = H1$.

Notice that $(H1)(x^2y) = Hx^2y, (Hx)(x^2y) = Hx^3y, (Hx^2)(x^2y^2x) = Hy^2x$, and $(Hx^3)(x^2y^2) = Hxy^2$. These all lie outside $\text{core}(X)$. Thus $n \neq 1$.

Now suppose that $n \geq 2$. Thus $x^{2^n} = (x^4)^{2^{n-2}} \in H$.

Notice that $(Hx)(x^{2^n}y^2) = Hxy^2, (Hx^2)(x^{2^n}y) = Hx^2y$, and $(Hx^3)(x^{2^n}y) = Hx^3y$. These all lie outside $\text{core}(X)$. Thus $Hg = H1$.

This proves (ii). \square

It is straightforward to prove the following.

7.2 Lemma. *Let $G = \langle x, y, t \mid x^{4t} = x^8, y^{4t} = y^8, x^{t^2} y^{t^2} x^{t^2} = x^4 y^4 x^4 \rangle$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(i) *If $n \neq 1$, then $(xyx)^{t^n} = x^{2^n} y^{2^n} x^{2^n}$ in G .*

(ii) *$(xyx)^{t^{n+2}} = (x^4)^{2^n} (y^4)^{2^n} (x^4)^{2^n}$ in G .* \square

Throughout the remainder of the section we work with the following example.

7.3 Hypotheses. Let $G = \langle x, y, t \mid x^{4t} = x^8, y^{4t} = y^8, x^{t^2} y^{t^2} x^{t^2} = x^4 y^4 x^4 \rangle$.

Let $T = (T, V, E, \iota, \tau)$ be the G -graph given by the following data, where \vee denotes the disjoint union:

$$\begin{aligned} V &= Gu \vee Gw, & G_u &= \langle x, y \rangle, & G_w &= \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle, \\ E &= Ge \vee Gf, & G_e &= \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle, & G_f &= \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle, \\ \iota(e) &= u, & \tau(e) &= t^2 w, & \iota(f) &= w, & \tau(f) &= tw. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 7.2, we see that the following hold:

$$\begin{aligned} G_e &\leq G_u, & G_{t^{-2}e} &= G_e^{t^2} = \langle x^{16}, x^4 y^4 x^4, y^{16} \rangle \leq G_w, \\ G_f &= G_w, & G_{t^{-1}f} &= G_f^t = \langle x^8, y^8 \rangle \leq G_w. \end{aligned}$$

Thus T is a well-defined G -graph.

Let $U = Gu$.

Let $H = \langle x, y \rangle \leq G$.

For any subset S of T , we let S^{xyx} denote $\{s \in S \mid (xyx)s = s\}$. \square

Since $G_w \leq G_u$, it is clear that U is a G -retract of V . We shall see that T is a G -tree, and that no G -tree has vertex set U .

7.4 Lemma. *If Hypotheses 7.3 hold, then the G -graph T is a tree, and H is freely generated by $\{x, y\}$.*

Proof. Let us momentarily forget Hypotheses 7.3.

Let $Y = (Y, \overline{V}, \overline{E}, \overline{\iota}, \overline{\tau})$ be the graph given as follows.

$$\overline{V} = \{\overline{u}, \overline{w}\}, \quad \overline{E} = \{\overline{e}, \overline{f}\}, \quad \overline{\iota}(\overline{e}) = \overline{u}, \quad \overline{\tau}(\overline{e}) = \overline{\iota}(\overline{f}) = \overline{\tau}(\overline{f}) = \overline{w}.$$

Let $Y_0 := (Y_0, \overline{V}, \{\overline{e}\}, \overline{\iota}, \overline{\tau})$ be the unique maximal subtree of Y .

Using the notation of Definitions I.3.1 of [3], let $(G(-), Y)$ be the graph of groups given by the following data.

$$\begin{aligned} G(\overline{u}) &= \langle x, y \mid \rangle, & G(\overline{w}) &= \langle x', y' \mid \rangle, & G(\overline{e}) &= \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle, & G(\overline{f}) &= \langle x', y' \rangle, \\ (x^4)^{t\overline{\tau}} &= x'^4, & (xyx)^{t\overline{\tau}} &= x'y'x', & (y^4)^{t\overline{\tau}} &= y'^4, & (x')^{t\overline{\tau}} &= x'^2, & (y')^{t\overline{\tau}} &= y'^2. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that, in the notation of Definitions I.3.1 of [3], $(-)^{t\overline{\tau}}$ denotes the edge-group monomorphism associated to \overline{e} .

Let $G := \pi(G(-), Y, Y_0)$, as in Definitions I.3.4 of [3]. Writing t for the element of G that realizes the monomorphism $t_{\overline{f}}: G(\overline{f}) \rightarrow G(\overline{w})$, we have

$$G = \langle x, y, x', y', t \mid x^4 = x'^4, xyx = x'y'x', y^4 = y'^4, x'^t = x'^2, y'^t = y'^2 \rangle.$$

Then $\langle x, y \mid \rangle = G(\overline{u}) \leq G$ by Corollary I.7.5 of [3].

Now $x'^{t^2} = x'^{2t} = x'^4 = x^4$. Thus $x' = x^{4t^{-2}}$. Similarly, $y' = y^{4t^{-2}}$. Hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} G &= \langle x, y, t \mid x^4 = x^{16t^{-2}}, xyx = x^{4t^{-2}} y^{4t^{-2}} x^{4t^{-2}}, y^4 = y^{16t^{-2}}, \\ &\quad x^{4t^{-1}} = x^{8t^{-2}}, \quad y^{4t^{-1}} = y^{8t^{-2}} \rangle \\ &= \langle x, y, t \mid x^{4t^2} = x^{16}, x^{t^2} y^{t^2} x^{t^2} = x^4 y^4 x^4, y^{4t^2} = y^{16}, \\ &\quad x^{4t} = x^8, \quad y^{4t} = y^8 \rangle \\ &= \langle x, y, t \mid x^{4t} = x^8, x^{t^2} y^{t^2} x^{t^2} = x^4 y^4 x^4, y^{4t} = y^8 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $T = (T, V, E, \iota, \tau)$ be $T(G(-), Y, Y_0)$, as in Definitions I.3.4 of [3]. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} V &= G\bar{u} \vee G\bar{w}, \quad G\bar{u} = \langle x, y \rangle, \quad G\bar{w} = \langle x', y' \rangle = \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle^{t^{-2}}, \\ E &= G\bar{e} \vee G\bar{f}, \quad G\bar{e} = \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle, \quad G\bar{f} = \langle x', y' \rangle = \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle^{t^{-2}}, \\ \iota(\bar{e}) &= \bar{u}, \quad \tau(\bar{e}) = \bar{w}, \quad \iota(\bar{f}) = \bar{w}, \quad \tau(\bar{f}) = t\bar{w}. \end{aligned}$$

By Bass-Serre Theory, T is a G -tree; see [3, Theorem I.7.6].

Let $u := \bar{u}$, $w := t^{-2}\bar{w}$, $e := \bar{e}$, $f := t^{-2}\bar{f}$.

Then $\iota e = u$, $\tau e = t^2 w$, $\iota f = w$, $\tau f = tw$.

Thus the above G and T agree with the G and T of Hypotheses 7.3, and the result is proved. \square

7.5 Lemma. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If Hypotheses 7.3 hold, then the following also hold.*

- (i) $(t^n G_u e)^{xyx} = \{t^n e\}$ if $n \neq 1$.
- (ii) $(t^{n+2} G_w t^{-2} e)^{xyx} = \begin{cases} \{t^n e\} & \text{if } n \neq 1, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } n = 1. \end{cases}$
- (iii) $(t^{n+2} G_w t^{-1} f)^{xyx} = \begin{cases} \{t^{n+1} f\} & \text{if } n \neq 0, \\ \emptyset & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$
- (iv) $(t^{n+2} G_w f)^{xyx} = \{t^{n+2} f\}$.

Proof. (i). Let $g \in G_u = \langle x, y \rangle$.

Suppose that $n \neq 1$ and that $(xyx)t^n g e = t^n g e$. Then $(xyx)^{t^n g} \in G_e$. By Lemma 7.2(i),

$$(x^{2^n} y^{2^n} x^{2^n})^g \in G_e = \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle.$$

By Lemma 7.1(ii), $g \in \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle = G_e$. Hence $t^n g e = t^n e$. It is now easy to see that (i) holds.

(ii). Let $g \in G_w = \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle$.

Suppose that $(xyx)t^{n+2} g t^{-2} e = t^{n+2} g t^{-2} e$. Then $(xyx)^{t^{n+2} g t^{-2}} \in G_e$. By Lemma 7.2(ii),

$$((x^4)^{2^n} (y^4)^{2^n} (x^4)^{2^n})^g \in G_e^{t^2} = \langle x^4, xyx, y^4 \rangle^{t^2} = \langle x^{16}, x^4 y^4 x^4, y^{16} \rangle.$$

By Lemma 7.1(ii), $n \neq 1$ and $g \in \langle x^{16}, x^4 y^4 x^4, y^{16} \rangle = G_e^{t^2}$. Hence $t^{n+2} g t^{-2} e = t^n e$. It is now clear that (ii) holds.

(iii). Let $g \in G_w = \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle$.

Suppose that $(xyx)t^{n+2} g t^{-1} f = t^{n+2} g t^{-1} f$. Then $(xyx)^{t^{n+2} g t^{-1}} \in G_f$. By Lemma 7.2(ii),

$$((x^4)^{2^n} (y^4)^{2^n} (x^4)^{2^n})^g \in G_f^t = \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle^t = \langle x^8, y^8 \rangle.$$

By Lemma 7.1(i), $n \neq 0$ and $g \in \langle x^8, y^8 \rangle = G_f^t$. Hence $t^n g t^{-1} f = t^{n-1} f$. It is now clear that (iii) holds.

(iv). By Lemma 7.2(ii), $(xyx)^{t^{n+2}} \in \langle x^4, y^4 \rangle = G_f = G_w$. \square

7.6 Lemma. *If Hypotheses 7.3 hold, then*

$$V^{xyx} = \{t^n u \mid n \in \mathbb{N} - \{1\}\} \cup \{t^{n+2} w \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

From [3, Definitions I.3.4], we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \iota^{-1}(t^n u) &= t^n G_u e, & \tau^{-1}(t^n u) &= \emptyset, \\ \iota^{-1}(t^{n+2} w) &= t^{n+2} G_w f, & \tau^{-1}(t^{n+2} w) &= t^{n+2} G_w t^{-2} e \cup t^{n+2} G_w t^{-1} f. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.5(ii), (iii) and (iv), the edges of T^{xyx} incident to $t^2 w$ are e and $t^2 f$, the edges of T^{xyx} incident to $t^3 w$ are $t^2 f$ and $t^3 f$, and, for $n \geq 2$, the edges of T^{xyx} incident to $t^{n+2} w$ are $t^n e$, $t^{n+1} f$ and $t^{n+2} f$.

Hence, in T^{xyx} , the neighbours of $t^2 w$ are u and $t^3 w$, the neighbours of $t^3 w$ are $t^2 w$ and $t^4 w$, and, for $n \geq 2$, the neighbours of $t^{n+2} w$ are $t^n u$, $t^{n+1} w$ and $t^{n+3} w$.

By Lemma 7.5(i), if $n \neq 1$, then the unique edge of T^{xyx} incident to $t^n u$ is $t^n e$, and hence the unique neighbour of $t^n u$ in T^{xyx} is $t^{n+2} w$.

The result now follows. \square

We now have the desired example.

7.7 Theorem. *There exists a group G and a G -set U such that U is a G -retract of the vertex set of some G -tree but U is not the vertex set of any G -tree.*

Proof. We assume that Hypotheses 7.3 hold.

By Lemma 7.4, U is a G -retract of the vertex set of some G -tree.

Suppose that there exists a G -tree T' with $VT' = U = Gu$. We will derive a contradiction.

Temporarily returning to the tree T , we let L denote the subtree of T with vertex set $\langle t \rangle w$ and edge set $\langle t \rangle f$. Then L is homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} and t acts on L by translation. In particular, $\langle t \rangle$ acts freely on VT . Hence, $\langle t \rangle$ acts freely on $VT' \subseteq VT$. As in [3, Proposition I.4.11], there exists a subtree L' of T' homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} on which t acts by translation.

Let v' denote the vertex of L' closest to u in T' . It is well known, and easy to prove, that the T' -geodesic from u to $t^2 u$, denoted $T'[u, t^2 u]$, is the concatenation of the four T' -geodesics $T'[u, v']$, $T'[v', tv']$, $T'[tv', t^2 v']$, and $T'[t^2 v', t^2 u]$.

By Lemma 7.6, and the fact that $\langle t \rangle$ acts freely on VT' ,

$$(7.7.1) \quad VT'^{xyx} = (Gu)^{xyx} = \{t^n u \mid n \in \mathbb{N} - \{1\}\} = \{t^n u \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} - \{tu\}.$$

By (7.7.1), or by direct calculation, xyx fixes u , moves tu , and fixes $t^2 u$. Thus, xyx fixes $T'[u, t^2 u]$, and, hence, xyx fixes v' , fixes tv' , and fixes $t^2 v'$.

In particular, $tu \neq tv'$, hence $u \neq v'$, that is, $u \notin L'$.

Since xyx fixes v' , we see, by (7.7.1), that $v' = t^n u$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} - \{1\}$. Hence $u = t^{-n} v' \in t^{-n} L' = L'$. This is a contradiction. \square

Acknowledgments

The research of the first-named author was funded by the DGI (Spain) through Project BFM2003-06613.

We are grateful to Gilbert Levitt for making us think about the sliding operation at a most opportune moment.

We thank a referee for several useful suggestions.

References

- [1] Pierre de la Harpe and Alain Valette, *La propriété (T) de Kazhdan pour les groupes localement compacts (avec un appendice de Marc Burger)*, Astérisque **175**, Soc. Math. de France, 1989.
- [2] Warren Dicks, *Equivalence of the strengthened Hanna Neumann conjecture and the amalgamated graph conjecture*, Invent. Math. **117**(1994), 373–389.
Errata at <http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/InvErr.html>
- [3] Warren Dicks and M. J. Dunwoody, *Groups acting on graphs*, Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. **17**, CUP, Cambridge, 1989.
Errata at <http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/DDerr.html>
- [4] Warren Dicks and Peter Kropholler, *Free groups and almost equivariant maps*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **27**(1995), 319–326.
Addenda at <http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/almost.html>
- [5] Warren Dicks and Peter A. Linnell, *L^2 -Betti numbers of one-relator groups*, Math. Ann. (to appear).
<http://arxiv.org/abs/math.GR/0508370>
- [6] M. J. Dunwoody, *Folding sequences*, pp. 139–158 in: The Epstein birthday schrift (eds. Igor Rivin, Colin Rourke and Caroline Series), Geom. Topol. Monographs **1**, Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, 1998.
<http://www.maths.warwick.ac.uk/gt/GTMon1/paper7.abs.html>
- [7] Max Forester, *Deformation and rigidity of simplicial group actions on trees*, Geom. Topol. **6**(2002), 219–267.
<http://www.maths.warwick.ac.uk/gt/GTVol6/paper8.abs.html>
- [8] E. Rips and Z. Sela, *Cyclic splittings of finitely presented groups and the canonical JSJ decomposition*, Ann. Math. **146**(1997), 53–109.

WARREN DICKS, DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTIQUES, UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA,
E-08193 BELLATERRA (BARCELONA), SPAIN

E-mail address: dicks@mat.uab.cat

URL: <http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/>

M. J. DUNWOODY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON, SOUTH-
AMPTON, ENGLAND SO17 1BJ

E-mail address: M.J.Dunwoody@maths.soton.ac.uk

URL: <http://www.maths.soton.ac.uk/staff/Dunwoody/>