

Annulus-Torus decompositions for Poincaré duality pairs

Peter Scott*

Mathematics Department
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA.
email: pscott@umich.edu

Gadde A. Swarup

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Melbourne
Victoria 3010, Australia.
email: anandaswarupg@gmail.com

December 29, 2018

Dedicated to Terry Wall on his 70th birthday

Abstract

There are several algebraic analogues of the JSJ -decomposition of a 3-manifold, one of which was described by the authors. We study this analogue in the special case of Poincaré duality pairs.

Introduction

In [23], we obtained canonical decompositions for almost finitely presented groups analogous to the JSJ -decomposition of a 3-manifold. In particular, for many almost finitely presented groups G , and any integer $n \geq 1$, we

*Partially supported by NSF grants DMS 9626537 and 0203883

defined a decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, and we showed that when G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary, then $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ essentially yields the JSJ -decomposition of M . We recall that the JSJ -decomposition of M is given by a possibly disconnected compact submanifold $V(M)$ which is called the characteristic submanifold of M , such that the frontier of $V(M)$ consists of essential annuli and tori, and each component of $V(M)$ is an I -bundle or a Seifert fibre space. Further each component of the closure of $M - V(M)$ is simple. In this paper, we consider the structure of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, in the case of Poincaré duality pairs (G, \mathcal{S}) of dimension $n + 2$, where $n \geq 1$. The results we obtain are very closely analogous to the above description for 3-manifolds. This greatly generalises work of Kropholler in [13] and of Castel in [5]. Kropholler described a canonical decomposition of such Poincaré duality pairs in any dimension at least 3, and Castel described a canonical decomposition of such Poincaré duality pairs in dimension 3 only, but their decompositions are analogous to the Torus Decomposition of an orientable Haken 3-manifold. See section 5 for a discussion.

A Poincaré duality pair is the algebraic analogue of an aspherical manifold with aspherical boundary components whose fundamental groups inject. It consists of a group G which corresponds to the fundamental group of the manifold, and a family of subgroups which correspond to the fundamental groups of the boundary components, and the whole setup satisfies an appropriate version of Poincaré duality. The main difficulty in establishing the results in this paper is that if one considers any of the decompositions of G described in [23], then a priori there is no connection between the decomposition and the boundary groups of the pair. In the topological case, if one considers the full characteristic submanifold $V(M)$ of an orientable Haken manifold M with incompressible boundary, one can double M along its boundary to obtain a closed Haken 3-manifold DM , and there is a natural submanifold DV of DM which is the double of $V(M)$. Further, in most cases, DV is the characteristic submanifold of DM . Interestingly, one can reverse this process and construct the full characteristic submanifold of M by starting with the characteristic submanifold $V(DM)$ of DM and “un-doubling” to obtain the required submanifold $V(M)$ of M . In the algebraic context, doubling a $(n + 2)$ -dimensional Poincaré duality pair (G, \mathcal{S}) along its boundary yields a $(n + 2)$ -dimensional Poincaré duality group DG , but in general there is no natural way to double an algebraic decomposition of G to obtain a corresponding decomposition of DG . However, it seems to us

very reasonable to believe that when (G, \mathcal{S}) is a Poincaré duality pair, the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ can be doubled just as in the topological setting to obtain the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$ of DG , which is the analogue of the *JSJ*-decomposition of a closed manifold. Our arguments in this paper do not prove that, but they do show that the algebraic situation is very similar to the topological one. If we start with the Poincaré duality group DG , and the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$, then one algebraic analogue of “undoubling” would be simply to restrict this decomposition to G using the Subgroup Theorem. This certainly determines a graph of groups structure on G , and we believe that this decomposition of G is essentially equal to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, but we do not prove this either. One difficulty is that we are unable to show directly that this decomposition of G has any of the enclosing properties required of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. This is partly because our idea of enclosing is much stronger than simply requiring certain subgroups of G to be conjugate into certain vertex groups of a given decomposition of G . For example if a splitting of G is enclosed by a vertex v of a graph of groups decomposition Γ of G , then we can split Γ at v to obtain a refined graph of groups structure for G which has an extra edge associated to the given splitting.

An important point about our ideas in [23] and in this paper is that we consider all almost invariant subsets of a group G rather than just those which correspond to splittings. In the topological setting, this corresponds to considering essential maps rather than essential embeddings of codimension-1 manifolds. We do not know how to carry out the program in this paper using only splittings. The main goal in [23] was to enclose the algebraic analogues of immersed annuli and tori (the analogues were almost invariant sets over virtually polycyclic groups). It turns out that the analogy is stronger in the case of Poincaré duality pairs. The decomposition $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ which we obtained in [23] was constructed to enclose the analogues of immersions of annuli and tori whereas in the *JSJ* theory ([10], [11] and [33]), the aim was to enclose essential Seifert pairs. When G is the fundamental group of a 3-manifold, the difference turns out to be minor (consisting of small Seifert fibre spaces) and one can easily go from one decomposition to the other. In the case of groups it seems more natural to enclose almost invariant sets over virtually polycyclic subgroups, that is the analogues of immersions of annuli and tori, rather than Seifert pairs and to make the distinction clear, we will call the decompositions that we obtain Annulus–Torus decompositions. It should be pointed out that when doubling a manifold, the *JSJ*-decompositions behave better than the Annulus–Torus decompositions, and we will switch from one

to the other when it is convenient. Similar comments apply to our algebraic decompositions of Poincaré duality pairs.

Our main result, Theorem 4.27, is a description of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ for an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair (G, \mathcal{S}) , when $n \geq 1$. We leave the precise statement till later because it requires the introduction of a substantial amount of terminology. Some of the result is simply a restatement of our results from [23]. But an important part of the result is that all the edge splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are induced by essential annuli and tori in (G, \mathcal{S}) , in a sense which we define in section 4. This means that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ is very closely analogous to the JSJ -decomposition of an orientable 3-manifold for every value of $n \geq 1$.

In section 1, we recall the main definitions and results from our work in [23]. In section 2, we introduce the idea of an almost invariant subset of a group being adapted to a family of subgroups. This idea will be used at several points in this paper. In section 3, we apply our results from section 2 to prove a relative version of the torus theorem for group pairs which are not assumed to satisfy Poincaré duality. In section 4, we discuss the definition of a Poincaré duality group and pair, and then we discuss essential annuli and tori (the terms ‘annulus’ and ‘torus’ are used in a generalised sense) in orientable Poincaré duality pairs. We show that each such object has a naturally associated almost invariant set, which we call its dual. We also show that all almost invariant sets over $VPCn$ groups in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair are ‘generated’ by duals of essential annuli. In section 5, we discuss the analogues of torus decompositions for orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups and pairs. These decompositions were already obtained by Kropholler [13] under the extra hypothesis that any VPC subgroup has finitely generated centraliser, a condition which he called Max-c. In [14] Kropholler showed that the Max-c condition holds in dimension 3. However an example due to Mess [17] shows that the Max-c condition is not always satisfied. In dimension 3, this decomposition was also obtained by Castel [5]. The comparison between our results and Kropholler’s results in the case of orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups is discussed briefly in [23], but we discuss this in more detail here. In section 6, we continue studying orientable $PD(n+2)$ pairs, and consider the crossing of almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ groups with almost invariant subsets over $VPC(n+1)$ groups. This is a new feature of our arguments in this paper, which could not be handled in the more general setting of [23]. In section 7, we bring together the various pieces and prove our main result, Theorem 4.27. Finally in section 8, we discuss some natural further questions.

1 Preliminaries

In this section we recall the main definitions and results from [23] which we will use. But we will start by briefly discussing some 3-manifold theory which motivates and guides all our work. Let M be an orientable Haken 3-manifold with incompressible boundary. Jaco and Shalen [10] and Johannson [11] proved the existence and uniqueness of the characteristic submanifold of M . We will denote this submanifold by $JSJ(M)$. Its frontier consists of essential annuli and tori in M , and each component of $JSJ(M)$ is a Seifert fibre space or I -bundle. Further any essential map of a Seifert fibre space into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $JSJ(M)$, and this condition characterises $JSJ(M)$. In order to compare this with algebraic generalisations, we note that, in particular, any essential map of the annulus or torus into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $JSJ(M)$. This weaker condition does not characterise $JSJ(M)$, but does characterise a submanifold of M which we denote by $AT(M)$. The letters AT stand for Annulus-Torus. This is discussed in detail in chapter 1 of [23], but the notation $AT(M)$ is not used. Any essential map of the annulus or torus into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $AT(M)$, and $AT(M)$ is minimal, up to isotopy, among all essential submanifolds of M with this property. (A compact submanifold of M is essential if its frontier consists of essential embedded surfaces.) We will say that the family of all essential annuli and tori in M *fills* $AT(M)$, and we regard $AT(M)$ as a kind of regular neighbourhood of this family. The connection between $AT(M)$ and $JSJ(M)$ can be described as follows. The submanifold $JSJ(M)$ has certain exceptional components. These are of two types. One type is a solid torus W whose frontier consists of three annuli each of degree 1 in W , or of one annulus of degree 2 in W , or of one annulus of degree 3 in W . The other type lies in the interior of M and is homeomorphic to the twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle. (Note that M is orientable, so that only one such bundle can occur.) Then $AT(M)$ can be obtained from $JSJ(M)$ by discarding all these exceptional components, replacing each of them by a regular neighbourhood of its frontier, and finally discarding any redundant product components from the resulting submanifold.

Recall from the previous paragraph that the family of all essential annuli and tori in M fills $AT(M)$, and that we regard $AT(M)$ as a kind of regular neighbourhood of this family. However, $AT(M)$ is filled by a smaller family of essential annuli and tori in M , and this turns out to be crucial for the algebraic analogues we are discussing in this paper. Let $AT_{\partial}(M)$ denote

the union of those components of $AT(M)$ which meet ∂M , and let $AT_{int}(M)$ denote the union of the remaining components of $AT(M)$. Then any essential annulus in M can be properly homotoped to lie in $AT_{\partial}(M)$. Thus it is clear that any essential torus in M which is homotopic into $AT_{int}(M)$ cannot cross any such annulus, and that $AT_{int}(M)$ must be filled by tori which are homotopic into $AT_{int}(M)$. Further, it is easy to show that $AT_{\partial}(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M . We conclude that $AT(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M .

For future reference, we will also need to discuss the Torus Decomposition of M and its relationship with $AT(M)$. As above one can characterise a submanifold $T(M)$ of M by the property that any essential map of a torus into M can be homotoped into $T(M)$ and that $T(M)$ is minimal, up to isotopy, among all essential submanifolds of M with this property. Of course if M admits no essential annulus, then $AT(M)$ and $T(M)$ are equal. In general, $T(M)$ is obtained from $AT(M)$ as follows. Any component of $AT_{int}(M)$ is left unchanged. Now $AT_{\partial}(M)$ has three types of component. The first type is a Seifert fibre space which is not a solid torus and such that each boundary torus lies in the interior of M , or is contained in ∂M , or meets ∂M in vertical annuli. The second type is a solid torus which meets ∂M in annuli and the third type is an I -bundle over a surface F which meets ∂M in the associated ∂I -bundle over F . As no essential torus in M can be homotopic into a component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ of the second or third type, all such components are omitted when we form $T(M)$. Finally let W denote a component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ which is of the first type. Thus W is a Seifert fibre space which is not a solid torus and $W \cap \partial M$ consists of tori and vertical annuli in ∂W . By pushing into the interior of W each torus component of ∂W which meets ∂M in annuli, we obtain a Seifert fibre space W' which is contained in and homeomorphic to W . Note that the components of the closure of $W - W'$ are homeomorphic to $T \times I$, and $W' \cap \partial M$ consists only of tori. Replacing W by W' for each such component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ finally yields $T(M)$. Note that it is clear that $T(M) \subset AT(M)$ and that an essential torus in M is homotopic into $AT(M)$ if and only if it is homotopic into $T(M)$.

Next we recall the cohomological formulation of the theory of ends and of almost invariant subsets of a group. Let G be a group and let E be a set on which G acts on the right. Let PE denote the power set of all subsets of E . Under Boolean addition (“symmetric difference”) this is an additive group of exponent 2. Write FE for the additive subgroup of finite subsets. We refer

to two sets A and B whose symmetric difference lies in FE as *almost equal*, and write $A \stackrel{a}{=} B$. This amounts to equality in the quotient group PE/FE . Now define

$$QE = \{A \subset E : \forall g \in G, A \stackrel{a}{=} Ag\}.$$

The action of G on PE by right translation preserves the subgroups QE and FE , and QE/FE is the subgroup of elements of PE/FE fixed under the induced action. Elements of QE are said to be *almost invariant*. If we take E to be G with the action of G being right multiplication, then the number of ends of G is

$$e(G) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}_2} (QG/FG).$$

If G is finite, all subsets are finite and clearly $e(G) = 0$. Otherwise, G is an infinite set which is invariant (not merely “almost”), so $e(G) \geq 1$.

If H is a subgroup of G , and we take E to be the coset space $H \backslash G$ of all cosets Hg , still with the action of G being right multiplication, then the number of ends of the pair (G, H) is

$$e(G, H) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \left(\frac{Q(H \backslash G)}{F(H \backslash G)} \right).$$

When H is trivial, so that $e(G, H) = e(G)$, this can be formulated in terms of group cohomology as follows. The abelian group PG is naturally a (right) \mathbb{Z}_2G -module, and the submodule FG can be identified with the group ring \mathbb{Z}_2G . Thus the invariant subgroup QG/FG equals $H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G)$. Now the short exact sequence of coefficients

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2G \rightarrow PG \rightarrow PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G \rightarrow 0$$

yields the following long exact cohomology sequence.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) \rightarrow H^0(G; PG) \rightarrow H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) \rightarrow H^1(G; PG) \rightarrow$$

For any group G , the group $H^n(G; PG)$ is zero if $n \neq 0$ and isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2 when $n = 0$. And if G is infinite, then $H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) = 0$. Also when G is infinite, the non-zero element of $H^0(G; PG)$ maps to the element of $H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G)$ which corresponds to the equivalence class of G in QG/FG , under the identification of these two groups. It follows that when G is infinite, the group $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of G modulo almost equality and complementation.

If H is nontrivial, let E denote the coset space $H \backslash G$. The abelian group PE is naturally a (right) $\mathbb{Z}_2 G$ -module, and we denote the submodule FE by $\mathbb{Z}_2 E$. Thus the invariant subgroup QE/FE equals $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Now the short exact sequence of coefficients

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 E \rightarrow PE \rightarrow PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E \rightarrow 0$$

yields the following long exact cohomology sequence.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; PE) \rightarrow$$

For any group G and any subgroup H , the group $H^n(G; PE)$ is isomorphic to $H^n(H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and if the index of H in G is infinite, then $H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) = 0$. Thus, as above, when H has infinite index in G , the image of the coboundary map $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ modulo almost equality and complementation.

If G is finitely presented, this description connects very nicely with topology. Let X be a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 2-skeleton, let \tilde{X} denote its universal cover, and let X_H denote the cover of X with fundamental group H . Thus X_H is the quotient of \tilde{X} by the (left) action of H acting as a covering group. Because X has finite 2-skeleton, the part of the long exact cohomology sequence shown above is isomorphic to the corresponding part of the following long exact cohomology sequence for X_H ,

$$H_f^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow$$

where $H_f^i(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denotes cellular cohomology with finite supports. Thus when H has infinite index in G , the image of the coboundary map $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ modulo almost equality and complementation. If G is finitely generated but not finitely presented, we can take X to be a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1-skeleton but it is no longer correct to identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ with $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. In fact, cellular cohomology with finite supports for a cell complex which is not locally finite is an unreasonable idea, as the coboundary of a finite cochain need not be finite. However it is easy to define a modified version of this theory in our particular setting. For future reference we set this out as a remark.

Remark 1.1. *Let G be a group which is finitely generated but need not be finitely presented, and let X be a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1–skeleton. Let H be a subgroup of G , and let X_H denote the cover of X with fundamental group H . We replace the use of cochains on X_H with finite support by cochains whose support consists of only finitely many cells above each cell of X . Note that as X has only finitely many 1–cells, such 1–cochains are finite. In this paper, $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ will denote the appropriate cohomology group of this cochain complex. This enables us to identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ with $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.*

This is the topological formulation of Lemma 7.4 in [3].

Recall that the invariant subgroup QE/FE equals $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Thus the elements of $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ are equivalence classes of almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ under the equivalence relation of almost equality. Also the elements of $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are equivalence classes of cellular 0–cochains on X_H which have finite coboundary. The support of such a cochain is a subset of the vertex set of X_H . Thus whether or not G is finitely presented, the isomorphism between $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ and $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ associates to an almost invariant subset Y of $H \backslash G$ a subset Z of the vertex set of X_H with finite coboundary, where Z is unique up to almost equality. This is a convenient fact which we will use on several occasions. Note that Y is trivial, i.e. finite or co-finite, if and only if Z is finite or co-finite. Also if Y and Y' are almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ with corresponding subsets Z and Z' of the vertex set of X_H , then the intersections $Y \cap Y'$ and $Z \cap Z'$ also correspond.

Next we recall some more basic facts about almost invariant sets. If X and Y are a pair of almost invariant subsets of G , the four sets $X \cap Y$, $X \cap Y^*$, $X^* \cap Y$ and $X^* \cap Y^*$ are called the *corners* of the pair. If X is H –almost invariant and Y is K –almost invariant, a corner of the pair (X, Y) is *small* if it is H –finite or K –finite. (We showed that these two conditions are equivalent so long as X and Y are both nontrivial.) We say that X *crosses* Y if all four corners of the pair (X, Y) are K –infinite. The preceding parenthetical comment shows that if X and Y are nontrivial, then X crosses Y if and only if Y crosses X . In [22] and [23], we defined a partial order \leq on certain families of almost invariant subsets of a finitely generated group G as follows. The idea of the definition is that $Y \leq X$ means that Y is “almost” contained in X . If E is a family of almost invariant subsets of G , we say that the elements of E are in *good position* if whenever U and V are elements of E such that two of the corners of the pair are small, then one corner is empty. If the elements of E are in good position, then we defined $Y \leq X$ to

mean that either $Y \cap X^*$ is empty or it is the only small corner of the pair (X, Y) . We showed that \leq is a partial order on E . Note that if $Y \subset X$ then automatically $Y \leq X$. Note also that the requirement of good position was needed to avoid the possibility of having distinct sets X and Y such that $Y \leq X$ and $X \leq Y$. In [19], we defined an even stronger condition. If E is a family of almost invariant subsets of G , we say that the elements of E are in *very good position* if whenever U and V are elements of E , either none of the four corners of the pair is small or one is empty. This means that the partial orders on E induced by inclusion and by \leq are the same. We also showed that one can often arrange that families of almost invariant sets are in very good position by replacing the given sets by equivalent ones.

Next we recall the theory of algebraic regular neighbourhoods. In [23], we defined an algebraic regular neighbourhood (Definition 6.1) and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood (Definition 6.18) of a family of almost invariant subsets of a finitely generated group G . We discuss the difference between these objects immediately after Definition 1.4 below. Each is a bipartite graph of groups structure Γ for G with certain properties. The basic property of Γ is that the V_0 -vertices enclose the given almost invariant sets. See chapters 4 and 5 of [23] for the definition and basic properties of enclosing. Algebraic regular neighbourhoods need not exist, but we showed that when they exist they are unique up to isomorphism of bipartite graphs of groups. We also showed that if one has a finite family of almost invariant sets each over a finitely generated subgroup of G , then it always has an algebraic regular neighbourhood and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood. The main results of [23] were existence results for infinite families in several special cases. In this paper, we will use the existence results for reduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods.

Before stating these existence results, we briefly discuss how the topological and algebraic situations are related. Groups which are virtually polycyclic (*VPC*) play an important role in this paper. The Hirsch length of such a group will simply be called the length for brevity. Almost invariant sets which do not cross other almost invariant sets play a special role. We will need the following definition from [23].

Definition 1.2. *Let G be a one-ended finitely generated group and let X be a nontrivial almost invariant subset over a subgroup H of G .*

For $n \geq 1$, we will say that X is n -canonical if $H \setminus X$ has zero intersection number with any nontrivial almost invariant subset of any $K \setminus G$, for which

K is VPC of length at most n .

Let G denote any one-ended almost finitely presented group. The natural algebraic analogue of an essential annulus in a 3-manifold M is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC1$ subgroup, and the natural analogue of an essential torus in M is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC2$ subgroup. As $AT(M)$ is a kind of regular neighbourhood of the family of all essential annuli and tori in M , it would seem natural to consider the algebraic regular neighbourhood in G of the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over VPC subgroups of length 1 or 2. However, we showed in [23] that, even when G is the fundamental group of a 3-manifold, such a family need not possess an algebraic regular neighbourhood with the right properties. But recall from our earlier discussion that $AT(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M . The algebraic analogue of this family is the family $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC1$ subgroups and of all 1-canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC2$ subgroups. In [23], we showed that $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ has a regular neighbourhood which is precisely analogous to the decomposition given by $AT(M)$. We also described analogous constructions for VPC subgroups of G of higher length. This is contained in Theorem 1.11 below.

Next we need to introduce some more definitions which we used in [23].

Definition 1.3. *If E is a G -invariant family of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of a group G , we will say that an element of E which crosses no element of E is isolated in E .*

When forming a regular neighbourhood of a family E of almost invariant sets, isolated elements yield special vertices which we also call isolated.

Definition 1.4. *A vertex of a graph of groups Γ is isolated if it has exactly two incident edges for each of which the inclusion of the associated edge group into the vertex group is an isomorphism.*

Note that the two edges incident to an isolated vertex have the same associated edge splitting. Conversely if two distinct edges e and e' of a minimal graph Γ of groups have associated edge splittings which are conjugate, there is an edge path λ in Γ which starts with e and ends with e' such that all the interior vertices of λ are isolated, and all the edges in λ have associated edge

splittings which are conjugate. When one forms the algebraic regular neighbourhood Γ of a family E of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of a group G , it may happen that Γ has such edge paths with more than two edges. One could reduce Γ by simply collapsing each maximal such edge path in Γ to a single edge. However Γ is bipartite and one wants to preserve this property, so one may instead need to collapse such a maximal edge path to two edges. The resulting bipartite graph of groups is the reduced regular neighbourhood of E . It never has three distinct edges such that the associated splittings of G are all conjugate. We formalise this in the following definition.

Definition 1.5. *A minimal bipartite graph of groups Γ is called reduced bipartite if it does not have three distinct edges such that the associated splittings of G are all conjugate.*

Some other special types of vertices also occur when one forms a regular neighbourhood.

Definition 1.6. *Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of a group G . A vertex v of Γ is of VPC-by-Fuchsian type if $G(v)$ is a VPC-by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is not finite nor two-ended, and there is exactly one edge of Γ which is incident to v for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$ and this edge carries K . If the length of the normal VPC subgroup of $G(v)$ is n , we will say that v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.*

Note that if $G = G(v)$, then Γ must consist of v alone, and the Fuchsian quotient group of G corresponds to a closed orbifold. Conversely if the Fuchsian quotient group of $G(v)$ corresponds to a closed orbifold, then Γ must consist of v alone and $G = G(v)$. Note also that if v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, then each peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$.

The assumption in Definition 1.6 that the Fuchsian quotient of $G(v)$ not be finite nor two-ended is made to ensure the uniqueness of the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient. This is immediate from the following result.

Lemma 1.7. *Let G be a group with a normal $VPCk$ subgroup L with Fuchsian quotient Φ . Suppose that Φ is not finite nor two-ended. If L' is a $VPCk$ normal subgroup of G with Fuchsian quotient, then L' must equal L .*

Proof. If L' is not contained in L , the image of L' in Φ is a nontrivial normal VPC subgroup, which we denote by N . As no Fuchsian group can be $VPC2$, it follows that N must be $VPC0$ or $VPC1$. If N is $VPC0$, i.e. finite, then Φ must also be finite. If N is $VPC1$, then it must be of finite index in Φ . As we are assuming that Φ is not finite nor two-ended, it follows that L' must be contained in L . Similarly L must be contained in L' , so that L and L' are equal, as required. \square

We note that in [23] we used the word Fuchsian to include discrete groups of isometries of the Euclidean plane, as well as the hyperbolic plane. The additional groups were all virtually $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. The reason for this abuse of language was that we wanted to include the case of VPC groups in the statements of our results. However in all of the main results of this paper, it will be convenient to exclude the case of VPC groups.

Definition 1.8. *Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of a group G . A vertex v of Γ is n -simple, if whenever X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a VPC subgroup of length at most n such that X is enclosed by v , then X is associated to an edge splitting of Γ .*

In particular, Γ cannot be further refined by splitting at v along a VPC group of length at most n .

Recall that if H is a subgroup of a group G , the *commensuriser*, $Comm_G(H)$, of H in G is the subgroup of G consisting of all elements g such that the conjugate of H by g is commensurable with H . Trivially, $Comm_G(H)$ contains H . We will say that $Comm_G(H)$ is *large* if it contains H with infinite index, and is *small* otherwise.

The following existence result combines the statements of Theorems 12.3 and 12.5 of [23]. We have made one slight modification in the last sentence of part 1, where we refer to the number of coends of a subgroup in a group. See page 33 of [23] for a brief discussion of this concept. It was introduced independently by Bowditch [2] under the name of coends, by Geoghegan [8] under the name of filtered coends, and by Kropholler and Roller [15] under the name of relative ends.

Theorem 1.9. *Let G be a one-ended, almost finitely presented group which is not VPC and does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC groups of length $< n$, and let \mathcal{F}_n denote the collection of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups.*

Then \mathcal{F}_n has an unreduced and a reduced regular neighbourhood in G . Let $\Gamma_n = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_n : G)$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}_n in G .

Then Γ_n is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G with the following properties:

1. Each V_0 -vertex v of Γ_n satisfies one of the following conditions:
 - (a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is $VPCn$.
 - (b) v is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and elements of \mathcal{F}_n enclosed by v cross strongly if at all.
 - (c) $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H , such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, and elements of \mathcal{F}_n enclosed by v cross weakly if at all.

Further, if H is a $VPCn$ subgroup of G such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, then Γ_n will have a non-isolated V_0 -vertex v such that $G(v) = Comm_G(H)$ if and only if H has at least 4 coends in G .

2. Γ_n consists of a single vertex if and only if \mathcal{F}_n is empty, or G itself satisfies condition b) or c) in 1). In the first case, Γ_n consists of a single V_1 -vertex. In the second case, Γ_n consists of a single V_0 -vertex.
3. Any element of \mathcal{F}_n is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of Γ_n , and each V_0 -vertex of Γ_n encloses some element of \mathcal{F}_n . In particular, any splitting of G over a $VPCn$ subgroup is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of Γ_n . Further, any non-isolated V_0 -vertex of Γ_n encloses some non-isolated element of \mathcal{F}_n .
4. If X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a finitely generated subgroup H , and if X does not cross any element of \mathcal{F}_n , then X is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of Γ_n .
5. If X is a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to a splitting of G over H , if X does not cross any element of \mathcal{F}_n , and if X is sandwiched by elements of \mathcal{F}_n , then X is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of Γ_n .
6. The V_1 -vertices of Γ_n are n -simple.

7. If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are minimal, reduced bipartite, graphs of groups structures for G which satisfy conditions 3) and 5) above, then they are isomorphic.
8. The graph of groups Γ_n is invariant under automorphisms of G .

Remark 1.10. *The assumption that G is not VPC is made to simplify the statement of this result. If G is VPC($n + 1$), then Γ_n consists of a single V_0 -vertex v with associated group G . In this case, v may not satisfy any of the conditions in part 1) of the above theorem.*

We will say that a V_0 -vertex in case 1c) is of commensuriser type if v is not isolated, and is of large commensuriser type if, in addition, H has large commensuriser.

Note that we showed in Example 11.1 of [23] that, even if G is finitely presented, the group associated to a V_0 -vertex of commensuriser type need not be finitely generated.

The statement at the end of part 1) with the assumption that H has at least 4 coends in G comes from the proofs of Propositions 7.16, 7.17, 8.1 and 8.6 of [23]. Note that if H has large commensuriser in G , the proof of Proposition 8.1 of [23] shows that H has infinitely many coends in G . This uses the fact that we have excluded the case when G is VPC.

In part 5), the assumption that X is sandwiched by elements of \mathcal{F}_n means that there are elements U and V of \mathcal{F}_n such that $U \leq X \leq V$. This condition did not appear in [23], but is necessary as discussed in our errata page [24]. It is automatically satisfied if H is finitely generated.

When $n = 2$, this result is the algebraic analogue of the Torus decomposition $T(M)$ of a closed orientable Haken 3-manifold M . See the start of this section for a discussion of $T(M)$. As M is compact, its fundamental group G is finitely presented. As M is irreducible, it follows that G is also one-ended. As M is closed, our discussion in [25] implies that G does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC groups of length 1. Now the above result asserts that $\Gamma_2(G)$ exists, and we showed in [23] that it is the graph of groups structure for G determined by the frontier of $T(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_2(G)$ correspond to the components of $T(M)$. In this case, $\Gamma_2(G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type. An isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_2(G)$ corresponds to a component of $T(M)$ homeomorphic to $T \times I$. A V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_2(G)$ which is of VPC1-by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $T(M)$ which is homeomorphic to a Seifert fibre space.

Next we come to the following more general result which combines the statements of Theorems 13.12 and 13.13 of [23]. Again we assume that G is not VPC in order to simplify the statement.

Theorem 1.11. *Let G be a one-ended, almost finitely presented group which is not VPC and does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC subgroups of length $< n$, and let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the collection of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup.*

Then $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ has an unreduced and a reduced regular neighbourhood in G . Let $\Gamma_{n,n+1} = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1} : G)$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G .

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G with the following properties:

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$.*
 - (b) *v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n , and elements of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ enclosed by v cross strongly if at all.*
 - (c) *$G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n+1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, and elements of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which are enclosed by v and are over groups commensurable with H cross weakly if at all.*

Further, if H is a $VPCn$ subgroup of G such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ will have a non-isolated V_0 -vertex v such that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ if and only if H has at least 4 coends in G .

2. *$\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single vertex if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ is empty, or G itself satisfies condition b) or c) in 1). In the first case, $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single V_1 -vertex. In the second case, $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single V_0 -vertex.*
3. *Any element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and each V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ encloses some element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. In particular, any splitting of G over a $VPCn$ subgroup, and any n -canonical splitting of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.*

Further any non-isolated V_0 -vertex of Γ_n encloses some non-isolated element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$.

4. If X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a finitely generated subgroup H , and if X does not cross any element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, then X is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.
5. If X is a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to a splitting of G over H , if X does not cross any element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, and if X is sandwiched by elements of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, then X is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.
6. The V_1 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ are $(n+1)$ -simple.
7. If Γ_1 and Γ_2 are minimal, reduced bipartite, graphs of groups structures for G which satisfy conditions 3) and 5) above, then they are isomorphic.
8. The graph of groups $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is invariant under automorphisms of G .

When $n = 1$, this result is the algebraic analogue of the Annulus-Torus decomposition $AT(M)$ of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary. See the start of this section for a discussion of $AT(M)$. As M is compact, its fundamental group G is finitely presented. As M is irreducible and has incompressible boundary, it follows that G is also one-ended. Now the above result asserts that $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ exists, and we showed in [23] that it is the graph of groups structure for G determined by the frontier of $AT(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ correspond to the components of $AT(M)$. An isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ homeomorphic to $A \times I$ or $T \times I$. A V_0 -vertex of $VPC1$ -by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is a Seifert fibre space not meeting ∂M . A V_0 -vertex of $VPC0$ -by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is an I -bundle and meets ∂M in the associated S^0 -bundle. A V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type, where $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPC1$ subgroup H , corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is a Seifert fibre space and meets ∂M . Finally, in this case, $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ has no V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type, where $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser of a $VPC2$ subgroup of G .

In the special case when M is closed or admits no essential annuli, then G has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over any $VPC1$ subgroup, so that $\Gamma_2(G)$ is defined and equals $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$.

Recall that $JSJ(M)$ can be obtained from $AT(M)$ by adding certain exceptional submanifolds of M . We will describe analogous algebraic constructions for any n and any group G for which $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ exist. The results of these constructions are graphs of groups structures $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ for G , which we call the completions of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ respectively. There are two cases to the construction.

If $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ has a V_1 -vertex w such that $G(w)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, and if w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$, then we subdivide e into two edges. The new vertex is a V_1 -vertex and w becomes a V_0 -vertex. If the original V_0 -vertex of e is isolated, then in addition we collapse e to a point, which becomes a new V_0 -vertex.

If $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ has a V_1 -vertex w such that $G(w)$ is $VPCn$, and if w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, or if w has exactly three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$, then we subdivide each of the incident edges into two edges. The new vertices are V_1 -vertices and w becomes a V_0 -vertex. If the original V_0 -vertex of any of the edges incident to w is isolated, then in addition we collapse that edge.

Making all these changes for every such V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ yields $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$.

If $n = 1$ and G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary, then the discussion in [23] shows that $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ is the graph of groups determined by the frontier of $JSJ(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ correspond to the components of $JSJ(M)$. Those V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ which are obtained from V_1 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ correspond to the exceptional components of $JSJ(M)$. If M is closed or admits no essential annuli, then $\Gamma_2^c(G)$ is defined and equals $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$. Also those V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_2^c(G)$ which are obtained from V_1 -vertices of $\Gamma_2(G)$ correspond to the exceptional components of $JSJ(M)$.

2 Adapted Almost Invariant Sets

In this section we discuss the idea of an almost invariant subset of a group being adapted to some family of subgroups. This is the beginning of a relative theory of almost invariant subsets of a group which we will develop fully in

a later paper [9]. The idea of a splitting being adapted to some family of subgroups was introduced by Müller in [18]. This is Definition 2.3 of this paper. But for general almost invariant sets the idea of being adapted seems to be new.

If G is a group with subgroups H and K , such that $H \subset K$, and if X is a H -almost invariant subset of G , then $X \cap K$ is a H -almost invariant subset of K . Normally there is no natural converse construction, but in Proposition 2.14 we will give such a construction in an important special case. Note that if $X \cap K$ is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K , then X must be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G , but the converse need not hold.

We consider a finitely generated group G with a minimal graph of groups decomposition Γ . Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of Γ , so that G acts on T without inversions, and T is a minimal G -tree. After fixing a vertex w of T , we define a G -equivariant map $\varphi : G \rightarrow V(T)$ by the formula $\varphi(g) = gw$. We recall some notation from chapter 2 of [23]. An oriented edge s of T determines a natural partition of $V(T)$ into two sets, namely the vertices of the two subtrees obtained by removing the interior of s from T . Let Y_s denote the collection of all the vertices of the subtree which contains the terminal vertex of s , and let Y_s^* denote the complementary collection of vertices. We define the sets $Z_s = \varphi^{-1}(Y_s)$ and $Z_s^* = \varphi^{-1}(Y_s^*)$. Lemma 2.10 of [23] shows that, if S denotes the stabiliser of s , then Z_s is a S -almost invariant subset of G , and its equivalence class is independent of the choice of basepoint w .

Let K denote the stabiliser of a vertex v of T , and assume that K is finitely generated. Note that we will not assume that the stabilisers of the edges of T which are incident to v are finitely generated. Suppose there is a finitely generated subgroup H of G and a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by v . As remarked above, $X \cap K$ is a (possibly trivial) H -almost invariant subset of K which we will denote by Y . Recall from Definition 4.2 of [23] that to say that X is enclosed by v means that for every edge s of T which is incident to v and oriented towards v , we have one of the intersections $Z_s^* \cap X^*$ or $Z_s^* \cap X$ is small. As H is finitely generated, Lemma 4.14 of [23] tells us that X is equivalent to a H' -almost invariant subset P of G , where H' is commensurable with H , such that for every edge s of T which is incident to v and oriented towards v , we have one of the inclusions $Z_s^* \subset P$ or $Z_s^* \subset P^*$.

Let e be an edge of T incident to v , and oriented towards v . Let S_e denote the stabiliser of e , let u denote the other vertex of e , and choose u

to be the basepoint of T . As the stabiliser S_e of e fixes u , it follows that $S_e \subset \varphi^{-1}(u) \subset \varphi^{-1}(Y_e^*) = Z_e^*$, so that S_e is contained in P or P^* . As S_e also fixes v , it is a subgroup of K , so that S_e is contained in $P \cap K$ or $P^* \cap K$. Let Q and Q^* denote $P \cap K$ and $P^* \cap K$ respectively. Now consider any element k of K , so that ke is also incident to v . It follows that $kS_e \subset \varphi^{-1}(ku) \subset \varphi^{-1}(Y_{ke}^*) = Z_{ke}^*$, so that kS_e is also contained in P or P^* . As kS_e is contained in K , it follows that kS_e must be contained in Q or Q^* .

Now we return to our original almost invariant sets X and $Y = X \cap K$. Let $C(K)$ denote the Cayley graph of K with respect to some finite generating set. As X and P are equivalent almost invariant subsets of G , it follows that Y and Q are equivalent almost invariant subsets of K . Hence there is a constant d such that Q is contained in the d -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y , and Q^* is contained in the d -neighbourhood of Y^* . Hence for each element k in K , we have that kS_e is contained in the d -neighbourhood of Y or of Y^* . Now consider the vertex V of Γ which is the image of v under the natural projection map $T \rightarrow \Gamma$. Thus V carries the subgroup K of G . Let S_1, \dots, S_n denote the subgroups of K carried by the edges of Γ which are incident to V . As the preceding argument can be made for any edge of T which is incident to v , we see there is a constant D such that for each k in K , and each S_i , we have kS_i is contained in the D -neighbourhood of Y or of Y^* . Note that it is possible for kS_i to be contained in the D -neighbourhood of Y and of Y^* simultaneously, but if this occurs then S_i must be $k^{-1}Hk$ -finite so that S_i is commensurable with some subgroup of the conjugate $k^{-1}Hk$ of H .

The above discussion leads to the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *Let K be a finitely generated group with a subgroup H , and a H -almost invariant subset Y . Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . We will say that Y is adapted to \mathcal{S} if there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $C(K)$, and an integer D such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in the D -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* .*

Remark 2.2. *If Y is adapted to \mathcal{S} , then so is any almost invariant subset of K which is equivalent to Y .*

If the condition in this definition holds for some finite generating set of K , then it holds for any such set.

If Y is adapted to \mathcal{S} , and we replace each S_i by some conjugate, then Y is also adapted to the new family.

It might seem more natural to remove the integer D from the above definition, and simply require that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in a bounded neighbourhood of Y or of Y^ . If all the S_i 's are finitely generated, the two ideas are equivalent, by Corollary 2.9 below, but we suspect they are not equivalent in general.*

Using our new definition, we can now summarise the discussion preceding Definition 2.1 as follows. Let G be a finitely generated group with finitely generated subgroups H and K , such that $H \subset K$, and suppose that G has a minimal graph of groups decomposition Γ with a vertex V whose associated group is K . Let \mathcal{S} denote the family of subgroups of K associated to the edges of Γ which are incident to V . If X is a H -almost invariant subset of G which is enclosed by V , then the H -almost invariant subset $Y = X \cap K$ of K is adapted to \mathcal{S} .

Later in this section, in Proposition 2.14, we will describe a natural converse construction, in which we start with a H -almost invariant subset Y of K which is adapted to \mathcal{S} , and produce a H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by V , such that $X \cap K$ is equivalent to Y .

The following definition, due to Müller [18], is natural when one considers splittings of a group.

Definition 2.3. *Let K be a group with a splitting σ over a subgroup H , and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . The splitting σ of K is adapted to \mathcal{S} if each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of σ .*

As a splitting of K over H has a naturally associated H -almost invariant subset of K , we now have two different ideas of what it means for a splitting of K to be adapted to a family \mathcal{S} of subgroups. The following lemma connects these ideas.

Lemma 2.4. *Let K be a finitely generated group, let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of subgroups of K , and let σ be a splitting of K over a subgroup H . Then the splitting σ is adapted to \mathcal{S} if and only if any H -almost invariant subset of K associated to σ is adapted to \mathcal{S} .*

Remark 2.5. *In this lemma, H and the S_i 's need not be finitely generated.*

Proof. Let T be the K -tree corresponding to the splitting σ , and let s be an edge of T with stabiliser H .

Suppose that the splitting σ is adapted to \mathcal{S} , so that each S_i has a conjugate L_i which fixes a vertex of s . If L_i fixes the vertex v of s , we choose v as the basepoint of T , so that $L_i \subset \varphi^{-1}(v)$. If we orient s towards v , then the H -almost invariant subset Z_s of K is associated to σ , and it clearly contains L_i . Further for each $k \in K$, we have $kL_i \subset \varphi^{-1}(kv)$ which must be contained in Z_s or Z_s^* . Thus Z_s is adapted to S_i , and hence so is any H -almost invariant subset of K which is associated to σ . Similar arguments for each i show that any H -almost invariant subset of K which is associated to σ must be adapted to \mathcal{S} . This completes the proof of one half of the lemma.

For the second half, we suppose that any H -almost invariant subset of K which is associated to σ is adapted to \mathcal{S} . We need to show that each S_i fixes some vertex of T .

Fix a basepoint w of T , so that we have the K -equivariant map $\varphi : K \rightarrow V(T)$ given by the formula $\varphi(g) = gw$. Next pick a finite generating set of K , and let $C(K)$ denote the corresponding Cayley graph. There is an integer D such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in the D -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Z_s or of Z_s^* . In the quotient graph $H \backslash C(K)$, the image $H \backslash \delta Z_s$ of δZ_s is finite. Hence the D -neighbourhood in $H \backslash C(K)$ of $H \backslash \delta Z_s$ contains only finitely many vertices. We let N denote the pre-image in $C(K)$ of these vertices, so that N consists of all vertices of $C(K)$ in the D -neighbourhood of δZ_s , and N is a finite union of cosets Hg of H . Thus, for each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in the union of N with one of Z_s or Z_s^* . As H fixes the edge s of T , the image $\varphi(Hg)$ of the coset Hg consists of vertices of T all at the same distance from s as the vertex $\varphi(g)$. It follows that there is an integer M such that $\varphi(N)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of s . Hence, for every k in K , the image $\varphi(kS_i)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of Y_s or Y_s^* . After replacing k by k^{-1} , this is equivalent to the condition that, for every k in K , the image $\varphi(S_i)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of $kY_s = Y_{ks}$ or $kY_s^* = Y_{ks}^*$. As every edge of T is a translate of s , it follows that for every edge e of T , the image $\varphi(S_i)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of Y_e or of Y_e^* .

First suppose that S_i is finitely generated. If S_i does not fix a vertex of T , then some element k of S_i also does not fix a vertex and so has an axis l in T . Pick an edge e of l , and consider the vertices $\varphi(k^n) = k^n w$, for all integers n . This collection of vertices contains vertices of T which are arbitrarily far from e on each side of e . This contradicts the fact that $\varphi(S_i)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of Y_e or of Y_e^* , thus proving that S_i must fix some vertex of T .

Now consider the general case when S_i need not be finitely generated, and suppose that S_i does not fix a vertex of T . The preceding paragraph shows that each finitely generated subgroup of S_i fixes some vertex of T . Express S_i as an ascending union of finitely generated subgroups S_i^n , $n \geq 1$, and let T_n denote the fixed subtree of S_i^n . We have $T_n \supset T_{n+1}$, for $n \geq 1$. As S_i itself does not fix a vertex, the intersection of all the T_n 's must be empty. Let d_n denote the distance in T of w from T_n . Then $d_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By going to a subsequence we can assume that d_n is never zero. Consider the path from w to T_n and let e_n denote the edge of this path which meets T_n . As S_i^n does not fix e_n , there is an element k_n of S_i^n which does not fix e_n . It follows that $k_n w$ lies distance d_n from e_n on the T_n -side of e_n . Of course the vertex w lies at distance $d_n - 1$ from e_n on the other side of e_n . If we choose n large enough to ensure that $d_n > M + 1$, this contradicts the fact that, for every edge e of T , the image $\varphi(S_i)$ is contained in the M -neighbourhood of Y_e or of Y_e^* . This contradiction shows that S_i must fix some vertex of T . As this holds for each i , it follows that σ is adapted to \mathcal{S} as required, which completes the proof of part 2). \square

There is also a natural generalisation of these ideas to graphs of groups.

Definition 2.6. *Let K be a group with a graph of groups structure Γ , and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . Then Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} if each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of Γ .*

Lemma 2.7. *Let K be a finitely generated group, and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . Further let Γ be a finite minimal graph of groups structure for K . Then Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} if and only if each edge splitting of Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} .*

Proof. Recall that if e is an edge of a graph of groups structure Γ for K , then the splitting σ_e of K associated to e is obtained by collapsing to a point each component of the complement of the interior of e in Γ . If e separates Γ , the result is an interval and σ_e is an amalgamated free product. If e fails to separate Γ , the result is a loop and σ_e is a HNN extension.

Now suppose that Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} . Thus each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of Γ . It follows immediately that, for each edge e of Γ , each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of σ_e , so that each splitting σ_e is adapted to \mathcal{S} .

Conversely suppose that each edge splitting of Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} . We proceed by induction on the number m of edges of Γ . If $m = 1$, the result is

trivial. Now let e_1, \dots, e_m denote the edges of Γ , and consider the universal covering K -tree T of Γ . Pick an edge e of Γ and let f denote an edge of T in the pre-image of e . Collapsing the edge e yields a graph of groups decomposition Γ' of K with $m - 1$ edges. The universal covering K -tree T' of Γ' is obtained from T by collapsing to a point the edge f and each of its translates. As the edge splittings of Γ' are adapted to \mathcal{S} , it follows by induction that each S_i fixes a vertex v'_i of T' . The pre-image in T of v'_i is a subtree, which must be preserved by S_i . This subtree is a component of the pre-image in T of e . Now we will apply this argument twice with e chosen to be e_1 and then to be e_2 . We see that S_i preserves a subtree T_1 of T which is a component of the pre-image in T of e_1 , and it also preserves a subtree T_2 of T which is a component of the pre-image in T of e_2 . As the intersection $T_1 \cap T_2$ contains no edges, it must be empty or a single vertex. If it is not empty, then $T_1 \cap T_2$ is a vertex of T fixed by S_i . If $T_1 \cap T_2$ is empty, then S_i must fix every vertex on the geodesic path joining T_1 and T_2 , so again S_i fixes a vertex of T . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Next we need the following technical result.

Lemma 2.8. *Let K be a finitely generated group with subgroups S and H such that S is finitely generated. Let Y be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K . Then the set $\{k \in K : kS \not\subset Y, kS \not\subset Y^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HkS .*

Proof. This result is very closely related to Lemma 2.30 of [23], and has a similar proof, but does not follow from it as that was a result about two almost invariant sets. Also we are not assuming that H is finitely generated.

Let Γ denote the Cayley graph of K with respect to some finite generating set for K . Note that if $kS \not\subset Y$ and $kS \not\subset Y^*$, then any connected subcomplex of Γ which contains kS must meet the coboundary of Y . As S is finitely generated, there is a finite connected subgraph C of $S \backslash \Gamma$ such that C contains the single point which is the image of S and the natural map $\pi_1(C) \rightarrow S$ is onto. Thus the pre-image D of C in Γ is connected and contains S . Let Δ denote a finite subgraph of D which projects onto C , and let Φ denote a finite subgraph of δY which projects onto the quotient $H \backslash \delta Y$. If kD meets δY , there must be elements s and h in S and H respectively such that $ks\Delta$ meets $h\Phi$. Now $\{\gamma \in K : \gamma\Delta \text{ meets } \Phi\}$ is finite, as K acts freely on Γ . It follows that $\{k \in K : kD \text{ meets } \delta Y\}$ consists of a finite number of double cosets HkS , which proves the required result. \square

The following easy consequence clarifies a point about Definition 2.1.

Corollary 2.9. *Let K be a finitely generated group with a subgroup H , and a H -almost invariant subset Y . Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ be a family of finitely generated subgroups of K . Then Y is adapted to \mathcal{S} if and only if there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $C(K)$, such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in a bounded neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* .*

Proof. If Y is adapted to \mathcal{S} , then Definition 2.1 tells us that there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $C(K)$, and an integer D such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in the D -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* . It is thus trivial that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in a bounded neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* .

Now suppose that there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $C(K)$, such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in a bounded neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* . We need to show that there is a uniform bound D for the sizes of these bounded neighbourhoods. Now Lemma 2.8 tells us that the set $\{k \in K : kS_i \not\subset Y, kS_i \not\subset Y^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HkS_i . If kS_i is contained in the d -neighbourhood of Y or of Y^* , the same holds for hkS_i , for every h in H , so that HkS_i is contained in the d -neighbourhood of Y or of Y^* . As we have only finitely many such double cosets, it follows that there is a uniform bound for the sizes of the neighbourhoods of Y and Y^* which contain the translates kS_i . As there are only finitely many S_i 's, it follows at once that there is an integer D such that for each S_i and each $k \in K$, we have kS_i contained in the D -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* . \square

The following result shows that the situation is particularly simple when we consider almost invariant sets adapted to a single subgroup S of K , even if S is not finitely generated.

Lemma 2.10. *Let K be a finitely generated group with subgroups H and S . Let Y be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K which is adapted to S . Then*

1. *Y is equivalent to a H -almost invariant subset Z of K such that for each $k \in K$, we have one of the inclusions $kS \subset Z$ or $kS \subset Z^*$.*

2. The set $\{k \in K : kS \not\subset Y, kS \not\subset Y^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HgS .

Remark 2.11. Part 2) of this lemma does not follow from Lemma 2.8 as it is not assumed that S is finitely generated.

Proof. As Y is adapted to S , Definition 2.1 tells us that there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $C(K)$, and an integer D such that for each $k \in K$, we have kS contained in the D -neighbourhood in $C(K)$ of Y or of Y^* .

1) As Y is a H -almost invariant subset of K , its quotient $H \backslash Y$ is an almost invariant subset of $H \backslash K$. Now we consider how the cosets kS meet Y and Y^* . Note that distinct cosets kS are disjoint, and are permuted by the action of G on itself by left multiplication. Thus the images in $H \backslash K$ of any two of these cosets must coincide or be disjoint. As the image in $H \backslash C(K)$ of δY is finite, it follows that the image in $H \backslash C(K)$ of the D -neighbourhood of δY is finite. As we know that kS is contained in the D -neighbourhood of Y or of Y^* , we know that the image in $H \backslash K$ of either $kS \cap Y$ or $kS \cap Y^*$ is finite, and there are only finitely many images in $H \backslash K$ of cosets kS which meet $H \backslash Y$ and $H \backslash Y^*$. Now we construct a subset W of $H \backslash K$ from $H \backslash Y$ by altering $H \backslash Y$ for each $k \in K$ such that kS meets both Y and Y^* . If $kS \cap Y$ has finite image in $H \backslash K$, we remove that image from $H \backslash Y$. If $kS \cap Y$ has infinite image in $H \backslash K$, then $kS \cap Y^*$ has finite image in $H \backslash K$, and we add that image to $H \backslash Y$. As only finitely many images in $H \backslash K$ of cosets kS meet both $H \backslash Y$ and $H \backslash Y^*$, we have altered $H \backslash Y$ finitely many times by adding or subtracting a finite set. It follows that the new set W is almost equal to $H \backslash Y$, and so is an almost invariant subset of $H \backslash K$. Thus the pre-image in K of W is a H -almost invariant subset Z which is H -almost equal to Y , so that Z is equivalent to Y . Note that because the images in $H \backslash K$ of any two of the cosets kS must coincide or be disjoint, the finite sets which were added to or subtracted from $H \backslash Y$ are disjoint from each other. In particular, it follows that for each $k \in K$, the image in $H \backslash K$ of the coset kS is entirely contained in W or in W^* . It follows immediately that for each $k \in K$, we have one of the inclusions $kS \subset Z$ or $kS \subset Z^*$, as required.

2) Recall from the proof of part 1) that there are only finitely many images in $H \backslash K$ of cosets kS which meet $H \backslash Y$ and $H \backslash Y^*$. It follows immediately that the set $\{k \in K : kS \not\subset Y, kS \not\subset Y^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HgS , as required. \square

Remark 2.12. *If the image in $H \setminus K$ of both $kS \cap Y$ and $kS \cap Y^*$ is finite, then the above proof arranges that $kS \subset Z^*$. It would be possible to change the construction of Z to arrange that instead $kS \subset Z$. Thus whenever this situation occurs there is a certain amount of choice in our construction of Z .*

Before going any further, we need to recall some basic facts about the cubings constructed by Sageev in [20]. We will need the following definition.

Definition 2.13. *Let E be a partially ordered set, equipped with an involution $A \rightarrow A^*$ such that $A \neq A^*$, and if $A \leq B$ then $B^* \leq A^*$. An ultrafilter V on E is a subset of E satisfying*

1. *For every $A \in E$, we have $A \in V$ or $A^* \in V$ but not both.*
2. *If $A \in V$ and $A \leq B$ then $B \in V$.*

Consider a finitely generated group G with subgroups H_1, \dots, H_n . For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let X_i be a nontrivial H_i -almost invariant subset of G , and let $E = \{gX_i, gX_i^* : g \in G, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. In [20], Sageev gave a construction of a cubing from the set E equipped with the partial order given by inclusion. The involution $A \rightarrow A^*$ on E is complementation in G .

Let $\mathcal{K}^{(0)}$ denote the collection of all ultrafilters on E . Construct $\mathcal{K}^{(1)}$ by attaching an edge to two vertices $V, V' \in \mathcal{K}^{(0)}$ if and only if they differ by replacing a single element by its complement, i.e. there exists $A \in V$ such that $V' = (V - \{A\}) \cup \{A^*\}$. Note that the fact that V and V' are both ultrafilters implies that A must be a minimal element of V . Also if A is a minimal element of V , then the set $V' = (V - \{A\}) \cup \{A^*\}$ must be an ultrafilter on E . Now attach 2-dimensional cubes to $\mathcal{K}^{(1)}$ to form $\mathcal{K}^{(2)}$, and inductively attach n -cubes to $\mathcal{K}^{(n-1)}$ to form $\mathcal{K}^{(n)}$. All such cubes are attached by an isomorphism of their boundaries and, for each $n \geq 2$, one n -cube is attached to $\mathcal{K}^{(n-1)}$ for each occurrence of the boundary of an n -cube appearing in $\mathcal{K}^{(n-1)}$. The complex \mathcal{K} constructed in this way will not be connected, but one special component can be picked out in the following way. For each element g of G , define the ultrafilter $V_g = \{A \in E : g \in A\}$. These special vertices of \mathcal{K} are called *basic*. Two basic vertices V and V' of \mathcal{K} differ on only finitely many complementary pairs of elements of E , so that there exist elements A_1, \dots, A_m of E which lie in V such that V' can be obtained from V by replacing each A_i by A_i^* . By re-ordering the A_i 's if needed, we can arrange that A_1 is a minimal element of V . It follows that

$V_1 = (V - \{A_1\}) \cup \{A_1^*\}$ is also an ultrafilter on E , and so is joined to V by an edge of \mathcal{K} . By repeating this argument, we will find an edge path in \mathcal{K} of length m which joins V and V' . It follows that the basic vertices of \mathcal{K} all lie in a single component C . As the collection of all basic vertices is preserved by the action of G on \mathcal{K} , it follows that this action preserves C . Finally, Sageev shows in [20] that C is simply connected and $CAT(0)$ and hence is a cubing.

If σ is a k -dimensional cube in a cubing C , viewed as a standard unit cube in \mathbb{R}^k and $\hat{\sigma}$ denotes the barycentre of σ , then a *dual cube* in σ is the intersection with σ of a $(k - 1)$ -dimensional plane running through $\hat{\sigma}$ and parallel to one of the $(k - 1)$ -dimensional faces of σ . Given a cubing, one may consider the equivalence relation on edges generated by the relation which declares two edges to be equivalent if they are opposite sides of a square in C . Now given an equivalence class of edges, the *hyperplane* associated to this equivalence class is the collection of dual cubes whose vertices lie on edges in the equivalence class. It is not hard to show that hyperplanes are totally geodesic subspaces. Moreover, in [20] it is shown that hyperplanes do not self-intersect (i.e. a hyperplane meets a cube in a single dual cube) and that a hyperplane separates a cubing into precisely two components, which we call the *half-spaces* associated to the hyperplane.

An important aspect of Sageev's construction is that one can recover the elements of E from the action of G on the cubing C . Recall that an edge f of C joins two vertices V and V' if and only if there exists $A \in V$ such that $V' = (V - \{A\}) \cup \{A^*\}$. If f is oriented towards V' , we will say that f *exits* A . We let \mathcal{H}_A denote the hyperplane associated to the equivalence class of f . This equivalence class consists of all those edges of C which, when suitably oriented, exit A . Now let X denote an H -almost invariant subset of G which is an element of E , such that X contains the identity e of G . Thus X lies in the basic vertex $V_e = \{A \in E : e \in A\}$. As X^* is non-empty, it contains some element k and so lies in the basic vertex V_k . Now any path joining V_e to V_k must contain an edge which exits X , so we can define the hyperplane \mathcal{H}_X as above. Let \mathcal{H}_X^+ denote the half-space determined by \mathcal{H}_X which contains the basic vertex V_e . Sageev showed that the subset $\{g \in G : gV_e \in \mathcal{H}_X^+\}$ of G equals X .

For future reference we note the following points. By definition an edge of C exits a single element A of E . Thus if X and Y are distinct (and non-complementary) elements of E , the hyperplanes \mathcal{H}_X and \mathcal{H}_Y have no dual cubes in common. Further if X and Y are elements of E such that X

contains e and is properly contained in Y , then the hyperplanes \mathcal{H}_X and \mathcal{H}_Y are disjoint, so that the half-space \mathcal{H}_X^+ is contained in the half-space \mathcal{H}_Y^+ . To see that these hyperplanes must be disjoint, note that otherwise there is a square in C whose four vertices lie in the four regions into which \mathcal{H}_X and \mathcal{H}_Y together separate C . In particular, there is a vertex V in $\mathcal{H}_X^+ \cap \mathcal{H}_Y^+$, and edges f and f' with one end at V which exit X and Y respectively. But this implies that both X and Y are minimal elements of the ultrafilter V , which contradicts the fact that X is properly contained in Y .

Now we are ready to start the construction which we promised immediately before Definition 2.3. The result we obtain is the following.

Proposition 2.14. *Let G be a finitely generated group with finitely generated subgroups H and K , such that $H \subset K$, and suppose that G has a minimal graph of groups decomposition Γ , with a vertex V whose associated group is K . Let $E(V)$ denote the family of subgroups of K associated to the edges of Γ incident to V . Let Y be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K which is adapted to the family $E(V)$.*

Then there is a H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by V such that $X \cap K = Y$.

Remark 2.15. *Our construction produces a set X which lies in a unique equivalence class, unless there is a group S in $E(V)$ which is conjugate commensurable with a subgroup of H .*

Note that the proof below shows that if Y is associated to a splitting of K over H , then this proposition holds even when H is not finitely generated.

Proof. Our construction is simplest in the case when Y is associated to a splitting σ of K . As Y is adapted to the family of subgroups $E(V)$, Lemma 2.4 tells us that each group in $E(V)$ is conjugate into a vertex group of the splitting σ . Thus we can refine Γ to a new graph of groups decomposition of G in which V is replaced by a single edge. This edge determines a splitting of G over H whose associated H -almost invariant subset X has the property that $X \cap K$ is equivalent to Y .

In order to generalise this construction, we first rephrase it in terms of the universal covering G -tree T of Γ . Let v be a vertex of T above V with stabiliser K , and let $star(v)$ denote the collection of edges of T incident to v . We replace v by a copy of the K -tree $T(\sigma)$ determined by the splitting σ of K , and replace each translate of v by another copy of $T(\sigma)$. As Y is adapted to the family of subgroups $E(V)$, it follows that if s is an edge of $star(v)$,

and if S denotes its stabiliser, then S fixes some vertex $w(s)$ of $T(\sigma)$. We will attach s to $w(s)$ and will make the analogous construction for all edges of $star(v)$. If for each such edge s , the vertex $w(s)$ is the only point of $T(\sigma)$ fixed by S , there is a natural action of K on $T(\sigma) \cup star(v)$. In general, we choose a vertex $w(s)$ of $T(\sigma)$ to which to attach s and then, for each k in K , we attach ks to $kw(s)$ in order that this action of K on $T(\sigma) \cup star(v)$ should exist. Next we extend this construction equivariantly to the translates of v . For any element g of G and any edge s of $star(v)$, we attach gs to the vertex $gw(s)$ of the tree $gT(\sigma)$. This construction clearly yields a tree with a natural action of G . In the quotient of this tree by G , the image of $T(\sigma)$ is a single edge which determines a splitting of G over H whose associated H -almost invariant subset X has the property that $X \cap K$ is equivalent to Y . Note that if there is an edge s of $star(v)$ whose stabiliser S fixes more than one vertex of $T(\sigma)$, the choices in this construction may lead to more than one splitting of G . In this case, S must fix an edge of $T(\sigma)$ so that S is contained in a conjugate of H . Thus we produce a unique splitting of G unless S is contained in a conjugate of H .

Now suppose that we have a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset Y of K which is adapted to the family of subgroups $E(V)$, but need not be associated to a splitting of K . We will follow much the same construction as in the previous paragraph, but will replace the use of the tree $T(\sigma)$ by the cubing $C(Y)$ constructed by Sageev in [20]. Note that there is a natural action of K on $C(Y)$. We replace v by a copy of $C(Y)$, and replace each translate of v by another copy of $C(Y)$. Lemma 2.17 below implies that if s is an edge of $star(v)$, and if S denotes its stabiliser, then S fixes some point $w(s)$ of $C(Y)$. We will attach s to $w(s)$ and will make the analogous construction for all edges of $star(v)$. If for each such edge s , the point $w(s)$ is the only point of $C(Y)$ fixed by S , there is a natural action of K on $C(Y) \cup star(v)$. In general, we choose a point $w(s)$ of $C(Y)$ to which to attach s and then, for each k in K , we attach ks to $kw(s)$ in order that this action of K on $C(Y) \cup star(v)$ should exist. Next we extend this construction equivariantly to the translates of v . For any element g of G and any edge s of $star(v)$, we attach gs to the point $gw(s)$ of the cubing $gC(Y)$. This construction yields a space C which clearly has a natural action of G . Further C is simply connected and $CAT(0)$. Note that if the point $w(s)$ of $C(Y)$ to which we attach the edge s is not a vertex of $C(Y)$, then C does not have the structure of a cubing. However we could subdivide the cubes of $C(Y)$ to arrange that $w(s)$ is a vertex. Strictly speaking it is this subdivision which is $CAT(0)$.

By replacing Y by Y^* if needed we can assume that the identity element e of K lies in Y . Recall from the discussion preceding this proposition, that there is a hyperplane Π_Y in $C(Y)$ such that the half-space \mathcal{H}_Y^+ which contains the basic vertex V_e satisfies $\{g \in K : gV_e \in \mathcal{H}_Y^+\} = Y$. If each edge of $star(v)$ is attached to a point of $C(Y)$ which does not lie in Π_Y , then Π_Y , regarded as a hyperplane in C , separates C into two half-spaces. Denote the half-space of C which contains V_e by \mathcal{H}^+ , and define $X = \{g \in G : gV_e \in \mathcal{H}^+\}$. Thus \mathcal{H}^+ contains \mathcal{H}_Y^+ , and $X \cap K = Y$. As the stabiliser of \mathcal{H}_Y^+ equals H , Lemma 1.17 of [19] shows that X is a H -almost invariant subset of G . Collapsing each copy of $C(Y)$ to a point yields a quotient map from C to the G -tree T , and it is easy to see that for every edge s of T which is incident to v and oriented towards v , we have Z_s^* contained in X or X^* . Thus X is enclosed by v , as required. If some edge of $star(v)$ is attached to a point of $C(Y)$ which lies in Π , then we simply replace Π by a parallel hyperplane Π' which does not contain the point of attachment of any edge of $star(v)$. As before the hyperplane Π' , regarded as a hyperplane in C , determines a H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by v such that $X \cap K$ is equivalent to Y , as required. Note that different choices of the hyperplane Π' may yield inequivalent almost invariant sets X . This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

As our proof of the fixed point result is quite involved, we start by giving the proof in a special case.

Lemma 2.16. *Let K be a finitely generated group with subgroups H and S such that H is finitely generated, and let Y be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K which is adapted to S . Suppose that S is not conjugate commensurable with any subgroup of H , and let $C(Y)$ denote the cubing constructed by Sageev in [20], so that K acts on $C(Y)$. Then there is a vertex of $C(Y)$ fixed by S .*

Proof. As Y is adapted to S , there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $\Gamma(K)$, and an integer D such that for each $k \in K$, we have S contained in the D -neighbourhood in $\Gamma(K)$ of kY or of kY^* . We will write $S <_D kY$ to denote the statement that S is contained in the D -neighbourhood in $\Gamma(K)$ of kY , and will write $S < kY$ to denote the statement that S is contained in some bounded neighbourhood in $\Gamma(K)$ of kY . We note that if $S < Y$ and $S < Y^*$, then S must be commensurable with some subgroup of H . For the image of S in the quotient graph $H \backslash \Gamma(K)$

must lie within a bounded distance of $H \backslash \delta Y$ which is finite, and hence must itself be finite. Hence if $S < kY$ and $S < kY^*$, then S must be conjugate commensurable with some subgroup of H . Thus our assumption on S implies that there is no $k \in K$ such that $S < kY$ and $S < kY^*$.

We claim that $V(S) = \{U \in E : S <_D U\}$ is an ultrafilter on the set E partially ordered set by inclusion. We know that there is no $k \in K$ such that $S <_D kY$ and $S <_D kY^*$. Thus for every $U \in E$, exactly one of $S <_D U$ and $S <_D U^*$ holds, so that $V(S)$ satisfies condition 1) of Definition 2.13. Now suppose that $S <_D A$ and $A \subset B$. It follows that $S <_D B$, so that $B \in V(S)$. Thus $V(S)$ satisfies condition 2) of Definition 2.13. Hence $V(S)$ is an ultrafilter on E , as claimed, and so is a vertex of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$. As the action of S on G preserves S , it must also fix the vertex $V(S)$.

It remains to show that $V(S)$ is a vertex of the component $C(Y)$ of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$. Let e denote the identity element of K , and recall that $V_e = \{U \in E : e \in U\}$ is an ultrafilter on the set E partially ordered by inclusion, and is a basic vertex of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$ which lies in $C(Y)$. In order to show that $V(S)$ lies in $C(Y)$, it suffices to show that V_e can be joined to $V(S)$ by a path in $\mathcal{K}(Y)$. Equivalently it suffices to show that V_e differs from $V(S)$ on only finitely many pairs $\{U, U^*\}$ of elements of E . Clearly $V(S)$ and V_e coincide for all $U \in E$ such that $S \subset U$. It remains to consider those elements U of E such that $S <_D U$ but $S \not\subset U$. Note that if $S <_D U$, we cannot have $S <_D U^*$, and so we must have $S \not\subset U^*$. Thus the set $\{g \in K : S <_D gY, S \not\subset gY\}$ is contained in the set $\{g \in K : S \not\subset gY, S \not\subset gY^*\}$. Now Part 2) of Lemma 2.10 tells us that the set $\{k \in K : kS \not\subset Y, kS \not\subset Y^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HgS . Thus the set $\{g \in K : S \not\subset gY, S \not\subset gY^*\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets SgH . It follows that the set $\{g \in K : S <_D gY, S \not\subset gY\}$ is contained in the union of finitely many double cosets Sk_iH , $1 \leq i \leq m$. For each i , we claim that e lies in all but finitely many of the translates sk_iY of Y , where $s \in S$. Assuming this claim, it now follows that $V(S)$ and V_e differ on only finitely many pairs. Thus $V(S)$ is a vertex of $C(Y)$ which is fixed by S , as required.

Now we prove the above claim. For each i , let Y_i denote k_iY , and let H_i denote $k_iHk_i^{-1}$, so that Y_i is a H_i -almost invariant subset of K . As $S <_D Y_i$, the intersection $S \cap Y_i^*$ is H_i -finite. Denote this intersection by W_i . As W_i is H_i -finite, there are elements a_1, \dots, a_n of K such that W_i is contained in the union $H_ia_1 \cup \dots \cup H_ia_n$. Now let s be an element of S , and suppose that e does not lie in sk_iY , so that e must lie in $sk_iY^* = sY_i^*$. As $e \in S$, we have $e \in S \cap sY_i^* = sW_i$. Thus s^{-1} lies in W_i , so that s

lies in the union $a_1^{-1}H_i \cup \dots \cup a_n^{-1}H_i$. Hence there is j such that s lies in $a_j^{-1}H_i = a_j^{-1}k_i H k_i^{-1}$, so that sk_i lies in $a_j^{-1}k_i H$. Thus the translates $sk_i Y$ of Y such that $S <_D sk_i Y$ but $e \notin sk_i Y$ are among the finitely many translates $a_j^{-1}k_i Y$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$. This completes the proof of the claim, and hence completes the proof of Lemma 2.16. \square

Now we give the proof of our general fixed point result, which uses the same basic idea, but the construction of the fixed point is substantially more complicated.

Lemma 2.17. *Let K be a finitely generated group with subgroups H and S such that H is finitely generated, and let Y be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of K which is adapted to S . Let $C(Y)$ denote the cubing constructed by Sageev in [20], so that K acts on $C(Y)$. Then S fixes some point of $C(Y)$.*

Remark 2.18. *This result does not assert that S fixes a vertex of $C(Y)$. But as S acts on $C(Y)$ preserving the cubing, it follows that S must fix the centre of some cube of $C(Y)$.*

Proof. As Y is adapted to S , there is a finite generating set of K with associated Cayley graph $\Gamma(K)$, and an integer D such that for each $k \in K$, we have S contained in the D -neighbourhood in $\Gamma(K)$ of kY or of kY^* . As before, we will write $S <_D kY$ to denote the statement that S is contained in the D -neighbourhood in $\Gamma(K)$ of kY . As S may be conjugate commensurable with a subgroup of H , it is possible to have $S <_D kY$ and $S <_D kY^*$ simultaneously. However, we can still find points of $C(Y)$ fixed by S . We will argue much as at the start of section 3 of [19]. Recall that E denotes the set $\{kY, kY^* : k \in K\}$, and that E is partially ordered by inclusion.

As in the proof of Lemma 2.16, we would like to define an ultrafilter V on the partially ordered set E so that V lies in $C(Y)$ and is fixed by S . This may not be possible, but we will instead define an ultrafilter on E which lies in $C(Y)$ and has finite S -orbit. As $C(Y)$ is $CAT(0)$, it will follow that S has a fixed point in $C(Y)$, as required. We will define this ultrafilter on E in several steps, starting with a certain subset E_0 of E , and then extending to larger subsets of E .

Let E_0 denote the collection of elements A of E such that we do not simultaneously have $S <_D A$ and $S <_D A^*$. Now we define $V_0 = \{A \in E_0 : S <_D A\}$. We claim that V_0 is an ultrafilter on E_0 . The definition of E_0 ensures that for each pair $\{A, A^*\} \in E_0$, we have exactly one of $S <_D A$ or

$S <_D A^*$, so that condition 1) of Definition 2.13 holds. Now suppose that $A \in V_0$, $B \in E_0$ and $A \subset B$. As $S <_D A$, it follows that $S <_D B$, so that B lies in V_0 . Thus V_0 satisfies condition 2) of Definition 2.13, so that V_0 is an ultrafilter on E_0 , as claimed. Note that the action of S on E by left multiplication preserves E_0 and V_0 .

We wish to complete V_0 to an ultrafilter on all of E . Thus for each pair $\{A, A^*\}$ contained in $E - E_0$, we need to decide whether A or A^* is to lie in our ultrafilter. Our first step is to show that $E - E_0$ is finite. Recall that if A lies in $E - E_0$, then $S <_D A$ and $S <_D A^*$. It follows that S is contained in $N_D(\delta A)$. The proof of Lemma 2.10 shows that the set $\{k \in K : kS \text{ meets } N_D(\delta Y)\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets HgS . Equivalently the set $\{k \in K : S \text{ meets } kN_D(\delta Y)\}$ consists of the union of finitely many double cosets SgH . Thus $\{k \in K : kY \in E - E_0\}$ is contained in the union of finitely many double cosets SgH . Consider one such double coset SkH . We claim that SkH is itself the union of only finitely many cosets gH . Assuming this claim, it follows that $\{k \in K : kY \in E - E_0\}$ consists of the union of finitely many cosets gH , so that $E - E_0$ is finite. To prove our claim, recall that if $kY \in E - E_0$ we know that $S <_D kY$ and $S <_D kY^*$, so that S is commensurable with a subgroup of kHk^{-1} . Thus S can be expressed as the union of cosets $g_i(S \cap kHk^{-1})$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} SkH &= S(kHk^{-1})k = \left(\cup_{i=1}^n g_i(S \cap kHk^{-1})\right) (kHk^{-1})k \\ &= \left(\cup_{i=1}^n g_i(kHk^{-1})\right) k = \cup_{i=1}^n g_i kH, \end{aligned}$$

so that SkH is the union of finitely many cosets gH as claimed.

In our next step, for each $B \in E - E_0$ for which there exists $A \in V_0$, with $A \subset B$, we add B to V_0 . That is, we set

$$V_1 = V_0 \cup \{B \in E - E_0 \mid \exists A \in V_0, A \subset B\}.$$

We claim that V_1 is an ultrafilter on the set $E_1 = V_1 \cup V_1^*$, where V_1^* denotes the set $\{X^* : X \in V_1\}$. By construction V_1 satisfies condition 2) of Definition 2.13, namely that if $A \in V_1$, $B \in E_1$ and $A \subset B$ then $B \in V_1$. Now we claim that V_1 also satisfies condition 1) of Definition 2.13. Suppose that there is B in E_1 such that B and B^* both lie in V_1 . As V_0 is an ultrafilter on E_0 , it follows that B and B^* both lie in $E_1 - E_0$. Thus we have A_1 and A_2 in V_0 , with $A_1 \subset B$ and $A_2 \subset B^*$. Hence $A_1 \subset A_2^*$. As A_1 and A_2 lie in V_0 , we have $S <_D A_1$ and $S <_D A_2$. As $A_1 \subset A_2^*$, it follows that $S <_D A_2^*$ which contradicts the definition of E_0 . It follows that V_1 is an ultrafilter on E_1 , as

required. We note that the action of S on E by left multiplication preserves E_1 and V_1 .

If E_1 is not all of E , we let A_2 denote a maximal element of $E - E_1$. Such an element must exist as $E - E_1$ is contained in the finite set $E - E_0$. We form V_2 from V_1 by adding A_2 . We claim that V_2 is an ultrafilter on the set $E_2 = V_2 \cup V_2^*$. Note that the action of S on E need not preserve E_2 or V_2 . Clearly V_2 satisfies condition 1) of Definition 2.13, namely that V_2 does not contain B and B^* , for any B in E_2 . Now suppose that $C \in V_2$ and $C \subset D$, where $D \in E_2$. If $C \in V_1$, then the definition of V_1 implies that $D \in V_1$ also and hence $D \in V_2$. If $C \notin V_1$, then $C = A_2$. As C is maximal in $E - E_1$, it follows that either $D = C$, and so obviously lies in V_2 , or that $D \in E_1$. If $D \in V_1^*$, then $D^* \in V_1$ and $D^* \subset C^*$, which implies that $C^* \in V_1$. Thus $C \in E_1$ which contradicts our choice of $A_2 \in E - E_1$. Hence when $C = A_2$, either $D = C$ or $D \in V_1$. It follows that in all cases D must lie in V_2 , so that V_2 satisfies condition 2) of Definition 2.13. This completes the proof of the claim that V_2 is an ultrafilter on E_2 .

If E_2 is not all of E , we let A_3 denote a maximal element of $E - E_2$, and we form V_3 from V_2 by adding A_3 . We claim that V_3 is an ultrafilter on the set $E_3 = V_3 \cup V_3^*$. Again we note that the action of S on E need not preserve E_3 or V_3 . Clearly V_3 satisfies condition 1) of Definition 2.13, namely that V_3 does not contain B and B^* , for any B in E_3 . Now suppose that $C \in V_3$ and $C \subset D$, where $D \in E_3$. If $C \in V_1$, then the definition of V_1 implies that $D \in V_1$ also and hence $D \in V_2$. If $C \notin V_1$, then C equals A_2 or A_3 . If $C = A_2$, the fact that C is maximal in $E - E_1$ again implies that $D = C$ or that $D \in E_1$. As in the preceding paragraph, it follows that if $C = A_2$, then $D \in V_2$, and hence $D \in V_3$. If $C = A_3$, the fact that C is maximal in $E - E_2$ implies that $D = C$ or that $D \in E_2$. If $D \in E_1$, the preceding argument shows that we must have $D \in V_3$. This leaves the possibility that $D \in E_2 - E_1$, so that D must equal A_2 or A_2^* . If $D = A_2$, then D lies in V_2 , and hence in V_3 , as required. If $D = A_2^*$, we have $A_3 = C \subset D = A_2^*$, which implies that $A_2 \subset C^*$. As A_2 as maximal in $E - E_1$, this is a contradiction. It follows that in all cases D must lie in V_3 , so that V_3 satisfies condition 2) of Definition 2.13. This completes the proof of the claim that V_3 is an ultrafilter on E_3 .

We continue in this way until all the elements of the finite set $E - E_0$ have been exhausted. The resulting set V_m is an ultrafilter on E , and hence a vertex of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$. As the action of S on E preserves V_0 , and $E - E_0$ is finite, it follows that the S -orbit of V_m is finite. Assuming that V_m lies in

the component $C(Y)$ of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$, it follows that its S -orbit is also contained in the $CAT(0)$ space $C(Y)$, so that S must fix some point of $C(Y)$. Note that this fixed point need not be unique. The construction of V_2 and each of its successors involves making a choice of a maximal element. Thus the above construction may yield many (but only finitely many) such ultrafilters.

It remains to show that V_m must be a vertex of the component $C(Y)$ of $\mathcal{K}(Y)$. The proof is essentially the same as in the proof of Lemma 2.16. We need to show that V_e differs from V_m on only finitely many pairs. The proof of Lemma 2.16 shows that V_0 and $V_e \cap E_0$ differ on only finitely many pairs. As $E - E_0$ is finite, it follows that V_e differs from V_m on only finitely many pairs, as required. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

For future reference, we will prove the following result. Recall that we discussed the definitions of good position and very good position at the start of this section.

Lemma 2.19. *Let G be a finitely generated group with finitely generated subgroups H_1, \dots, H_n and K , such that $H_i \subset K$, and suppose that G has a minimal graph of groups decomposition Γ , with a vertex V whose associated group is K . Let $E(V)$ denote the family of subgroups of K associated to the edges of Γ incident to V . For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let Y_i be a nontrivial H_i -almost invariant subset of K which is adapted to the family $E(V)$.*

A H_i -almost invariant subset X_i of G which is enclosed by V such that $X_i \cap K = Y_i$ will be called an extension of Y_i to G . Then the following statements hold.

1. *For each i , let X_i be any extension of Y_i to G . If $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, and if there is k in K such that Y_i and kY_j cross, then X_i and kX_j also cross.*
2. *For each i , let X_i be any extension of Y_i to G . If $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, and if g is an element of $G - K$, then X_i and gX_j do not cross.*
3. *Suppose that the Y_i 's are in very good position. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is an extension X_i of Y_i to G such that X_i and gX_j cross if and only if g lies in K and the subsets Y_i and gY_j of K cross.*

Proof. 1) As Y_i crosses kY_j , all four corners of the pair (Y_i, kY_j) are H_i -infinite. As X_i contains Y_i and X_j contains Y_j , it follows immediately that all four corners of the pair (X_i, kX_j) are H_i -infinite, so that X_i and kX_j cross.

2) Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of Γ , and let v be a vertex of T which lies above V and has stabiliser K . Without loss of generality we can suppose that each X_i is enclosed by v , so that gX_i is enclosed by gv . As g does not lie in K , the vertices gv and v are distinct. Let s be an edge of T which lies on the path joining v and gv , and assume s is oriented towards v . As X_i is enclosed by v , either X_i is equivalent to Z_s or Z_s^* , or we have $Z_s^* \leq X_i$ or $Z_s^* \leq X_i^*$. As gX_j is enclosed by gv , either gX_j is equivalent to Z_s or Z_s^* , or we have $Z_s \leq gX_j$ or $Z_s \leq gX_j^*$. It follows that either X_i is equivalent to gX_j or to gX_j^* , or we have one of the four inequalities $gX_j^{(*)} \leq Z_s^* \leq X_i^{(*)}$. In all cases X_i and gX_j cannot cross.

3) First let X_i be any extension of Y_i to G . Recall from part 1) that if $k \in K$ and Y_i and kY_j cross, then X_i and kX_j also cross. Also recall from part 2) that if $g \in G - K$, then X_i and gX_j cannot cross. Thus if X_i and gX_j cross, then g lies in K . It remains to show that we can choose the X_i 's so that if $k \in K$ and X_i and kX_j cross, then Y_i and kY_j cross.

We will construct the extensions X_i of Y_i as in the proof of Proposition 2.14 using the cubing $C(Y)$ constructed by Sageev from the set $E(Y) = \{kY_i, kY_i^* \mid k \in K\}$ partially ordered by inclusion. Let \mathcal{H}_i denote the hyperplane of $C(Y)$ determined by Y_i .

If the hyperplanes \mathcal{H}_i and $k\mathcal{H}_j$ are disjoint, then trivially X_i and kX_j are nested. Thus if X_i and kX_j cross, the hyperplanes \mathcal{H}_i and $k\mathcal{H}_j$ must intersect. Now we observed in the discussion immediately before Proposition 2.14 that if Y_i and kY_j were nested, this would imply that \mathcal{H}_i and $k\mathcal{H}_j$ were disjoint. We conclude that Y_i and kY_j are not nested. But as the Y_i 's are in very good position this implies that Y_i and kY_j cross, completing the proof of part 3). \square

The following example shows that the conclusion of part 3) of the above lemma need not hold for all choices of the extensions X_i .

Example 2.20. *Let N be a compact connected surface, let Σ be a component of ∂N with subarcs μ and ν whose union equals Σ and whose intersection consists of only two points. Suppose that N contains an essential embedded arc λ such that $\partial\lambda$ lies in ν . Let \tilde{N} denote the universal cover of N , and pick a lift λ_0 of λ to \tilde{N} . As λ is essential in N , the arc λ_0 must join distinct components of the pre-image of Σ in $\partial\tilde{N}$. Let Σ_0 denote one of these components and let ν_0 denote the lift of ν which contains $\lambda_0 \cap \Sigma_0$. Let μ_0 denote a lift of μ which meets ν_0 . As $\partial\lambda$ lies in ν there is a second lift of λ to \tilde{N} which*

has one end in ν_0 . Let k denote the element of $\pi_1(N)$ such that $k\lambda_0$ meets ν_0 . Note that as $\lambda_0 \cap \nu_0$ and $k\lambda_0 \cap \nu_0$ project to distinct points of ν , we must have $k\Sigma_0 \neq \Sigma_0$. By re-labelling if needed we can assume that $k\lambda_0 \cap \nu_0$ lies between μ_0 and $\lambda_0 \cap \nu_0$. Now we construct a new arc λ'_0 by sliding $\lambda_0 \cap \Sigma_0$ in Σ_0 past $k\lambda_0 \cap \Sigma_0$ and then past μ_0 . Let λ' denote the image in N of λ'_0 . Thus λ' is obtained from λ by sliding one end once round Σ . By construction λ' has one point of self intersection. Further λ' is properly homotopic to λ in N , but is not properly homotopic to λ in $N - \mu$.

Let P be any compact connected surface with non-empty boundary which is not a disc, and form a compact connected surface M from P and N by identifying μ with some arc in ∂P . Let \tilde{M} denote the universal cover of M , and identify \tilde{N} with a component N_0 of the pre-image of N in \tilde{M} . Let G denote $\pi_1(M)$ and let K denote the subgroup of G which stabilises N_0 . Thus K is isomorphic to $\pi_1(N)$.

After picking a base point in N_0 which does not lie on λ_0 or λ'_0 , the simple arcs λ_0 and λ'_0 determine almost invariant subsets Y and Y' of K , and almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , such that $X \cap K = Y$ and $X' \cap K = Y'$. As λ_0 and λ'_0 are essential in N_0 , all these sets are nontrivial. Further it is easy to arrange that Y equals Y' . For if we choose the basepoint in the interior of N_0 , then all its translates by K will also lie in the interior of N_0 . Thus we simply need to ensure that λ_0 and λ'_0 coincide except in a small neighbourhood of ∂N_0 . As λ is a simple arc in N , it follows that all the translates of λ_0 in N_0 are disjoint so that pairs of translates of Y are nested. Thus Y (and Y') is in very good position. In particular $k\lambda_0$ and λ_0 are disjoint so that Y and kY do not cross, and X and kX do not cross. But X' and kX' do cross. Three of the corners of the pair (X', kX') have the same infinite intersection with K as do the corners of the pair (X, kX) , and in addition the fourth corner which has empty intersection with K but contains μ is also infinite.

In the setting of the above lemma, there is only one H_i and this is trivial. The graph of groups Γ is a single edge with trivial edge group corresponding to the fact that G is the free product of $\pi_1(P)$ and $\pi_1(N)$. This example shows that the conclusion of part 3) of the above lemma need not hold for all choices of the extensions X_i .

3 A Relative Torus Theorem

In this section we will be concerned with various algebraic generalisations of the topological Torus Theorem.

In [21], Scott proved the following version of this result.

Theorem 3.1. (*Torus Theorem*) *Let M be a compact orientable irreducible 3-manifold with incompressible boundary which admits an essential singular torus. Then either*

1. M admits an embedded essential torus, or
2. $\pi_1(M)$ has an infinite cyclic normal subgroup.

The first algebraic generalisation of the Torus Theorem was given by Kropholler in Theorem A1 of [13], where he proved an analogous result for orientable $PD(n+2)$ -pairs, for every $n \geq 1$, subject to his Max-c assumption. Later Casson and Jungreis [4] and Gabai [7] independently gave a characterisation of Fuchsian groups. In the exceptional case of Theorem 3.1 when the 3-manifold M admits no embedded essential torus, their result implies that $\pi_1(M)$ must be \mathbb{Z} -by-Fuchsian. In the corresponding case of Kropholler's result, the conclusion becomes that the group G must be $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian.

Later Dunwoody and Swenson proved their algebraic Torus Theorem [6] which holds for arbitrary finitely generated groups. Here we state a simplified version of their result.

Theorem 3.2. (*Algebraic Torus Theorem*) *Let $n \geq 0$, and let G be a finitely generated group which does not have any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC subgroups of length $\leq n$. Suppose that G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Then one of the following holds:*

1. G is $VPC(n+2)$.
2. G splits over some $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup.
3. G is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian.

Remark 3.3. *In case 3), if the Fuchsian group splits over a two-ended subgroup, we have case 2). The only infinite Fuchsian groups which do not so split are themselves two-ended or are triangle groups.*

In most of this paper, we will be concerned with Poincaré duality pairs, but in this section, we will consider arbitrary pairs, and will prove a relative version of the Algebraic Torus Theorem. It follows easily from the absolute version using the techniques of [23] and the result of Proposition 2.14.

The following result is a well known and important consequence of the Algebraic Torus Theorem.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $m \geq 1$, and let G be a finitely generated group which is not VPC of length $\leq m + 1$, nor VPC k -by-Fuchsian, where $k < m$, and does not split over any VPC subgroups of length $\leq m$. Then G does not have any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC subgroups of length $\leq m$.*

Proof. Suppose the result is false and let l be the least integer $\leq m$ such that G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a VPC l subgroup of G . If $l = 0$, then G has more than one end and Stallings' Theorem [27][28] implies that G splits over a finite subgroup, which contradicts the hypothesis of the corollary. If $l > 0$, we apply the Torus Theorem with $n = l - 1$. Cases 1) and 3) of that result cannot hold by our hypotheses on G . Thus we have case 2), so that G splits over some VPC l subgroup. As $l \leq m$, this contradicts our hypotheses and so completes the proof of the corollary. \square

Now we can deduce the following relative version of the Algebraic Torus Theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *(Relative Torus Theorem) Let G be a finitely generated group, and let $n \geq 0$. Let \mathcal{S} be a non-empty family of subgroups S_1, \dots, S_m , such that no S_i is VPC of length $\leq (n+1)$. Suppose that G does not have any nontrivial almost invariant subsets, adapted to \mathcal{S} , over VPC subgroups of length $\leq n$. Suppose that G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset, adapted to \mathcal{S} , and over a VPC $(n+1)$ subgroup. Then G has a splitting, adapted to \mathcal{S} , over a VPC $(n+1)$ subgroup.*

Remark 3.6. *This result has no cases corresponding to cases 1) and 3) of Theorem 3.2. This is because of the assumptions on the family \mathcal{S} .*

Note that the assumption that no S_i is VPC of length $\leq (n+1)$ plays a crucial role in the argument we use here. If this restriction is removed, there are exceptional cases related to case 3) of Theorem 3.2. The simplest such case occurs when $n = 0$, and G is the fundamental group of a disc with two

holes, and \mathcal{S} consists of the fundamental groups of the three boundary components. We believe that this restriction can be removed by using a different argument, but will keep that for a later paper.

Note also that the groups S_i are not assumed to be finitely generated.

Finally if the pair (G, \mathcal{S}) is $PD(n+2)$, this result is very close to Kropholler's generalisation of the Torus Theorem in [13]. In the case when the pair (G, \mathcal{S}) is $PD3$, this result follows from Castel's work in [5].

Remark 3.7. If $n = -1$, the above statement becomes a relative version of Stallings' structure theorem [27][28] for finitely generated groups with more than one end, in which the S_i 's are required not to be finite. However Swarup [31] proved a relative version of Stallings' theorem in which the S_i 's are unrestricted. This generalised an earlier result of Swan [30] in which G was assumed to be torsion free and the family \mathcal{S} consisted of a single subgroup.

Proof. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, let G_i be isomorphic to $G \times \mathbb{Z}^{n+3}$, and identify S_i with the subgroup $S_i \times \{0\}$ of G_i . Note that G_i is finitely generated and does not split over any VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$. We construct a new group G' by gluing the G_i 's to G along the S_i 's. More precisely, G' is the fundamental group of a graph Γ' of groups with $m + 1$ vertices v, v_1, \dots, v_m carrying the groups G, G_1, \dots, G_m respectively, and m edges e_1, \dots, e_m such that e_i joins v to v_i and carries S_i . Thus G' is finitely generated. As G' contains subgroups isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^{n+3} , it cannot be VPC of length $\leq n + 1$, nor $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian, where $k < n$.

Recall that G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset X over a $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup H of G such that X is adapted to \mathcal{S} . Thus Proposition 2.14 implies that we can extend X to a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X' of G' . Note that as no S_i is VPC of length $\leq (n + 1)$, it follows that no S_i can be conjugate commensurable with a subgroup of H . Thus the extension X' is unique up to equivalence.

Next we claim that G' does not split over any VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$. For such a splitting would determine an action of G' on a tree T which does not fix a vertex and whose edge stabilisers are VPC of length $\leq n$. As G_i cannot split over any VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$, each G_i must fix a vertex of T . In particular, each S_i fixes a vertex of T . If G does not fix a vertex of T , then G splits over some VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$ with each S_i conjugate into a vertex group, which contradicts the hypothesis that G has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets, adapted to \mathcal{S} , over VPC subgroups of length $\leq n$. Thus G must fix a vertex v of T . As G' cannot fix v , some

G_i must fix a different vertex w of T , which implies that S_i fixes each edge on the path from v to w . But this is impossible as no S_i is VPC of length $\leq n$. This contradiction completes the proof of the claim.

Now Corollary 3.4 implies that G' does not have any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC subgroups of length $\leq n$. As G' possesses a nontrivial almost invariant subset X' over the $VPC(n+1)$ group H , we can apply Theorem 3.2 to G' . As G' contains subgroups isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^{n+3} , it follows that G' cannot be $VPC(n+2)$ or $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian. Thus G' splits over some $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup K . This splitting determines an action of G' on a tree T which does not fix a vertex and whose edge stabilisers are $VPC(n+1)$. As in the preceding paragraph, each G_i fixes some vertex of T , and hence so does each S_i . As in that argument, if G fixes a vertex of T , then some S_i must fix an edge of T . However this is not possible as no S_i is VPC of length $\leq (n+1)$. It follows that G does not fix a vertex of T . Thus we obtain a splitting of G which is adapted to \mathcal{S} and is over some subgroup L of K . As K is $VPC(n+1)$, and G cannot split, adapted to \mathcal{S} , over any VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$, it follows that L must be $VPC(n+1)$. Hence G has a splitting, adapted to \mathcal{S} , over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup, as required. \square

4 Poincaré duality pairs and essential annuli and tori

We refer to Brown [3], Bieri and Eckmann [1], Kapovich and Kleiner [12], and Wall [36] for various definitions of Poincaré duality groups and pairs. The definition of Bieri and Eckmann is that G is a Poincaré duality group of dimension $n+2$ if $H^i(G; \mathbb{Z}G)$ is 0, when $i \neq n+2$, and is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} when $i = n+2$. Further G is orientable if the action of G on $H^{n+2}(G; \mathbb{Z}G)$ is trivial. In the following, we will be mostly concerned with orientable Poincaré duality groups and pairs. A Poincaré duality pair is a pair (G, \mathcal{S}) , where $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ is a system of subgroups of G , such that the double of G along \mathcal{S} is a Poincaré duality group. It follows that each S_i must be a $PD(n+1)$ group. We will usually denote \mathcal{S} by ∂G . Note that the order of the S_i 's is irrelevant, and that repetitions are allowed. However, if any repetition occurs, or even if two distinct S_i 's are conjugate, there is a $PD(n+1)$ group H , such that the pair (G, \mathcal{S}) equals $(H, \{H, H\})$, which is a trivial $PD(n+2)$ pair analogous to the product of a closed $(n+1)$ -manifold with the unit

interval. We will usually assume that $n \geq 1$, so that our Poincaré duality groups and pairs are at least 3–dimensional. The above definition implies that G is almost finitely presented, which suffices for the accessibility results that we use. If G is finitely presented then the corresponding $K(G, 1)$ space is dominated by a finite complex (see Theorem 7.1 in Chapter 8 of [3]) and then G is a Poincaré duality group in the sense of Wall [36].

We will collect here some useful basic results about Poincaré duality groups and pairs. The following result due to Kropholler and Roller is Lemma 2.2 of [16]. It will be needed at several points in this paper. Similar results are well known in the topology of 3–manifolds.

Lemma 4.1. *(Kropholler and Roller) Let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n+2)$ pair with ∂G non-empty. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *G is a $PD(n+1)$ group and ∂G consists of a single group S which has index 2 in G ; or*
2. *G is a $PD(n+1)$ group and the pair $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$; or*
3. *For each group S in ∂G , the index of S in G is infinite, and $\text{Comm}_G(S) = S$. Further if S and S' are distinct groups in ∂G , they are not conjugate commensurable.*

It will also be convenient to state separately the following easy consequences.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Then*

1. *If ∂G consists of a single group S which has index 2 in G , then G itself must be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group.*
2. *If S is a group in ∂G , and K is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G commensurable with S , then K is contained in S .*
3. *If $(G, \partial G)$ splits, adapted to ∂G , over a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H , and if H is commensurable with an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup K of G , then K is contained in H .*

Proof. 1) As $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, S must be an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group. Thus G is also a $PD(n+1)$ group. If G were orientable, the fact that S has index 2 in G would imply that the induced map $\mathbb{Z} \cong H_{n+1}(S) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ would be multiplication by 2. But this map must be zero as $S = \partial G$. This contradiction shows that G must be non-orientable.

2) We apply Lemma 4.1. If case 3) of that lemma holds, the fact that K must commensurise S implies that K is contained in S . If case 2) of that lemma holds, the result is trivial. If case 1) of that lemma holds, then part 1) of this lemma tells us that G is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group. Hence S is the orientation subgroup of G , so that any orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G must be contained in S .

3) First suppose that ∂G is empty so that G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group. As G splits over H we have G equal to $A *_H B$ or to $A *_H$ for some subgroups A or B . In the first case, Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that each of the pairs (A, H) and (B, H) is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. In the second case, there are two inclusions of H into A whose images we denote by H_1 and H_2 , and Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(A, \{H_1, H_2\})$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. As K is commensurable with H , it must be conjugate into A or B . Now part 2) shows that K is contained in H , as required.

If ∂G is not empty, we recall that the given splitting of G over H is adapted to ∂G . Thus if we consider DG , the double of G over ∂G , the given splitting of G over H induces a splitting of DG over H . Now we can apply the above argument to the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG to deduce that K is contained in H , as required. \square

The following observation will also be useful at several points in this paper.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n+2)$ pair, and suppose that G is VPC. Then one of the following holds:*

1. ∂G is empty and G is $VPC(n+2)$.
2. ∂G is non-empty, G is $VPC(n+1)$, and either $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$, or ∂G is a single group S and G contains S with index 2.

Proof. If ∂G is empty, then G has cohomological dimension $n+2$, and so G must be $VPC(n+2)$. Thus we have case 1) of the corollary.

If ∂G is non-empty, each group in ∂G is $PD(n+1)$, and is also VPC . Thus each group in ∂G is $VPC(n+1)$. Thus G must have cohomological dimension $n+1$, and so G is $VPC(n+1)$. As this implies that any group in ∂G has finite index in G , Lemma 4.1 implies that we must have case 2) of the corollary. \square

Now we will begin our discussion of almost invariant sets in Poincaré duality groups and pairs. The analogy between π_1 -injective maps of surfaces into 3-manifolds and almost invariant subsets of groups was one of the guiding principles in [22] and [23]. In particular, essential maps of annuli and tori into orientable 3-manifolds have corresponding nontrivial almost invariant sets.

We start by describing the analogous correspondence when one considers an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group G . As G and H are orientable, it follows that $e(G, H) = 2$. Thus G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X_H which is unique up to equivalence and complementation. This is the almost invariant subset of G which we associate to H . We call it the *dual* of H . The restriction that H and G be orientable is not crucial to ensure that $e(G, H) = 2$, but it does simplify the statements somewhat. What is crucial is that when we consider the inclusion of H into G , it should commute with the orientation homomorphisms. For otherwise $e(G, H) = 1$, so that G has no nontrivial H -almost invariant subsets. In topological terms, we want our codimension-1 manifolds to have trivial normal bundle or equivalently to be two-sided. Our higher dimensional analogue of a torus is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group H which is also $VPC(n+1)$, and then a torus in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group G is an injective homomorphism $\Phi : H \rightarrow G$. Note that a $PD(n+2)$ group G is torsion free, so that a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is always $PD(n+1)$.

Next we consider $PD(n+2)$ pairs. If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with nonempty boundary, and if H is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , then $e(G, H)$ may not equal 2. Thus it is no longer clear how to naturally associate a H -almost invariant subset of G to H . However in the topological context, a map of a codimension-1 closed orientable manifold into an orientable manifold determines a corresponding almost invariant set in a natural way. For simplicity, consider the case when $n = 1$ and G is the fundamental group of an orientable 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary, and H is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface F . Pick a map of F into M so that $\pi_1(F)$ maps to H

by the given isomorphism, and consider its lift to the cover M_F of M with fundamental group H . Then M_F need not have two ends, so that the group H does not determine a unique H -almost invariant subset of G . But, as F is two-sided in M , the lift of F into M_F separates M_F into two pieces, and so F does determine a unique H -almost invariant subset Y of G . Note that Y will be trivial if and only if F is homotopic into a component of ∂M .

In the algebraic setting, where $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with nonempty boundary and H is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , we get round this difficulty by considering the double DG of G along ∂G . Since DG is orientable, H determines a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X_H of DG . The H -almost invariant subset of G which we associate to H is the intersection $Y = X_H \cap G$. It is clear that Y is a trivial H -almost invariant subset of G if H is conjugate to a subgroup of one of the S_i 's. The following result shows that, as in the topological situation, this is the only way in which Y can be trivial.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with nonempty boundary, and let H be an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Let X_H denote the H -almost invariant subset of DG determined by H , and let Y denote the H -almost invariant subset $X_H \cap G$ of G . If Y is trivial, then H is conjugate to a subgroup of one of the S_i 's.*

Proof. To prove this result we need to use some techniques from [23]. Let Δ denote the graph of groups structure for DG corresponding to its construction by doubling. Thus Δ has two vertices w and \bar{w} , and m edges each joining the two vertices. We identify G with the vertex group $G(w)$. As DG is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group, each S_i determines, up to complementation and equivalence, a unique S_i -almost invariant subset X_i of DG . Thus X_i is associated to the edge splitting of Δ which is over S_i . Since each of H and S_i has two coends in DG , Proposition 7.4 of [23] shows that the associated almost invariant sets X_H and X_i must cross strongly if they cross at all. As $H \subset G = G(w)$, it is clear that X_H cannot cross any X_i strongly, and so does not cross any X_i at all. Thus X_H must be enclosed by one of the vertices of Δ . If X_H is enclosed by \bar{w} , then H must be a subgroup of $G(\bar{w})$. As H is a subgroup of $G(w)$, this implies that H is conjugate into some S_i , as required. Thus we will assume that X_H is enclosed by w . Note that the discussion just before Definition 2.1 shows that $Y = X_H \cap G$ is adapted to ∂G .

As Y is trivial, one of Y or Y^* is H -finite. We consider the action of DG on the universal covering DG -tree T of Δ . There is a vertex v of T

with stabiliser $G = G(v)$ which lies above w such that X_H is enclosed by v . Corollary 4.16 of [23] tells us that X_H determines a nontrivial partition of the edges of T which are incident to v . Suppose that Y is H -finite and let e be an edge of T which is incident to v and on the X_H -side of v . Then X_H is equivalent to an almost invariant subset W of G which contains $G(e)$. The fact that $Y = X_H \cap G(v)$ is H -finite implies that $W \cap G(v)$ is also H -finite, and hence in particular that $G(e)$ itself is H -finite. Thus $H \cap G(e)$ has finite index in $G(e)$. Now $G(e)$ is a conjugate of some S_i . As H and S_i are both $PD(n+1)$, a subgroup of $G(e)$ of finite index is also $PD(n+1)$ and hence of finite index in H . It follows that H is commensurable with a conjugate of S_i . As H is orientable, part 2) of Corollary 4.2 shows that H is conjugate to a subgroup of S_i . This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The conclusion of the above discussion is that if $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, and H is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , we can associate a H -almost invariant subset Y of G to H , and Y will be nontrivial so long as H is not conjugate into some S_i . We will say that Y is *dual* to H . Recall that the discussion just before Definition 2.1 shows that Y is adapted to ∂G . When H is $VPC(n+1)$ and Y is nontrivial, we will say that H is an *essential* torus in G . If G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group, then, as above, we associate X_H itself to H . In this case, we may also refer to H as an essential torus in G , though the word ‘essential’ is redundant in this case.

For later reference, we briefly consider the situation where $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, and H is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Unlike the case when ∂G is empty, G may possess nontrivial H -almost invariant subsets. However the following result shows that no such subset of G can be adapted to ∂G .

Lemma 4.5. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, let H be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , and let X be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G . Then X is not adapted to ∂G .*

Proof. As usual we let DG denote the double of G along ∂G , so that DG is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group. We recall that if K is a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of DG , then $e(DG, K)$ equals 2 if K is orientable and equals 1 otherwise. In particular, DG has no nontrivial H -almost invariant subset.

Suppose that X is adapted to ∂G . Then Proposition 2.14 tells us that there is a H -almost invariant subset \overline{X} of DG such that $\overline{X} \cap G$ equals X .

As X is a nontrivial almost invariant set, so is \overline{X} . This contradiction shows that X cannot be adapted to ∂G , as required. \square

For the rest of this section, we will discuss essential maps of higher dimensional ‘annuli’ into orientable $PD(n+2)$ pairs. It turns out that we need two types of higher dimensional analogue of an annulus. The first and most obvious type is a trivial orientable $PD(n+1)$ pair $A_H = (H; \{H, H\})$, where $n \geq 1$, and H is an orientable PDn group which is also $VPCn$. We call this an *untwisted annulus*. The second type is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ pair $\Lambda_H = (H, H_0)$, where H is a non-orientable PDn group which is also $VPCn$, and H_0 is the orientation subgroup of H . We call this a *twisted annulus*. When $n = 2$, an example of a 3-manifold of this type is the twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle with orientable total space. Note that there are no twisted annuli when $n = 1$, as any $PD1$ group is orientable. In particular, there are no twisted annuli in a 3-manifold. Algebraically, an annulus in a $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ is an injective homomorphism of pairs $\Theta : A_H \rightarrow (G, \partial G)$ or $\Theta : \Lambda_H \rightarrow (G, \partial G)$. Again the above orientation restrictions are not crucial, but they do simplify the statements. What is crucial is that Θ should commute with the orientation homomorphisms, so that, in topological terms, our annuli have trivial normal bundle or equivalently are two-sided.

It will be very helpful to consider a map θ of aspherical spaces such that the induced map on fundamental groups is Θ . For this we need to choose a $K(H, 1)$, and to construct a $K(G, 1)$ with the $K(S_i, 1)$ ’s as disjoint subcomplexes, for $i \geq 1$. To simplify the notation, for an untwisted annulus we write A for $K(H, 1) \times I$, and ∂A for $K(H, 1) \times \partial I$. The two components of ∂A will be denoted by $\partial_0 A$ and $\partial_1 A$. If $n = 1$, then A can be chosen to be the usual annulus $S^1 \times I$. For a twisted annulus, we write A for the twisted I -bundle over $K(H, 1)$ determined by the orientation homomorphism of H , and write ∂A for the induced S^0 -bundle. Finally we write M for $K(G, 1)$, and ∂M for the union of the $K(S_i, 1)$ ’s, for $i \geq 1$. Then Θ is induced by a map $\theta : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$. We will say that Θ is *essential* if θ cannot be homotoped into ∂M relative to ∂A . Note that as G is finitely generated, we can choose M to have finite 1-skeleton. If G is finitely presented, we can also choose M to have finite 2-skeleton.

Now suppose that θ is an essential map of an untwisted annulus A into M , with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , and identify H with its image in G under θ_* . Let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H , and let \widetilde{M} denote

the universal cover of M . Let $\theta_H : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_H, \partial M_H)$ be the lift of θ . The image of the fundamental class $[A] \in H_{n+1}(A, \partial A; \mathbb{Z})$ is an element α of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. Let Σ denote the component of ∂M_H which contains $\theta_H(\partial_0 A)$. We will assume that the base point of A lies in $\partial_0 A$. As M_H and Σ are aspherical and the inclusion of Σ in M_H induces an isomorphism of fundamental groups, Σ is a deformation retract of M_H . As θ is essential, it follows that $\theta_H(\partial_1 A)$ must lie in a different component Σ' of ∂M_H . This implies that α is a nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$.

If θ is an essential map into M of a twisted annulus A with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , we again identify H with its image in G under θ_* . Recall that $\pi_1(\partial A)$ equals the orientation subgroup H_0 of H . Let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H , and let $\theta_H : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_H, \partial M_H)$ be the lift of θ . Again we let α denote the image in $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ of the fundamental class $[A] \in H_{n+1}(A, \partial A; \mathbb{Z})$. Let Σ denote the component of ∂M_H which contains $\theta_H(\partial A)$, and consider the inclusions $H_0 = \pi_1(\partial A) \subset \pi_1(\Sigma) \subset \pi_1(M_H) = H$. If $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ equals H , then M_H deformation retracts to Σ , which contradicts the hypothesis that θ is essential. It follows that we must have $\pi_1(\Sigma) = H_0$. In turn this implies that α is a nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. We note that the double cover A_0 of A with $\pi_1(A_0)$ equal to H_0 is an untwisted annulus, and the induced map $\theta_0 : A_0 \rightarrow M_0$ is also essential.

We also note that, whether or not A is twisted, the induced action of H on the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M preserves the union of two distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. If some element of H interchanges these two components, then A is twisted. Otherwise, A is untwisted. Conversely, suppose that two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ are each stabilised by a PDn subgroup H of G . Then there is an essential map θ of an untwisted annulus A to M with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , and a lift $\theta_H : A \rightarrow M_H$ which maps $\partial_0 A$ to $H \setminus \Sigma$ and maps $\partial_1 A$ to $H \setminus T$. If the union of Σ and T is stabilised by a PDn subgroup H of G and if some element of H interchanges Σ and T , let H_0 denote the subgroup of H of index 2 which stabilises both Σ and T . Then there is an essential map θ of a twisted annulus A to M with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , and the induced essential map θ_0 of the double cover A_0 of A with $\pi_1(A_0)$ equal to H_0 has a lift to M_{H_0} which maps $\partial_0 A_0$ to $H \setminus \Sigma$ and maps $\partial_1 A_0$ to $H \setminus T$. Thus in all cases, if the union of two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ is stabilised by a PDn subgroup H of G , then H , Σ and T determine an essential annulus in $(M, \partial M)$, which we denote by $H_{\Sigma, T}$.

Now we will use the following result, which was proved by Swarup in [32], in order to associate an almost invariant subset of G to an essential annulus.

Lemma 4.6. *(Swarup) Let G be a finitely generated group with one end, and let H be a PDn subgroup. Then the restriction map $r : H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(H; \mathbb{Z})$ is trivial.*

Remark 4.7. *The PDn subgroup H need not be orientable.*

Proof. Recall from the discussion on page 8, that we can identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ with $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. However if G is finitely generated but not finitely presented, we need to modify the definition of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ as in Remark 1.1. In either case, M need not be locally finite, so any reference we make to the number of ends of a cover of M really refers to the number of ends of the 1-skeleton of the cover.

Let β denote an element of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, and let $\gamma \in H^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ denote $r(\beta)$. Thus γ can be represented by a map $g : M_H \rightarrow S^1$. Represent β by a finite cocycle $c : M_H^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ on the 1-skeleton $M_H^{(1)}$ of M_H , and let Σ denote the support of c . Thus Σ is a finite subcomplex of $M_H^{(1)}$, and c restricted to any simplex of $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$ is trivial. As c also represents γ , for any component L of $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$, the map $\pi_1(L) \rightarrow \pi_1(S^1)$ induced by g is trivial. Now, since Σ is finite, $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$ has at least one unbounded component L whose coboundary δL must be finite as $\delta L \subset \delta \Sigma$.

We first consider the case when $n = 1$, so that the PDn group H is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} . Suppose that γ is non-zero. Then the induced map $g_* : H \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is non-zero and hence injective, so that the map $\pi_1(L) \rightarrow H$ induced by inclusion must be trivial. Hence L lifts to \widetilde{M} and has infinitely many disjoint lifts. This implies that \widetilde{M} has infinitely many ends which contradicts the fact that G has only one end. This contradiction implies that γ must be zero, as required. In the general case when $n > 1$, we consider the induced map $g_* : H \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, let N denote the kernel of g_* , and consider the cover $q_N : M_N \rightarrow M_H$. If γ is non-zero, then g_* must also be non-zero, so that N has cohomological dimension $\leq n - 1$ by a theorem of Strebel [29]. Thus $H_n(M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_n(\partial M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ are both zero. It follows from the exact sequence of the pair $(M_N, \partial M_N)$ that $H_{n+1}(M_N, \partial M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero. Thus $H_f^1(M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero and therefore M_N has only one end. But as before, L has infinitely many disjoint lifts to M_N which shows that M_N has infinitely many ends. This contradiction implies that γ must be zero which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Our real interest lies in the corresponding restriction map with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients in place of \mathbb{Z} . This map need not be trivial, but the fact that r is trivial yields enough information about the case of \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients for our purposes.

Corollary 4.8. *Let G be a finitely generated group with one end, and let H be a PDn subgroup. Let ρ denote the map of cohomology groups given by reduction modulo 2 of the coefficients. Then the image of $\rho : H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ equals the image of the coboundary map $\delta : H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$, given on page 8. Thus the image of ρ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of $H \setminus G$ modulo almost equality and complementation.*

Proof. As before, we let M denote a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1–skeleton, and let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H .

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{r} & H^1(H; \mathbb{Z}) \\
 & & \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \rho \\
 H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{\bar{r}} & H^1(H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \\
 \cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \\
 H_c^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\bar{r}} & H^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)
 \end{array}$$

where the bottom two rows come from the long exact cohomology sequences given on page 8. Lemma 4.6 tells us that the map r is zero. As the image of δ equals the kernel of the map \bar{r} , it follows immediately that the image of ρ is contained in the image of δ . Now consider an element of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ which lies in the image of δ . Such an element is represented by a finite 1–cochain c such that $c = \delta Y$, where Y is some subset of the vertices of M_H . If we regard c as a cochain with values 0 or 1 in \mathbb{Z} instead of \mathbb{Z}_2 , then c is still equal to δY , and so $\delta c = 0$ with \mathbb{Z} coefficients. Thus c represents an element of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ which is isomorphic to $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$. It follows that the image of δ is contained in the image of ρ , so that the images must be equal, as required. \square

Suppose that $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair. We can now associate a nontrivial H –almost invariant subset X_θ to an essential annulus θ with fundamental group H . Our discussion before Lemma 4.6 shows that θ determines a non-zero element $\alpha \in H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, which is isomorphic

to $H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$. The Poincaré dual of α , regarded as an element of this second group, is a nontrivial element β of $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$. Corollary 4.8 above shows that $\rho(\beta)$ determines an almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ modulo almost equality and complementation, and the pre-image in G of such a set is the required H -almost invariant subset X_θ of G . We will say that X_θ is *dual* to the essential annulus θ .

If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and the almost invariant subset of G associated to a splitting is dual to an essential annulus or torus, we will say that the splitting is dual to an essential annulus or torus, as appropriate.

If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair which admits an essential annulus, the dual almost invariant subset of G is nontrivial and is over a $VPCn$ subgroup. The converse is not true. In general G will have many nontrivial such subsets which are not dual to any essential annulus. In the following two results, we consider this in more detail. In particular, we show that if G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPCn$ subgroup, then $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential annulus.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be a $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Let α be an element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, so that $\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is supported by some finite number k of components of ∂M_H .*

1. *If α is non-zero, then k is non-zero.*
2. *If α is non-zero, then each of the k components of ∂M_H which support $\partial\alpha$ carries a subgroup of finite index in H . If H is orientable then $k \geq 2$.*
3. *If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, then $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential map of an annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in H .*

Proof. 1) Consider the exact sequence.

$$H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$$

Since H is a PDn group, it follows that $H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero. Thus the map ∂ in this sequence is injective. If α is non-zero, it follows that $\partial\alpha$ is non-zero, and hence that k is non-zero.

2) If Σ is one of the components of ∂M_H which supports $\partial\alpha$, then $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z})$ must be nontrivial. Note that the fundamental group of any component of ∂M_H is a subgroup of H . As H is PDn , Strebel's result in [29] implies that a subgroup of H of infinite index has cohomological dimension less than n . Hence $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ must have finite index d in H , so that $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z})$ is infinite cyclic. Now suppose that H is orientable. Then $H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ must also be infinite cyclic. Further the map $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is multiplication by d , and so is injective. We know that the map $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ has nontrivial kernel as it contains $\partial\alpha$. It follows that ∂M_H has a second boundary component Σ' which carries $\partial\alpha$. Thus when H is orientable, we must have $k \geq 2$.

3) If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, Corollary 4.8 implies that $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$, and hence $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, is nontrivial. Suppose first that H is orientable. Then part 2) shows that there are two distinct components Σ and Σ' of ∂M_H such that each of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ and $\pi_1(\Sigma')$ is a subgroup of finite index in H . It follows that $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential map of an untwisted annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in H . If H is non-orientable, we consider the orientation subgroup H_0 of H which is of index 2. As H_0 is a subgroup of H of finite index, G has a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset. Now we apply the above discussion to H_0 in place of H and obtain an essential map of an untwisted annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in H_0 , and hence of finite index in H , as required. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

In the next result, we prove more.

Proposition 4.10. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be a $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Then we have the following results.*

1. *No nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G can be adapted to ∂G .*
2. *If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X , there is an orientable subgroup H' of finite index in H , such that X is equivalent to a sum of H' -almost invariant subsets of G each dual to an untwisted annulus.*
3. *If ∂M_H has k components each of which carries a subgroup of finite index in H , then the number of coends of H in G is at least k .*

4. If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X which crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over any finite index subgroup of H , then X is dual to an annulus.

Proof. 1) Suppose there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset Y of G which is adapted to ∂G . We will consider the $PD(n+2)$ group DG obtained by doubling G along ∂G , and the corresponding graph of groups decomposition Δ of DG , which has a vertex w with associated group G . Proposition 2.14 tells us that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by w such that $X \cap G$ equals Y . But part 2) of Lemma 4.26 tells us that DG has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups. This contradiction shows that no nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G can be adapted to ∂G , as required.

2) Let X be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G , and let Y denote the almost invariant subset $H \setminus X$ of $H \setminus G$. Thus, as discussed on page 8, the equivalence class of Y under almost equality is an element of $H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$. We let $[Y]$ denote the image of this equivalence class in $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ under the coboundary map δ given on page 8. Thus $[Y]$ is represented by any almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ which is almost equal to Y or to Y^* . As H is $VPCn$, and torsion free, it is PDn . Thus Corollary 4.8 tells us that there is an element β of $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ such that $\rho(\beta) = [Y]$. Let α denote the element of $H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ which is Poincaré dual to β . Regard α as an element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, and consider $\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. From Proposition 4.9, $\partial\alpha$ is non-zero, so there is at least one component of ∂M_H which lies in its support. Each component Σ of ∂M_H which supports $\partial\alpha$ carries a subgroup of H of finite index. Let H'' denote the intersection of all conjugates in H of these subgroups, let H_0 denote the maximal orientable subgroup of H of index at most 2, and let H' denote the intersection $H'' \cap H_0$. Thus H' is an orientable normal subgroup of H of finite index. By replacing H by H' , we can assume that H is orientable and that the finitely many components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ of ∂M_H which support $\partial\alpha$ all carry H . As H is orientable, we must have $k \geq 2$.

If i and j are distinct integers, there is an essential untwisted annulus A_{ij} in M_H with fundamental group H and whose boundary components lie in Σ_i and Σ_j . Let α_{ij} denote the image of the fundamental class of A_{ij} in $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. Then $\partial\alpha_{ij} \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . Regard α_{ij} as an element of $H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$, and let $\beta_{ij} \in H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ be Poincaré dual to α_{ij} . Then Corollary 4.8 tells us that

$\rho(\beta_{ij}) \in H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ equals $[Y_{ij}]$, for some almost invariant subset Y_{ij} of $H \setminus G$ which is said to be dual to A_{ij} .

Now we let ρ denote reduction of coefficients mod 2. Let \bar{Y} denote $\rho\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and let \bar{Y}_{ij} denote $\rho\partial\alpha_{ij} \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then \bar{Y}_{ij} is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . As H is orientable, it follows that \bar{Y} is supported by some subset of $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$. Let γ denote any nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ whose image in $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is supported by some subset of the Σ_i 's. As each Σ_i carries H , this image must be supported by at least two components of ∂M_H . Thus a simple induction argument on k shows that \bar{Y} must be equal to a sum of \bar{Y}_{ij} 's.

Now consider the following commutative diagram. The vertical maps are Poincaré duality isomorphisms, the top horizontal map is the boundary map in the long exact homology sequence of the pair $(M_H, \partial M_H)$, and the bottom horizontal map is induced by the inclusion of ∂M_H into M_H .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & H_f^1(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \end{array}$$

As H is PDn , it follows that $H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is zero. Thus the map ∂ in this diagram must be injective, so that i^* is also injective.

Recall that $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ and $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are naturally isomorphic, so that we can identify $[Y]$ and $[Y_{ij}]$ with elements of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Now, under Poincaré duality, \bar{Y} corresponds to $i^*[Y]$ and \bar{Y}_{ij} corresponds to $i^*[Y_{ij}]$. As \bar{Y} equals a sum of \bar{Y}_{ij} 's, and i^* is injective, it follows that $[Y]$ is equal to a sum of $[Y_{ij}]$'s. Thus Y is equivalent to a sum of Y_{ij} 's and their complements. Hence X is equivalent to a sum of H -almost invariant subsets of G each dual to an untwisted annulus in M_H , as required.

3) In order to show that the number of coends of H in G is at least k , it suffices to show there is a subgroup H' of H of finite index such that $e(G, H')$ is at least k . As in part 2), by replacing H by a suitable subgroup of finite index, we can suppose that ∂M_H has components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ each carrying H . Consider the composite map

$$H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{i^*} H_f^1(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

If $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, the almost invariant subset Y_{ij} of $H \setminus G$ in part 2) determines an element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ whose image \bar{Y}_{ij} in $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ under

this composite map is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . As the $\overline{Y_{ij}}$'s span a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subgroup of $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and the kernel of δ is nontrivial, it follows that $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has dimension at least k , so that $e(G, H)$ is at least k , as required.

4) In part 2) of this lemma, we showed that, after replacing H by a suitable subgroup of finite index, the almost invariant subset $Y = H \setminus X$ of $H \setminus G$ is equivalent to a sum of almost invariant subsets Y_{ij} , $i \neq j$, of $H \setminus G$ where Y_{ij} is dual to an untwisted annulus in M_H with boundary in $\Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_j$. By re-labelling the Σ_i 's if needed, we can assume that $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and that each index between 1 and m occurs.

If $m = 2$, then Y is equivalent to Y_{12} , and we are done. We will show that no other case is possible.

If $m = 3$, then, after renumbering, Y must be equivalent to $Y_{12} + Y_{23}$. But this implies that \overline{Y} is supported on Σ_1 and Σ_3 which contradicts our assumption that $m = 3$.

Now suppose that $m \geq 4$. Recall that an almost invariant subset Y of $H \setminus G$ determines an element $[Y]$ of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ which can be represented by a 0-cochain with finite coboundary. The support Z of this cochain is an infinite subset of vertices in M_H , with infinite complement Z^* . Similarly each Y_{ij} yields a corresponding infinite subset of vertices Z_{ij} in M_H , with infinite complement Z_{ij}^* . It will be convenient to consider Z and the Z_{ij} 's rather than Y and the Y_{ij} 's. Lemma 4.11 below shows that there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that the vertex set of Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} and the vertex set of Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* . This implies that the four corners of the pair (Z, Z_{ij}) are infinite, as Z and Z^* each meet both Σ_k and Σ_l in an infinite set of vertices. Hence the four corners of the pair (Y, Y_{ij}) are infinite, so that Y crosses Y_{ij} . This contradicts our hypothesis that X crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over any finite index subgroup of H , which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

In the next lemma we consider how two untwisted annuli can cross.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be an orientable $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Suppose that $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_4$ are distinct components of ∂M_H each with fundamental group H . Let Y_{ij} denote the almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ dual to the annulus A_{ij} in M_H which has fundamental group H and has boundary in Σ_i and Σ_j . Then there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that Y_{ij} crosses Y_{kl} .*

Proof. As at the end of the previous lemma, it will be convenient to consider Z_{ij} rather than Y_{ij} , where Z_{ij} is the support of a 0-cochain on M_H with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by Y_{ij} .

For three distinct integers i, j and k , the vertex set of Σ_k must be almost contained in Z_{ij} or Z_{ij}^* . For simplicity we will say that Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} to mean that the vertex set of Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} . Note that Σ_i and Σ_j are not almost contained in Z_{ij} or in Z_{ij}^* .

Now let i, j, k and l be distinct integers. We will say that Z_{ij} *separates* Σ_k and Σ_l if Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} and Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* , or vice versa.

Claim 4.12. Y_{ij} crosses Y_{kl} if and only if Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l , and Z_{kl} separates Σ_i and Σ_j .

Suppose first that Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l . Then Y_{ij} must cross Y_{kl} , because all four corners of the pair (Z_{ij}, Z_{kl}) will be infinite as each has infinite intersection with Σ_k or Σ_l .

Next suppose that Z_{ij} does not separate Σ_k and Σ_l . Without loss of generality, we can assume that Σ_k and Σ_l are both almost contained in Z_{ij} . Then each of the corners $Z_{ij}^* \cap Z_{kl}$ and $Z_{ij} \cap Z_{kl}^*$ intersects Σ_k and Σ_l in a finite set. As each of Σ_i and Σ_j is almost contained in one of Z_{kl} or Z_{kl}^* , it follows that one of these two corners intersects at most one of Σ_i and Σ_j in an infinite set. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that this corner is $Z_{ij}^* \cap Z_{kl}$, which we denote by V . Let W denote $Y_{ij}^* \cap Y_{kl}$. Thus W is an almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ and the corresponding element $[W]$ of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is represented by a 1-cocycle equal to the coboundary δV . Our choice of V means that at most one component of ∂M_H is not almost contained in V^* . This implies that the element \overline{W} of $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is supported on at most one component of ∂M_H . As H is orientable, part 2) of Proposition 4.9 implies that W must be trivial. It follows that Y_{ij} and Y_{kl} do not cross, which completes the proof of the claim.

Now suppose that the lemma is false. Then the above claim shows that, for any four distinct integers i, j, k and l , the boundary components Σ_k and Σ_l must both be almost contained in Z_{ij} or both in Z_{ij}^* . By replacing each of Z_{12} and Z_{23} by its complement if needed, we can arrange that Z_{12} meets each of Σ_3 and Σ_4 in a finite set and that Z_{23} meets each of Σ_1 and Σ_4 in a finite set. Note that we cannot have $Y_{12} \leq Y_{23}$ as Z_{12} meets Σ_1 in an infinite set, and Z_{23} meets Σ_1 in a finite set. And we cannot have $Y_{23} \leq Y_{12}$ as Z_{23}

meets Σ_3 in an infinite set and Z_{12} meets Σ_3 in a finite set. It follows that $Y_{12} \cup Y_{23}$ is equivalent to Y_{13} or its complement. Now $Z_{12} \cup Z_{23}$ meets Σ_4 in a finite set, and has infinite intersection with Σ_2 . Hence it is not the case that Σ_2 and Σ_4 are both almost contained in Z_{13} or in Z_{13}^* , so that Z_{13} separates Σ_2 and Σ_4 . Now the above claim shows that Y_{13} and Y_{24} must cross. This contradicts our supposition, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Let DM denote the space obtained by doubling M along ∂M , and let DG denote the fundamental group of DM . If M is a 3-manifold, an annulus in M can be doubled to yield a torus in DM . If the annulus is essential, then the torus will be π_1 -injective. In general, doubling an essential topological annulus $f : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ yields a π_1 -injective map $Df : DA \rightarrow DM$, where DA denotes the double of A along its boundary. Thus Df is a torus in DM . In terms of almost invariant sets, this yields the following statement. If Y is a nontrivial H -almost invariant set dual to an essential annulus in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$, then there is a natural way to double Y . One obtains a nontrivial almost invariant subset X of DG over the double of H , i.e. an essential torus in DG , such that $X \cap G$ equals Y . At first sight, this result sounds somewhat similar to that in Proposition 2.14, as both results are about constructing an almost invariant subset X of DG from an almost invariant subset Y of G . However they are completely different as Proposition 2.14 requires that Y be adapted to ∂G , whereas a nontrivial H -almost invariant set over a $VPCn$ subgroup of G is never adapted to ∂G , by part 1) of Proposition 4.10. Note that it now follows from part 3) of Proposition 4.9 that if G has any nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPCn$ subgroup, then there is an essential torus in DG .

Having completed our discussion of the analogues in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair of annuli and tori in a 3-manifold, we next need to discuss the analogues of the various types of component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold. In our earlier discussion in section 1, we described only two types of such component, namely I -bundles and Seifert fibre spaces. But in order to describe the algebraic analogues correctly, we will need to subdivide into more cases.

We start by considering a component W of the characteristic submanifold of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M such that W is an I -bundle over a surface F . Thus $\pi_1(W)$ equals $\pi_1(F)$ and the frontier of W in M consists of the restriction of the I -bundle to ∂F and so consists of essential annuli. In addition, if F is orientable, the I -bundle is trivial and W meets ∂M in two

copies of F , and if F is non-orientable, then the I -bundle is nontrivial and W meets ∂M in one copy of the orientable double cover of F . We will assume for the moment that F is not an annulus or Moebius band, so that $\pi_1(W)$ is not finite nor two-ended. Let \widetilde{F} , \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{M} denote the universal covers of F , W and M respectively. Thus \widetilde{W} is homeomorphic to $\widetilde{F} \times I$. Further each component of the pre-image in \widetilde{M} of W consists of a copy of \widetilde{W} such that $\widetilde{W} \cap \partial \widetilde{M} = \widetilde{F} \times \{0, 1\}$, and $\widetilde{F} \times \{0\}$ and $\widetilde{F} \times \{1\}$ lie in distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. Thus the induced action of $\pi_1(W)$ on \widetilde{M} preserves the union of two distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. If some element of $\pi_1(W)$ interchanges these two components, then W is a twisted I -bundle. Otherwise, W is untwisted. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 4.13. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and as above let M be an aspherical space with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G , and let v be a vertex of Γ which is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type. (See Definition 1.6. Note that each peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ is $VPCn$.)*

Then v is of I -bundle type if there are two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ such that

1. *the induced action of $G(v)$ on \widetilde{M} preserves the union of Σ and T , and*
2. *for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, if e_K denotes the edge of Γ which is incident to v and carries K , then the edge splitting associated to e_K is given by the essential annulus $K_{\Sigma, T}$. (See the discussion just before Lemma 4.6.)*

Next we consider a component W of the characteristic submanifold of M such that W is a Seifert fibre space. We will assume for the moment that the orbifold fundamental group of the base orbifold of W is not finite nor two-ended. Thus $\pi_1(W)$ is $VPC1$ -by-Fuchsian, the frontier of W in M consists of boundary torus components or of vertical annuli in its boundary, and W meets ∂M in boundary torus components or vertical annuli in its boundary. We distinguish three types of such component.

We will say that W is an *interior* component if it lies in the interior of M . Our first definition is the algebraic analogue of such a component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold.

Definition 4.14. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ which is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. (See Definition 1.6.)*

Then v is of interior Seifert type if each edge of Γ which is incident to v determines a splitting of G over an essential torus.

Recall that Lemma 1.7 shows that the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient is unique. Note that as G is torsion free, so is L , so that L is PDn . The following little result applied to any edge group of v tells us that L must be orientable. Of course this question did not arise in the case of a 3-manifold as then L was the fundamental group of a closed 1-manifold, and the only such manifold is orientable.

Lemma 4.15. *Let K be an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and let L be a $VPCn$ normal subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then L is an orientable PDn group.*

Proof. As K is torsion free, so is L , and hence L is PDn . As $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ has an infinite cyclic subgroup of index 2, there is a subgroup K_0 of K , of index at most 2, such that K_0 contains L , and L is normal in K_0 with infinite cyclic quotient. As K is orientable, so is K_0 . Now Theorem 7.3 of [1] shows that L is orientable. \square

We will say that a Seifert fibre space component W of the characteristic submanifold of M is *adapted to ∂M* if there are no annuli in its frontier. In this case each boundary torus of W is either a component of ∂M or lies in the interior of M and so is a component of the frontier of W in M . Our next definition is the algebraic analogue of such a component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold.

Definition 4.16. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is not finite nor two-ended.*

Then v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G if the following conditions hold:

1. *If K is a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$, then either K is a conjugate of a group in ∂G , or K is carried by an edge of Γ which is incident to v .*
2. *For each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, there is at most one edge which is incident to v and carries K .*

3. Each edge of Γ which is incident to v carries a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ and determines a splitting of G over an essential torus in G .

Remark 4.17. *If v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the two possibilities in 1) for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$ are mutually exclusive. For an essential torus in G cannot be a conjugate of a group in ∂G .*

If W is not adapted to ∂M , we can push into the interior of W those components of ∂W which meet ∂M in annuli to obtain a Seifert fibre space W' which is homeomorphic to W and adapted to ∂M . Note that each component of the closure of $W - W'$ is homeomorphic to $T \times I$. Recall that the annuli in which W meets ∂M must be vertical in W . Our next definition is the algebraic analogue of such a component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold M .

Definition 4.18. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is not finite nor two-ended. Let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient.*

Then v is of Seifert type if Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G with the following properties:

1. *There is a vertex v' of Γ' with $G(v') = G(v)$ such that v' is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Thus each edge of Γ' which is incident to v' carries a peripheral subgroup of $G(v')$ and determines a splitting of G over an essential torus in G .*
2. *The projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends v' to v and is an isomorphism apart from the fact that certain edges incident to v' are mapped to v .*
3. *Let e denote an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and mapped to v . Thus $G(e)$ is a peripheral subgroup K of $G(v')$. Let w denote the other vertex of e . Then $G(w) = K$, and there is at least one other edge incident to w . Further for each such edge the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus, and the boundary of each such annulus carries L .*

Remark 4.19. *When comparing this definition with the topological situation, think of Γ as being dual to the frontier of W and the refinement Γ' as being*

dual to the union of the frontiers of W and of W' . Note that if v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then v is trivially of Seifert type. One simply takes Γ' equal to Γ in the above definition.

Part 3) of the definition corresponds to the facts that each component of the closure of $W - W'$ is homeomorphic to $T \times I$, and that the frontier annuli of W must be vertical in W . The reason for the formulation involving the boundary of each annulus is that some of the annuli involved may be twisted, a phenomenon with no analogue in 3-manifold theory.

There are three special cases which are not covered by the above definitions. For our definition of the term *VPC-by-Fuchsian* in Definition 1.6 requires that the Fuchsian quotient group not be finite nor two-ended.

Definition 4.20. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ group.*

Then v is of solid torus type if it is not isolated, and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus, and there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of finite index in $G(v)$ such that the boundary of each such annulus carries H .

A vertex of solid torus type is of special solid torus type if either v has valence 3 and $H = G(v)$, or if v has valence 1 and H has index 2 or 3 in $G(v)$.

Remark 4.21. *As mentioned after the previous definition, the annuli involved in this definition may be twisted. However, in the special case when v is of special solid torus type, the conditions imply that each of the annuli must be untwisted.*

Definition 4.22. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G .*

A vertex v of Γ is of special Seifert type if v has only one incident edge e , the splitting of G associated to e is dual to an essential torus, and $G(e)$ is a subgroup of index 2 in $G(v)$.

Remark 4.23. *As $G(v)$ is a finite, torsion free extension of $G(e)$, it follows that $G(v)$ is also $PD(n+1)$. Also part 3) of Corollary 4.2 implies that $G(v)$ must be non-orientable.*

Our last definition is the algebraic analogue of a component W of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold which is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to $K \widetilde{\times} I$, but has some annuli in its frontier. There are subcases here, depending on whether or not W has a component of its frontier which is a torus, and whether or not W contains a torus component of ∂M . It is not possible to have both. Note that in all cases, there is a Seifert fibration of W for which all the annuli in its frontier are vertical. If W is $T \times I$ or $K \widetilde{\times} I$, this is equivalent to the condition that all the frontier annuli carry the same subgroup of $\pi_1(W)$ and that $\pi_1(W)$ splits over this subgroup. This is what we generalise in the definition below. Recall that as G is torsion free, a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup is automatically $PD(n+1)$.

Definition 4.24. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . A vertex v of Γ is of torus type if $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and one of the following cases hold:*

1. *$G(v)$ is orientable and is one of the groups in ∂G , and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that $G(v)$ splits over H and the boundary of each such annulus carries H .*
2. *$G(v)$ is orientable, one of the edges of Γ incident to v carries $G(v)$, and the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential torus in G . For each of the remaining edges of Γ incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that $G(v)$ splits over H and the boundary of each such annulus carries H .*
3. *$G(v)$ is orientable, and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that $G(v)$ splits over H and the boundary of each such annulus carries H . In addition Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group $G(e)$ associated to e is equal to $G(v)$, and the edge splitting associated to e is dual to an essential torus in G .*

4. $G(v)$ is non-orientable, and we denote the orientable subgroup of index 2 by $G(v)_0$. For each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)_0$ such that $G(v)$ splits over H and the boundary of each such annulus carries H . In addition Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group associated to e is equal to $G(v)_0$, and the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential torus in G . Finally one vertex of e has valence 1, and associated group $G(v)$.

Remark 4.25. Note that Lemma 5.6 tells us that if a $VPC(n+1)$ group G splits over a subgroup H , then H is $VPCn$, and is normal in G with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Now we are almost in a position to state the main result of this paper. But first here are two important facts about Poincaré duality pairs which follow immediately from Lemma 4.3 of Kropholler in [13].

Lemma 4.26. (Kropholler and Roller) Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n+2)$ pair. Then

1. G has no nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPCk$ subgroup with $k < n$.
2. If ∂G is empty, so that G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, then G has no nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPCk$ subgroup with $k \leq n$.

Lemma 4.26 implies that if $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, then the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of Theorem 1.11 exists. That theorem tells us that for any group G , the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are of four types, namely they are isolated, of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k is $n-1$ or n , or of commensuriser type. Our main result is the following theorem which asserts that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ and its completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ have properties analogous to the topological picture in dimension 3. If $n = 1$, and G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M , then $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ is dual to the frontier of $AT(M)$ and $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ is dual to the frontier of $JSJ(M)$, where $AT(M)$ and $JSJ(M)$ are the submanifolds of M discussed at the start of section 1.

Theorem 4.27. (Main Result) *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC . Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup. Finally let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ denote the completion of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.*

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ have the following properties, in addition to those which follow immediately from the properties of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ described in Theorem 1.11:

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$, and the edge splittings associated to the two edges incident to v are dual to essential annuli or tori in G .*
 - (b) *v is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of I -bundle type. (See Definition 4.13.)*
 - (c) *v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 4.14.)*
 - (d) *v is of commensuriser type. Further v is of Seifert type (see Definition 4.18), or of torus type (see Definition 4.24) or of solid torus type (see Definition 4.20).*
2. *The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type (see Definition 4.22) or of special solid torus type (see Definition 4.20).*
3. *Each edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is dual to an essential annulus or torus in G .*
4. *Any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group and adapted to ∂G is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and also by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. This vertex cannot be of I -bundle or solid torus type.*
5. *If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.*

Remark 4.28. *Part 3) follows immediately from parts 1) and 2), as the definitions of the various types of V_0 -vertex in the statements of parts 1) and 2) all contain the requirement that the edge splittings be dual to an essential annulus or torus.*

Part 4) does not follow from the properties of a regular neighbourhood as an almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group which is adapted to ∂G need not be n -canonical, and so need not lie in the family $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Note that, from [25], we know that there may be almost invariant subsets of G over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups which are not adapted to ∂G .

Part 5) also does not follow from the properties of a regular neighbourhood as a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H of G may be non-orientable.

5 Torus Decompositions for $PD(n+2)$ groups and pairs

We will start this section by considering an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group G , where $n \geq 1$, and the graph of groups structure $\Gamma_{n+1}(G) = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n+1} : G)$ of Theorem 1.9. Recall from Lemma 4.26 that such a group cannot admit any nontrivial almost invariant subset over a VPC subgroup of length $\leq n$, so that $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ does exist. It is a reduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}_{n+1} in G , where \mathcal{F}_{n+1} is the collection of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Since G is orientable, the nontrivial almost invariant sets in \mathcal{F}_{n+1} are automatically over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ groups. Recall that if H is an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , we call H a torus, and G possesses a unique nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, up to equivalence and complementation. Thus \mathcal{F}_{n+1} can be thought of as the collection of all essential tori in G . It will be convenient to denote $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ by $T_{n+1}(G)$, and we will call $T_{n+1}(G)$ the *torus decomposition* of G . We will also use $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ to denote the completion $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$, as discussed at the end of section 1.

In chapter 12 of [23], we briefly discussed the connection between $T_{n+1}(G)$ and Kropholler's decomposition in [13] in the case of orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups. Using the present notation, it follows from Theorem 5.1 below that $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ is the same as Kropholler's decomposition. We will show shortly that this also holds for the case of a $PD(n+2)$ pair. In dimension 3, it is clear that $T_2(G)$ is the same as Castel's decomposition in [5] as his decomposition

is defined to be $\Gamma_2(G)$. As in the statement of Theorem 1.9, it will be convenient to state Theorem 5.1 excluding the case when G is VPC . For if G is a $VPC(n+2)$ group, then $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ consists of a single V_0 -vertex.

Theorem 5.1. *If G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group which is not VPC , then $T_{n+1}(G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ have the following properties:*

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is a torus in G .*
 - (b) *v is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 4.14.)*
2. *The V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type. (See Definition 4.22.)*
3. *Each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G)$ and of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ is dual to an essential torus in G .*
4. *If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$.*

Remark 5.2. *If G has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups, then \mathcal{F}_{n+1} is empty and $T_{n+1}(G)$, and hence $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, consists of a single V_1 -vertex.*

Proof. 1) Part 1) of Theorem 1.9 tells us that $T_{n+1}(G)$ is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G , and that each V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is isolated, of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, or of commensuriser type. If v is a V_0 -vertex of commensuriser type, then v encloses an element X of \mathcal{F}_{n+1} which is over some $VPC(n+1)$ group H , and $G(v)$ is of the form $Comm_G(H)$. Further X crosses weakly some of its translates by $Comm_G(H)$. In the present situation, G is $PD(n+2)$ and H is $VPC(n+1)$, so that the number of coends of H in G is 2. Now Proposition 7.4 of [23] implies that no almost invariant set can cross X or any of its translates weakly, so that V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type cannot occur. It follows that each V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. As each edge splitting is over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , it follows that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is dual to an essential torus in G . Hence any V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ which is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type must be of interior Seifert type. This completes the proof of part 1) of the theorem.

2) The construction of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ from $T_{n+1}(G)$ described in section 1 can only introduce V_0 -vertices of special Seifert type, so part 2) of the theorem holds.

3) Part 3) of the theorem follows immediately from parts 1) and 2).

4) First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

If H is orientable, the pair (G, H) has two ends, so there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G . As X is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$, it follows that H is conjugate into $G(v)$. Hence H is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required.

If H is non-orientable, let H_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. As the pair (G, H_0) has two ends, there is a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset of G . As $T_{n+1}(G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, it follows from part 1) of Theorem 1.9 and Remark 1.10 that H_0 must have small commensuriser, which we denote by K . This means that K contains H_0 with finite index, so that K is itself $VPC(n+1)$ and $PD(n+1)$. Note that K must contain H , so that K is non-orientable. We let K_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. Note that K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G . The preceding paragraph shows that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$ such that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. As K contains K_0 with finite index, it follows that there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$. If w is a V_0 -vertex, then K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required. So we now consider the case when w is a V_1 -vertex. In particular, v and w must be distinct. Thus there is an edge e of $T_{n+1}(G)$ which is incident to w such that $G(e)$ contains K_0 . As all the edge groups of $T_{n+1}(G)$ are torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal K_0 . If $E(w)$ denotes the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w , then Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. As the commensuriser in $G(w)$ of $G(e) = K_0$ is not equal to K_0 , Lemma 4.1 shows that K_0 is the only element of the family $E(w)$, and $G(w)$ contains K_0 with index 2. Thus w has valence 1, and $G(w)$ equals a conjugate of K . Now it follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required. \square

Next we discuss the torus decomposition of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ with non-empty boundary. Recall from the previous section the discussion of an essential torus in G . In particular, we let DG denote the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group obtained by doubling G along its boundary. Then

given an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H of G , there is a H -almost invariant subset X_H of DG associated to H , and the intersection $Y_H = X_H \cap G$ is a H -almost invariant subset of G which is nontrivial unless H is conjugate into ∂G . Let \mathcal{T}_{n+1} denote the family of all such nontrivial subsets Y_H of G , where H is $VPC(n+1)$. Then the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of $(G, \partial G)$ will be the reduced regular neighbourhood in G of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} . This is the natural definition, but it is not obvious that this regular neighbourhood exists. One immediate problem is that G may have nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups, so this decomposition is different from any of those proved to exist in [23]. In order to show that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ exists, we will use the fact that DG does not have nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups, so we can apply results from [23].

Theorem 5.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that ∂G is non-empty, and let \mathcal{T}_{n+1} denote the family of almost invariant subsets Y_H of G described above. Then \mathcal{T}_{n+1} has a reduced regular neighbourhood $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ in G . Further $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G .*

Proof. If G is VPC , part 2) of Corollary 4.3 tells us that either $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$, or that ∂G is a single group S and G contains S with index 2. In the second case, part 1) of Corollary 4.2 tells us that G must be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group. It follows that in either case, the pair $(G, \partial G)$ admits no essential tori, so that \mathcal{T}_{n+1} is empty. Thus \mathcal{T}_{n+1} has a reduced regular neighbourhood which consists of a single V_1 -vertex, and this is trivially adapted to ∂G . For the rest of this proof we will assume that G is not VPC .

Recall our discussion at the start of the previous section. The natural graph of groups structure Δ for the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG has two vertices w and \bar{w} and edges joining them which correspond to the groups of ∂G . Given an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H of G , there is a H -almost invariant subset X_H of DG associated to H , and the intersection $Y_H = X_H \cap G$ is a H -almost invariant subset of G . An important point about X_H is that it is enclosed by the vertex w of Δ , where we identify G with $G(w)$, so that Y_H is adapted to ∂G .

Now consider $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$, which is the collection of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of DG which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Recall that as DG is $PD(n+2)$, it is torsion free so that a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup K of DG must be $PD(n+1)$. Further, as DG is orientable, if there is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of DG which is over K , then K must be

orientable, and all such almost invariant subsets of DG are equivalent up to complementation. Also recall from Theorem 5.1 that the reduced regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ exists, and is denoted $T_{n+1}(DG)$, and its V_0 -vertices are either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. As we will need to use our construction of unreduced regular neighbourhoods in [23], we note that Theorem 1.9 tells us that the unreduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ in DG also exists. We will use the notation $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ for this unreduced regular neighbourhood. As in the case of the reduced regular neighbourhood, its V_0 -vertices are either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ denote the subfamily of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ which consists of non-trivial almost invariant subsets of DG which are over subgroups of G which are non-peripheral in G . Note that $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ is G -invariant but is not DG -invariant. We claim that $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ possesses an unreduced regular neighbourhood $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ in DG , and hence a reduced regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. We recall from [23] that any finite subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ possesses an unreduced regular neighbourhood in DG . As $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, the same holds for a regular neighbourhood of any subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus the proof of Theorem 1.9 which we gave in chapter 12 of [23] shows that the V_0 -vertices of the unreduced regular neighbourhood of a finite subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ must be either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. Now we consider the construction in the proof of Theorem 9.2 of [23]. This constructs $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ by expressing $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ as an ascending union of finite subsets \mathcal{E}_{n+1}^k . We obtain a sequence of bipartite graphs of groups decompositions $\bar{\Gamma}^k$ of DG for each of which, every V_0 -vertex must be either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. The accessibility results of [23] imply that the sequence must stabilise so that $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ exists as required. Further each V_0 -vertex of $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ is either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Let T_{DG} denote the universal covering DG -tree of $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$, and recall that the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} are the CCC's of all the translates by DG of elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$. Now we consider the construction of the unreduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} described in chapter 6 of [23]. One starts by choosing one element of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} from each equivalence class, and then considers the CCC's of these elements. There is a natural map φ from the equivalence classes of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} to the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$, given by

sending the class of Y_H to the class of X_H . Clearly if two elements of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} cross, then the corresponding elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ also cross. Now recall that elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ which cross must do so strongly. It follows that if two elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ cross, then the corresponding elements of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} also cross. Hence φ induces a G -equivariant bijection between the collection P of all CCC's of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} and a subset Q of the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} . It also follows that the pretree structures on P and Q are the same. In particular, the pretree structure on the collection P of all CCC's of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} is discrete. Now the proof of Theorem 3.8 of [23] shows that there is a bipartite G -tree T_G whose quotient by G is the unreduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G . Thus \mathcal{T}_{n+1} also has a reduced regular neighbourhood in G , so the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of G exists.

Recall that each of the edge splittings of Δ crosses no element of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$, and so must be enclosed by some V_1 -vertex of the unreduced regular neighbourhood $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. Thus we can refine $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ by splitting at V_1 -vertices to obtain a graph of groups decomposition $\bar{\Gamma}\Delta$ of DG which also refines Δ . Recall that each element of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ is enclosed by the vertex w of Δ . Thus if we remove the interiors of the edges of $\bar{\Gamma}\Delta$ which correspond to the edges of Δ , we will be left with the single vertex \bar{w} and a connected graph of groups $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ whose fundamental group is $G(w)$, which we continue to identify with G . We claim that $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the unreduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G . Thus the graph of groups Γ_w obtained by reducing $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. In particular, it will then follow immediately that each group in ∂G is conjugate into some vertex group of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, so that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G .

Recall from two paragraphs previously that the map φ induces a G -equivariant injection from the V_0 -vertices of T_G to the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} . It follows that φ induces a G -equivariant injection from the V_0 -vertices of T_G to the V_0 -vertices of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}\Delta}$. Let T denote the subtree of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}\Delta}$ spanned by the V_0 -vertices in the image of φ . As T_G is a minimal G -tree, T must be the minimal G -invariant subtree of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}\Delta}$. It follows that T is the universal covering G -tree of $\bar{\Gamma}_w$, proving that $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the unreduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G , as claimed. Note that it also follows that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is the decomposition of G induced from $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. \square

The properties of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ when ∂G is non-empty are similar to those in the case when ∂G is empty. The fact that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G

plays an important role. Before listing these properties, it will be convenient to introduce the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is defined in the same way as we defined the completions of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ at the end of section 1.

The following result lists the properties of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and its completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ when ∂G is non-empty. As usual, it will be convenient to exclude the case when G is *VPC*. For in that case $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ are equal and consist of a single V_1 -vertex.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that ∂G is non-empty. If G is not *VPC*, then $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ have the following properties:*

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is an essential torus in G .*
 - (b) *v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . (See Definition 4.16. Note that this includes the possibility that v is of interior Seifert type.)*
2. *The V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type. (See Definition 4.22.)*
3. *Each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$.*
4. *If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$.*

Remark 5.5. *It follows from property 4) that $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ is the same as Kropholler's decomposition in [13]. In dimension 3, it is also easy to see that $T_2(G, \partial G)$ is the same as Castel's decomposition in [5].*

Proof. It will be convenient to prove part 3) first.

3) It follows from the proof of Theorem 5.3 that the reduced graphs of groups decompositions $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ and Δ have a common refinement $\Gamma\Delta$ which consists of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and a single extra V_1 -vertex \bar{w} which is joined to $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ by edges e_1, \dots, e_m whose associated splittings are those of Δ . As the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ are isolated or of

$VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, the same holds for the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma\Delta$. Each edge of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, regarded as an edge of $\Gamma\Delta$, determines a splitting of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup. It follows that this splitting is dual to an essential torus in DG . Hence each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, as required.

1) Let v be an isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma\Delta$. If one of the e_i 's is incident to v , then v has only one incident edge e in $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and the inclusion of $G(e)$ into $G(v)$ is an isomorphism. But this contradicts the minimality of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Thus no e_i is incident to v , and v must be an isolated V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$.

Now let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma\Delta$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If no e_i is incident to v , then v is a V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. As each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, it follows that v is of interior Seifert type. If some e_i is incident to v , the associated edge group is a group in ∂G . It follows that v is a V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G .

Thus the V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ are isolated, or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , which completes the proof of part 1) of the theorem.

2) The construction of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ from $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ described in section 1 can only introduce V_0 -vertices of special Seifert type, so part 2) of the theorem holds.

4) First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

Suppose that H is orientable. The hypothesis that H is not conjugate into ∂G implies that H is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G dual to H . As X is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it follows that H is conjugate into $G(v)$. Hence H is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required.

Now suppose that H is non-orientable, and let H_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. If H_0 is conjugate into a group S in ∂G , this conjugate of H_0 will be a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of the $PD(n+1)$ group S and so will be of finite index. Thus S must itself be $VPC(n+1)$ and be conjugate commensurable with H_0 . As H is not conjugate into S , it follows that $Comm_G(S) \neq S$, so Lemma 4.1 implies that G contains S with index 2. But this implies that G is $VPC(n+1)$ which contradicts the hypothesis that G is not VPC . This contradiction shows that H_0 is not conjugate into ∂G .

It follows from the discussion in section 4 that H_0 is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset of G which is dual to H_0 . As $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, it

follows from part 1) of Theorem 1.11 and Remark 1.10 that H_0 must have small commensuriser, which we denote by K . This means that K contains H_0 with finite index, so that K is itself $VPC(n+1)$ and $PD(n+1)$. Note that K must contain H , so that K is non-orientable. We let K_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. Note that K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G , and is not conjugate into ∂G . The preceding paragraph shows that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. As K contains K_0 with finite index, it follows that there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$. If w is a V_0 -vertex, then K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, as required. So we now consider the case when w is a V_1 -vertex. In particular, v and w must be distinct. Thus there is an edge e of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is incident to w such that $G(e)$ contains K_0 . As all the edge groups of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ are torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal K_0 . Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w .

Recall that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is over a $PD(n+1)$ group. If ∂G were empty so that G was a $PD(n+2)$ group, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] would tell us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. As ∂G is not empty this need not be the case, but instead we apply Theorem 8.1 of [1] to the graph of groups structure $\Gamma\Delta$ of DG described in the proof of Theorem 5.4. This shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . Let $\overline{E}(w)$ denote this augmented family of subgroups of $G(w)$, so that the pair $(G(w), \overline{E}(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. As the commensuriser in $G(w)$ of the group $G(e) = K_0$ is not equal to K_0 , Lemma 4.1 shows that K_0 is the only element of the family $\overline{E}(w)$, and $G(w)$ contains K_0 with index 2. Thus w has valence 1, and $G(w)$ equals a conjugate of K . Now it follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, as required. \square

At this point we pause to prove two simple results about VPC groups which will be needed on several occasions.

Lemma 5.6. *Let G be a $VPC(n+1)$ group which splits over a subgroup L . Then L is $VPCn$, and is normal in G with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

Proof. The result is equivalent to asserting that, for a $VPC(n+1)$ group G , any minimal G -tree must be a point or a line. We will prove this by

induction on the length of G . The induction starts when G has length 1. Then G has two ends and the result is standard. Now suppose that G has length $n + 1 \geq 2$, and that the result is known for VPC groups of length $\leq n$. Let T be a minimal G -tree. There is a subgroup G' of finite index in G which normalises some $VPCn$ subgroup L' . By our induction assumption, the action of L' on T must fix a point or have a minimal subtree T' which is a line. In the second case, the minimal subtree of T left invariant by G' must also be T' . In the first case, we let T' denote the fixed subtree of L' , i.e. T' consists of all vertices and edges fixed by L' . The action of G' must preserve T' , so that the quotient group $L' \backslash G'$ acts on T' . As this quotient has two ends, it follows that the minimal subtree of T' left invariant by G' is a point or a line. Thus in either case, the minimal subtree of T left invariant by G' is a point or a line. As G' has finite index in G , this minimal subtree must equal T , so that T itself is a point or a line as required. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let G be a $VPC(n + 1)$ group with a normal $VPCn$ subgroup L such that $L \backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let K be a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of G which is commensurable with L . Then the following hold:*

1. K is contained in L .
2. If $K \backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, then $K = L$.

Proof. 1) If K is not contained in L , then the image of K in the quotient $L \backslash G$ is a nontrivial finite normal subgroup. As neither \mathbb{Z} nor $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ possesses such a subgroup, it follows that K must be contained in L as required.

2) If $K \backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, we can apply the first part with the roles of K and L reversed. We deduce that L is contained in K , so that $K = L$ as required. \square

We also give the following useful technical result about VPC -by-Fuchsian groups.

Lemma 5.8. *Let G be a group with a normal $VPCn$ subgroup L with Fuchsian quotient Φ , and let K be a $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup of G .*

1. *Then $L \cap K$ is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.*
2. *If H is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, and if H is commensurable with L , then H equals $L \cap K$.*

Proof. 1) As L is $VPCn$ and normal in G , the intersection $L \cap K$ must be $VPCk$, for some $k \leq n$, and normal in K . Hence the quotient of K by $L \cap K$ is a VPC subgroup of Φ of length at least 1. As a Fuchsian group can have no $VPC2$ subgroups, it follows that k must equal n and the quotient of K by $L \cap K$ must be $VPC1$. As the only $VPC1$ subgroups of a Fuchsian group are isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, the result follows.

2) This follows from Lemma 5.7. □

We will need some information about the V_1 -vertices of the above torus decompositions. Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let w be a V_1 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w . Recall that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is over a $PD(n+1)$ group. If ∂G is empty so that G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. In general, the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ need not be $PD(n+2)$, but instead we apply Theorem 8.1 of [1] to the graph of groups structure $\Gamma\Delta$ of DG described in the proof of Theorem 5.4. This shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . As any essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it follows that any orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of $G(w)$ is conjugate into one of the groups in $E(w)$. It will be convenient to give a name to this property of a $PD(n+2)$ pair.

Definition 5.9. *An orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal if any orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is conjugate into one of the groups in ∂G .*

Remark 5.10. *As G is torsion free, a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is also torsion free and hence is $PD(n+1)$. Thus it makes sense to say that such a subgroup is orientable.*

Recall from the preceding paragraph that if w is a V_1 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, then the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . The resulting $PD(n+2)$ pair is atoroidal.

This is precisely analogous to the definition of atoroidal for a 3-manifold. In the case when an orientable atoroidal 3-manifold M has boundary consisting of tori it is easy to show that it is annulus free, i.e. that it admits no essential annulus, unless M is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to a twisted

I -bundle over the Klein bottle. We will now prove the algebraic analogue of this fact.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable atoroidal $PD(n+2)$ pair, where $n \geq 1$, and suppose that each group in ∂G is $VPC(n+1)$. Let A and B be groups in ∂G , possibly $A = B$. Let S and T be $VPCn$ subgroups of A and B respectively, and let g be an element of G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. A and B are the same element of ∂G , and $g \in A$.
2. A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , are the only groups in ∂G , and $A = G = B$. Thus $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$.
3. A and B are the same element of ∂G . Further A is the only group in ∂G , and has index 2 in G .

Remark 5.12. *The hypothesis that there is g in G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$ means that the pair $(G, \partial G)$ admits an annulus. The conclusion of the proposition is that either this annulus is inessential (case 1) or that we have the special cases in 2) or 3).*

Proof. As $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal, any orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is conjugate into one of the groups in ∂G . Suppose that G contains a non-orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup K . Then K has a subgroup of index 2 which must be conjugate into a group H of ∂G . As H is $VPC(n+1)$, it follows that K and H are conjugate commensurable. As H cannot contain a non-orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup, it follows that $Comm_G(H) \neq H$. Now Lemma 4.1 shows that ∂G consists of a single group H which has index 2 in G , so that we have case 3) of this proposition. Thus in what follows we will assume that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable.

First we consider the case when A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , so that we do not have case 1) of the proposition.

If gAg^{-1} and B are conjugate commensurable, then Lemma 4.1 shows that we must have case 2) of the proposition.

If A and B are not conjugate commensurable, we will obtain a contradiction. After a suitable conjugation, we can arrange that $A \cap B$ is $VPCn$. Thus A , B and $A \cap B$ contain respectively finite index subgroups A' , B' and L such that L is normal in each of A' and B' , and $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$ are both infinite

cyclic (see Lemma 13.2 of [23]). Thus A' and B' are orientable $PD(n+1)$ groups, and L is PDn . Now let K denote the amalgamated free product $A' *_L B'$, so that L is normal in K with quotient a free group F of rank 2. We identify F with the fundamental group of a surface M which is a disc with two holes, in such a way that two of the boundary components of M carry the groups $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$. Thus F together with the subgroups $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$ and a third infinite cyclic subgroup forms a $PD2$ pair. The pre-images in K of the three boundary groups of this pair yield three $PD(n+1)$ subgroups of K . Theorem 7.3 of [1] implies that K together with these subgroups forms a $PD(n+2)$ pair. Two of these three boundary subgroups of K are equal to A' and B' . As A' and B' are orientable and together generate K , it follows that the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is orientable. The inclusions of A' and B' into G determine a homomorphism of K into G , and we consider the image H in G of the third boundary subgroup $\partial_3 K$ of K . As $\partial_3 K$ is an extension of L by an infinite cyclic group, H is an extension of the $VPCn$ group L by a cyclic group. Thus H is $VPC(n+1)$ or $VPCn$.

If H is $VPC(n+1)$, it must be orientable as we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable. As $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal, this implies that H is conjugate into a group in ∂G . Thus the map from K to G can be regarded as a map of $PD(n+2)$ pairs. Recall that the maps from the boundary subgroups A' and B' of K to the boundary subgroups A and B of G each have non-zero degree. As A and B are distinct, and K has only one other boundary group, it follows that the map from K to G must also have non-zero degree. Hence the image of K in G is a subgroup G' of finite index. Further L must be normal in G' . Recall that we are considering the case where $(G, \partial G)$ admits an annulus with fundamental group L whose boundary lies in the groups A and B of ∂G . As we are also assuming that A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , this annulus is automatically essential. As discussed immediately after Corollary 4.8, an essential annulus with fundamental group L determines a nontrivial L -almost invariant subset of G . In particular, it follows that $e(G, L) > 1$. This implies that $e(G', L) > 1$. As L is normal in G' , it follows that $e(L \setminus G') > 1$. Now we apply Stallings' structure theorem [27][28] for groups with more than one end. If $e(L \setminus G') = 2$, then $L \setminus G'$ is virtually infinite cyclic, so that G' , and hence G , must be $VPC(n+1)$. But then Corollary 4.3 implies that G , A and B are all equal, which contradicts our assumption that A and B are not commensurable. If $e(L \setminus G') = \infty$, then either $L \setminus G'$ is of the form $P *_R Q$, where R is finite, $P \neq R \neq Q$ and one of P and Q contains R with index at least 3, or $L \setminus G'$ is of the

form $P*_R$, where R is finite and at least one of the inclusions of R into P is not an isomorphism. In either case, it is easy to see that $L\backslash G'$ contains infinitely many conjugacy classes of maximal infinite cyclic subgroups. It follows that $L\backslash G'$ contains infinitely many conjugacy classes of maximal two-ended subgroups. As a group is two-ended if and only if it is $VPC1$, the pre-images of these subgroups in G' form an infinite collection of conjugacy classes of maximal $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of G' . Recall that we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable. As G' is of finite index in G , there is a finite family $\partial G'$ of $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of G' such that $(G', \partial G')$ is an orientable atoroidal $PD(n+2)$ pair. Thus any maximal $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G' must be conjugate to one of the groups in $\partial G'$. As $\partial G'$ is a finite family, this is a contradiction, which completes the proof that H cannot be $VPC(n+1)$.

Now consider the case when H is $VPCn$. Recall that L is normal in $\partial_3 K$ with infinite cyclic quotient. Thus L is normal in H with finite cyclic quotient of some order d . There is a d -fold regular cover M_d of the surface M in which the pre-image of the third boundary component of M is a single circle C . Now M_d determines a subgroup K_d of K of index d , and L is normal in K_d with quotient $\pi_1(M_d)$. The boundary component C of M_d determines a boundary subgroup ∂_C of K_d . By construction the image of ∂_C in G is equal to L . We let \overline{M} be obtained from M_d by gluing a disc onto C , and let \overline{K} denote the corresponding quotient of K_d . Thus L is normal in \overline{K} with quotient $\pi_1(\overline{M})$, and \overline{K} yields an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with one less boundary subgroup than K_d . Further the homomorphism from K_d to G factors through \overline{K} . Each boundary subgroup of \overline{K} maps to a conjugate of A or B , so that the map from \overline{K} to G is a map of $PD(n+2)$ pairs. Again we have a map of non-zero degree as it is of non-zero degree on the boundary. Now we argue exactly as in the preceding paragraph to obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof that if A and B are not conjugate commensurable, we have a contradiction.

Finally we consider the case when A and B are the same element of ∂G . This should lead to case 3) of the proposition, but as we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable, we will instead obtain a contradiction. Let K denote the double of G along A . As $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and A is one of the groups in the family ∂G , there is a natural structure of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair on K . Recall that there are $VPCn$ subgroups S and T of A , and an element g of G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Suppose that g does not lie in A , so that we do not have case

1). It follows that $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential annulus with both ends in A . As discussed at the end of section 4, this implies that K admits an essential torus which clearly crosses the torus in K represented by the subgroup A . Now we consider the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(K, \partial K)$. As K admits an essential torus, either this decomposition consists of a single V_0 -vertex or it has at least one edge.

If $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ has at least one edge, then the associated splitting σ of K along an essential torus cannot cross any torus in K . In particular, it cannot cross the torus A , nor can it equal this torus. It follows that σ determines an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$. But this contradicts the fact that $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal. It follows that $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ must consist of a single V_0 -vertex, so that either K is VPC or the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian.

If K is VPC , then G must also be VPC , so Corollary 4.3 tells us that either G has two boundary groups each equal to G , or G has one boundary group which is a subgroup of G of index 2. The first case is not possible as we assumed g does not lie in A , and the second case is not possible, as part 1) of Corollary 4.2 shows that G would be $VPC(n+1)$ and non-orientable which contradicts our assumption that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable.

If the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian, we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup and let Φ denote the quotient Fuchsian group. We can assume that K is not VPC , so Lemma 1.7 tells us that L is unique. Also part 1) of Lemma 5.8 tells us that as A is $VPC(n+1)$, the intersection $A \cap L$ must be $VPCn$ and hence of finite index in L . As K is the double of G along A , it follows that L must be conjugate into a vertex group of this splitting. As L is normal in K , it now follows that A must contain L . Thus G is itself isomorphic to a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the normal $VPCn$ subgroup is L . We denote the quotient group by Θ . As A is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , the group Θ must be infinite. If Θ is two-ended, then G is $VPC(n+1)$, and we have a contradiction by the preceding paragraph. Thus we can assume that Θ is not two-ended. This implies that there are elements δ and ε in Θ of infinite order such that δ and ε have non-zero geometric intersection number. The pre-images in G of the infinite cyclic subgroups of Θ generated by δ and ε are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups D and E of G . Note that $D \cap E = L$. By replacing δ and ε by their squares if needed, we can ensure that they are orientable elements of Φ , so that D and E will be orientable. As δ and ε have non-zero geometric intersection number, it follows that D and E are tori in K which cross. As D and E are subgroups of G , it follows

that D and E are tori in $(G, \partial G)$ which cross. But this contradicts the hypothesis that $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal. This contradiction completes the proof of the proposition. \square

We now apply Proposition 5.11 to get information about the V_1 -vertices of the torus decomposition of a Poincaré duality pair.

Proposition 5.13. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let w be a V_1 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let s and t be edges of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which are incident to w , where possibly $s = t$. Let S and T be $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(s)$ and $G(t)$ respectively, and let g be an element of $G(w)$ such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. $s = t$ and $g \in G(s)$.
2. s and t are distinct and w is isolated, so that s and t are the only edges incident to w , and $G(s) = G(w) = G(t)$.
3. $s = t$, the vertex w has valence 1, and $G(s)$ has index 2 in $G(w)$.

Proof. Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w . If ∂G is empty, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.9, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by some groups in ∂G , and the $PD(n+2)$ pair obtained this way is atoroidal. Applying Proposition 5.11 to this pair yields three cases, which yield the three cases of this proposition. \square

Remark 5.14. *If we consider the completed torus decomposition $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ of the $PD(n+2)$ pair, then the third case in Proposition 5.13 cannot occur. For such V_1 -vertices of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ become V_0 -vertices when $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is completed to $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$.*

We will also need information about the V_0 -vertices of the torus decomposition of a Poincaré duality pair. Part 1) of Theorem 5.4 states that a V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ must be isolated or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . In the next result, we consider the second type of V_0 -vertex.

Lemma 5.15. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let v be a V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . (See Definition 4.16.) Let L denote the VPCn normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient Φ . Let s and t be edges of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which are incident to v , where possibly $s = t$. Let S and T be VPCn subgroups of $G(s)$ and $G(t)$ respectively, and let g be an element of $G(v)$ such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. $s = t$ and $g \in G(s)$.
2. S is commensurable with L .

Proof. Let $E(v)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(v)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to v . If ∂G is empty, then as discussed just before Definition 5.9, the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is orientable $PD(n+2)$. In general, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(v)$ is augmented by some groups in ∂G . Let $\overline{E}(v)$ denote this augmented family of groups. As v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the normal subgroup L of $G(v)$ is contained in each group in $\overline{E}(v)$. Let $\partial\Phi$ denote the family of subgroups of Φ obtained by taking the quotient by L of each group in $\overline{E}(v)$. Thus the pair $(\Phi, \partial\Phi)$ is the orbifold fundamental group of a compact 2-dimensional orbifold $(F, \partial F)$. Note that as v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the group Φ is not finite nor two-ended.

Let S', T' and g' denote the images of S, T and g in Φ , so that we have the equation $g'S'g'^{-1} = T'$ in Φ . If S' is finite, then $S \cap L$ has finite index in S , so that S is commensurable with L , and we have case 2) of the lemma. Otherwise S' is an infinite subgroup of a group H in $\partial\Phi$. Let A denote an infinite cyclic subgroup of S' , and let F_A denote the orbifold cover of F with fundamental group A . Thus F_A has a boundary component which carries A . Also, as A is torsion free, F_A is a surface. If g' does not lie in H , then this surface admits an essential annulus, and so must be an annulus. In particular, F_A is compact and hence a finite cover of F . As Φ is not two-ended, this is impossible so that g' must lie in H , and hence so does T' . Thus S', T' and g' all lie in the same group H in $\partial\Phi$, which means that we have case 1) of the lemma. \square

An important consequence of Proposition 5.13 is the following.

Lemma 5.16. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, let V be a V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of*

Seifert type adapted to ∂G , and let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Then

$$G(V) = N_G(L) = \text{Comm}_G(L)$$

where $N_G(L)$ denotes the normalizer of L in G .

Proof. The inclusions $G(V) \subset N_G(L) \subset \text{Comm}_G(L)$ are all clear. Thus it remains to prove that $\text{Comm}_G(L) \subset G(V)$.

Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and let v denote a vertex of T above V with stabiliser $G(v)$ equal to $G(V)$. Suppose that $\text{Comm}_G(L)$ does not equal $G(V)$. Then there is an element g of $\text{Comm}_G(L)$ which does not fix v , and we let L' denote the intersection $L \cap gLg^{-1}$. Thus L' is a $VPCn$ subgroup of G which fixes both v and gv , and hence fixes every edge on the path λ joining v to gv .

If w is a V_1 -vertex of λ , then L' fixes w and two distinct incident edges. Now Proposition 5.13 shows that w has valence 2 in T and that the two incident edges each have the same stabiliser. It also implies that $G(w)$ contains this stabiliser with index 1 or 2, but we will not need to distinguish these cases. Recall that any V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is isolated or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . If v_0 is an interior V_0 -vertex of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then Lemma 5.15 shows that L' must be commensurable with the $VPCn$ subgroup L_0 of $G(v_0)$ which is normal in $G(v_0)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

Now let μ denote the subinterval of λ between v and the first V_0 -vertex w of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Possibly μ equals λ . The preceding discussion shows that any pair of adjacent edges of μ have the same stabiliser. Thus the stabiliser of μ equals an edge group H of $G(v)$, which is also an edge group of $G(w)$. Hence the subgroup K of G generated by $G(v)$ and $G(w)$ equals $G(v)*_H G(w)$, and K has the natural structure of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. The splitting of K over H is over an essential torus in K . Recall that L is the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient, and let L'' denote the corresponding $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(w)$. If w equals gv , then $L'' = gLg^{-1}$, so that L' is a subgroup of L'' . If w is not equal to gv , then the discussion in the preceding paragraph shows that L' is commensurable with L'' . As L' is contained in L , it follows that in either case L and L'' are commensurable. As each is a normal subgroup of H with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, part 2) of Lemma 5.7 shows that L and L'' must be equal. Thus the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian. It

follows that there is an essential torus in K which crosses the essential torus determined by H , and hence an essential torus in G which crosses the torus determined by H . But this contradicts the fact that the edge splittings of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ do not cross any essential torus in G .

We conclude that every element of $Comm_G(L)$ lies in $G(V)$. Thus $G(V) = N_G(L) = Comm_G(L)$ as required. \square

There is another more technical consequence of Proposition 5.13 which will only be needed in the case when G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, i.e. when ∂G is empty, but the general result is no more difficult. Before stating this result it will be convenient to have the following definition.

Definition 5.17. *Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups structure for a group G , let v be a vertex of Γ , and let X be a H -almost invariant subset of G which is enclosed by v .*

Then X is peripheral in v if X is equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to some edge of Γ which is incident to v .

The word peripheral here is very natural, but the reader should note that when $(G, \partial G)$ is a Poincaré duality pair, this idea may have nothing to do with ∂G .

Lemma 5.18. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let H and H' be essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$ whose dual almost invariant sets X and X' are enclosed by V_0 -vertices V and V' of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Suppose that $H \cap H'$ is a $VPCn$ subgroup K of G . Suppose further that X is not peripheral in V . Then V must be of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, X and X' are both enclosed by V , and K is commensurable with the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient.*

Proof. As X is not peripheral in V , the vertex V of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ cannot be isolated. Thus Theorem 5.4 implies it must be of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. Now part 1) of Lemma 5.8 tells us that the intersection $H \cap L$ must be $VPCn$, and hence of finite index in L .

Suppose that V equals V' . Then part 1) of Lemma 5.8 tells us that the intersection $H' \cap L$ must also be $VPCn$, and hence of finite index in L . Thus the intersection $H \cap H' \cap L$ is of finite index in L , and so is also $VPCn$. As $K = H \cap H'$ is assumed to be $VPCn$, it follows that K and L must be commensurable, as required.

In what follows, we will suppose that V and V' are distinct. Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let v be a vertex above V which is fixed by H and let v' be a vertex above V' which is fixed by H' . Then K fixes the path λ joining v to v' . Now we are in much the same situation as in the proof of Lemma 5.16, with v' in place of gv . Thus if w is a V_1 -vertex of λ , then w has valence 2 in T and the two incident edges each have the same stabiliser, and if v_0 is an interior V_0 -vertex of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then K must be commensurable with the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L_0 of $G(v_0)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

Now we consider the edge e of λ which is incident to v . As K fixes e , it is a subgroup of the torus group $G(e)$. Our hypothesis that X is not peripheral in V implies that $H \cap G(e)$ is commensurable with the normal $VPCn$ subgroup L of $G(v)$. As K is a $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(e)$ and of H , it follows that K must be commensurable with L . It remains to prove that X' must be enclosed by V .

As in the proof of Lemma 5.16, we let μ denote the subinterval of λ between v and the first V_0 -vertex v'' of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . As before any pair of adjacent edges of μ have the same stabiliser. Thus the stabiliser of μ equals the edge group $G(e)$ of $G(v)$, which is also an edge group of $G(v'')$.

If v'' is not equal to v' , so that μ is properly contained in λ , the above discussion shows that K must be commensurable with the normal $VPCn$ subgroup L'' of $G(v'')$. As K is commensurable with L and L'' , it follows that L and L'' are commensurable. As each is a normal subgroup of $G(e)$ with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, Lemma 5.7 shows that L and L'' must be equal. Now the same argument as we used in the proof of Lemma 5.16 yields a contradiction. We deduce that μ must equal λ .

Let e' denote the edge of λ which is incident to v' . As all consecutive edges of λ have the same stabiliser, it follows that $G(e) = G(e')$. If X' is not peripheral in v' , the preceding argument with the roles of X and X' reversed shows that K must be commensurable with the normal subgroup L' of $G(v')$. If X' is peripheral in v' but is not equivalent to the almost invariant set associated to the edge e' , then Lemma 5.15 shows that K must be commensurable with L' . Thus either K is commensurable with L' , or X' is equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to e' . In the first case, we derive a contradiction as before. In the second case, we recall that each interior vertex of λ is isolated or of special Seifert type. Thus consecutive edges of λ not only have the same stabilisers but they

have equivalent associated almost invariant subsets of G . Hence X' must be equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to e , so that X' is enclosed by v , and hence by V , as required. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

6 Enclosing properties of Annulus-Torus Decompositions

Let G denote any almost finitely presented group which has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC subgroups of length less than n . Recall that $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denotes the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups and of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. The decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of G is the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, and its V_0 -vertices correspond to the cross connected components of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Its properties are described in Theorem 1.11. For brevity, we will denote $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ by \mathcal{F} in the rest of this section. In the case when $(G, \partial G)$ is a $PD(n+2)$ pair, we will also consider the family \mathcal{F}' of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups together with all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G . Note that, by Lemma 4.5, nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G are dual to essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$. Thus from the topological point of view, it seems very natural to consider the family \mathcal{F}' . However, one obvious reason why our theory in [23] discusses algebraic regular neighbourhoods of $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ rather than \mathcal{F}' is that, for general groups, there is no analogue of \mathcal{F}' . Another reason is that elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ need not be n -canonical and our methods in [23] cannot handle this situation. In this section, we will show that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' (Corollary 6.4) and that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same reduced regular neighbourhoods (Theorem 6.12). This technical result will be used in section 7 of this paper in a crucial way. It is the algebraic analogue of the situation discussed in the second paragraph of section 1, with $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ being the algebraic analogue of $AT(M)$, the family \mathcal{F}' being the algebraic analogue of the family of all essential annuli and tori in M , and the family \mathcal{F} being the algebraic analogue of the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M .

We will start by showing that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' . To do this we need to consider almost invariant subsets of G which are not adapted to ∂G . We start with the following simple result.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Suppose that X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group H and that X is not adapted to ∂G . Then there is a subgroup S_i of G with a conjugate in ∂G such that $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$.*

Proof. As X is not adapted to ∂G , there is S_i in ∂G , and $g \in G$, such that both $X \cap S_i$ and $X^* \cap S_i$ are not H -finite. By replacing S_i by a conjugate, we can arrange that both $X \cap S_i$ and $X^* \cap S_i$ are not H -finite. Thus both of them are not $(H \cap S_i)$ -finite. Let K denote $H \cap S_i$. Then $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of S_i which is over K , so that $e(S_i, K) > 1$. As K is a subgroup of the $VPC(n+1)$ group H , it must be $VPCk$, for some $k \leq n+1$. As K must have infinite index in the $PD(n+1)$ group S_i , Strebel's result [29] shows that K has cohomological dimension $\leq n$. Thus K is $VPCk$, for some $k \leq n$.

Recall the following long exact cohomology sequence from page 8.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; PE) \rightarrow$$

Here H is a subgroup of a group G , and E denotes $H \backslash G$. Also $H^0(G; PE) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $e(G, H)$ equals the dimension over \mathbb{Z}_2 of $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Thus if $e(G, H) > 1$, then $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ is non-zero. In the setting of the present lemma, as $e(S_i, K) > 1$ we see that $H^1(S_i; \mathbb{Z}_2(K \backslash S_i))$ must be non-zero. As S_i is $PD(n+1)$, this last group is isomorphic to $H_n(S_i; \mathbb{Z}_2(K \backslash S_i))$ which is in turn isomorphic to $H_n(K, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Thus $H_n(K, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is non-zero. As K is torsion free and $VPCk$, for some $k \leq n$, it follows that k must equal n , so that $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$ as required. \square

Now we can prove the following.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Suppose that X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H and is not adapted to ∂G . Then X crosses some nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over some $VPCn$ subgroup of G and is dual to an essential annulus.*

Remark 6.3. *In particular, if such X exists, then there are essential annuli in the pair $(G, \partial G)$ which are over $VPCn$ subgroups of H .*

Proof. The proof of this result is suggested by our arguments in [22]. Since X is not adapted to ∂G , the proof of Lemma 6.1 shows that, after conjugation, there is a group S_i in ∂G such that $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of S_i over $H \cap S_i$, and $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$. We denote $H \cap S_i$ by K . By replacing H by a subgroup of finite index if necessary, we can arrange that H is orientable, that K has a finite index subgroup L which is normal in H , and that the quotient $L \backslash H$ is infinite cyclic. Theorem 7.3 of [1] now implies that L is orientable.

As in section 4, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . We denote the cover of M corresponding to L by M_L . As S_i contains L , there is a component Σ of ∂M_L with fundamental group L . Since L is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient, the quotient $L \backslash H$ acts naturally on M_L , and we obtain infinitely many components of ∂M_L which are translates of Σ and have fundamental group L . Let Y denote the almost invariant subset $L \backslash X$ of $L \backslash G$, and let Z denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_L with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_L; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by Y . As $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial L -almost invariant subset of S_i , both Z and Z^* meet Σ in infinite sets of vertices with finite coboundary. As X is H -invariant, both Z and Z^* also meet each translate of Σ by $L \backslash H$ in infinite sets of vertices with finite coboundary.

As the number of these translates of Σ is infinite, it is certainly greater than 4, so that we can apply Lemma 4.11. As in that lemma, let $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_3$ and Σ_4 denote four distinct translates of Σ by elements of $L \backslash H$, and let A_{ij} denote the annulus in M_L with fundamental group L and joining Σ_i and Σ_j . Let X_{ij} denote the L -almost invariant subset of G dual to A_{ij} , and let Y_{ij} denote the almost invariant subset $L \backslash X_{ij}$ of $L \backslash G$. Let Z_{ij} denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_L with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_L; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by Y_{ij} . The proof of Lemma 4.11 shows that there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l , i.e. Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} and Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* , or vice versa. It follows that Y must cross Y_{ij} because each of the four corners of the pair (Z, Z_{ij}) is infinite as it has infinite intersection with Σ_k or Σ_l . Thus X crosses the L -almost invariant subset X_{ij} of G . As X_{ij} is dual to an essential annulus, this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The point of this proposition is the following corollary.

Corollary 6.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. If X is a n -canonical almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H , then X is automatically adapted to ∂G . Thus \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' .*

Remark 6.5. *As X is adapted to G , it follows from Lemma 4.5 that H must be orientable.*

Proof. If X is not adapted to ∂G , then Proposition 6.2 tells us that X crosses some nontrivial almost invariant set over some $VPCn$ subgroup of G , which contradicts the hypothesis that X is n -canonical. Hence the definitions of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' show that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' , as claimed. \square

Next we give several results about how elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ can cross elements of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 6.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group K . Then the following hold:*

1. *If Y is dual to an essential annulus, then X crosses Y strongly.*
2. *There is an almost invariant set Y' over a group K' commensurable with K such that Y' is dual to an essential annulus and X crosses Y' strongly.*

Proof. As X lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G .

1) Suppose that Y is dual to an essential annulus A . As discussed immediately after the proof of Lemma 4.11, the double DG of G along ∂G contains a torus which is the double of the annulus A . We let DY denote the DK -almost invariant subset of DG associated to this torus. As X is adapted to ∂G , Proposition 2.14 yields a H -almost invariant subset \overline{X} of DG such that $\overline{X} \cap G$ equals X . As X and Y cross, it follows that \overline{X} and DY must also cross. As H and DK are both orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG , each has two coends in DG . Now Proposition 7.4 of [23] shows that \overline{X} and DY must cross each other strongly. This implies that X crosses Y strongly, thus completing the proof of part 1).

2) As in section 4, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union

is denoted ∂M . Consider the cover M_K , the element of $H_f^1(M_K; \mathbb{Z})$ corresponding to $K \setminus Y$ and its dual class α in $H_{n+1}(M_K, \partial M_K; \mathbb{Z})$. The boundary of α has support in only finitely many components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ of ∂M_K . Note that Proposition 4.9 tells us that there must be at least one such component of ∂M_K , and each such component must carry a subgroup of finite index in K . By replacing K by a suitable orientable subgroup of finite index, we can arrange that K is orientable and that each of $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ carries K itself. As K is orientable, we know that $k \geq 2$. For each pair of integers i and j between 1 and k , there is an annulus A_{ij} in M_K whose boundary lies in $\Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_j$. Let X_{ij} denote the dual K -almost invariant subset of G , and let Y_{ij} denote the almost invariant subset $K \setminus X_{ij}$ of $K \setminus G$. Let Z_{ij} denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_K with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_K; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by Y_{ij} . We will show that X must cross one of these Y_{ij} 's. This will be the required Y' . Now part 1) will imply that X crosses Y' strongly.

Let Z denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_K with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_K; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by X . As X is adapted to ∂G , we know that for each component Σ_i of ∂M_K the vertices of Σ_i are almost all in Z or almost all in Z^* . Thus if X crosses none of the Y_{ij} 's, it follows that, after replacing X by X^* if needed, the vertices of each Σ_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, almost all lie in Z . As X and Y_{ij} do not cross, it now follows that $Y_{ij} \leq X$ or $Y_{ij}^* \leq X$. By replacing Y_{ij} by its complement if needed, we can arrange that $Y_{ij} \leq X$, for all i and j . Part 2) of Proposition 4.10 tells us that Y is equivalent to a sum of some of the Y_{ij} 's and their complements. If there are no complements in the sum, then we have $Y \leq X$, which contradicts the assumption that X crosses Y . The same inequality holds if the number of complements in the sum is even. If the number of complements in the sum is odd, then we have $X^* \leq Y$, which again contradicts the assumption that X crosses Y . This contradiction shows that X must cross some Y_{ij} and so completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Two easy consequences are the following results.

Lemma 6.7. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses nontrivial almost invariant sets Y and Y' over $VPCn$ groups L and L' respectively. Then L and L' are commensurable.*

Proof. As X lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G

which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G . By part 2) of Lemma 6.6, we may assume that X crosses Y and Y' strongly. As X crosses Y strongly, it follows that $e(H, H \cap L) \geq 2$. As H is $VPC(n+1)$, it follows that $H \cap L$ is $VPCn$ and hence of finite index in L . Thus by replacing L by a subgroup of finite index, we can assume that it is a subgroup of H . Similarly we can assume that L' is also a subgroup of H . If L and L' are not commensurable, it follows that some element of L' is hyperbolic with respect to Y which implies that Y' crosses Y strongly. Now Corollary 7.10 of [23] implies that L has small commensuriser which contradicts the fact that H commensurises L . This contradiction shows that L and L' must be commensurable as required. \square

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X and X' be elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ such that X crosses X' and also crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group L . Then X' crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y' over a $VPCn$ group L' commensurable with L .*

Proof. As X and X' lie in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, they are nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups H and H' respectively, and are adapted to ∂G . It follows that X and X' must cross each other strongly. Let L' denote the intersection $H \cap H'$, which is $VPCn$. By part 2) of Lemma 6.6, we may assume that X crosses Y strongly, and the proof of Lemma 6.7 shows that we can assume that L is a subgroup of H .

If L and L' are not commensurable subgroups of H , then some element of L' is hyperbolic with respect to Y . This implies that X' crosses Y strongly, thus proving the lemma in this case.

Now suppose that L and L' are commensurable. Lemma 13.1 of [23] implies that there are finite index subgroups H_1 of H and L_1 of L such that L_1 is normal in H_1 with infinite cyclic quotient. We let Γ denote the Cayley graph of G with respect to some finite generating set, and consider the action of $L_1 \backslash H_1$ on the graph $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$. Let h be an element of $H_1 - L_1$. As $L_1 \backslash \delta Y$ is finite, there is a finite connected subcomplex C of $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$ which contains $L_1 \backslash \delta Y$. Thus for all but finitely many elements g of $L_1 \backslash H_1$, we have $gC \cap C$ empty, so that $g(L_1 \backslash Y)$ and $L_1 \backslash Y$ are nested. As X crosses Y strongly, the intersection $Y \cap H_1$ is a nontrivial L_1 -almost invariant subset of H_1 . As $L_1 \backslash H_1$ is infinite cyclic, there is a power h^m of h such that $Y \cap H_1 \subset h^m(Y \cap H_1)$. Thus by replacing h by a suitable power if needed, we can arrange that $Y \subset hY$. Also Y cannot be equivalent to hY . For if this happens, then L_1

has infinite index in $\{g \in H_1 : gY \text{ is equivalent to } Y\}$, and we can apply Theorem 5.8 from [26] to the action of $L_1 \backslash H_1$ on $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$. The proof of this result implies that H_1 must have finite index in G , which is impossible as X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over H .

As h normalises L_1 , each translate $h^n Y$ of Y is also L_1 -almost invariant. If X' crosses Y or any translate $h^n Y$, we will have proved the lemma. Thus we can suppose that X' does not cross $h^n Y$, for any integer n . By replacing X' and Y by their complements if needed, we can arrange that $X' \leq Y$. This implies that $X' \leq h^k Y$ for all $k \geq 0$. We claim that the inequality $X' \leq h^k Y$ cannot hold for every integer k . To see this pick a finite generating set for G and let C denote the corresponding Cayley graph for G . Now recall that given a pair of nontrivial almost invariant subsets U and W of G , each over a finitely generated subgroup of G , there is an integer d such that if $U \leq gW$ then U is contained in the d -neighbourhood of gW , where distances are measured in C . As the intersection of all the $h^k Y$ is empty, the inequalities $X' \leq h^k Y$, for every k , would imply that X' is empty, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim. Thus there must be a least integer k such that $X' \leq h^k Y$. Now by replacing Y by $h^k Y$ if needed, we can suppose that $k = 0$. Thus we have $X' \leq Y$ and $X' \not\leq h^{-1} Y$.

Recall that L and $L' = H \cap H'$ are commensurable. This implies that h and its powers do not lie in L' . Let h_+ denote $\{h^k : k \geq 0\}$, let h_- denote $\{h^k : k \leq 0\}$, and let h_\pm denote $h_+ \cup h_-$. As X and X' cross strongly, it follows that $h_\pm \cap X'$ and $h_\pm \cap X'^*$ each contain points which are arbitrarily far from $\delta X'$. In particular, both sets are infinite. The fact that $X' \leq Y \leq hY \leq h^2 Y \leq \dots$ implies that $h_+ \cap X'$ is finite, so that $h_- \cap X'$ must be infinite.

As we know that X' does not cross $h^{-1} Y$ and $X' \not\leq h^{-1} Y$, we must have one of the inequalities $X' \leq h^{-1} Y^*$, $h^{-1} Y^* \leq X'$ or $h^{-1} Y \leq X'$. If $X' \leq h^{-1} Y^*$, then $X' \leq h^{-k} Y^*$, for every $k \geq 0$, so that $h_- \cap X'$ is finite, which is a contradiction. If $h^{-1} Y^* \leq X'$, the inequality $X' \leq Y$ implies that $h^{-1} Y^* \leq Y$, which is impossible as $h^{-1} Y \subset Y$. Thus we must have $h^{-1} Y \leq X'$. Now this implies that X' crosses the nontrivial L_1 -almost invariant set $Y' = Y^* \cup h^{-1} Y$, completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 6.9. *Example 2.13 of [25] shows that Lemmas 6.7 and 6.8 are not valid if X is not adapted to ∂G . In that example, G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M constructed by gluing two Seifert fibre spaces M_1 and M_2 along a boundary torus T , so that the Seifert fibrations*

do not match. Thus the given decomposition of M is essentially its JSJ decomposition. Denote $\pi_1(T)$ by H , and let σ' denote the splitting of G over H determined by T . Note that σ' is adapted to ∂G . Let X' denote a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to σ' .

In this example, each M_i has at least one boundary component other than T , and so admits essential annuli disjoint from T . Thus M itself admits essential annuli, so that G does possess nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC1 subgroups. We described a splitting σ of G over H which crosses σ' , and is not adapted to ∂G . Let X denote a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to this splitting. Thus X crosses X' . We also showed that X crosses annuli in M_1 and M_2 . As annuli in M_1 and M_2 carry incommensurable subgroups of G , Lemma 6.7 fails. It follows from results we proved in [25] that X' is 1-canonical, i.e. X' does not cross any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a VPC1 subgroup. Thus Lemma 6.8 also fails.

Now we can start on the proof that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same regular neighbourhoods. We want to show that the reduced regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}')$ of \mathcal{F}' is isomorphic to the reduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} , which is $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. It seems natural to approach this by proving that each element of \mathcal{F}' is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, but this seems hard to do directly. Instead we will consider our construction of unreduced regular neighbourhoods from [23]. We will show that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same unreduced regular neighbourhoods which will immediately imply that they also have the same reduced regular neighbourhoods. Briefly our construction goes as follows. Let E denote a G -invariant family of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G , and assume that the elements of E are in good position. Thus we have a G -invariant partial order \leq on E , essentially given by almost inclusion. A cross-connected component (CCC) of E is an equivalence class of the equivalence relation generated by crossing. We let P denote the collection of CCC's of E . We showed that there is a natural idea of betweenness on the elements of P which gives it a pretree structure. If this pretree is discrete, we can construct a bipartite G -tree T with P as its V_0 -vertices, and the graph of groups $\Gamma = G \setminus T$ is the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of the family E .

Let $P(\mathcal{F})$ denote the collection of all CCC's of elements of \mathcal{F} , and let $P(\mathcal{F}')$ denote the collection of all CCC's of elements of \mathcal{F}' . Thus $P(\mathcal{F})$ and $P(\mathcal{F}')$ have natural pretree structures. As we know that \mathcal{F} has an unreduced regular neighbourhood, we know that $P(\mathcal{F})$ is a discrete pretree. Recall that

Corollary 6.4 shows that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' . This inclusion yields a natural map $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$, which is clearly G -equivariant. We will show that φ is a G -equivariant bijection such that φ and φ^{-1} preserve the pretree idea of betweenness. Thus φ induces a G -equivariant isomorphism of the pretrees. This implies that the pretree determined by \mathcal{F}' is discrete, so that \mathcal{F}' has an unreduced regular neighbourhood in G which is isomorphic to the unreduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} . Thus the reduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}' in G is isomorphic to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ as required.

Recall that $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ consists of all those nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G , but are not n -canonical. In particular every element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ crosses some element of \mathcal{F} . It follows immediately that $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$ is surjective. We will show in the proof of Theorem 6.12 that it is injective. Note also that φ clearly preserves betweenness in the sense that if three CCC's A , B and C of $P(\mathcal{F})$ satisfy ABC , i.e. B is between A and C , and if the image vertices A' , B' and C' of $P(\mathcal{F}')$ are distinct, then $A'B'C'$. But it is not automatic that φ^{-1} preserves betweenness, and this needs proof in the special case under consideration. We give here a simple example which makes clear that this is a real and subtle problem.

Example 6.10. *Let M denote the compact surface obtained from the 2-disc by removing the interiors of two subdiscs. Thus $G = \pi_1(M)$ is free of rank 2. Let λ and μ denote two simple essential arcs properly embedded in M and intersecting transversely in a single point which cannot be removed by an isotopy of λ and μ . Let $N(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda \cup \mu)$ denote regular neighbourhoods of λ and $\lambda \cup \mu$ respectively, and let $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ denote the bipartite graphs of groups decompositions of G which are determined by the frontiers in M of $N(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda \cup \mu)$ respectively. Then $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ will be non-isomorphic graphs of groups. Now λ and μ determine almost invariant subsets $X(\lambda)$ and $X(\mu)$ of G obtained by lifting them to arcs $\bar{\lambda}$ and $\bar{\mu}$ in the universal cover of M and choosing one side of the lift. We can regard $\Gamma(\lambda)$ as the algebraic regular neighbourhood of $X(\lambda)$ and can regard $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ as the algebraic regular neighbourhood of the family $\{X(\lambda), X(\mu)\}$. As λ is a simple arc on M , the translates of $\bar{\lambda}$ are disjoint, so that the family $E(\lambda)$ of translates of $X(\lambda)$ and its complement is nested. Thus each CCC of $E(\lambda)$ consists of a single translate of $X(\lambda)$. If we let $E(\lambda, \mu)$ denote the family of translates of $X(\lambda)$ and $X(\mu)$ and their complements, then each CCC of $E(\lambda, \mu)$ will consist of a single translate of $X(\lambda)$ and a single translate of*

$X(\mu)$. In each case, the stabiliser of each CCC is trivial. Thus if $P(\lambda)$ and $P(\lambda, \mu)$ denote the families of CCC's of $E(\lambda)$ and $E(\lambda, \mu)$, the natural equivariant map φ from $P(\lambda)$ to $P(\lambda, \mu)$ is a bijection. Further it is clear that φ preserves betweenness. But this cannot be true for the inverse map φ^{-1} . For the fact that $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ are not isomorphic implies that the pretree structures on $P(\lambda)$ and $P(\lambda, \mu)$ must be different.

The following technical result is the key to handling this difficulty.

Lemma 6.11. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above, and let $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$ be the natural map. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses an almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group K , and let B denote the CCC of $P(\mathcal{F})$ which contains Y so that the CCC $\varphi(B)$ of $P(\mathcal{F}')$ contains X and Y . Then*

1. Y cannot be isolated in \mathcal{F} .
2. If U and V belong to CCC's A and C of $P(\mathcal{F})$ such that $A \neq B \neq C$, and if $U \leq X \leq V$, then there is an element Z of B such that $U \leq Z \leq V$.

Proof. As X lies in \mathcal{F}' , it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G .

1) If Y is isolated in \mathcal{F} , then part 4) of Proposition 4.10 implies that Y is dual to an annulus. Now part 1) of Lemma 6.6 implies that X crosses Y strongly. Thus $e(H, H \cap K) \geq 2$, so that $H \cap K$ must be $VPCn$, and so of finite index in K . Now Lemma 13.1 of [23] shows that, by replacing H and K by subgroups of finite index, we can suppose that K is a subgroup of H and is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient. Let h be an element of $H - K$. As K is normal in H , the translate hY of Y is also K -almost invariant. As Y is assumed to be isolated in \mathcal{F} , no translate $h^n Y$ of Y can cross Y . As in the proof of Lemma 6.8, by replacing h by a suitable power if needed, we can suppose that $Y \subset hY$. Also as in that proof, Y cannot be equivalent to hY . Now it follows that Y crosses the nontrivial K -almost invariant set $hY^* \cup h^{-1}Y$, so that Y cannot be isolated. This contradiction completes the proof of part 1).

2) If X crosses Y weakly, part 2) of Lemma 6.6 shows that there is a K' -almost invariant set Y' such that K' is commensurable with K , and Y' is dual to an annulus. It also shows that X crosses Y' strongly and hence that H

commensurises K' . In particular K' , and hence K , has large commensuriser. Now Proposition 8.6 of [23] shows that all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G over subgroups commensurable with K belong to a single CCC apart from a finite number which are isolated. (Note that this proposition as stated only applies to the case when K is $VPC1$, but essentially the same proof works in general.) As X crosses Y and Y' , part 1) tells us that Y and Y' cannot be isolated, so it follows that Y and Y' belong to the same CCC B . Thus, by replacing Y by Y' if needed, we can assume that Y is dual to an annulus, so that X crosses Y strongly.

As in part 1), we can further assume that K is a subgroup of H and is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient. In particular, it follows that H must preserve the CCC B , so that for every $g \in H$, we have gY belongs to B . As no element of the CCC A can cross any element of B , it follows that, for every $g \in H$, we have $U \leq gY^{(*)}$. Similarly, for every $g \in H$, we have $gY^{(*)} \leq W$. By replacing Y by its complement if needed, we can suppose that $U \leq Y$.

Now we consider the action of $K \backslash H$ on $K \backslash \Gamma$, and let h be an element of $H - K$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.8, by replacing h by a suitable power and Y by its complement if needed, we can suppose that $Y \subset hY$. Also as in that proof, Y cannot be equivalent to $h^n Y$, for any non-zero value of n . As $U \leq Y$, the inclusion $Y \subset hY$ implies that $U \leq h^k Y$ for all $k \geq 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.8, the inequality $U \leq h^k Y$ cannot hold for every integer k , and by replacing Y by a suitable translate $h^k Y$ if needed, we can suppose that $U \leq Y$ and $U \not\leq h^{-1} Y$. Thus we must have $U \leq h^{-1} Y^* \subset h^{-2} Y^*$, and hence $U \leq Y \cap h^{-2} Y^*$. Let R denote the intersection $Y \cap h^{-2} Y^*$. As $h^{-2} Y^*$ is K -almost invariant, it follows that R is also K -almost invariant. Now let Z denote the intersection $R \cap X$. We claim that Z is a K -almost invariant subset of G . Certainly $KZ = Z$ as each of R and X is invariant under the left action of K . The coboundary δZ of Z is the union of subsets of δR and δX . As δR is K -finite, it remains to show that $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ is K -finite. Now δX is H -finite, and contains the union of the translates $h^n(\delta Z \cap \delta X)$, for every integer n . As the translates of R by powers of h are all disjoint, it follows that the translates of $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ by powers of h are all disjoint. Now it follows that $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ must be K -finite, so that δZ itself is K -finite as required. Recall that we have the inequalities $U \leq R$ and $U \leq X$, so that we also have $U \leq Z$. Finally we claim that as $Z = Y \cap h^{-2} Y^* \cap X$, it crosses $hZ = hY \cap h^{-1} Y^* \cap X$. For $Z \cap hZ$ contains U , and so must be nontrivial, and similar comments apply to the other corners of the pair (Z, hZ) . Thus

Z is a nontrivial and non-isolated almost invariant subset of G over K and hence must belong to the CCC B . Now the inequalities $U \leq Z \leq X \leq V$ complete the proof of part 2) of the lemma. \square

Theorem 6.12. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Let \mathcal{F} denote the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups and of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Thus the reduced regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} exists and is $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Let \mathcal{F}' denote the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups together with all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G . Then \mathcal{F}' has a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G , and this is naturally isomorphic to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.*

Proof. Recall our discussion immediately before Example 6.10. There is a natural G -equivariant surjection $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$. We need to show that φ is an injection and that $P(\mathcal{F})$ and $P(\mathcal{F}')$ have the same pretree idea of betweenness.

Suppose that φ is not injective. Then there must be elements Y_0 and Y_1 of \mathcal{F} , belonging to distinct CCC's v_0 and v_1 of $P(\mathcal{F})$, and a sequence X_1, \dots, X_n of elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ such that X_1 crosses Y_0 , and X_n crosses Y_1 , and X_i crosses both X_{i-1} and X_{i+1} , for each i such that $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. Let X_i be almost invariant over H_i , and Y_j over K_j , and note that each H_i is orientable. We claim that $H_1 \cap K_0$ has finite index in K_0 . If X_1 crosses Y_0 strongly, then $e(H_1, H_1 \cap K_0) \geq 2$. As H_1 is $VPC(n+1)$, it follows that $H_1 \cap K_0$ must be $VPCn$ and so the claim follows in this case. If X_1 crosses Y_0 weakly, then part 2) of Lemma 6.6 tells us that there is a nontrivial almost invariant set Y' over a group K' commensurable with K_0 such that X_1 crosses Y' strongly. As before this implies that $H_1 \cap K'$ must be $VPCn$, so it follows that $H_1 \cap K_0$ must also be $VPCn$, and the claim follows in this case also.

Now Lemma 13.1 of [23] implies that a subgroup of finite index in H_1 commensurises $H_1 \cap K_0$ and hence commensurises K_0 itself, so that K_0 has large commensuriser in G . Proposition 8.6 of [23] shows that the collection of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 form a single CCC apart from finitely many isolated elements. Part 1) of Lemma 6.11 shows that Y_0 cannot be isolated. Thus the CCC v_0 of $P(\mathcal{F})$ which contains Y_0 contains all the nontrivial and non-isolated almost invariant subsets of G which are over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 . As X_1 crosses an element of v_0 , and also crosses X_2 , Lemma 6.8 shows

that X_2 must cross some nontrivial almost invariant subset Y_2 of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 . Again part 1) of Lemma 6.11 shows that Y_2 cannot be isolated. It follows that Y_2 lies in the CCC v_0 . Now, by induction, it follows that each X_i must cross some element of v_0 . Thus X_n crosses an element Z_0 of v_0 and the element Y_1 of v_1 . Lemma 6.7 shows that Z_0 and Y_1 must have commensurable stabilisers, and Lemma 6.11 shows that Y_1 cannot be isolated. But this implies that Y_1 also lies in the CCC v_0 , which contradicts our assumption. This completes the proof that φ is injective and hence is a bijection.

Finally Lemma 6.11 shows that the betweenness relations on the two pretrees $P(\mathcal{F}')$ and $P(\mathcal{F})$ are the same, which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7 Proof of the Main Theorem

In this section we use our work from previous sections to show how our main result, Theorem 4.27, follows from Theorem 1.11. One of the things we need to prove when $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair is that all the edge splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are dual to essential annuli and tori. If an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ is incident to a V_0 -vertex v which is isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, it is trivial that the edge group is $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. But if v is of commensuriser type, then we do not even know that the edge group is finitely generated. However we will show in this section that when $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair the edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are all $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. Assuming this, the following result shows that the edge splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are all dual to essential annuli and tori.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC . Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup. Let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . (See Theorem 1.11.) Finally let e be an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with associated edge splitting σ .*

1. *If $G(e)$ is $VPCn$, then σ is dual to an essential annulus in G .*
2. *If $G(e)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, then σ is dual to an essential torus in G .*

Proof. Let X denote the $G(e)$ -almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge splitting σ . As σ is an edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, it follows that X crosses no element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. If $G(e)$ is $VPCn$, then X is automatically an element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, and hence is an isolated element. Now part 4) of Proposition 4.10 implies that X is dual to an essential annulus in G , as required. If $G(e)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, the fact that X crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPCn$ subgroup implies that X is n -canonical and so is again an element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Now Corollary 6.4 and Remark 6.5 show that X is adapted to ∂G and that $G(e)$ is orientable, so that X is dual to an essential torus in G , as required. \square

Recall that part 1) of Theorem 1.11 states that each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

- a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$.
- b) v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n .
- c) v is of commensuriser type, so that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n+1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

We will consider cases b) and c) in the lemmas which follow. We start with case b), where v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n .*

1. *If $k = n$, then v is of interior Seifert type (see Definition 4.14).*
2. *If $k = n-1$, then v is of I -bundle type (see Definition 4.13).*

Proof. 1) As v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, the groups associated to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v are all $VPC(n+1)$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splittings of G associated to these edges are dual to essential tori. It follows that v is of interior Seifert type, as claimed.

2) In this case $G(v)$ is $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian where the Fuchsian quotient group Θ is not finite nor two-ended, and there is exactly one edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$ and this edge carries K . Let $E(v)$ denote the collection of these edge groups. Note that each group in $E(v)$ is $VPCn$. Thus Lemma 7.1 implies that the

edge splittings of G associated to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v are dual to essential annuli.

We claim that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$. Let L denote the $VPC(n-1)$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient Θ . Let $\partial\Theta$ denote the family of subgroups of Θ which are the images of the groups in $E(v)$, so that the pair $(\Theta, \partial\Theta)$ is a Fuchsian pair. If Θ is torsion free, then the pair $(\Theta, \partial\Theta)$ is $PD2$. In this case, as L is $PD(n-1)$, Theorem 7.3 of [1] implies that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$. In general Θ has a torsion free subgroup of finite index, and the pre-image in $G(v)$ of this subgroup yields a $PD(n+1)$ pair of finite index in $G(v)$. As $G(v)$ is torsion free, it follows that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ itself is $PD(n+1)$, as claimed. Note that this pair need not be orientable.

Consider any orientation preserving non-peripheral element α in Θ of infinite order. As Θ is not finite nor two-ended, there is another orientation preserving non-peripheral element β in Θ of infinite order such that α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number. Thus α and β determine nontrivial almost invariant subsets of Θ such that each is over an infinite cyclic subgroup, each is adapted to $\partial\Theta$, and they cross strongly. The pre-images in $G(v)$ of these subsets of Θ are almost invariant subsets of $G(v)$ such that each is over a $VPCn$ subgroup, each is adapted to $E(v)$, and they cross strongly. We denote these $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(v)$ by C and D . Now Proposition 2.14 shows us that we can extend these sets to almost invariant subsets P and Q of G over C and D such that P and Q are enclosed by v . As the almost invariant subsets of $G(v)$ cross strongly, P and Q must also cross strongly. Now Proposition 7.2 of [23] shows that C and D must each have two coends in G . Note that $C \cap D$ equals the $VPC(n-1)$ normal subgroup L of $G(v)$. As in section 4, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Now we consider the covers M_L , M_C and M_D of M with fundamental groups L , C and D respectively.

Suppose that C and D are orientable. The fact that G possesses a non-trivial C -almost invariant subset implies that M_C has at least two boundary components which carry a subgroup of C of finite index. As C has two coends in G , part 3) of Proposition 4.10 shows that the number of such boundary components of M_C and of each finite cover of M_C is exactly 2. Hence each of these two boundary components of M_C must carry C itself. We denote these two boundary components by $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 M_C$. Note that it follows that C preserves precisely two boundary components of the uni-

versal cover \widetilde{M} of M , and that all other C -orbits of boundary components of \widetilde{M} are infinite. Now as in section 4, there is an untwisted annulus A and a map $\theta : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_C, \partial M_C)$ which is an isomorphism on fundamental groups and sends $\partial_1 A$ into $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 A$ into $\partial_2 M_C$. Similarly D preserves precisely two boundary components of the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M , and all other D -orbits of boundary components of \widetilde{M} are infinite. We denote by $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 M_D$ the images in M_D of the two boundary components of \widetilde{M} which are preserved by D . Also there is an untwisted annulus B and a map $\phi : (B, \partial B) \rightarrow (M_D, \partial M_D)$ which is an isomorphism on fundamental groups and sends $\partial_1 B$ into $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 B$ into $\partial_2 M_D$.

Now we consider the pre-images of these annuli in the common cover M_L of M_C and M_D . Above θ we have a map θ_L into M_L of a two-ended cover A_L of A , and θ_L maps ∂A_L into the two components of ∂M_L which lie above $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 M_C$. Similarly above ϕ we have a map ϕ_L into M_L of a two-ended cover B_L of B , and ϕ_L maps ∂B_L into the two components of ∂M_L which lie above $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 M_D$. The fact that P crosses Q strongly implies that $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ must cross the image of ϕ_L strongly, in the natural sense that $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ contains points arbitrarily far from the image of ϕ_L and on each side. In particular $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ must meet the image of ϕ_L , and hence must meet $\phi_L(\partial_1 B_L)$ or $\phi_L(\partial_2 B_L)$. As the same argument applies to $\theta_L(\partial_2 A_L)$, it follows that the two components of ∂M_L which contain $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ and $\theta_L(\partial_2 A_L)$ are the same as the two components of ∂M_L which contain $\phi_L(\partial_1 B_L)$ and $\phi_L(\partial_2 B_L)$. Hence C and D preserve the same two boundary components Σ and T of the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M .

If either C or D is not orientable, we apply the above arguments to their orientable subgroups of index 2. We will see that the action of the group generated by C and D on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} has one orbit with the two elements Σ and T , and all other orbits are infinite.

Let Θ_0 denote the subgroup of Θ generated by all orientation preserving non-peripheral elements, and let $G(v)_0$ denote the pre-image of Θ_0 in $G(v)$. Thus Θ_0 has index at most 2 in Θ , so that $G(v)_0$ has index at most 2 in $G(v)$. Consider the action of $G(v)_0$ on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} . As any two orientation preserving non-peripheral elements of Θ belong to a finite sequence of such elements each crossing the next, it follows that Σ and T form one or two orbits and that all other orbits are infinite. It follows that the same statement holds for the action of $G(v)$ on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} .

Let K denote a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$, let e_K denote the edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v and carries K , and let $\theta_K : (A_K, \partial A_K) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ be an essential annulus which is dual to the edge splitting associated to e_K . We need to show that the annulus θ_K equals $K_{\Sigma,T}$. In general there can be many distinct annuli all carrying the same group, so there is something to be proved.

Let S denote the stabiliser of Σ , so that S is one of the groups in ∂G . We first consider the case when no element of $G(v)$ interchanges Σ and T , so that $G(v)$ is contained in S . As v is a vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with associated group $G(v)$, there is a natural induced decomposition of S as the fundamental group of a graph of groups $\Gamma(S)$, with a vertex V with associated group $S \cap G(v) = G(v)$. Further the stars of v in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of V in $\Gamma(S)$ are isomorphic, i.e. there is a bijection between the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v and the edges of $\Gamma(S)$ incident to V , and corresponding edges have the same associated groups. Note that $\Gamma(S)$ is probably not minimal, and may well be infinite. However, as S is finitely generated, there is a finite minimal subgraph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ of $\Gamma(S)$ which carries S .

Recall from the start of this proof that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$. In particular, $G(v)$ itself is not $PD(n+1)$. Also each group in $E(v)$ is $VPCn$. As S is $PD(n+1)$, and $G(v)$ is not $PD(n+1)$ nor $VPCn$, it follows that the minimal graph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ must contain V , and at least one edge incident to V . As S is $PD(n+1)$, Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(V), E_\mu(V))$ is $PD(n+1)$, where $E_\mu(V)$ denotes the family of subgroups of $G(V)$ associated to edges of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ incident to V . As the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$, and $G(V) = G(v)$ and $E_\mu(V)$ is a subfamily of $E(v)$, it follows that the families $E_\mu(V)$ and $E(v)$ must be equal. In particular every edge of $\Gamma(S)$ which is incident to V must also be an edge of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$. Recall that K is a group in $E(v)$, that e_K denotes the edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v and carries K , and that $\theta_K : (A_K, \partial A_K) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ denotes an essential annulus which is dual to the edge splitting associated to e_K . Let φ_K denote the lift of θ_K into $M_{G(v)}$. As the edge of $\Gamma(S)$ corresponding to e_K is an edge of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$, it follows that the splitting of G over K associated to e_K induces a splitting of S over K . This implies that φ_K must have a boundary component on the image of Σ in $M_{G(v)}$. The same argument applied to the stabiliser of T shows that φ_K must also have a boundary component on the image of T in $M_{G(v)}$. Hence the annulus θ_K must be $K_{\Sigma,T}$, which completes the proof of the lemma, on the assumption that no element of $G(v)$ interchanges Σ and T .

If there are elements of $G(v)$ which interchange Σ and T , we let S denote the stabiliser of Σ , and let $G(v)_0$ denote $S \cap G(v)$. Note that in this case the images of Σ and T in $M_{G(v)}$ are the same. Then we make essentially the same argument as in the preceding paragraph. This time the vertex V of $\Gamma(S)$ has associated group $G(v)_0$. Given the edge e_K of the star of v in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which has associated group K , the star of V in $\Gamma(S)$ has either one corresponding edge with associated group K or it has two corresponding edges each with associated group K_0 , where $K_0 = K \cap G(v)_0$. As the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$, it follows that the pair $(G(V), E(V))$ is also $PD(n+1)$. Hence as above, the minimal subgraph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ of $\Gamma(S)$ which carries S must contain V and each edge of $\Gamma(S)$ which is incident to V . Thus, as before, the lift φ_K of the annulus θ_K into $M_{G(v)}$ must have all of its boundary on the image of Σ . Note that there are two cases here, depending on whether the annulus A_K is twisted or untwisted. In either case it follows that the annulus θ_K must be $K_{\Sigma,T}$, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we consider the case when v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type. This is the most difficult case, and we will need most of our previous work in this paper. Note that in Theorem 1.11, the vertex group $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ need not even be finitely generated. Before we start, here is a preliminary result.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of commensuriser type such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

Then v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over a subgroup of H of finite index, and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross.

Proof. As $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , any V_0 -vertex arises from a cross-connected component (CCC) of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. As v is of commensuriser type, all the crossings in this CCC must be weak and all the almost invariant sets in this CCC are over groups commensurable with H . As in section 4, we consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . By replacing H by an orientable subgroup if needed, we can assume that the cover M_H of M with fundamental group H has at least

two boundary components which carry a subgroup of H of finite index. We claim that some finite cover of M_H must have at least four such boundary components. For otherwise, there is a subgroup K of finite index in H such that ∂M_K has either two or three boundary components which carry a subgroup of finite index in K , and each such component carries K itself. In the first case, there is a K -almost invariant subset Y of G such that any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a subgroup of finite index in H is equivalent to Y or Y^* . In the second case there are K -almost invariant subsets Y_1, Y_2 and Y_3 of G such that any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a subgroup of finite index in H is equivalent to Y_i or Y_i^* , for some i . In either case, none of these almost invariant sets crosses each other, which contradicts our assumption that v is of commensuriser type. It follows that some finite cover of M_H has at least four such boundary components, as claimed. Now Lemma 4.11 shows that we can find almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over a subgroup of H of finite index, and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. When $n = 1$, Proposition 8.6 of [23] shows that X and X' must be enclosed by the V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and essentially the same argument applies for all values of n . \square

Recall that we want to consider a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, and that we do not even know that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ is finitely generated. We first deal with two special cases when $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ is certainly finitely generated.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If H has finite index in $G(v)$, then v is of solid torus type (see Definition 4.20).

Proof. Let e_1, \dots, e_m denote the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v , and denote the associated subgroups of $G(v)$ by H_1, \dots, H_m . The hypothesis implies that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ is itself $VPCn$. Hence each H_i is also $VPCk$, for some $k \leq n$. Now Lemma 4.26 implies that G cannot split over a $VPCk$ subgroup if $k < n$. It follows that each H_i is $VPCn$, and now Lemma 7.1 tells us that the edge splitting of G associated to e_i is dual to an essential annulus A_i . It remains to show that the boundaries of these

annuli all carry the same subgroup of $G(v)$. We write ∂H_i for the group carried by the boundary of A_i . Note that as each H_i is a $VPCn$ subgroup of the $VPCn$ group $G(v)$, it must be of finite index in $G(v)$. Thus each H_i is commensurable with H .

Lemma 7.3 shows that v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over a subgroup of H of finite index, and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. By replacing H by a subgroup of finite index, we can assume that X and X' are both H -almost invariant. As discussed in section 4, the doubles of these annuli are tori T and T' in DG . These tori must cross and are therefore enclosed by the same V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Hence V is not an isolated vertex, so that V must be of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. We let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. As T and T' are non-peripheral tori enclosed by V , Lemma 5.18 shows that the intersection group $T \cap T'$ must be commensurable with L . As $T \cap T'$ contains the $VPCn$ group H , it follows that H is commensurable with L , and hence that each H_i is also commensurable with L . Let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i . The tori T_i and T have the $VPCn$ subgroup $H \cap H_i$ in common. As T is non-peripheral in V , Lemma 5.18 shows that T_i must also be enclosed by V . Now Lemma 7.5 below shows that ∂H_i must equal L , as required. This completes the proof that v is of solid torus type. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and suppose that G has a splitting over a $VPCn$ subgroup H_i which is dual to an essential annulus A_i in $(G, \partial G)$. Let ∂H_i denote the group carried by the boundary of A_i , and let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling A_i . Let V denote a vertex of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, and let L denote the normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Suppose that T_i is enclosed by V , and that H_i is commensurable with L . Then ∂H_i equals L .*

Proof. Observe that ∂H_i is a normal subgroup of T_i with quotient Q isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, depending on whether the annulus A_i is untwisted or twisted. As ∂H_i is assumed to be commensurable with L , part 2) of Lemma 5.8 implies that ∂H_i equals $L \cap T_i$, so that ∂H_i must be contained in L .

As in section 4, it will again be convenient to consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces which correspond to ∂G whose union is denoted by ∂M . Let Σ be a component of ∂M such that one end of A_i is in Σ . The splitting of G over H_i determined

by A_i induces a splitting of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ over ∂H_i . Thus part 3) of Corollary 4.2 shows that ∂H_i is a maximal orientable $VPCn$ subgroup of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. Now DG splits over $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ and this induces the splitting of T_i over ∂H_i . As ∂H_i is contained in L , we can identify Q with a subgroup of the Fuchsian quotient group of $G(V)$ by L . Now we consider the full pre-image \overline{T}_i of Q in $G(V)$. Thus L is normal in \overline{T}_i with quotient Q . In particular \overline{T}_i is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of $G(V)$ which contains T_i with finite index. As the splitting of DG over $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ induces a splitting of T_i over ∂H_i , it follows that it induces a splitting of \overline{T}_i over some subgroup L' of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ which contains ∂H_i with finite index. Thus L and L' must be commensurable. As \overline{T}_i splits over L' , Lemma 5.6 shows that L' must be a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of \overline{T}_i with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Now part 2) of Lemma 5.7 shows that L' must equal L . In particular, it follows that $\partial H_i \subset L \subset \pi_1(\Sigma)$. Recall from Lemma 4.15 that L must be orientable. Now the maximality of ∂H_i among orientable $VPCn$ subgroups of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ implies that ∂H_i must equal L , as required. \square

Next we consider a case where $Comm_G(H)$ contains H with infinite index, but still must be finitely generated.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, then v is of torus type (see Definition 4.24).

Proof. As $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, and G cannot split over a $VPCk$ subgroup with $k < n$, it follows that the group associated to each edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v must be $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splittings of G associated to these edges are dual to essential annuli or tori. Let $\Sigma(v)$ denote the collection of all these splittings.

We start by considering the number of splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ which can be dual to an essential torus. Note that such a splitting must be over a maximal orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , by part 3) of Corollary 4.2. If $G(v)$ is orientable, any such edge splitting must be over $G(v)$. If $G(v)$ is non-orientable, then any such edge splitting must be over $G(v)_0$, the orientable subgroup of $G(v)$ of index 2. Let $T_{n,n+1}$ denote the universal covering G -tree of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and let w denote a vertex of $T_{n,n+1}$ above v and with stabiliser

$G(v)$. If $G(v)$ is orientable, suppose that two of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ are dual to an essential torus, and if $G(v)$ is non-orientable, suppose that one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ is dual to an essential torus. In either case, there are two distinct edges of $T_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to w and have the same stabiliser, which is $G(v)$ or $G(v)_0$. Let X and Y denote the almost invariant subsets of G associated to these edges. As each is dual to the same essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ they must be equivalent. Now Corollary 4.16 of [23] implies that w must have valence 2, and that any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is enclosed by w is equivalent to X , which contradicts our assumption that v encloses nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G over the $VPCn$ group H .

The above paragraph shows that if $G(v)$ is orientable, then at most one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ can be dual to a torus, and if $G(v)$ is non-orientable, then none of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ can be dual to a torus. Further if $G(v)$ is orientable and one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ is dual to a torus, the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ shows that there must also be a splitting in $\Sigma(v)$ which is dual to an essential annulus. Thus in all cases, $\Sigma(v)$ must contain at least one splitting which is dual to an essential annulus. Let e_1, \dots, e_m denote all those edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v and have associated edge splitting dual to an essential annulus. Denote the associated $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(v)$ by H_1, \dots, H_m . Let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i associated to the edge splitting of G over H_i .

Lemma 7.3 implies that v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. Further we can assume that X and X' are both H -almost invariant. The doubles of these annuli are tori in DG which must cross, and are therefore both enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus neither torus is peripheral in V , and V is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient, then H is commensurable with L .

We now consider the case when $G(v)$ is orientable. Let W denote the almost invariant subset of DG which is over $G(v)$.

As H_i is a subgroup of $G(v)$, the tori T_i and $G(v)$ have the $VPCn$ subgroup H_i in common. If W is not peripheral in V , then Lemma 5.18 shows that the almost invariant subset of DG associated to the torus T_i must be enclosed by V , and that H_i is commensurable with L . Now Lemma 7.5 shows that ∂H_i must equal L . As ∂H_i is a subgroup of $G(v)$ which in turn is a subgroup of $G(V)$, and as L is normal in $G(V)$, it follows that ∂H_i is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(v)$ with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, so that

$G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . If W is peripheral in V , then we will need a different argument which we give later.

We next consider how the $VPC(n+1)$ group $G(v)$ sits in G . There are three cases.

The first case is when $G(v)$ is conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G . Note that this implies that no edge incident to v has associated splitting dual to an essential torus. As in section 4, it will again be convenient to consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces which correspond to ∂G whose union is denoted by ∂M . Let Σ be a component of ∂M such that $G(v)$ is a subgroup of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. As $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ must contain $G(v)$ with finite index, it is conjugate into some vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus either $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ equals $G(v)$, or some edge incident to v has associated group equal to $G(v)$. As the second case is impossible, $G(v)$ must equal $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. Consider the cover M_H of M with fundamental group equal to H . There will be a component of ∂M_H which covers Σ and has fundamental group H . As we already know that M_H admits essential annuli which carry H , it follows that there is an essential annulus in M which carries H and has one end on Σ . Doubling such an annulus yields a torus in DG which crosses the torus Σ . It follows that the $G(v)$ -almost invariant subset W of DG associated to $G(v)$ is not peripheral in the V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ which encloses W , so the argument in the preceding paragraph applies and shows that each ∂H_i equals L . As above, it also follows that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . Thus we have case 1) of Definition 4.24.

If $G(v)$ is not conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G , then we let Y denote the nontrivial $G(v)$ -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G . As Y is adapted to ∂G , Theorem 6.12 tells us that it must be enclosed by some V_0 -vertex w of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. If w is not equal to v , then there must be an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v , and carries $G(v)$. Thus in any case, Y is enclosed by v . Now we have two subcases depending on whether or not Y is peripheral in v .

If Y is not peripheral in v , then Y must cross some almost invariant subset Z of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and belongs to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . Lemma 6.6 shows that Y must cross some almost invariant subset Z' of G also over a subgroup commensurable with H and dual to an annulus in $(G, \partial G)$. Now part 1) of Lemma 6.11 shows that Z' cannot be isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ and so must also belong to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . We conclude that Y crosses some annulus enclosed by v . It follows that W crosses the torus which is the double of this

annulus. As above this implies that W is not peripheral in V , and hence that each ∂H_i equals L , and that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . As v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and Y is enclosed by v and is over $G(v)$, it follows that Y crosses no torus in G so that Y determines a splitting of G over $G(v)$. As Y is enclosed by v and is not peripheral in v , this shows that we have case 3) of Definition 4.24.

If Y is peripheral in v , we let e be the edge to which Y is associated. We also let X_i denote the H_i -almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge e_i . Now the definition of betweenness in our construction of an algebraic neighbourhood in [23] implies that there is an element Z of the CCC which gives rise to v which lies between X_i and Y . More precisely, there is a nontrivial almost invariant subset Z of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and which is enclosed by v such that $Y^{(*)} \leq Z \leq X_i^{(*)}$, where $Y^{(*)}$ denotes one of Y or Y^* . As H_i stabilises both X_i and Y , it follows that H_i lies within some bounded neighbourhood of δZ . In turn this implies that a subgroup of finite index in H_i must stabilise Z . Thus H_i and H must be commensurable. As H is commensurable with L , it follows that H_i is commensurable with L , and now Lemma 7.5 shows that ∂H_i must equal L . As above, it also follows that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . Thus we have case 2) of Definition 4.24.

This completes the proof that v is of torus type, in the case when $G(v)$ is orientable.

Now we consider the case when $G(v)$ is non-orientable, and we let W denote the almost invariant subset of DG which is over $G(v)_0$. As before W is enclosed by V .

If $G(v)_0$ is conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G , then the non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group $G(v)$ is commensurable with that group in ∂G . Now part 1) of Corollary 4.2 shows that G itself must be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and that G must contain $G(v)_0$ with finite index. In particular it would imply that G is $VPC(n+1)$, which is excluded in our hypotheses. Thus $G(v)_0$ cannot be conjugate to a subgroup of any group in ∂G , so we let Y denote the nontrivial $G(v)_0$ -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G . As before Y must be enclosed by v . As we showed earlier that no edge incident to v can have associated splitting dual to an essential torus, it follows that Y cannot be peripheral in v . As in the case when $G(v)$ is orientable, this implies that W is not peripheral in V , and hence that each ∂H_i equals L . As $G(v)$ contains $G(v)_0$ with finite index, $G(v)$ is contained in $G(V)$, after a suitable conjugation. As L is contained

in $G(v)_0$, it is also contained in $G(v)$, and the quotient $G(v)/L$ is a *VPC1* subgroup of the Fuchsian quotient $G(V)/L$. Hence $G(v)/L$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, so that $G(v)$ splits over L . Thus $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i , for each i , as required.

As v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and Y is enclosed by v and is over a subgroup of index 2 in $G(v)$, it follows that Y determines a splitting σ of G over $G(v)_0$. As $G(v)$ contains $G(v)_0$ with finite index, it must be conjugate into one of the vertex groups K of this splitting. Note that the splitting σ is dual to an essential torus in G . Thus, if ∂G is empty, Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair formed by K and one or two copies of $G(v)_0$ is $PD(n+2)$, where there will be two copies of $G(v)_0$ if σ is a HNN extension and only one copy otherwise. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.9, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when some family of groups in ∂G is added to the copies of $G(v)_0$. As K contains a conjugate of $G(v)$, one of the copies of $G(v)_0$ in ∂K is not equal to its own commensuriser in K . Thus Lemma 4.1 implies that K contains this copy of $G(v)_0$ with index 2, so that K must be a conjugate of $G(v)$, and ∂K consists only of $G(v)_0$. In particular it follows that σ must be an amalgamated free product and not a HNN extension.

As Y is enclosed by v , we can refine $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ by splitting at v to obtain a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma_{n,n+1}$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group associated to e is equal to $G(v)_0$, and the associated edge splitting is σ . As $G(v)$ contains $G(v)_0$ with finite index, one vertex of e must carry $G(v)$ and the other must carry $G(v)_0$. Let w denote the vertex of e with $G(w) = G(v)$. Recall from the preceding paragraph that σ is an amalgamated free product and that one vertex group of σ is conjugate to $G(v)$. It follows that the edge e of Γ' is separating, and that if we remove the interior of e from Γ' then the component of the resulting subgraph which contains w must carry the group $G(v)$. As $G(w)$ equals $G(v)$, the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that this subgraph must consist solely of w , so that w has valence 1 in Γ' . This shows that we have case 4) of Definition 4.24, and so completes the proof that v is of torus type in all cases. \square

Now we consider the general situation of a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type. Note that a priori, the group $G(v)$ need not be finitely generated, but we show not only that $G(v)$ is finitely generated, but also describe its structure.

Lemma 7.7. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If H has infinite index in $G(v)$, and $G(v)$ is not $VPC(n+1)$, then v is of Seifert type (see Definition 4.18).

Proof. Lemma 7.3 implies that v must enclose two almost invariant subsets of G , each dual to an annulus and crossing each other. Further we can assume that each is over H . The doubles of these annuli are tori in DG which must cross, and are therefore both enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus neither torus is peripheral in V , and V is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient Φ , then H is commensurable with L . Now Lemma 5.16 tells us that $G(V) = Comm_{DG}(L)$. It follows that $G(V)$ is also equal to $Comm_{DG}(H)$, and so $G(V)$ contains $Comm_G(H) = G(v)$. Thus $G(v)$ is itself a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the normal $VPCn$ subgroup H' is commensurable with H . (But note that at this stage it is still possible that $G(v)$ is not finitely generated!) As we are assuming H has large commensuriser, it follows that the Fuchsian quotient group Θ must be infinite. Further as $G(v)$ is not $VPC(n+1)$, the quotient Θ cannot be two-ended. This implies that there are elements α and β in Θ of infinite order such that α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number. The pre-images in $G(v)$ of the infinite cyclic subgroups of Θ generated by α and β are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups A' and B' of $G(v)$. Note that $A' \cap B' = H'$.

If we regard α and β as elements of Φ , the pre-images in $G(V)$ of the same infinite cyclic subgroups are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups A and B of $G(V)$. By replacing α and β by their squares if needed, we can ensure that they are orientable elements of Φ , so that A and B will be orientable. As α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number, it follows that A and B are tori in DG which cross. As A' and B' are subgroups of finite index in A and B respectively, they also are tori in DG which cross. As A' and B' are subgroups of $G(v)$ which is a subgroup of G , it follows that A' and B' are tori in G which are enclosed by v and which cross.

Now we consider the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Each of A' and B' must be enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. As A' and B' cross, they must both be enclosed by a single V_0 -vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, and neither

is peripheral in u . Thus u is not isolated, and so Theorem 5.4 shows that u must be of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Let L' denote the normal subgroup of $G(u)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Recall that A' and B' are tori in G which cross and that $A' \cap B' = H'$. Lemma 5.18 implies that H' is commensurable with L' . Now Lemma 5.16 implies that $G(u)$ equals $Comm_G(L')$. It follows that $G(u) = Comm_G(L') = Comm_G(H') = Comm_G(H) = G(v)$. Note that as $G(u)$ is finitely generated, it follows that $G(v)$ must be finitely generated. As each of H' and L' is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient, Lemma 1.7 shows that H' and L' must be equal.

Now Theorem 6.12 shows that each essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ which is enclosed by the vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is also enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. As the tori which are enclosed by u and are not peripheral in u form a single CCC, they must all be enclosed by v . It follows that the vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by the vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus there is a refinement Γ' of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and a vertex v' of Γ' , such that the projection map $p : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma_{n,n+1}$ sends v' to v and is an isomorphism apart from the fact that certain edges incident to v' are mapped to v . Further the vertex v' , like u , is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , and $G(v') = G(u)$ maps isomorphically to $G(v)$. This last fact implies that if e is an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and mapped to v , then the other vertex w of e has associated group equal to $G(e)$. As Γ' is minimal there is at least one other edge incident to w , and each such edge must carry a subgroup of the $VPC(n+1)$ group $G(w) = G(e)$. Thus each such edge carries a $VPCk$ subgroup of G , where $k \leq n+1$. As usual, Lemma 7.1 tells us that the associated splitting of G must be dual to an essential annulus or torus in $(G, \partial G)$. If one of these other edges incident to w has associated splitting dual to an essential torus, the edge group must equal $G(e)$, so that the vertex w of Γ' has two incident edges with associated splittings over the same essential torus. In this case, as in the proof of Lemma 7.6, Corollary 4.16 of [23] implies that w must have valence 2, and we modify Γ' by collapsing the edge e . By repeating this process we will arrange that if e is an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and mapped to v , with the other vertex of e being w , then each other edge e_i incident to w must carry a $VPCn$ subgroup H_i of $G(w) = G(e)$, so that the associated edge splitting is dual to an annulus A_i in $(G, \partial G)$. As usual we write ∂H_i for the group carried by ∂A_i . At this point we have proved that most of Definition 4.18 holds. It remains to show that ∂H_i equals L' , for each i , where L' is the normal subgroup of $G(u) = G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

The image of e_i in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is an edge incident to v , so its associated edge splitting is enclosed by v . The edge splitting of G associated to the edge e of Γ' is dual to a torus T which is also enclosed by v . We claim that the torus T cannot be peripheral in v . To see this we need to consider the universal covering G -trees T' and $T_{n,n+1}$ of Γ' and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ respectively. Let V' be a vertex of T' above v' with stabiliser equal to $G(v')$. Let E be an edge of T' above e which is incident to V' and has stabiliser equal to $G(e)$, let W denote the other vertex of E , and let E_i denote an edge of T' above e_i which is incident to W and has stabiliser equal to H_i . Orient E and E_i towards V' , and let Z_E and Z_i denote the associated almost invariant subsets of G . The orientations imply that $Z_i^* \leq Z_E^*$. If T were peripheral in v , the fact that Z_i is enclosed by v would imply that $Z_E^* \leq Z_i$ or $Z_E^* \leq Z_i^*$. The first inequality would imply that $Z_i^* \leq Z_i$, which is obviously impossible. The second inequality would imply that Z_i and Z_E were equivalent. This is impossible as their stabilisers are not commensurable, as H_i is $VPCn$ and $G(e)$ is $VPC(n+1)$. This contradiction shows that the torus T cannot be peripheral in v , as claimed.

Now let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i with fundamental group H_i . As T is not peripheral in v , it must cross some almost invariant subset of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and belongs to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . As in the proof of Lemma 7.6, Lemmas 6.6 and 6.11 imply that T crosses some annulus enclosed by v , and so crosses the torus obtained by doubling this annulus. Lemma 5.18 then implies that T and this torus are enclosed by the vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ and are not peripheral in V . As H_i is contained in $G(e)$, Lemma 5.18 now shows that T_i is enclosed by V and that H_i is commensurable with L . Lemma 7.5 then shows that ∂H_i must equal L . In particular, $G(e)$ contains L . As $G(e)$ is an edge torus of the V_0 -vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it must contain L' . As L and L' are commensurable normal $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(e)$ each of which has quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, Lemma 5.7 implies that L' equals L . We conclude that ∂H_i equals L' , for each i . We have now established all the requirements in Definition 4.18, so that v must be of Seifert type in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, as required. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.7. \square

We are finally ready to prove our main result. For the convenience of the reader we restate it.

Theorem 4.27. (*Main Result*) *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair*

such that G is not VPC. Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a VPC n subgroup, together with all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a VPC $(n+1)$ subgroup. Finally let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ denote the completion of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ have the following properties, in addition to those which follow immediately from the properties of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ described in Theorem 1.11:

1. Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:
 - (a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$, and the edge splittings associated to the two edges incident to v are dual to essential annuli or tori in G .
 - (b) v is of VPC $(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of I -bundle type. (See Definition 4.13.)
 - (c) v is of VPC n -by-Fuchsian type, and is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 4.14.)
 - (d) v is of commensuriser type. Further v is of Seifert type (see Definition 4.18), or of torus type (see Definition 4.24) or of solid torus type (see Definition 4.20).
2. The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type (see Definition 4.22) or of special solid torus type (see Definition 4.20).
3. Each edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is dual to an essential annulus or torus in G .
4. Any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a VPC $(n+1)$ group and adapted to ∂G is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and also by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. This vertex cannot be of I -bundle or solid torus type.
5. If H is a VPC $(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.

Proof. 1) Recall that part 1) of Theorem 1.11 states that each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

- a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n + 1$.
- b) v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n - 1$ or n .
- c) v is of commensuriser type, and $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$

for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n + 1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

We will consider each type of V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ in turn.

a) Suppose that a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n + 1$. Let e denote either of the two edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v . Then $G(e)$ equals $G(v)$ and so is VPC of length n or $n + 1$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splitting of G associated to e is dual to an essential annulus or torus. It follows that we have case 1a) of Theorem 4.27.

b) Suppose that a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n - 1$ or n . If $k = n$, part 1) of Lemma 7.2 shows that v is of interior Seifert type, so that we have case 1c) of Theorem 4.27. If $k = n - 1$, part 2) of Lemma 7.2 shows that v is of I -bundle type, so that we have case 1b) of Theorem 4.27.

c) Suppose that v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, and that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n + 1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

If H has length $n + 1$, we recall from part 1) of Theorem 1.11 and Remark 1.10 that v encloses elements X and Y of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which are over a subgroup H' of finite index in H , and which cross weakly. Now Corollary 6.4 and Remark 6.5 imply that as X and Y are n -canonical, they must be adapted to ∂G , and H' must be orientable. Thus X and Y are dual to essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$. Now Proposition 2.14 tells us that there are H' -almost invariant subsets \bar{X} and \bar{Y} of DG such that $\bar{X} \cap G$ equals X and $\bar{Y} \cap G$ equals Y . As X and Y cross weakly, it follows that \bar{X} and \bar{Y} also cross weakly. But Proposition 7.4 of [23] implies that no almost invariant subset of DG can cross \bar{X} weakly, as H' has only 2 coends in DG . This contradiction shows that v cannot be of commensuriser type.

If H has length n , there are three cases depending on the index of H in $Comm_G(H)$. In all three cases, we have case 1d) of Theorem 4.27.

If this index is finite, Lemma 7.4 shows that v is of solid torus type.

If this index is infinite and $Comm_G(H)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$, Lemma 7.6 shows that v is of torus type.

In the remaining case, Lemma 7.7 shows that v is of Seifert type.

We have now shown that each V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted graph of groups $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies part 1) of the theorem.

2) A V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ which is obtained by the completion process arises from a V_1 -vertex w of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. It suffices to show that w is of special Seifert type or of special solid torus type. Recall that either $G(w)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$, or $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, or $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$. We consider each case.

If $G(w)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$, then Lemma 7.1 shows that the edge splitting associated to e is dual to an essential torus. It follows that w is of special Seifert type.

In the remaining cases, each edge incident to w carries a $VPCn$ group, so that Lemma 7.1 shows that the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus.

If $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, let H denote $G(e)$, let A denote the annulus associated to e , and let ∂H denote the subgroup of H carried by ∂A . We claim that A is untwisted. Assuming this claim, it follows that ∂H equals H and so has index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, which implies that w is of special solid torus type. It remains to prove the claim.

As usual we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to H . If A is twisted, then its lift into M_H has boundary in a single component Σ of ∂M_H whose fundamental group must equal ∂H . First suppose that H is normal in $G(w)$, so that the quotient $G(w)/H$ acts on M_H . Thus ∂M_H has two or three distinct components whose fundamental group equals ∂H , and each of these components contains the boundary of an essential twisted annulus. The double cover $M_{\partial H}$ must have two boundary components above each such component of ∂M_H , each with fundamental group equal to ∂H , giving a total of four or six such boundary components of $M_{\partial H}$. Part 3) of Proposition 4.10 now shows that H has at least 4 coends in G . This implies that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type with $G(v) = Comm_G(H)$. But w is a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $G(w)$ commensurises H , so that $G(w) \subset G(v)$. As w has a single incident edge e and $G(e) \neq G(w)$, this is impossible. This contradiction shows that if H is normal in $G(w)$, then the annulus A must be untwisted, as claimed. Now suppose that H is not normal in $G(w)$, so that

H has index 3 in $G(w)$. Let H_1 denote the intersection of the conjugates of H in $G(w)$. Thus H_1 is a normal subgroup of $G(w)$ of index some power of 3. If A_1 denotes the cover of A with fundamental group H_1 , the fact that this cover has odd degree implies that A_1 is itself a twisted annulus in M_1 . Now the preceding argument yields a contradiction, showing that the annulus A must be untwisted as claimed. This completes the proof that w must be of special solid torus type when $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$.

If $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has three incident edges e_1, e_2 and e_3 , each carrying $G(w)$, we let K denote $G(w)$, and let A_i denote the annulus associated to the edge e_i . We claim that each A_i is untwisted. Assuming this claim, it follows that the boundary of each A_i carries K , which implies that w is of special solid torus type. It remains to prove the claim.

As K is a torsion free $VPCn$ group it is also PDn . If K is orientable, then any annulus with fundamental group K must be untwisted, and if K is non-orientable, then any annulus with fundamental group K must be twisted.

Now suppose that K is non-orientable, so that each A_i is twisted. As usual we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M_K denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to K , and let M_0 denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to K_0 , the orientable subgroup of K of index 2. The lift of each annulus A_i into M_K has boundary in a single component Σ_i of ∂M_K whose fundamental group must equal K_0 . As the A_i 's determine non-conjugate splittings of G , the Σ_i 's must be distinct. As above, the double cover M_0 of M_K has two boundary components above each Σ_i each with fundamental group equal to K_0 . It follows that K has at least 6 coends in G , which implies that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type with $G(v) = Comm_G(K)$. Further any almost invariant subset of G over a subgroup commensurable with K must be enclosed by v . In particular, for each i , the K -almost invariant subset of G associated to e_i is enclosed by v . This implies that there is a path λ_i in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with v at one end and with the edge e_i at the other end, and each interior vertex of λ_i is isolated. As $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is reduced bipartite, each λ_i contains at most two edges. As v is a V_0 -vertex and w is a V_1 -vertex, it follows that each λ_i consists of the single edge e_i . Thus each e_i has v and w as its endpoints. Let Γ_K denote the subgraph of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which consists of the union of the e_i 's. As each e_i and w have associated group K , and $G(v)$ commensurises K , it follows that the group carried by Γ_K also commensurises K . But as $G(v)$

is the full commensuriser of K , this is impossible. This contradiction shows that K must be orientable, so that each A_i is untwisted, as claimed. This completes the proof that w must be of special solid torus type when $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$, and so completes the proof of part 2) of the theorem.

3) Part 3) of this theorem is a trivial consequence of parts 1) and 2), as the definitions of the various types of vertex (Definitions 4.13, 4.14, 4.18, 4.20, 4.22 and 4.24) all contain the requirement that the edge splittings be dual to an essential annulus or torus.

4) We note that any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group which is adapted to ∂G lies in the family \mathcal{F}' . Now Theorem 6.12 shows that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ equals the regular neighbourhood of the family \mathcal{F}' . Thus any element of \mathcal{F}' is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. The construction of the completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ shows that any element of \mathcal{F}' is also enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. The first sentence of part 4) follows.

The second sentence of part 4) is clear because if a vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is of I -bundle type or solid torus type, then the associated group $G(v)$ cannot contain a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup.

5) First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

Suppose that H is orientable. The hypothesis that H is not conjugate into ∂G implies that H is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G dual to H . Now Theorem 6.12 shows that X is enclosed by a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, so that H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and hence is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ as required.

Now we will suppose that H is non-orientable and is not conjugate into any V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. The proof of part 4) of Theorem 5.4 shows that the commensuriser K of H in G is itself a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Let K_0 denote the orientation subgroup of K . Then K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G , and the proof of part 4) of Theorem 5.4 shows that it is not conjugate into ∂G . Thus there is a nontrivial K_0 -almost invariant subset X of G which is adapted to ∂G . Theorem 6.12 shows that X is enclosed by a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, so that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. Our assumption that H is not conjugate into any V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that the same is true for K . As K contains K_0 with finite index, there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$, and w must be a V_1 -vertex. Hence there is an edge e of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to w such that $G(e)$ contains K_0 . As all the edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ are annulus

or torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal K_0 . Let σ denote the splitting of G over K_0 determined by the edge e , so that σ is dual to an essential torus in G , and let L denote the vertex group of σ which contains $G(w)$. If ∂G is empty, Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair formed by L and one or two copies of K_0 is $PD(n+2)$, where there will be two copies of K_0 if σ is a HNN extension and only one copy otherwise. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.9, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when some family of groups in ∂G is added to the copies of K_0 . As L contains a conjugate of K , one of the copies of K_0 in ∂L is not equal to its own commensuriser in L . Thus Lemma 4.1 implies that L contains this copy of K_0 with index 2, and ∂L consists only of K_0 . In particular it follows that σ must be an amalgamated free product and not a HNN extension. Now the inclusions $K_0 \subset K \subset G(w) \subset L$ hold up to conjugacy. It follows that $G(w)$ is equal to L and must be a conjugate of K . Hence the edge e of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is separating, and if we remove the interior of e from $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, then the component Γ_w of the resulting subgraph which contains w must carry the group $G(w)$. Now the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that Γ_w consists solely of w , so that w has valence 1 in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. It follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required. \square

We observe the following result which again shows the similarity between the algebra in this paper and the topology of 3-manifolds.

Lemma 7.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC. Suppose that X is a n -canonical almost invariant subset of G which is over a VPC($n+1$) group H , and that H intersects some group in ∂G in a VPC n group L . Then X is isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$.*

Proof. As usual, Lemma 13.1 of [23] tells us that H has a subgroup H' of finite index which normalises a subgroup L' of finite index in L . As in section 4, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M' denote the covering space of M with fundamental group L' . The hypothesis that H intersects some group in ∂G in the group L implies that there is a component of $\partial M'$ with fundamental group L' . The action of H'/L' on M' yields an infinite family of distinct such boundary components. Now the proof of part 3) of Lemma 4.10 shows that $e(G, L')$ is infinite.

As H' normalises L' , it also follows that L' has large commensuriser. Thus there is a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ such that $G(v) = Comm_G(L')$, so that $G(v)$

must contain H' . Also $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex w corresponding to the CCC of \mathcal{F} which contains X , and v and w must be distinct as X is n -canonical. It follows that there is a path joining v and w such that H' lies in the edge group of each edge on the path. Let e be an edge on this path. Recall that all edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ are $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. Thus $G(e)$ must be $VPC(n+1)$ and must contain H' with finite index. Let Y denote the almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge splitting of G given by e . Lemma 7.1 tells us that Y is adapted to ∂G . Now Corollary 6.4 tells us that X is also adapted to ∂G . But a H' -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G is unique up to equivalence and complementation, so it follows that X must be equivalent to Y or Y^* . As Y is isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, it follows that X is also isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. \square

8 Concluding remarks

Since one of the main results in the JSJ theory of 3-manifolds is Johansson's Deformation Theorem [11], it is natural to ask whether there is an analogous result for Poincaré duality pairs. Some of our discussion and definitions have been rather topological in order to suit the setting of group pairs and duality. A more algebraic description of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ should involve Poincaré duality triads rather than pairs, since a vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ has two distinct important types of subgroups, namely the edge groups and the intersection groups with ∂G . We feel that a reformulation in these terms and a strengthening of the statements would be necessary in order to formulate the analogue of Johansson's Deformation Theorem. In [35] Wall studied the notion of triads of Poincaré complexes. It is natural to ask whether our algebraic decompositions can be realised using finite aspherical Poincaré complexes. Suppose that G is the fundamental group of such a complex X of dimension $n+2$ and that G splits over a $VPCn$ group H . A basic question is whether X splits over a subcomplex Y with $\pi_1(Y) = H$. One expects to have to change the complex X to achieve this, so it seems better to ask whether there is a finite complex X' of the same simple homotopy type as X , such that X' splits over a suitable subcomplex Y . This involves the study of some obstruction groups most studied by Waldhausen [34]. For a general torsion free $VPCn$ group H , these obstruction groups are not well understood, so the problem seems difficult. But if we assume that H is torsion free and polycyclic, then Waldhausen's work shows that the obstruction groups are

zero, so that we can find such a complex X' as desired. However, even if we try to restrict our attention to almost invariant subsets of G over torsion free polycyclic subgroups, it seems possible that the edge groups of the decompositions we obtain may be VPC . If the edge groups are polycyclic, as happens in the 3-dimensional case, then the analogue of Johannson's Deformation Theorem can be formulated. We expect this analogue to be correct for 3-dimensional Poincaré duality pairs, and finite aspherical Poincaré 3-complexes. In general it may be true only when the peripheral groups are polycyclic.

References

- [1] R. Bieri and B. Eckmann, Relative homology and Poincaré duality for group pairs, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 13 (1978), 277-319.
- [2] B. H. Bowditch, Splittings of finitely generated groups over two-ended subgroups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 354 (2002), no. 3, 1049–1078.
- [3] K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 87, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.
- [4] A. Casson and D. Jungreis, Convergence groups and Seifert fibered 3-manifolds, *Invent. Math.* 118 (1994), no. 3, 441–456.
- [5] F. Castel, Centralisateurs dans les groupes à dualité de Poincaré de dimension 3, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 338 (2004), no. 12, 935–940.
- [6] M. J. Dunwoody and E. Swenson, The Algebraic Torus Theorem, *Invent. Math.* 140 (2000), 605–637.
- [7] D. Gabai, Convergence groups are Fuchsian groups, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 136 (1992), no. 3, 447–510.
- [8] R. Geoghegan, *Topological methods in group theory*, to appear in the series Graduate Texts in Mathematics (Springer Verlag).
- [9] V. Guirardel, P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Adapted almost invariant sets, in preparation.

- [10] W. Jaco and P. B. Shalen, Seifert fibered spaces in 3-manifolds, *Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc.* vol. 21, Number 220 (1979).
- [11] K. Johannson, Homotopy equivalences of 3-manifolds with boundary, *Lecture notes in Mathematics* 761 (Springer-Verlag, 1979).
- [12] M. Kapovich and B. Kleiner, Coarse Alexander duality and duality groups, *J. Differential Geom.* 69 (2005), no. 2, 279–352.
- [13] P. H. Kropholler, An analogue of the torus decomposition theorem for certain Poincaré duality groups, *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* (3) 60 (1990), 503–529.
- [14] P. H. Kropholler, A note on centrality in 3-manifold groups, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 107 (1990), no. 2, 261–266.
- [15] P. H. Kropholler and M. A. Roller, Relative ends and duality groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 61 (1989), 197–210.
- [16] P. H. Kropholler and M. A. Roller, Splittings of Poincaré duality groups II, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) 38 (1988), no. 3, 410–420.
- [17] G. Mess, Examples of Poincaré duality groups, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 110 (1990), no. 4, 1145–1146.
- [18] H. Müller, Decomposition theorems for group pairs, *Math. Z.* 176 (1981), 223–246.
- [19] G. A. Niblo, M. Sageev, P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Minimal cubings, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 15 (2005), no. 2, 343–366.
- [20] M. Sageev, Ends of group pairs and non-positively curved cube complexes, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3) 71 (1995), no. 3, 585–617.
- [21] P. Scott, Strong annulus and torus theorems and the enclosing property of characteristic submanifolds of 3-manifolds, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* (2) 35 (1984), 485–506.
- [22] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Splittings of groups and intersection numbers, *Geometry and Topology* 4 (2000), 179–218.

- [23] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Regular neighbourhoods and canonical decompositions for groups, *Astérisque* 289 (2003). vi+233 pages.
- [24] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, errata pages for "Regular neighbourhoods and canonical decompositions for groups", <http://math.lsa.umich.edu/~pscott/>.
- [25] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Canonical splittings of groups and 3-manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353 (2001), 4973-5001.
- [26] P. Scott and C. T. C. Wall, Topological methods in group theory, *Homological Group Theory*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 36 (1979), 137–214.
- [27] J. R. Stallings, On torsion-free groups with infinitely many ends, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 88 (1968), 312–334.
- [28] J. R. Stallings, *Group theory and three-dimensional manifolds*, Yale Mathematical Monographs 4, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1971.
- [29] R. Strebel, A remark on subgroups of infinite index in Poincaré duality groups, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 52 (1977), no. 3, 317–324.
- [30] R. G. Swan, Groups of cohomological dimension one, *J. Algebra* 12 (1969), 585–610.
- [31] G. A. Swarup, Relative version of a theorem of Stallings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 11 (1977/78), no. 1–3, 75–82.
- [32] G. A. Swarup, On the ends of pairs of groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 87 (1993), no. 1, 93–96.
- [33] F. Waldhausen, On the determination of some bounded 3-manifolds by their fundamental groups alone, *Proc. of the International symposium on Topology and its applications*, Here's-Novi, Yugoslavia, Beograd, 1969, 331–332.
- [34] F. Waldhausen, Whitehead groups of generalized free products, *Algebraic K-theory, II: "Classical" algebraic K-theory and connections with arithmetic* (Proc. Conf., Battelle Memorial Inst., Seattle, Wash., 1972), pp. 155–179, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 342, Springer, Berlin, (1973).

- [35] C. T. C. Wall, Poincaré complexes I, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 86 (1967), 213–245.
- [36] C. T. C. Wall, The geometry of abstract groups and their splittings, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 16 (2003), no. 1, 5–101.