

JSJ decompositions of pro- p groups

Pavel Zalesskii*

December 1, 2025

Abstract

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preliminaries	6
2.1	Trees	7
2.2	G-trees	7
2.3	$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees	9
2.4	Graph of pro- p groups	10
3	Accessibility	14
4	Standard refinements	16
5	Universally elliptic pro-p trees	19
6	JSJ splittings	22
7	Examples of JSJ-splittings	25
7.1	Free pro- p groups	25
7.2	Virtually free pro- p groups	25
7.3	Free splittings	26
7.4	Splittings over finite groups	26
7.5	Locally finite trees	29
7.5.1	Generalized Baumslag-Solitar groups	30
7.6	pro- p RAAGs	31
7.7	Non-rigid example	32

*Partially supported by CNPq and FAPDF

8	A few useful facts	33
8.1	Changing edge groups	33
8.2	Finiteness properties	34
8.3	Incidence structures of vertex groups	38
8.4	JSJ decompositions of vertex groups.	39
9	Trees of cylinders	41
9.1	Algebraic Interpretation	47
9.2	Automorphisms	52
9.3	Applications	56
10	Automorphisms	57
11	Compatibility	59
11.1	Examples	61
11.1.1	Free pro- p groups	61
11.1.2	Free pro- p products	61
11.1.3	Free product with amalgamation	62
11.1.4	Poincaré duality pro- p groups	62
12	Compatibility and free constructions of free pro-p groups	63
12.1	Free pro- p groups	63
12.2	Cyclic amalgamations or HNN-extensions of free pro- p groups decomposable as free pro- p products	68
12.3	Virtually free pro- p products	69
12.4	Virtually free pro- p groups	71
12.5	General case	72

1 Introduction

The dramatic advance of classical combinatorial group theory happened in the 1970's, when the Bass-Serre theory of groups acting on trees changed completely the face of the theory. This theory allowed to treat uniformly basic constructions of combinatorial theory of groups such as free products with amalgamation and HNN-extensions and obtain structural subgroup results of these constructions.

At the end of 20-th and in the first quarter of 21-st centuries Bass-Serre theory faced further development: the theory of JSJ decompositions of finitely generated groups. In fact JSJ decompositions first appeared in 3-dimensional topology with the theory of the characteristic submanifold by Jaco-Shalen and Johansson [JS, Joh] (the terminology JSJ was popularized by Sela). The topological ideas were carried over to group theory first by Kropholler [Kropholler] for some Poincaré duality groups. Later constructions of JSJ decompositions were given in various settings by Sela for torsion-free hyperbolic groups [Se], and in various settings by Rips-Sela [RS], Bowditch [B-98], Dunwoody-Sageev [DS99], Fujiwara-Papasoglu [FP06], Dunwoody-Swenson [DS00], Guirardel and Levitt [Gui], [GL], [GL11] ...). This has had a vast influence and range of applications in geometric and combinatorial group theory. Roughly speaking, a JSJ-splitting of a group G over a certain class of subgroups is a graph of groups decomposition of G which describes all possible decompositions of G as an amalgamated free product or an HNN extension over subgroups lying in the given class.

The profinite version of the Bass-Serre theory was initiated by Dion Gildenhuys and Luis Ribes in [GR] and then developed by Luis Ribes, Oleg Melnikov and the author because of the absence of the classical methods of combinatorial group theory for profinite groups (see [ZM-88, ZM-89, Za90, Z-92, RZ-00, RZ-14, R]. However it does not work in full strength even in the pro- p case. The reason is that if a pro- p group G acts on a pro- p tree T then a maximal subtree of the quotient graph T/G does not always exist and even if it exists it does not always lift to T . As a consequence the pro- p version of the Bass-Serre theory does not give subgroup structure theorems the way it does in the classical Bass-Serre theory. In fact, for infinitely generated pro- p subgroups there are counter examples. Nevertheless, the pro- p version of the subgroups structure theorem works for a finitely generated pro- p group G acting on a pro- p tree T but not the same way as in the classical Bass-Serre theory way. What is proved in [WZ18] that there exists another pro- p G -tree S in the same deformation space such that G is the fundamental pro- p group of the corresponding graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}, S/G)$ in the standard Bass-Serre theory maner. However, in contrast to the abstract situation $(\mathcal{G}, S/G)$ can be reduced and infinite, and the topology of S/G usually prevents removing an edge. So in general, the fundamental group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups does not split as an amalgamated free pro- p product or pro- p HNN-extension over an edge group. Nevertheless, if G is finitely generated then such a splitting of G exists over the edge stabilizer G_e for any edge e of T by [CZ, Theorem 4.2] (obtained in differen manner). This shows that the pro- p version of Bass-Serre theory is ready for JSJ-decomposition theory and to develop it is the obective of the present paper.

In the exposition we follow a general strategy of the nice book on JSJ-decompositions of (abstract) groups by Guirardel and Levitt [GL] stressing similarities and differences

between the abstract and pro- p cases. Namely, we give a general definition of JSJ decompositions (or rather of their Bass-Serre pro- p trees), as maximal universally elliptic pro- p trees. As in the abstract case, in general, there is no preferred JSJ decomposition, and the right object to consider is the whole set of JSJ decompositions: the JSJ deformation space. The importance of the notion of deformation space has complementary value in the pro- p case explained in the preceding paragraph. However, one needs to mention that the pro- p deformation space is usually much bigger than in its abstract analog because the group of automorphisms of pro- p groups usually are much larger: for example the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(F)$ of a free pro- p group F of finite rank is topologically infinitely generated in contrast to the abstract case.

We prove that JSJ decompositions exist for any finitely generated pro- p group, without any assumption on edge groups.

Theorem 1.1. *Let \mathcal{E} be a continuous family of subgroups of a pro- p group G . If G is finitely generated or \mathcal{E} -accessible, then JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T exists.*

In the presence of acylindricity, a pro- p group G is accessible (cf. [CAZ]) as well as for splittings of CSA groups over abelian groups (in particular, for splittings of pro- p limit groups). We define pro- p trees of cylinders and obtain canonical JSJ pro- p trees which are invariant under automorphisms.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a finitely generated CSA pro- p group. Suppose that G is indecomposable into a free pro- p product and \mathcal{E} consists of abelian subgroups. Then the pro- p tree of cylinders T_c is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree relative to not virtually cyclic abelian subgroups.*

Corollary 1.3. *Let G be a pro- p limit group and \mathcal{E} be the set of abelian subgroups of G . Suppose that G is indecomposable into a free pro- p product. Then the pro- p tree of cylinders T_c is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree relative to not virtually cyclic abelian subgroups.*

We introduce a variant in which the property of being universally elliptic is replaced by the more restrictive and rigid property of being universally compatible. This yields a canonical compatibility JSJ pro- p tree, not just a deformation space. We show that it exists for a pro- p group, without any assumption on edge groups (in contrast to the abstract case when this is true only for finitely presented groups).

We give many examples, and we work from time to time with relative decompositions (restricting to pro- p trees where certain subgroups are elliptic).

For the reader's convenience we now describe the detailed content of each section.

In the preliminary section (Section 2), we collect basic facts about pro- p -groups acting on pro- p trees, and we define $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H})$ -trees (trees with edge stabilizers in \mathcal{E} relative to \mathcal{H} , collapse maps, graphs of pro- p groups and frequently used results on pro- p groups acting on pro- p trees). We also define deformation spaces here.

Section 3 describes all the instances of accessibility known in the pro- p case.

Section 4 introduces refinements, compatibility and domination. It contains a construction of standard refinement. Namely, let G be a pro- p group acting on pro- p trees T_1 and T_2 . If all edge stabilizers of T_1 are elliptic in T_2 and $|T_1/G| < \infty$, there is a refinement of T_1 which dominates T_2 . If one drops the condition $|T_1/G| < \infty$ it does not work as

in the abstract case: but under assumption that G is finitely generated, one can choose a pro- p tree S from the deformation space of T_1 that admits a refinement \widehat{S} of S dominating T_2 .

Section 5 is dedicated to universal ellipticity and properties of it.

In Section 6 we define JSJ pro- p trees and the JSJ deformation space. We prove the existence of JSJ decompositions.

Section 7 is devoted to examples. We first consider Grushko decompositions (over the trivial group) and Stallings-Dunwoody decompositions (over finite p -groups), explaining how to interpret them as JSJ decompositions. We also consider small pro- p groups, and locally finite pro- p trees (such as those associated to cyclic splittings of generalized Baumslag-Solitar pro- p groups). All these examples of JSJ decompositions have only rigid vertices. At the end of the section we work out an example where the JSJ decomposition has flexible vertices. Moreover, we prove that flexible vertices of cyclic pro- p trees split a s a free pro- p product.

Theorem 1.4. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group and \mathcal{E} be the family of infinite cyclic pro- p groups. If $Q \neq \mathbb{Z}_p$ is a vertex stabilizer of a cyclic JSJ G -tree and Q does not split as a free pro- p product then it is elliptic in any cyclic G -tree.*

Section 8 contains various useful technical results. Given a vertex of a graph of pro- p groups or of a pro- p tree, we point out that any splitting of the vertex group which is relative to the incident edge groups extends to a splitting of G . Given a universally elliptic splitting of G , one may obtain a JSJ decomposition of G from relative JSJ decompositions of vertex groups. In particular, one may usually restrict to one-ended groups when studying JSJ decompositions (see Corollary 8.20). We also define and discuss relative finite generation and presentation (relative finite presentation of vertex groups is studied in Subsection 8.3).

Section 9 is devoted to the pro- p tree of cylinders. Given an admissible equivalence relation on the set \mathcal{E} of pro- p groups in \mathcal{E} , one may associate a pro- p tree of cylinders T_c to any pro- p tree T with compact set of edges and with edge stabilizers in \mathcal{E} . This pro- p tree only depends on the deformation space of T . We apply it to deduce the result on $\text{Aut}(G)$ in Section 9.2. Here is one of them, where for a subgroup $K \leq G$ we use notation $\text{Aut}_G(K)$ to be the group of all automorphisms of G that leave K invariant.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a free pro- p product with amalgamation. Suppose that G_1 and G_2 are rigid. Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)),$$

where 1 can be replaced by 2.

If H is malnormal then formula for splitting simplifies.

Corollary 1.6. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a non-fictitious free pro- p product with malnormal amalgamation. Suppose that G_1 and G_2 are rigid. Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(H)} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1),$$

where 1 can be replaced by 2.

In Subsection 9.3 we study tree of cylinders for torsion-free CSA groups: pro- p limit groups is the canonical example of them.

In Section 10 we extend Corollary 1.6 to pro- \mathcal{C} groups assuming that the amalgamated subgroup is malnormal (\mathcal{C} is a class of finite groups closed for subgroups, quotients and extensions).

In Section 11 we define universal compatibility and we show Theorem 11.4 (existence of the compatibility JSJ deformation space D_{co}). We then construct the compatibility JSJ tree T_{co} and we give examples.

In the last section we prove results on compatibility of free constructions (free pro- p products with amalgamation and HNN-extensions) with free and virtually free pro- p products. Here are two samples of them.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_C G_2$ be a finitely generated free pro- p product with cyclic amalgamation. Then G splits as a free pro- p product if and only if C belongs to a free factor of G_1 or G_2 .*

Theorem 1.8. *Let $G = \text{HNN}(G_1, C, t)$ be a finitely generated HNN-extension with cyclic associated subgroup. If G splits as a free pro- p product then C or C^t belongs to a free factor of G_1 .*

Conventions. Throughout the paper, unless otherwise stated, groups are pro- p , subgroups are closed, and homomorphisms are continuous. In particular, $\langle H \rangle$ will mean the topological generation in the paper and presentations are taking in the category of pro- p groups; a^g will stand for $g^{-1}ag$. $\mathbb{Z}_p, \mathbb{F}_p$ denote the p -adic integers and the field of p elements respectively and $\Phi(G)$ denotes the Frattini subgroup of G .

Acknowledgment. The paper was started when the author was visiting Department of Mathematics of University of Cambridge. The author thanks Henry Wilton for fruitful discussions, especially for pointing out abstract versions of the result of the last section of the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the necessary elements of the theory of pro- p trees. One can find more on this in [RZ-00, R].

A *graph* Γ is a disjoint union $E(\Gamma) \cup V(\Gamma)$ with two maps $d_0, d_1 : \Gamma \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ that are the identity on the set of vertices $V(\Gamma)$. For an element e of the set of edges $E(\Gamma)$, $d_0(e)$ is called the *initial* and $d_1(e)$ the *terminal* vertex of e .

Definition 2.1. A *profinite graph* Γ is a graph such that:

1. Γ is a profinite space (i.e. an inverse limit of finite discrete spaces);
2. $V(\Gamma)$ is closed; and
3. the maps d_0 and d_1 are continuous.

Note that $E(\Gamma)$ is not necessary closed.

A *morphism* $\alpha : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ of profinite graphs is a continuous map with $\alpha d_i = d_i \alpha$ for $i = 0, 1$.

By [ZM-88, Prop. 1.7] every profinite graph Γ is an inverse limit of finite quotient graphs of Γ . A *connected* profinite graph is by definition a profinite graph whose all finite quotient graphs are connected (in the usual sense).

2.1 Trees

Let \mathbb{F}_p be the field of p elements. For a profinite space X that is the inverse limit of finite discrete spaces X_j , $[[\mathbb{F}_p X]]$ is the inverse limit of $[\mathbb{F}_p X_j]$, where $[\mathbb{F}_p X_j]$ is the free \mathbb{F}_p -module with basis X_j . For a pointed profinite space $(X, *)$ that is the inverse limit of pointed finite discrete spaces $(X_j, *)$, $[[\mathbb{F}_p(X, *)]]$ is the inverse limit of $[\mathbb{F}_p(X_j, *)]$, where $[\mathbb{F}_p(X_j, *)]$ is the free \mathbb{F}_p -module with basis $X_j \setminus \{*\}$ [RZ10, Chapter 5.2].

For a profinite graph Γ , define the pointed space $(E^*(\Gamma), *)$ as $\Gamma/V(\Gamma)$, with the image of $V(\Gamma)$ as a distinguished point $*$, and denote the image of $e \in E(\Gamma)$ by \bar{e} . A profinite graph is called a *pro- p tree* if one has the following exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow [[\mathbb{F}_p(E^*(\Gamma), *)]] \xrightarrow{\delta} [[\mathbb{F}_p V(\Gamma)]] \xrightarrow{\epsilon} \mathbb{F}_p \rightarrow 0$$

where $\delta(\bar{e}) = d_1(e) - d_0(e)$ for every $e \in E(\Gamma)$ and $\epsilon(v) = 1$ for every $v \in V(\Gamma)$.

If v and w are elements of a profinite tree T , we denote by $[v, w]$ the smallest profinite subtree of T containing v and w (i.e. the intersection of all pro- p subtrees containing v, w) and call it geodesic.

2.2 G-trees

By definition, a profinite group G *acts* on a profinite graph Γ if we have a continuous action of G on the profinite space Γ that commutes with the maps d_0 and d_1 . We shall denote by T^G the set of fixed points for G .

Proposition 2.2. ([RZ-00, Proposition 3.5]). *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T and $\tilde{G} = \langle G_v \mid v \in V(T) \rangle$ be the subgroup generated by all vertex stabilizers. Then \tilde{G} is normal in G and T/\tilde{G} is a pro- p tree.*

Definition 2.3. If G acts on a pro- p tree T , any subgroup or element fixing a vertex will be called *elliptic* for the pair (G, T) . Otherwise the element is called *hyperbolic*. We denote by \tilde{G} the subgroup of G generated by all elliptic elements.

We prove here a pro- p version of the statement proved by Tits [Tits, 3.4]; note that the Tits option of having a G -invariant end does not occur in the pro- p case. So the two propositions below are valid in abstract case only for finitely generated groups.

Proposition 2.4. *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . If every element of G is elliptic then so is G .*

Proof. Let U be an open subgroup of G . By Proposition 2.2 G/U acts on pro- p tree T/U and so by [RZ-00, Theorem 3.9] fixes a vertex, i.e. the subset of fixed points $T/U^{G/U} \neq \emptyset$. Then $T^G = \varprojlim_U T/U^{G/U} \neq \emptyset$ as required. \square

From the proof of Proposition 2.4 we deduce the following

Corollary 2.5. *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . Suppose that G is virtually elliptic, i.e. possesses an open normal elliptic subgroup U . Then G is elliptic.*

Theorem 2.6. ([RZ-00, Corollary 3.8]). *Suppose that a pro- p group G acts on a pro- p tree T , and let v and w be two different vertices of T . Then the set of edges $E([v, w])$ of the geodesic $[v, w]$ is nonempty, and $G_v \cap G_w \leq G_e$ for every $e \in E([v, w])$.*

Proposition 2.7. *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T and g a hyperbolic element of G . Then there exists an open subgroup U containing it such that for any $g \leq K \leq U$ the image of g in K^{ab} is not torsion.*

Proof. Since $\langle g \rangle = \bigcap \{U \mid g \in U \leq_o G\}$ we can view it as $\langle g \rangle = \varprojlim_{U \leq_o G} U$. It follows that $\langle g \rangle = \varprojlim_{U \leq_o G} U/\tilde{U}$ and moreover $\langle g \rangle$ is the projective limit of the abelianizations $\langle g \rangle = \varprojlim_{U \leq_o G} (U/\tilde{U})^{ab}$, where \tilde{U} is the normal subgroup of U generated by elliptic elements. Hence the image g_U of g in $(U/\tilde{U})^{ab}$ is non-trivial for some U . By [RZ-00, Corollary 3.6] U/\tilde{U} is free pro- p and so its abelianization is torsion free and therefore g_U is not torsion. Now for any $K \leq U$ containing g one has the natural map $(K/\tilde{K})^{ab} \rightarrow (U/\tilde{U})^{ab}$ that proves the result. \square

Proposition 2.8. ([RZ-00, Lemma 3.11]). *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . Then there exists a minimal G -invariant pro- p subtree D of T . If $|D| > 1$ then it is unique.*

Theorem 2.9. ([CZ, Theorem 4.2]). *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T with no global fixed point. Then it splits as an amalgamated free pro- p product or pro- p HNN-extension over some edge stabilizer G_e in T .*

Definition 2.10. The action of a pro- p group G on a pro- p tree T is said to be k -acylindrical, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ a constant, if the set of fixed points of $g \in G$ has diameter at most k whenever $g \neq 1$.

Definition 2.11. A G -tree is called reduced if for any $e \in E(T)$ with vertices v, w one has $G_v \neq G_e \neq G_w$ unless v, w are in the same G -orbit.

2.3 $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees

Besides G , we usually also fix a (nonempty) family \mathcal{E} of subgroups of G which is stable under conjugation and under taking subgroups. More precisely, for a pro- p groups G , define $\text{Subgp}(G)$ to be the set of all closed subgroups of G and the topology for which the subsets $\{\text{Subgp}(U) \mid U \leq_o G\}$ of subsets of $\text{Subgp}(G)$, for all open subgroups U of G , is a base for the topology on $\text{Subgp}(G)$; it is called the *étale* topology on $\text{Subgp}(G)$.

Definition 2.12. Let G be a pro- p group and \mathcal{E} be a family of subgroups of G closed for conjugation. An \mathcal{E} -tree is a tree T whose edge stabilizers belong to \mathcal{E} .

Definition 2.13. Let X be a profinite space and G a profinite group. A family of closed subgroups $\{G_x \mid x \in X\}$ of G is said to be continuous if for any open subset U of G the subset $\{x \in X \mid G_x \subseteq U\}$ is open in X .

Note that for a continuous family $\{G_x \mid x \in X\}$ and any closed subset Y in X the subfamily $\{G_y \mid y \in Y\}$ is continuous.

Lemma 2.14. ([R, Lemma 5.2.2]). *Let G be a profinite group acting continuously on a profinite set X is continuous. Then the family of a point stabilizers $\{G_x \mid x \in X\}$ is continuous.*

In particular, if G acts on a profinite graph T the family of stabilizers $\{G_t \mid t \in T\}$ and the family of the vertex stabilizers $\{G_v \mid v \in V(T)\}$ is continuous. By [R, Lemma 5.2.1] a family $\{G_x \mid x \in X\}$ is continuous if and only if $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Subgp}(G)$ is continuous, where $\text{Subgp}(G)$ is endowed with the étale topology.

We often say that the corresponding splitting of G is \mathcal{E} -splitting or is the splitting over \mathcal{E} , or over groups in \mathcal{E} . We say cyclic pro- p tree (abelian pro- p tree, . . .) when \mathcal{E} is the family of cyclic (abelian, . . .) subgroups. We also fix an arbitrary set \mathcal{K} of subgroups of G , and we restrict to \mathcal{E} -trees T such that each $K \in \mathcal{K}$ is elliptic in T (in terms of graphs of groups, K is contained in a conjugate of a vertex group; if K is not finitely generated, then in the abstract case this is stronger than requiring that every $k \in K$ be elliptic, but in the pro- p case it is the same by Proposition 2.4). We call such a pro- p tree an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree, or a tree over \mathcal{E} relative to \mathcal{K} . The set of $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees does not change if we replace a group of \mathcal{K} by a conjugate, or if we enlarge \mathcal{K} by making it invariant under conjugation. If G acts non-trivially on an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree (i.e. without global fixed point), we say that G splits over \mathcal{E} (or over a group of \mathcal{E}) relatively to \mathcal{K} . The group G is freely indecomposable relative to \mathcal{K} if it does not split as a free pro- p product relatively to \mathcal{K} (this means that all subgroups of \mathcal{K} are in the free factor up to conjugation). If G is second countable then equivalently (unless $G = \mathbb{Z}_p$ and \mathcal{K} is trivial), G acts on a pro- p tree with trivial edge stabilizers relative to \mathcal{K} (see [R, Theorem 9.6.1]).

Definition 2.15. Let G be a pro- p group acting on pro- p \mathcal{E} -trees T_1 and T_2 . We say that T_1 and T_2 belong to the same deformation space if the set of elliptic elements for (G, T_1) and (G, T_2) are the same. Equivalently, if (G, T_1) and (G, T_2) have the same maximal vertex stabilizers.

Another way of saying this is the following: two pro- p trees belonging to the same deformation space over \mathcal{E} have the same vertex stabilizers, provided one restricts to groups not in \mathcal{E} .

2.4 Graph of pro- p groups

When we say that \mathcal{G} is a *finite graph of pro- p groups*, we mean that it contains the data of the underlying finite graph, the edge pro- p groups, the vertex pro- p groups and the attaching continuous maps. More precisely, let Δ be a connected finite graph. The data of a graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Δ) over Δ consists of a pro- p group $\mathcal{G}(m)$ for each $m \in \Delta$, and continuous monomorphisms $\partial_i : \mathcal{G}(e) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(d_i(e))$ for each edge $e \in E(\Delta)$.

The definition of the pro- p fundamental group of a connected profinite graph of pro- p groups is quite involved (see [ZM-89]). However, the pro- p fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ of a finite graph of finitely generated pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) can be defined as the pro- p completion of the abstract (usual) fundamental group $\Pi_1^{abs}(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ (we use here that every subgroup of finite index in a finitely generated pro- p group is open (cf. [NS-07, Theorem 1.1])). In general, we can define the fundamental pro- p group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ of finite graph of pro- p groups by the following presentation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \langle & \mathcal{G}(v), t_e \mid \text{rel}(\mathcal{G}(v)), \partial_1(g) = \partial_0(g)^{t_e}, g \in \mathcal{G}(e), \\ & t_e = 1 \text{ for } e \in T \rangle; \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

here T is a maximal subtree of Γ and

$$\partial_0 : \mathcal{G}(e) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(d_0(e)), \partial_1 : \mathcal{G}(e) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(d_1(e))$$

are monomorphisms. The elements t_e will be called *stable letters*.

If all $\mathcal{G}(v) = 1$ for $v \in V(\Gamma)$, then $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is simply the fundamental pro- p group of the graph Γ denoted by $\pi_1(\Gamma)$. Clearly, $\pi_1(\Gamma)$ is free pro- p .

Lemma 2.16. *Let $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the fundamental group of a finite graph of pro- p groups and suppose G is finitely generated. Then $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$, where either g_i is in a vertex group of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) , or g_i is a stable letter.*

Proof. Consider $\tilde{G} = \langle G(m)^g \mid m \in \Gamma, g \in G \rangle$. By [R, Corollary 3.9.3]

$$G/\tilde{G} \cong \pi_1(G \setminus T) = \pi_1(\Gamma)$$

is a free pro- p group. Then $G = \tilde{G} \rtimes \pi_1(\Gamma)$. Let $f : G \longrightarrow G/\Phi(G)$ be the natural epimorphism. Then $G/\Phi(G) = f(\tilde{G}) \oplus f(\pi_1(\Gamma))$ is an \mathbb{F}_p -vector space (cf. [RZ-00, Lemma 2.8.7 (b)]). Since $f(\tilde{G})$ is finite (because G is finitely generated), there are $w_1, \dots, w_l \in V(\Gamma)$, such that $f(\tilde{G}) = \langle f(G_{w_1}), \dots, f(G_{w_l}) \rangle$. Then $G/\Phi(G) = \{f(G_{w_1}), \dots, f(G_{w_l}), f(\pi_1(\Gamma))\}$. Hence $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle$, where either g_i is in a vertex group of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) , or g_i is a stable letter. □

In contrast to the abstract case, the vertex groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) do not always embed in $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$, i.e., $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is not always proper. However, the edge and vertex groups can be replaced by their images in $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ and after this replacement $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ becomes proper. Thus from now on we shall assume that $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is always proper, unless otherwise stated.

If all vertex and edge groups are trivial, we get the definition of the fundamental pro- p group of a finite connected graph which is the pro- p completion of the abstract fundamental group of Γ ; hence it is free pro- p on the basis $\Gamma \setminus V(\Gamma)$.

Remark 2.17. A finite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is said to be *reduced*, if for every edge e which is not a loop neither $\partial_1: \mathcal{G}(e) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(d_1(e))$ nor $\partial_0: \mathcal{G}(e) \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(d_0(e))$ is an isomorphism; we call an edge e which is not a loop and such that one of the edge maps ∂_i is an isomorphism *fictitious*. Any finite graph of pro- p groups can be transformed into a reduced finite graph of pro- p groups by collapsing fictitious edges using the following procedure. If e is a fictitious edge, we can remove $\{e\}$ from the edge set of Γ , and identify $d_0(e)$ and $d_1(e)$ to a new vertex y . Let Γ' be the finite graph given by $V(\Gamma') = \{y\} \sqcup V(\Gamma) \setminus \{d_0(e), d_1(e)\}$ and $E(\Gamma') = E(\Gamma) \setminus \{e\}$, and let (\mathcal{G}', Γ') denote the finite graph of groups based on Γ' given by $\mathcal{G}'(y) = \mathcal{G}(d_1(e))$ if $\partial_0(e)$ is an isomorphism, and $\mathcal{G}'(y) = \mathcal{G}(d_0(e))$ if ∂_0 is not an isomorphism. This procedure can be continued until there are no fictitious edges. The resulting finite graph of groups $(\bar{\mathcal{G}}, \bar{\Gamma})$ is reduced.

The reduction procedure just described does not change the fundamental group (as a group given by presentation), i.e. choosing a maximal subtree to contain the collapsing edge the morphism $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}', \Gamma')$ induces the identity map on the fundamental group given by presentation by eliminating redundant relations associated with the fictitious edge that are just collapsed by reduction.

The pro- p fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ acts on the standard pro- p tree S (defined analogously to the abstract one) associated to it, with vertex and edge stabilizers being conjugates of vertex and edge groups, and such that $S/\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \Gamma$ [ZM-88, Proposition 3.8]. Namely, the *standard (universal) pro- p tree* associated with the finite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) (or universal covering graph) is $S = S(G) = \bigcup_{m \in \Gamma} G/\mathcal{G}(m)$ (cf. [ZM-88, Proposition 3.8]). The vertices of S are those cosets of the form $g\mathcal{G}(v)$, with $v \in V(\Gamma)$ and $g \in G$; its edges are the cosets of the form $g\mathcal{G}(e)$, with $e \in E(\Gamma)$; and the incidence maps of T are given by the formulas:

$$d_0(g\mathcal{G}(e)) = g\mathcal{G}(d_0(e)); \quad d_1(g\mathcal{G}(e)) = gt_e\mathcal{G}(d_1(e)) \quad (e \in E(\Gamma), t_e = 1 \text{ if } e \in D).$$

There is a natural continuous action of G on S , and clearly $S/G = \Gamma$. Remark also that since Γ is finite, $E(S)$ is compact.

Note that (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is reduced if and only if $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ -tree $S(G)$ is reduced.

Example 2.18. If $G = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is the fundamental group of a finite graph of (abstract) groups then one has the induced graph of pro- p completions of edge and vertex groups $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ (not necessarily proper) and a natural homomorphism $G = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \rightarrow \Pi_1(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$. It is an embedding if $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is residually p . In this case $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \widehat{G}$ is simply the pro- p completion. Moreover, the standard tree $S(G)$ naturally embeds in $S(\widehat{G})$ if and only if the edge and vertex groups $\mathcal{G}(e)$, $\mathcal{G}(v)$ are closed in the pro- p topology of $\pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$, or equivalently $\mathcal{G}(e)$ are closed in $\mathcal{G}(d_0(e))$, $\mathcal{G}(d_1(v))$ with respect to the topology induced by the pro- p topology on G ([CB-13, Proposition 2.5]).

Definition 2.19. A graph of groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) will be called *k-acylindrical* if the action of $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ on $S = S(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is *k-acylindrical*.

In what follows, the notion of the fundamental pro- p group of an infinite profinite graph of pro- p groups is used only in Theorem 2.26, and in fact only in the form of the

inverse limit of fundamental groups of finite graphs of finite p -groups. We state this as a proposition that the reader can use as a definition. This all done in details in [AZ].

Definition 2.20. An inverse limit of finite graphs of finite p -groups is called a *profinite graph of pro- p groups*.

Proposition 2.21. ([AZ, Proposition 2.1, Definition 2.13 and Proposition 2.19]) An inverse limit $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \varprojlim_i (\mathcal{G}_i, \Gamma_i)$ of finite graphs of pro- p groups induces an inverse limit of the fundamental pro- p groups $\varprojlim_i \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_i, \Gamma_i)$ and $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \varprojlim_i \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_i, \Gamma_i)$.

If (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a finite graph of pro- p groups and Δ a connected subgraph of Γ we shall denote by (\mathcal{G}, Δ) the graph of pro- p groups restricted to Δ .

Lemma 2.22. ([SZ, Lemma 2.4]) Let (\mathcal{G}, Γ) be a proper finite graph of pro- p groups and Δ a connected subgraph of Γ . Then the natural homomorphism $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Delta) \longrightarrow \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is a monomorphism.

Lemma 2.23. Let $G = (\mathcal{G}, \Delta)$ be the fundamental group of a finite graph of pro- p groups. Suppose $G = H_1 \amalg H_2$ such that all infinite vertex groups are contained in H_1 . Then (\mathcal{G}, Δ) possesses a trivial edge group.

Proof. Let Δ_1 be a maximal subgraph of Δ such that all vertex groups of Δ_1 are in H_1 . Since any finite subgroups of G is conjugate into H_1 or H_2 (see [RZ-00, Theorem 4.2]) w.l.o.g. we may assume that Δ_1 is non-empty. Then for every edge $e \notin \Delta_1$ with vertex in Δ_1 the edge group $G(e) = 1$ since $H_1 \cap H_i^g = 1$ whenever $g \notin H_1$ or $i \neq 1$ (cf. [RZ10, Theorem 9.1.12]). As Δ_1 is proper in Δ and Δ is connected, the result follows. \square

Corollary 2.24. Let $G = (\mathcal{G}, \Delta)$ be the fundamental group of a finite graph of finite p -groups. Then G splits as a free pro- p product $G = \coprod_{i=1}^n G_n \amalg F$ such that each G_i is the fundamental group of a subgraph of groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ_i) with non-trivial edge groups and F is free pro- p .

We shall use several times later the following lemma which is the main ingredient of the proof of subsequent theorem.

Lemma 2.25. ([CZ, Lemma 4.1]) Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . Then $G = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} G/\tilde{U}$ and $G_U = G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ is the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of finite p -groups. Moreover, the inverse system $\{G/\tilde{U}, \pi_{VU}\}$ can be chosen in such a way that it is linearly ordered and for each $\{G/\tilde{V}\}$ of the system with $V \leq U$ there exists a natural morphism $(\eta_{VU}, \nu_{VU}) : (\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ where ν_{VU} is just a collapse of edges of Γ_V and $\eta_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m)) = \pi_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m))$; the induced homomorphism of the pro- p fundamental groups coincides with the canonical projection $\pi_{VU} : G/\tilde{V} \longrightarrow G/\tilde{U}$.

Theorem 2.26. ([WZ18, Theorem 1.1]) Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . Then G is the fundamental pro- p group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . Moreover, the vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) are stabilizers of certain vertices and edges of T respectively, and stabilizers of vertices and edges of T in G are conjugate to subgroups of vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) respectively.

Remark 2.27. If in Theorem 2.26 T/G is finite, then this theorem is subject of [ZM-89, Proposition 4.4] where finite generatedness of G is not asked; in fact in this case theorem states exactly as the main theorem of Bass-Serre theory. Therefore, the reduction procedure can be applied directly to T , the obtained tree will also be called reduced.

We also going to use often the following

Corollary 2.28. ([ZM-89, Corollary 4.5]). *Let H be an open subgroup of the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ of a finite graph of pro- p groups. Then H is the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{H}, \Delta)$ of a finite graph of pro- p groups that are intersections of H with the vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) .*

Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree with finite vertex stabilizers. It is not known whether Γ can be made finite in Theorem 2.26. In the abstract case it comes automatically. One could achieve it if one could bound the size of a reduced finite graph of finite p -groups in terms of the minimal number of generators of its pro- p fundamental group [CZ, Theorem 6.3] (i.e. if one have certain accessibility, see Section 3 for details). In the case of cyclic edge groups this is possible.

Corollary 2.29. ([CZ, Theorem 6.6]) *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T with cyclic edge stabilizers. Then G is the fundamental pro- p group of a finite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . Moreover, the vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) are stabilizers of certain vertices and edges of T respectively, and stabilizers of vertices and edges of T in G are conjugate to subgroups of vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) respectively.*

We finish the section stating the pro- p version of the Kurosh subgroup theorem.

Theorem 2.30. [Me] *Let $G = \coprod_{t \in T} G_t$ be a second countable pro- p group decomposed as a free pro- p product and let H be a subgroup of G . There exists a closed system $\{g_{t,\tau} \in H \setminus G/G_t \mid t \in T\}$ of double coset representatives such that*

$$H = \left(\coprod_{t \in T} \coprod_{g_{t,\tau} \in H \setminus G/G_t} H \cap G_t^{g_{t,\tau}} \right) \amalg F,$$

where F is a free pro- p group.

We shall need later a description of the normalizers of a subgroup over which splittings occur.

Proposition 2.31. (1) *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a free pro- p product with amalgamation. Then $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_2}(H)$.*

(2) *Let $G = HNN(G_1, H, t)$ be a pro- p HNN-extension.*

- *If H and H^t are conjugate in G_1 then: $N_G(H) = HNN(N_A(H), H, t')$ and $G = HNN(G, H, t')$.*
- *If H and H^t are not conjugate in G_1 then $N_G(H) = N_1 \amalg_H N_2$, where $N_1 = N_{G_1^t}(H)$ and $N_2 = N_{G_1}(H)$.*

Proof. (1) Note that the fact that all conjugates of H containing H coincide with H in the pro- p case (as well as in the profinite) imply that $N_G(H)$ acts on the subtree of fixed points S^H such that $S^H/N_G(H) = S/G$ and so $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_2}(H)$.

(2) Case 1. H and H^t are not conjugate in G_1 .

Like in (1) $N_G(H)$ acts on the subtree of fixed points S^H such that $E(S^H)/N_G(H) = E(S)/G$ and $V(S^H)/N_G(H)$ has two vertices.

In this case the normalizer splits as in (1): $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_1}(H^t)$.

Case 2. H and H^t are conjugate in G_1 say $H^{g_1} = H^t$ for some $g_1 \in G_1$. Then replacing t by tg_1^{-1} we may assume that t normalizes H . In this case $N_G(H) = HNN(N_{G_1}(H), H, t')$ is an HNN-extension.

□

3 Accessibility

Constructions of JSJ decompositions are based on accessibility theorems stating that, given suitable G and \mathcal{E} , there is an a priori bound for the number of orbits of edges of reduced (G, \mathcal{E}) -trees, under the assumption that there is no redundant vertex (if v has valence 2, it is the unique fixed point of some $g \in G$).

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{E} be a family of pro- p groups. A pro- p group G will be called \mathcal{E} -*accessible* if there is a number $a = a(G)$ such that any finite, proper, reduced graph of pro- p groups with edge groups in \mathcal{E} having fundamental group isomorphic to G has at most a edges. If \mathcal{E} is the class of all finite p -groups, an \mathcal{E} -accessible pro- p group will simply be called *accessible*.

The accessibility holds in the pro- p case in the following cases:

- (1) G is finitely generated and all groups in \mathcal{E} are finite with bounded order [wilk];
- (2) G is finitely generated and all groups in \mathcal{E} are cyclic [CZ];
- (3) G is finitely generated and the graph of groups are k -acylindrical for some k [CAZ].

For completeness we state precisely these three results.

Theorem 3.2. [Wilkes20, Theorem 3.1] *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group and let k be an integer. Let (\mathcal{G}, Γ) be a proper reduced finite graph of pro- p groups with $G = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ such that each edge group G_e has size at most k . Then Γ has at most $\frac{pk}{p-1}(d(G) - 1) + 1$ edges, where $d(G)$ is the minimal number of generators of G .*

Theorem 3.3. [CZ, Theorem 6.6] *Let $G = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of pro- p -groups, with procyclic edge groups, and assume that $d(G) = d \geq 2$. Then the vertex groups are finitely generated, the number of vertices of Γ is $\leq 2d - 1$, and the number of edges of Γ is $\leq 3d - 2$.*

Theorem 3.4. [CAZ, Theorem 1.1] *Let $G = \pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the fundamental group of a finite reduced k -acylindrical graph of pro- p groups. Then $|E(\Gamma)| \leq d(G)(4k + 1) - 1$, $|V(\Gamma)| \leq 4kd(G)$.*

We shall state here an accessibility for CSA pro- p groups. We say that a pro- p group is *SCA* if the maximal abelian subgroups of G are malnormal; this is equivalent to transitive commutativity of G . The proof of the next theorem will be performed in Subsection 9.3, but we state it here for the completeness.

Theorem 3.5. *Let \mathcal{E} be a class of abelian pro- p groups and G a finitely generated pro- p CSA-group. Then G is \mathcal{E} -accessible.*

Denote by \mathcal{G}_0 the class of all free pro- p groups of finite rank. Following [KZ] define inductively the class \mathcal{G}_n of pro- p groups G_n in the following way: G_n is a free amalgamated pro- p product $G_{n-1} \amalg_C A$, where G_{n-1} is any group from the class \mathcal{G}_{n-1} , C is any self-centralizing procyclic pro- p subgroup of G_{n-1} and A is any finite rank free abelian pro- p group such that C is a direct summand of A . The class of pro- p groups \mathcal{L} (*pro- p limit groups*) consists of all finitely generated pro- p subgroups H of some $G_n \in \mathcal{G}_n$, where $n \geq 0$. Then H is a subgroup of a free amalgamated pro- p product $G_n = G_{n-1} \amalg_C A$, where $G_{n-1} \in \mathcal{G}_{n-1}$, $C \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $A = C \times B \cong \mathbb{Z}_p^m$. By [Ribes, Theorem 3.2], this free amalgamated pro- p product is proper. Thus H acts naturally on the pro- p tree T associated to G_n and its edge stabilizers are procyclic.

By [KZ] L is CSA and so we deduce

Corollary 3.6. *Let G be a pro- p limit group. Then G is accessible over abelian subgroups.*

Of course pro- p limit pro- p groups accessible also over cyclic groups by Theorem 3.3. The accessibility number $a(G)$ is $3d(G) - 2$ by [CZ, Corollary 6.7].

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose \mathcal{E} is a finite set of finitely generated subgroups of a finitely generated pro- p group up to conjugation. Then G is \mathcal{E} -accessible. More precise, $|V(\Gamma)| \leq d(G)|E/G|$.*

Proof. Let (\mathcal{G}, Γ) be a reduced graph of groups with edge groups in \mathcal{E} such that $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$. First observe that, for every maximal subtree T of Γ , there are at most $d(G)$ edges in $\Gamma \setminus T$. Therefore it suffices to bound the number of edges of Γ whenever Γ is a tree. We use induction on $|\mathcal{E}/G|$.

Let S be the standard pro- p tree for (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . By [ZM-88, Theorem 2.10] or [RZ-00, Theorem 3.7] the subset of fixed points S^A of A is a pro- p subtree of S . One deduces that the maximal subgraph Δ_A of Γ such that A is a subgroup of each edge group of (\mathcal{G}, Δ_A) is connected. Choose A to be minimal in \mathcal{E} (by inclusion). Collapse Δ_B for each B minimal distinct from A . Putting $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Delta_B)$ on top of the vertex b to which a subgraph Δ_B was collapsed for every such B we obtain the graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}_A, \Delta_A)$ such that $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_A, \Delta_A)$ and every edge group is A .

We show the result for $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Delta_A)$. Since (\mathcal{G}, Δ_A) is reduced, $G_A/(A)^{G_A} \cong \Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Delta_A)$, where $\overline{G}(v) = G(v)/A^{G(v)}$, and so $(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Delta_A)$ is reduced (since A is contained in every edge group of (\mathcal{G}, Δ_A) and the number of edge subgroups in $G/(A)^{G_A} \text{cong} \Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Delta_A)$ is $|\mathcal{E}/G| - 1$). Therefore, $|V(\Delta_A)| \leq d(G)(|\mathcal{E}/G| - 1)$ by inductive hypothesis. Hence $|V(\Delta_A)| \leq d(G)(|\mathcal{E}/G| - 1) \leq d(G)|\mathcal{E}/G|$ as required.

Now Γ is covered by Γ_A , where A runs via minimal subgroups of E . Thus $V(\Gamma) \leq |E/G|d(G)$. □

4 Standard refinements

A collapse map $f : T \rightarrow T_0$ is a map obtained by collapsing connected components of certain subgraph D to vertices. If T is a G -tree, then assuming that D is G -invariant we have a G -collapse. Then by equivariance, the set of collapsed edges is G -invariant. Equivalently, f preserves alignment: the image of any geodesic $[a, b]$ is a vertex or the geodesic $[f(a), f(b)]$. Another characterization is that the preimage of every subtree is a subtree (cf. [CZ, Lemma 3.1]).

Remark 4.1. If T has a connected transversal of T/G one can express it in terms of graphs of groups. Namely one passes from $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = T/G$ to $\Gamma_0 = T_0/G$. Then the procedure of collapsing in the graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) can be generalized using Lemma 2.22. If Δ is a connected subgraph then we can collapse Δ to a vertex v and put $G(v) = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Delta)$ leaving the rest of edge and vertex groups unchanged. The fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_\Delta, \Gamma/\Delta) = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$. The graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}_\Delta, \Gamma/\Delta)$ will be called *collapsed*.

Definition 4.2. We say that a pro- p G -tree T refines a pro- p G -tree T_0 if there exists a G -collapse $f : T \rightarrow T_0$.

The inverse operation of the collapse is a refinement or the blowup. Suppose (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a finite graph of pro- p groups and v is a vertex of Γ . Let $(\mathcal{G}_v, \Gamma_v)$ be a splitting of G_v in which incident edge groups to v are elliptic. One may then refine Γ at v using Γ_v , so as to obtain a pro- p splitting (\mathcal{G}, Γ_0) whose edges are those of Γ together with those of Γ_v . Note that Γ_0 is not uniquely defined because there is flexibility in the way edges of Γ_0 are attached to vertices of Γ_v ; (abstract version is discussed in [GL16, Section 4.2]).

Definition 4.3. Two G -trees T_1, T_2 are compatible if they have a common refinement: there exists a tree \hat{T} with collapse maps $g_i : \hat{T} \rightarrow T_i$ $i = 1, 2$.

The next lemma shows that there is minimal such a \hat{T} .

Lemma 4.4. *Let T_1 and T_2 be compatible trees with a common refinement. There is a common refinement T of T_1 and T_2 such that no edge of T is collapsed in both T_1 and T_2 .*

Proof. Let T be any common refinement. Let Δ_1 and Δ_2 be the subgraphs of T whose connected components are collapsed to get T_1 and T_2 respectively. Put $\Delta = \Delta_1 \cap \Delta_2$. We collapse all connected components of Δ . It is a common refinement of T_1 and T_2 , and no edge is collapsed in both T_1 and T_2 . \square

Let T_1, T_2 be pro- p G -trees.

Definition 4.5. We say that a G -tree T_1 dominates a G -tree T_2 if every vertex stabilizer of T_1 fixes a vertex in T_2 , i.e. every subgroup which is elliptic in T_1 is also elliptic in T_2 .

In particular, every refinement of T_1 dominates T_1 . Beware that domination is defined by considering ellipticity of subgroups, not just of elements (this may make a difference in the abstract case if vertex stabilizers are not finitely generated, but not in pro- p by Proposition 2.4).

Example 4.6. Let G be a virtually free pro- p group. Then by [Z-19] G acts on a pro- p tree T with finite vertex stabilizers. So the G -tree T dominates any G -tree by Corollary 2.5.

Definition 4.7. (Ellipticity of trees) We say that a G -tree T_1 is elliptic with respect to T_2 if every edge stabilizer of T_1 fixes a vertex in T_2 .

Example 4.8. If the edge stabilizers of T_1 are finite (or more generally FA pro- p , i.e. pro- p groups that do not act on a pro- p tree without global fixed point, then T_1 is elliptic with respect to any G -tree.

Proposition 4.9. *Let T_1 and T_2 be pro- p G -trees such that T_1/G is finite. Suppose T_1 is elliptic with respect to T_2 . Then there exists a G -tree \hat{T}_1 with a morphism $p : \hat{T}_1 \rightarrow T_1$ such that*

- (1) p is a collapse map;
- (2) \hat{T}_1 is a refinement of T_1 that dominates T_2 ;
- (3) the stabilizer of any edge of \hat{T}_1 fixes an edge in T_1 or in T_2 ;
- (4) a subgroup of G is elliptic in \hat{T}_1 if and only if it is elliptic in both T_1 and T_2 .

Proof. We construct \hat{T}_1 as follows. For each vertex $v \in V(T_1)$, with stabilizer G_v which is not elliptic in T_2 , choose the minimal G_v -invariant subtree \tilde{Y}_v of T_2 (or put $\tilde{Y}_v = T_2$). For each edge e with vertices $v, w \in E(T_1)$, choose vertices $p_v \in \tilde{Y}_v$ and $p_w \in \tilde{Y}_w$ fixed by G_e ; this is possible because G_e is elliptic in T_2 by assumption and so has a fixed points in \tilde{Y}_v and \tilde{Y}_w by [RZ-00, Corollary 3.10]. We can make these choices G -equivariantly, since T_1/G is finite. We can now define a tree \tilde{T}_1 by blowing up each vertex v of T_1 into \tilde{Y}_v , and attaching edges of T_1 using the points p_v . Formally, we consider the disjoint union $(\bigcup_{v \in V(T_1)} \tilde{Y}_v) \cup (\bigcup_{e \in E(T_1)} e)$ (with $Y_v = v$ if G_v is elliptic in T_2), and for each edge e with vertices v, w of T_1 we identify v with $p_v \in \tilde{Y}_v$ and w with $p_w \in \tilde{Y}_w$. We define $\tilde{p} : \tilde{T}_1 \rightarrow T_1$ by sending Y_v to v , and sending $e \in E(T_1)$ to itself. This map clearly satisfy the first requirement. Then by [Z-92, Proposition on page 486] or [R, Proposition 3.9.1 combined with Corollary 3.10.2 and Proposition 3.10.4] \tilde{T}_1 is a pro- p tree.

In general, \tilde{T}_1 may fail to be minimal, so we define $\hat{T}_1 \subset \tilde{T}_1$ as the unique minimal G -invariant subtree (the action of G on \hat{T}_1 is non-trivial unless T_1 and T_2 are both points). We then define p as the restriction of \tilde{p} to \hat{T}_1 . Let us check that the other properties follow. Assertion (2) is clear.

If e is an edge of \hat{T}_1 that is not collapsed by p , then G_e fixes an edge of T_1 . Otherwise, $e \in Y_v$ for some vertex $v \in V(T_1)$, so G_e fixes an edge in T_2 , and Assertion (3) holds.

(2) implies one direction of (4). To prove the non-trivial direction of Assertion (4), assume that H is elliptic in T_1 and T_2 . Then $H \leq G_v$ for some $v \in T_1$, so H preserves the subtree $Y_v \subset \hat{T}_1$. So it is enough to prove that H fixes a point in Y_v . This holds because H is elliptic in T_2 (see [ZM-88, Theorem 2.13(b)]).

□

Remark 4.10. If T_2/G is finite, one may think of this construction in terms of graphs of pro- p groups, as follows. Starting from the graph of pro- p group $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma_1 = T_1/G)$, one replaces each vertex $v \in \Gamma_1$ by the graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}_v, \Gamma_v = Y_v/G)$ obtained from the action of G_v on its minimal subtree in T_2 , and one attaches each edge e of Γ_1 incident to v to a vertex of Γ_v whose group contains a conjugate of G_e .

Definition 4.11. (Standard refinement). Any tree \widehat{T}_1 as in Proposition 4.9 will be called a standard refinement of T_1 dominating T_2 .

In general, there is no uniqueness of standard refinements. However, by Assertion (4) of Proposition 4.9, all standard refinements belong to the same deformation space, which is the lowest deformation space dominating the deformation spaces containing T_1 and T_2 respectively. If T_1 dominates T_2 (resp. T_2 dominates T_1), then \widehat{T}_1 is in the same deformation space as T_2 (resp. T_1). Moreover, there is some symmetry: if T_2 also happens to be elliptic with respect to T_1 , then any standard refinement \widehat{T}_2 of T_2 dominating T_1 is in the same deformation space as T_1 .

In Proposition 4.9 we assumed that T_1/G is finite. If G is finitely generated we can generalize the proposition for general case on the cost of changing T_1 within deformation space without changing the edge stabilizers.

Proposition 4.12. *Let T_1 and T_2 be pro- p G -trees with G finitely generated. Suppose T_1 is elliptic with respect to T_2 . Then there exists a G -tree S from the deformation space of T_1 and a pro- p tree \hat{S} with a morphism $p : \hat{S} \rightarrow S$ such that*

- (0) *stabilizers of edges of S are stabilizers of certain edges of T_1 and edge stabilizers of T_1 are subgroups of some edge stabilizers of S .*
- (1) *p is a collapse map and the subtree that collapsed by p to v is the minimal G_v -invariant subtree of T_2 .*
- (2) *\hat{S} is a refinement of S that dominates T_2 .*
- (3) *the stabilizer of any edge of \hat{S} fixes an edge in T_1 or in T_2 .*
- (4) *a subgroup of G is elliptic in \hat{S} if and only if it is elliptic in both T_1 and T_2 .*
- (5) *if T_2 is minimal, every edge stabilizer of T_2 contains an edge stabilizer of \hat{S} .*

Proof. Let U be a linearly ordered by inclusion system of open normal subgroups U of G with $\bigcap_U U = 1$. Let \widetilde{U} be the (normal) subgroup of G generated by all U -stabilizers of vertices in T_2 . Put $G_U = G/\widetilde{U}$ and $T_U = T_2/\widetilde{U}$. Then

$$G = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} G_U \text{ and } T_2 = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} T_U.$$

By Proposition 2.2 T_U is a pro- p tree on which G_U naturally acts with $T_U/G_U = T_2/G := \Gamma$.

By Theorem 2.26 G is the fundamental pro- p group of a reduced profinite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Δ) whose edge and vertex groups are stabilizers of edges and vertices of T_1 and stabilizers of vertices and edges in T_1 are contained in stabilizers of some vertex and edge subgroups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) up to conjugation. Moreover (see the proof of Theorem 2.26), $(\mathcal{G}, \Delta) = \varprojlim_U (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ is the inverse limit of the finite reduced graphs of finite p -groups where the maps of the inverse system $\{\Gamma_U\}$ are collapses. Let $S = S(\mathcal{G}, \Delta)$ be the standard pro- p tree. Then T_1, S are in the same deformation space, so (0) holds.

Let S_U be the standard pro- p tree of $(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$. Then $S = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} S_U$ and the projection $S \rightarrow S_U$ is a collapse of connected components of certain profinite subgraph of S .

Note that S_U is elliptic with respect to T_U since T_1 is elliptic with respect to T_2 and therefore S is elliptic with respect to T_2 . Hence we can consider a standard refinement \hat{S}_U of S_U dominating T_U as in Proposition 4.9. In particular, $p_U : \hat{S}_U \rightarrow S_U$ is the collapse map and the pro- p subtrees that are collapsed by p_U to v_U are the minimal invariant subtrees of G_{v_U} for each non-elliptic G_{v_U} in T_U . Since U is linearly ordered, we can make \hat{S}_U to form an inverse system by attaching every edge e_{v_V} incident to $v_V \in S_V$ (for $V \leq U$) to a vertex of T_V whose image is exactly the vertex of T_U to which the image e_U of e_{v_V} in S_U was attached. Thus $\hat{S} = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} \hat{S}_U$ is a pro- p tree (by [RZ-00, Lemma 2.6 (b)]) that dominates T_2 . Moreover, the natural map $p : \hat{S} \rightarrow S$ (the projective limit of the collapse maps $p_U : \hat{S}_U \rightarrow S_U$ (cf. Proposition 4.9) is the collapse map such that the subtrees that collapsed by p to v is the minimal G_v -invariant subtree of T_2). Thus (1) holds.

Let us check that the other properties follow. Assertion (2) is clear.

If e is an edge of \hat{S} that is not collapsed by p , then G_e fixes the edge in S and therefore in T_1 . Otherwise, e is collapsed by p and so belongs to T_2 . Hence G_e fixes an edge of T_2 . Thus assertion (3) holds.

(2) implies one direction of (4). To prove the non-trivial direction of Assertion (4), assume that H is elliptic in T_1 and T_2 . Then $H \leq G_v$ for some $v \in T_1$, so $H \leq G_v$ for some $v \in V(S)$ and therefore $H \leq G_{v_U}$ for every U , where v_U is the image of v in S_U . Hence H preserves the subtree $Y_{v_U} \subset \hat{S}_U$. So it is enough to prove that H fixes a point in Y_{v_U} for every U . This holds because H is elliptic in $T_U = T_2/\tilde{U}$.

(5) Pick $e \in E(T_2)$. By [CZ, Theorem 4.2] G splits as an amalgamated free pro- p product $G_1 \amalg_{G_e} G_2$ or as HNN-extension $G = G_1 \amalg_{G_e}$ over G_e . As \hat{S} dominates T_2 for any edge $e' \in E(\hat{S})$ the stabilizers G_v, G_w of its vertices v, w stabilize a vertex in T_2 and hence are conjugate to G_1 or G_2 , say G_v is conjugate to G_1 and so we may assume that $G_v \leq G_1$. If $G_{e'}$ is not in a conjugate of G_e , then as $G_{e'} = G_v \cap G_w$, one has that G_w also must be contained in G_1 by [R, Corollary 7.1.5]. If this is the case for all e' then all vertex stabilizers of \hat{S} are contained in G_1 . This contradicts the minimality of T_2 . \square

5 Universally elliptic pro- p trees

Definition 5.1. A subgroup of G is called universally \mathcal{E} -elliptic if it is elliptic in every \mathcal{E} -tree on which G acts. In particular, the trivial group is universally elliptic.

Note that by Corollary 2.5 every finite p -group is universally elliptic. Of course, if a pro- p group does not act on a pro- p tree without global fixed point (such groups called FA-groups by Serre [Serre-80] and so we are going to use this term in the pro- p context) then it is universally elliptic. The class of FA pro- p groups is quite large and includes many example. All Fab pro- p groups, i.e pro- p groups whose open subgroups have finite abelianization are FA pro- p groups. Note that Fab pro- p groups include all just-infinite pro- p groups and all open pro- p subgroups of $SL_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. The pro- p completion

of Grigorchuk, Gupta-Sidki groups and other branch groups are FA pro- p groups as well as the Nottingham pro- p group.

Definition 5.2. A G -tree is called universally \mathcal{E} -elliptic if it is elliptic in every \mathcal{E} -tree on which G acts (i.e. every edge stabilizer is elliptic in every \mathcal{E} -tree).

Lemma 5.3. *Consider two G -trees T_1, T_2 . Suppose that T_1/G is finite (resp. G is finitely generated).*

- (1) *If T_1 is universally elliptic, then some refinement of T_1 (resp. some refinement of some S from the deformation space of T_1) dominates T_2 .*
- (2) *If T_1 and T_2 are universally elliptic, any standard refinement \hat{T}_1 of T_1 (resp. \hat{S} of some S from the deformation space of T_1) dominating T_2 is universally elliptic. In particular, there is a universally elliptic tree \hat{T}_1 (resp. \hat{S}) dominating both T_1 and T_2 .*

Proof. Both assertions follow directly from Assertions (2) and (3) of Proposition 4.9 (resp. 4.12). \square

For many purposes, it is enough to consider one-edge splittings, i.e. trees with only one orbit of edges.

Lemma 5.4. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree S with edge stabilizers in \mathcal{E} .*

- (1) *S is universally elliptic if and only if it is elliptic with respect to every one-edge splitting.*
- (2) *S dominates every universally elliptic tree if and only if it dominates every universally elliptic one-edge splitting.*

Proof. For the non-trivial direction, one needs to prove that S is elliptic with respect to a (G, \mathcal{E}) -tree T (resp. dominates T). Let $e \in E(S)$ be an edge (resp. $v \in V(S)$ be a vertex). We want to prove that G_e (resp. G_v) is elliptic in T .

Let U be an open normal subgroup of G and $\tilde{U} = \langle U_v \mid v \in V(T) \rangle$. By Lemma 2.25 $G = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft G} G/\tilde{U}$ and $G_U = G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ is the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of finite p -groups. Moreover, the inverse system $\{G_U, \pi_{VU}\}$ can be chosen in such a way that it is linearly ordered and for each $\{G_V\}$ of the system with $V \leq U$ there exists a natural morphism $(\eta_{VU}, \nu_{VU}) : (\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ where ν_{VU} is just a collapse of edges of Γ_V and $\eta_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m)) = \pi_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m))$; the induced homomorphism of the pro- p fundamental groups coincides with the canonical projection $\pi_{VU} : G_V \longrightarrow G_U$. Note also that $T_U = T/\tilde{U}$ is a pro- p tree by Proposition 2.2 and the vertex stabilizers of G_U acting on T_U are finite. So T_U is in the same deformation space as the standard pro- p tree S_U of $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$. Thus the projective limit argument reduces the proof to $G_U = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ acting on S_U .

We argue by induction on the number of edges of Γ_U to deduce that G_e (resp. G_v) is conjugate into a vertex group of $(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$. Choose a splitting of $G_U = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Delta_U)\Pi_{(G_U)_{e_U}}$ for some $e_U \in E(\Gamma_U)$, where Δ_U is a proper connected subgraph of Γ_U . As G_e (resp.

G_v) is elliptic with respect to this splitting (by hypothesis) we may assume w.l.o.g. that $G_e \leq \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Delta_U)$ (resp. $G_v \leq \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Delta_U)$). Then by the induction hypothesis G_e (resp. G_v) is conjugate into some vertex group of $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Delta_U)$ as needed. \square

Lemma 5.5. *Let G be a pro- p group and T_1, T_2 be pro- p trees on which G acts.*

- (1) *If T_1 refines T_2 and does not belong to the same deformation space, some $g \in G$ is hyperbolic in T_1 and elliptic in T_2 .*
- (2) *If every $g \in G$ which is elliptic in T_1 is also elliptic in T_2 , then T_1 dominates T_2 .*
- (3) *Suppose G is finitely generated and T_2 is minimal. If T_1 is elliptic with respect to T_2 , but T_2 is not elliptic with respect to T_1 , then G splits over an infinite index subgroup of an edge stabilizer of T_2 .*

Proof. (1) Since T_1 refines T_2 , every elliptic element in T_1 is elliptic in T_2 . If every elliptic element in T_2 is elliptic in T_1 then T_1 and T_2 have the same set of elliptic elements and so belong to the same deformation space. Therefore some hyperbolic element of T_1 becomes elliptic in T_2 .

(2) Let v be a vertex of T_1 . We need to show that G_v is elliptic in T_2 , but this follows from Proposition 2.4.

For (3) let G_e be an edge stabilizer of T_2 which is not elliptic in T_1 and let \hat{S} be the standard refinement from Proposition 4.12. By Proposition 4.12(5) G_e contains an edge stabilizer G_{e_1} of \hat{S} that has infinite index in G_e since it is elliptic in T_1 and G_e is not (see Corollary 2.5). By Theorem 2.9 G splits as a free pro- p product with amalgamation or as a pro- p HNN-extension over G_{e_1} . \square

Example 5.6. Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T . By Theorem 2.26 G is the fundamental pro- p group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . Let $S = S(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the standard pro- p tree. Then T and S are in the same deformation space. Moreover, S is universally elliptic if T is. The set of edges of S however is not compact in general; it is compact if and only if Γ is finite. This is the case if (G, T) is an \mathcal{E} -splitting and G is \mathcal{E} -accessible.

Note that (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is not unique. But if Γ is finite, then there exists a finite sequence of elementary transformations: reductions and expansions (expansion is the inverse operation to the reduction), that transforms one reduced graph of groups into another. To see this first note that we may assume that (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is reduced and the vertex groups of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) are exactly the maximal vertex stabilizers of G acting on T and so there are finitely many of them G_{v_1}, \dots, G_{v_n} . Therefore there exists an open normal subgroup U in G such that $G_{v_1}\tilde{U}/\tilde{U}, \dots, G_{v_n}\tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$ are precisely maximal finite subgroups of G/\tilde{U} up to conjugation and hence the vertex groups of (\mathcal{G}_U, Γ) for any choice of (\mathcal{G}_U, Γ) . By [Forester, Theorem 4.2] there exists a finite sequence of reductions and expansions that transform one choice to the other, and it does not depend on the chosen U , since the vertex groups are finite. Then the same finite sequence of reductions and expansions can be applied to (\mathcal{G}, Γ) using [CZ, Corollary 4.4] and its proof.

6 JSJ splittings

Definition 6.1. A JSJ decomposition (or JSJ tree) of a pro- p group G over \mathcal{E} is an \mathcal{E} -tree T on which G acts such that:

- T is universally elliptic;
- T dominates any other universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -tree T' on which G acts, i.e. the stabilizer of any vertex v of T stabilizes some vertex of T' .

If T/G is finite, then $G = (\mathcal{G}, T/G)$ is the fundamental pro- p group of a finite graph of pro- p groups (see Remark 2.27). We call the quotient graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}, T/G)$ a JSJ splitting, or a JSJ decomposition. Also, if the standard pro- p tree of the fundamental group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a JSJ G -tree, then we call (\mathcal{G}, Γ) a JSJ splitting, or a JSJ decomposition.

Remark 6.2. (i) The second condition in the definition is a maximality condition expressing that vertex stabilizers of T are as small as possible by Lemma 5.3.

- (ii) If (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a JSJ-splitting with $|\Gamma| < \infty$, then after the reduction from procedure described in Remark 2.17 we still have a JSJ-splitting. Indeed, the edge groups continue to be universally elliptic, and maximal vertex stabilizers do not change, so the obtained graph of groups still dominates any other JSJ-splitting.

Lemma 6.3. Any pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T with universally elliptic vertex stabilizers is a JSJ tree.

Proof. By assumption, T dominates every pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree. In particular, T is universally elliptic and dominates every universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -tree, so it is a JSJ tree. \square

Definition 6.4. (Rigid and flexible vertices). Let $H = G_v$ be a vertex stabilizer of a JSJ pro- p tree T (or a vertex group of the graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma = T/G)$). We say that H is rigid if it is universally elliptic, flexible if it is not. We also say that the vertex v is rigid (flexible) in this case. If H is flexible, we say that it is a flexible subgroup of G (over \mathcal{E}).

If T is a JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree, another pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T_0 is a JSJ pro- p tree if and only if T_0 is universally elliptic, T dominates T_0 , and T_0 dominates T . In other words, T_0 should belong to the deformation space of T over \mathcal{E}_{ell} , where \mathcal{E}_{ell} is the family of universally elliptic groups in \mathcal{E} .

Definition 6.5. If non-empty, the set of all JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -trees is a deformation space over \mathcal{E}_{ell} called the JSJ deformation space (of G over \mathcal{E}). We denote it by D_{JSJ} .

Remark 6.6. Let T be a JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree for G . Then the pro- p tree S from Example 5.6 belongs to D_{JSJ} . In fact, if \mathcal{E} is closed for finite quotients then generalizing [Wilson, Definition] of ultra filter we may see that S is the JSJ-decomposition obtained from inverse limit of ultra filter of virtually free quotients of G . Indeed, for any open normal subgroup U of G the group G/\tilde{U} acts on T/\tilde{U} . Moreover, T_1 dominates T_2 if and only if for any T_2/\tilde{U} there exists open normal V contained in U such that T_1/\tilde{V} dominates T_2/\tilde{U} and this is a definition of $\{T_1/\tilde{U} \mid U \triangleleft_o G\}$ being bigger than $\{T_2/\tilde{U} \mid U \triangleleft_o G\}$. Thus for $\{D/\tilde{U} \mid U \triangleleft_o G\}$ (where D ranges via all pro- p trees dominated by T), $\{T/\tilde{U} \mid U \triangleleft_o G\}$ is a maximal filter, i.e. an ultra filter.

Remark 6.7. If \mathcal{E} is invariant under a group A of automorphisms of G (in particular if \mathcal{E} is defined by restricting the isomorphism type), then so is the deformation space D_{JSJ} . Indeed, for $T \in D_{JSJ}$ and $\alpha \in A$ we can define a G -tree T_α with $T_\alpha = T$ and the action $g \cdot t = \alpha(g)t$. Then the stabilizer of $e \in T_\alpha = T$ is $\alpha^{-1}(G_e) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Using this we can deduce the following

Theorem 6.8. *Let G be a pro- p group having an open normal \mathcal{E} -accessible subgroup H acting on an infinite JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T . Suppose \mathcal{E} is G -invariant. Then G acts on an infinite pro- p \mathcal{E}' -tree S , where \mathcal{E}' consists of subgroups A of G such that $A \cap H \in \mathcal{E}$. Moreover, S is universally elliptic pro- p \mathcal{E}' -tree.*

Proof. By Remark 6.7 G acts on the deformation space D_{JSJ} for H . Write $H = \Pi_1(\mathcal{H}, \Delta)$ as the fundamental group of the corresponding reduced finite graph of pro- p groups. It follows then that G leaves the conjugacy classes of all vertex groups of (\mathcal{H}, Δ) invariant. By [AG, Theorem 8] G is the fundamental group of a reduced finite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) such that its vertex and edge groups intersected with H are subgroups of vertex and edge groups of (\mathcal{H}, Δ) . Thus the standard pro- p tree S of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is (G, \mathcal{E}') -tree. By Corollary 2.5 it is universally elliptic. □

Of course, if $\mathcal{H}(v), v \in V(\Gamma)$ are universally elliptic, then Theorem 9.32 holds independently of \mathcal{E} as it was used in the proof the G -invariance of vertex stabilizers only.

Corollary 6.9. *Let G be a pro- p group having an open subgroup H acting on an infinite JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T whose vertex stabilizers are universally elliptic. Then G acts on an infinite JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E}' -tree S , where \mathcal{E}' consists of subgroups A of G such that $A \cap H \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Corollary 6.10. *Let G be a pro- p group having an open subgroup H acting on an infinite JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T whose vertex stabilizers are FA. Then G acts on an infinite JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E}' -tree S , where \mathcal{E}' consists of subgroups A of G such that $A \cap H \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Lemma 6.11. *Assume G is finitely generated and all groups in \mathcal{E} are universally elliptic. If T is a JSJ-tree, then its finitely generated vertex stabilizers are universally elliptic. This applies in particular to splittings over finite groups.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.26 G is the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ of a profinite graph of pro- p groups over \mathcal{E} and by Example 5.6 its standard pro- p tree is universally elliptic and so replacing T by the standard pro- p tree S of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) we may assume that T is the standard pro- p tree for this graph of groups. If a vertex group $G(v)$ of v is flexible, then there exists a pro- p tree T_0 such that $G(v)$ is not elliptic in T_0 . Then by Theorem 2.9 $G(v)$ splits either as $G_0 *_A G_1$ or $G_0 *_A$, where $A \in \mathcal{E}$. As all edge groups are universally elliptic by hypothesis, the edge groups of all adjacent edges to v are conjugate into either G_0 or G_1 (see Corollary 2.5). Let $(\mathcal{G}, \hat{\Gamma})$ be the standard refinement of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) at v (see Proposition 4.12). Its standard pro- p tree T' , by our assumption on A , is universally elliptic, so by definition of the JSJ deformation space T dominates T' . This implies that G_v is elliptic in T' , hence in T_0 (see Proposition 4.12(2)), a contradiction. □

Theorem 6.12. *Let \mathcal{E} be a continuous family of subgroups of a pro- p group G and suppose that G is \mathcal{E} -accessible. Then JSJ pro- p tree T exists.*

Proof. Let (G, Γ) be a maximal reduced universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -splitting of G and $T(G)$ its standard pro- p tree (it might be trivial, i.e. be just a vertex). Note that $\Gamma = T/G$ is finite since G is \mathcal{E} -accessible. We show that (G, Γ) is JSJ-decomposition.

Let T' be another universally elliptic pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree for G . It suffices to show that the stabilizer G_v of any vertex v of T is elliptic in T' (indeed this would mean that edge groups also stabilize a vertex in T' and that T dominates T').

If not, then G splits as an amalgamated free pro- p product or pro- p HNN-extension over some edge stabilizer A in T' with not elliptic $G(v)$, say $G = G_1 \amalg_A G_2$ (remember that G is accessible, so T'/G is finite). Let $S(G)$ be a standard pro- p tree with respect to this splitting. Since T is universally elliptic every edge stabilizer in T is elliptic in $S(G)$. It follows that the stabilizer of an edge incident to v is in G_1 or in G_2 up to conjugation. Let $(\mathcal{G}, \hat{\Gamma})$ be the standard refinement of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) at v (see Remark 4.10). Then it is an \mathcal{E} -splitting of G dominating but not equal (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . This contradicts the maximality of the decomposition. □

Corollary 6.13. *Let G be a pro- p group and \mathcal{E} a continuous family of subgroups of G . If G is \mathcal{E} -accessible, then there exists JSJ pro- p tree T such that T/G is finite.*

In particular, using k -acylindricity and cyclic accessibility (cf. Theorem 3.4 and Theorem 3.3) we deduce

Corollary 6.14. *(i) A k -acylindrical JSJ-decomposition of a finitely generated pro- p group exists.*

(ii) Suppose \mathcal{E} consists of cyclic groups. Then JSJ-decomposition exists.

We show now that in contrast to the abstract situation a JSJ-splitting exists for finitely generated pro- p groups regardless of \mathcal{E} -accessibility. However the JSJ pro- p tree might not have compact set of edges.

Theorem 6.15. *Let \mathcal{E} be a continuous family of subgroups of a finitely generated pro- p group G . Then JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree exists.*

Proof. Let T_i be the set of all universally elliptic pro- p \mathcal{E} -trees on which G acts. By Example 5.6 there exists a universally elliptic pro- p tree S_i in the same deformation space as T_i . We claim that $\{S_i \mid i \in I\}$ is filtered. Indeed, if say, S_i does not dominate S_j then by Proposition 4.12 there exists a standard refinement \hat{S}_i that dominates both S_i and S_j . Now let $S = \varprojlim_i S_i$. We claim that S dominates every universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -tree. But this is clear, since S dominates every S_i and hence every T_i .

Now we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 6.12 to show that S is a JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree. Let T' be another universally elliptic pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree for G . It suffices to show that any vertex stabilizer G_v of T is elliptic in T' .

If not, then G_v acts on T' non-trivially. Since S is universally elliptic every edge stabilizer in S is elliptic in T' . It follows that every edge group of an edge incident to v is elliptic in T' . Let \hat{S} be the standard refinement of S at v (cf. Proposition 4.12 and 4.10). By Proposition 4.12 (3) \hat{S} is universally elliptic, since S and T' are. Then \hat{S} dominates S

(by Proposition 4.12(2)), but S does not dominate \hat{S} . This contradicts the definition of S . □

We illustrate this theorem in Example 7.4 in the next section and finish this section with the following simple facts for future reference.

Lemma 6.16. *Let G be a pro- p group, T be a JSJ pro- p tree, and S any G -tree. Suppose either G is finitely generated or T/G is finite.*

- (i) *There is a tree \hat{T} which refines T and dominates S ;*
- (ii) *If S is universally elliptic, it may be refined to a JSJ pro- p tree.*

Proof. Since T is elliptic with respect to S , one can construct a standard refinement \hat{T} of T dominating S (Propositions 4.9, 4.12). It satisfies the first assertion. For the second assertion, since S is elliptic with respect to T , we can consider a standard refinement \hat{S} of S dominating T . It is universally elliptic by the second assertion of Lemma 5.3, and dominates T , so it is a JSJ tree. □

7 Examples of JSJ-splittings

Recall that we have fixed \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{K} , and we only consider $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees. Unless otherwise indicated, G is only assumed to be finitely generated in this section. At the end of this section we shall give two examples of JSJ decompositions having flexible vertices, but most examples here will have all vertices rigid. The fact that they are indeed JSJ decompositions will be a consequence of Lemma 6.3.

7.1 Free pro- p groups

Let $G = F_n$ be a finitely generated free pro- p group, let \mathcal{E} be arbitrary, and $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$. Then the JSJ deformation space of F_n over \mathcal{E} is the space of pro- p trees on which F_n acts freely. Note that if we assume that T/F_n is reduced then it is just a bouquet and T is the Cayley graph of F_n .

7.2 Virtually free pro- p groups

More generally, if G is virtually free pro- p , by the main result of [HZ-13] G splits as a the fundamental pro- p group of a finite graph of finite p -groups. Thus if \mathcal{E} consists of all finite subgroups, then D_{JSJ} is the space of trees with finite vertex stabilizers.

Recall that there exists a finite sequence of elementary transformations: reductions and expansions (expansion is the inverse operation to the reduction), that transforms one JSJ splitting into another (cf. Example 5.6).


Note that there is the following open

Question 7.1. *Is a finitely generated pro- p group G acting on a pro- p tree T with finite vertex stabilizers accessible and hence is virtually free pro- p ?*

7.3 Free splittings

This is the pro- p version of the Grushko JSJ-decomposition.

Suppose \mathcal{E} consists only of the trivial subgroup of G , and $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$. Thus \mathcal{E} -trees are trees with trivial edge stabilizers, also called free splittings. Then the JSJ deformation space exists. We call it the Grushko deformation space. It consists of trees T such that edge stabilizers are trivial, and vertex stabilizers are freely indecomposable and different from \mathbb{Z}_p (one often considers \mathbb{Z}_p as freely decomposable since it splits as an HNN-extension over the trivial group). Denoting by $G = G_1 \amalg \dots \amalg G_n \amalg F_m$ a decomposition of G such that $G_i \neq \mathbb{Z}_p$ are indecomposable, and F_m is free pro- p (such splitting always exists for a finitely generated pro- p group G), the quotient graph of groups T/G has one vertex with group G_i for each i , and all other vertex groups are trivial. Below is the picture of the Grushko JSJ-decomposition when $n = 3$, $m = 2$.



Note that this graph of groups is not reduced, it admits a collapse of one edge; after this it becomes reduced.

If $\mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$, the JSJ deformation space is the Grushko deformation space relative to \mathcal{K} . Edge stabilizers of JSJ trees are trivial, groups in \mathcal{K} fix a vertex, and vertex stabilizers are freely indecomposable relative to their subgroups which are conjugate to a group in \mathcal{K} .

Proposition 7.2. *Let G be a second countable pro- p group and $G = G_1 \amalg \dots \amalg G_n \amalg F_m$ be a Grushko decomposition relative to \mathcal{K} . Any finitely generated \amalg -indecomposable relative to \mathcal{K} subgroup A of H is conjugate to a subgroup of G_i for some i . Moreover, if $G = A \amalg B$ for some closed subgroup B of G , then A is conjugate to some G_i .*

Proof. Follows from the pro- p version of the Kurosh subgroup theorem (see Theorem 2.30). □

7.4 Splittings over finite groups

This is a pro- p version of Stallings-Dunwoody JSJ-space.

If \mathcal{E} is the set of finite subgroups of G , and $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$, then the JSJ deformation space is the set of trees whose edge groups are finite and whose vertex groups either finite or virtually freely indecomposable (one deduces from the main result of [WEZ-16] that a pro- p tree is maximal for domination if and only if its vertex stabilizers are virtually indecomposable as a free pro- p product). If G is finitely generated, JSJ deformation space exists by Theorem 6.15. If G is accessible there exists a cofinite JSJ pro- p tree.

Remark 7.3. There is a cofinite JSJ pro- p tree over \mathcal{E} if \mathcal{E} is a family of finite subgroups of bounded order. The reason is Wilkes pro- p version of Linnell's accessibility [wilk, Theorem 3.1].

If $\mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$, then we talk about JSJ deformation space relative to \mathcal{K} . Edge stabilizers are finite, groups in \mathcal{K} fix a vertex, and vertex stabilizers are virtually freely indecomposable relative to their subgroups which are conjugate to a group in \mathcal{K} : they do not split over finite subgroups relative to their subgroups which are conjugate to a group in \mathcal{K} . As above, the relative JSJ space exists if G is finitely generated. If \mathcal{E} consists of finite groups of bounded order (and K is arbitrary) then there exists a cofinite JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree. If \mathcal{E} contains finite groups of arbitrary large order, a cofinite JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree exists if relative accessibility holds.

We finish the subsection with the example of an inaccessible finitely generated pro- p group presented by Wilkes in [Wilkes, Section 4.2] that illustrates Theorem 6.15.

Example 7.4. First define the map $\mu_n : \{0, \dots, p^{n+1} - 1\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, p^n - 1\}$ by sending an integer to its remainder modulo p^n . Define $H_n = \mathbb{F}_p[\{0, \dots, p^n - 1\}]$ to be the \mathbb{F}_p -vector space with basis $\{h_0, \dots, h_{p^n-1}\}$. There are inclusions $H_n \subseteq H_{n+1}$ given by inclusions of bases, and retractions $\eta_n : H_{n+1} \rightarrow H_n$ defined by $h_k \rightarrow h_{\mu_n(k)}$. Note also that there is a natural action of $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ on H_n given by cyclic permutation of the basis elements, and that these actions are compatible with the retractions η_i . The inverse limit of the H_n along these retractions is the completed group ring $H_\infty = \mathbb{F}_p[[\mathbb{Z}_p]]$ with multiplication ignored. The continuous action of \mathbb{Z}_p on the given basis of H_∞ allows to form a sort of a pro- p wreath product $H_\omega = \mathbb{F}_p[[\mathbb{Z}_p]] \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_p = \varprojlim (H_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/p^n)$ which is a pro- p group into which H_∞ embeds.

Next set $K_n = \mathbb{F}_p \times H_n = \langle k_n \rangle \times H_n$. Set $G_1 = K_1 \times \mathbb{F}_p$. For $n > 1$, let G_n be a finite p -group with presentation $G_n = \langle k_{n-1}, k_n, h_0, \dots, h_{p^n-1} \mid k_i^p = h_i^p = 1, h_i \leftrightarrow h_j, k_{n-1} \leftrightarrow h_i \text{ for all } i \neq p^{n-1}, k_n = [k_{n-1}, h_{p^n-1}] \text{ central} \rangle$ where \leftrightarrow denotes the relation 'commutes with'.

The choice of generator names describes maps

$$H_n \longrightarrow G_n, K_{n-1} \longrightarrow G_n, K_n \longrightarrow G_n.$$

One may easily see that all three of these maps are injections. Define a retraction map $\rho_n : G_n \rightarrow K_{n-1}$ by killing k_n and by sending $h_k \rightarrow h_{\mu_{n-1}(k)}$. Note that ρ_n is compatible with $\eta_n : H_n \rightarrow H_{n-1}$ that is, there is a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_{n-1} & \xrightleftharpoons[\rho_n]{} & G_n \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ H_{n-1} & \xrightleftharpoons[\eta_n]{} & H_n \end{array}$$

Define $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_m, \Gamma_m, v_m)$ to be the pro- p fundamental group of the following graph of groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} G_1 & & K_1 & \longrightarrow & G_2 & \cdots & G_{m-1} & \xrightarrow{K_{m-1}} & G_m \\ \bullet & & & & \bullet & & \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}$$

Note that the retraction $\rho_n : G_n \longrightarrow K_{n-1}$ induces the retraction $P_{m+1} \longrightarrow P_m$ represented by the collapse the last right edge of the picture.

Then $P = \varprojlim_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_m, \Gamma_m, v_m)$ is the fundamental group of the following profinite graph of pro- p groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} G_1 & & K_1 & & G_2 & & K_2 & & G_3 & & \dots & & G_\infty \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & & & \bullet \end{array}$$

where the vertex at infinity is a one point compactification of the edge set of the graph and so does not have an incident edge to it; thus the edge set is not compact. The vertex group G_∞ of the vertex at infinity is $G_\infty = K_\infty = \varprojlim_{i \in \mathbb{N}} K_i = H_\infty$. Let $J = P \amalg_{H_\infty} H_\omega$. Then J is the fundamental group of the following profinite graph of groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} G_1 & & K_1 & & G_2 & & \dots & & H_\infty & & H_\infty & & H_\omega \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \bullet \end{array}$$

By [Wilkes, Section 4.3], this graph of pro- p groups is injective and by [Wilkes, Section 4.4] $J = \langle G_1, H_\omega \rangle$. Since G_1 is finite and H_ω is 2-generated, J is finitely generated (in fact for $p = 2$ the group J is 3-generated). Collapsing the right edge we shall get the reduced graph of pro- p groups since no vertex group equals to an edge group of an incident edge. Note that the latter graph of groups has a unique vertex ∞ whose vertex group is infinite and isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}_p \wr \mathbb{Z}_p$ which does not split over a finite p -group. This is a JSJ decomposition of J over finite p -groups.

Small groups

Recall that G is small in $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees if for any such tree T the group G has no free non-abelian pro- p subgroup acting freely on T : there always is a fixed point, or the action on the minimal subtree has cocyclic or codihedral kernel (see [RZ-00, Theorem 3.15]). This is in particular the case if G is small, i.e. contains no non-abelian free pro- p group. If G does not fix a vertex, then every vertex stabilizer in the minimal subtree has a subgroup of index at most 2 fixing an edge (the index is 2 if $p = 2$).

Lemma 7.5. *If G is small in $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees, and T is a non-trivial universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree, then T dominates every $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree.*

Proof. Since the action of G on T is non-trivial, every vertex stabilizer contains an edge stabilizer with index at most 2 (by above). It follows that every vertex stabilizer is universally elliptic, since the stabilizer of the edge is (see Proposition 2.5). So T dominates every $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree. \square

Corollary 7.6. *If G is small in $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees, there is at most one non-trivial deformation space containing a universally elliptic tree.*

In this situation, the JSJ deformation space always exists: if there is a deformation space as in the corollary, it is the JSJ space; otherwise, the JSJ space is trivial.

Example 7.7. Consider for instance (non-relative) cyclic splittings of solvable pro- p Baumslag-Solitar groups

$$BS(1, n) = \langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^n, n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_p,$$

where n is supernatural rather than natural number. If $n = 1$ (so $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p$), there are infinitely many deformation spaces (corresponding to epimorphisms $G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$) and there is no non-trivial universally elliptic tree.

If $n \neq \pm 1$ there exists a unique deformation space containing the Bass-Serre tree S of the HNN extension $\langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^n \rangle = HNN(\langle a \rangle, \langle a \rangle, t)$. This pro- p tree is universally elliptic and therefore is JSJ-tree. Indeed, vertex stabilizers of a non-trivial G -tree T have to be cyclic, since 2-generated subgroups are open in G and if stabilize a vertex then so is G by Corollary 2.5. By Theorem 2.9 G splits as a non-trivial (non-fictitious) free pro- p product with amalgamation $G_1 \amalg_{G_e} G_2$ or HNN-extension $HNN(G_1, G_e, t)$. As G is soluble, either $G = G_1 \amalg_{G_e} G_2$ with $[G_1 : G_e] = 2 = [G_2 : G_e]$ or $HNN(G_e, G_e, t')$. In the first case G_1, G_2 are cyclic and so T/G has one edge only, $p = 2$ and G/G_e is infinite dihedral, which is impossible for $n \neq -1$. Thus this case of the amalgamation $G = G_1 \amalg_{G_e} G_2$ does not occur.

So $G = HNN(G_e, G_e, t')$ and T is the Bass-Serre tree of $HNN(\langle a \rangle, \langle a \rangle, t')$, where t' is a unit of $\langle t \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. As $\langle a \rangle$ is a unique normal subgroup N of G such that $G/N \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$, $\langle a \rangle = G_e$. Therefore a is elliptic in T .

Thus we proved that S is universally elliptic in this case.

If $n = -1$ ($p = 2$, and so G is pro-2 Klein bottle group), there are exactly two non-trivial deformation spaces: one contains the Bass-Serre tree of the HNN extension $\langle a, t \mid tat^{-1} = a^{-1} \rangle$, the other contains the tree associated to the amalgam $\langle t \rangle \amalg_{\langle t^2=v^2 \rangle} \langle v \rangle$, with $v = ta$. None of these trees is universally elliptic (t and v are hyperbolic in the HNN extension, and a is hyperbolic in the amalgam). Thus the JSJ deformation space of $BS(1, -1)$ is the trivial one.

The essential feature of JSJ theory is the description of flexible vertices, in particular the fact that flexible vertex stabilizers are often “surface-like” ([RS, DS99, FP06] and [GL, Theorem 6.2]). The next theorem show that flexible vertices of cyclic pro- p trees split as a free pro- p product.

Theorem 7.8. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group and \mathcal{E} be the family of infinite cyclic pro- p groups. If $Q \neq \mathbb{Z}_p$ is a vertex stabilizer of a cyclic JSJ G -tree and Q does not split as a free pro- p product then it is elliptic in any cyclic G -tree.*

Proof. Let T be a JSJ G -tree where Q is not elliptic. By Lemma 5.5(3) Q splits as a free pro- p product, contradicting the hypothesis. □

7.5 Locally finite trees

One can generalize the previous example to locally finite trees with small edge stabilizers (i.e. \mathcal{E} consists of small pro- p groups). The example of it is a non-soluble Baumslag-Solitar pro- p group,

$$BS(m, n) = \langle a, t \mid ta^mt^{-1} = a^n, \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \amalg_{\mathbb{Z}_p} (\mathbb{Z}_p \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_p),$$

where m, n are supernatural numbers. Since a^m and a^n have the same order in every finite quotient, they generate the same group \mathbb{Z}_p and this \mathbb{Z}_p is the amalgamated subgroup identified with $n\mathbb{Z}_p = m\mathbb{Z}_p$ in the first factor and with the normal semidirect factor in the second factor; in particular this normal subgroup is normal in G .

Definition 7.9. Let be G a pro- p group, and $H \leq_c G$. The pro- p commensurator of H in G , denoted $Comm_G(H)$, is the set defined as:

$$Comm_G(H) = \overline{\{g \in G \mid H^g \cap H \leq_o H \text{ and } H^g \cap H \leq_o H^g\}}.$$

Observe that the commensurator $Comm_G(H)$ is a (closed) subgroup of G and $N_G(H) \leq Comm_G(H)$.

Theorem 7.10. ([BZ, Theorem 3.4]) Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T and H a non-trivial non-elliptic subgroup of G . Let D be a minimal C -invariant pro- p subtree of T . Then $Comm_G(H)$ acts on D .

Theorem 7.11. ([BZ, Theorem 4.4]) Let $G = (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the fundamental group of a reduced graph of pro- p groups and suppose that G is finitely generated. If $[G(d_0(e)) : G(e)] < \infty$, and $[G(d_1(e)) : G(e)] < \infty$ for all $e \in E(\Gamma)$. Then $G = Comm_G(G(e)) = N_G(J)$, for any $e \in E(\Gamma)$, where $J \leq_o G(e)$.

7.5.1 Generalized Baumslag-Solitar groups

Definition 7.12. A generalized Baumslag-Solitar pro- p group (GBS) is a finitely generated pro- p group which acts on a pro- p tree T with infinite cyclic vertex and edge stabilizers.

Let \mathcal{E} be the set of cyclic subgroups of G (including the trivial subgroup), and $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$. Unless G is metacyclic, the deformation space of T is the JSJ deformation space. To prove this we need the following theorem on commensurator.

Theorem 7.13. [BZ, Theorem 4.7]) Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting irreducibly on a pro- p tree T , such that G_v is infinite cyclic group and $G_e \neq 1$ for all $v \in V(T)$, $e \in E(T)$. Then $Comm_G(G_e) = G$, for any $e \in E(T)$.

Theorem 7.14. Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting irreducibly on a pro- p tree T , such that G_v is infinite cyclic pro- p group for all $v \in V(T)$ and $G_e \neq 1$ for all $e \in E(T)$. Unless G is metacyclic-by $\mathbb{Z}/2$, the deformation space of T is the JSJ deformation space.

Proof. By Lemma 6.3 it suffices to show that every vertex stabilizer H of T is universally elliptic. The commensurator of H is G by Theorem 7.13. Then by Theorem 7.11 H contains some open J which is normal in G . If H acts hyperbolically on a minimal pro- p tree T , then so is J . Then by [CZ, Proposition 8.2 (2)] G/J is either cyclic or infinite dihedral. This implies that G is either metacyclic or $p = 2$ and G is metacyclic-by $\mathbb{Z}/2$. \square

7.6 pro- p RAAGs

Let Δ be a finite graph. The associated right-angled Artin pro- p group A_Δ (RAAG, also called graph group, or partially commutative group) is the group presented as follows: there is one generator a_v per vertex, and a relation $a_v a_w = a_w a_v$ if there is an edge between v and w (see [SZ]). The decomposition of Δ into connected components induces a decomposition of A_Δ as a free pro- p product of freely indecomposable RAAGs (which may be infinite cyclic), so to study JSJ decompositions of A_Δ one may assume that Δ is connected.

Definition 7.15 (Standard subgroups). A subgroup of G_Γ is called a *standard subgroup* if it is the subgroup generated by a subset $V' \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. If $\Gamma = \emptyset$, by convention we set G_Γ to be the trivial subgroup.

Definition 7.16 (Support of an element). Let g be an element of a (pro- p) RAAG G_Γ . The *support* $\alpha(g)$ of g is the set of canonical generators of the unique minimal standard subgroup of G_Γ containing g .

Definition 7.17 (Links and stars). Let g be an element of a (pro- p) RAAG G_Γ . The link $\text{Link}(g)$ of g is the set of vertices of $\Gamma \setminus \alpha(g)$ that are adjacent to each of the vertices in $\alpha(g)$. If v is a canonical generator, we denote by $\text{Star}(v)$ the full subgraph generated by $\text{Link}(v) \cup v$.

Definition 7.18 (Hanging vertex). We say that a vertex v of Γ is a *hanging vertex* if $\text{Star}(v)$ is a complete graph and for every $w \in \text{link}(v)$, $\text{Star}(w)$ is not a complete graph.

Abusing the notation, if $S \subseteq V(\Gamma)$, we denote by G_S the standard subgroup generated by the full subgraph generated by S .

In [CPZ] is given a characterization of the splitting of G_Γ over an abelian pro- p group. It is also given the following JSJ-decomposition of G_Γ over abelian subgroups.

Theorem 7.19. ([CPZ]) *Let $G = G_\Gamma$ be a pro- p RAAG associated to a connected finite graph Γ .*

There is a (possibly trivial) decomposition of G as a fundamental pro- p group of a reduced finite graph of pro- p groups $(\mathcal{G}_\Theta, \Theta)$ with the following properties:

- *the underlying graph Θ is either a tree or a tree with loops;*
- *vertex groups of $(\mathcal{G}_\Theta, \Theta)$ are standard subgroups which are either abelian or their underlying graph does not contain any disconnecting complete graph;*
- *each edge group of $(\mathcal{G}_\Theta, \Theta)$ is a standard subgroup associated with a disconnecting complete subgraph of Γ ;*
- *hanging vertices do not belong to any vertex group.*


Furthermore, the standard pro- p tree associated to this decomposition is an abelian JSJ tree decomposition (T_Θ, G) of G .

7.7 Non-rigid example

Unlike the previous subsections, we now consider an example with flexible vertices which is a pro- p version of an example from [GL]. We consider cyclic splittings with $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$.

Suppose that G_Σ is the fundamental pro- p group of a closed orientable hyperbolic surface Σ . Any simple closed geodesic γ on Σ defines a cyclic splitting (an amalgam or an HNN-extension, depending on whether γ separates or not). A non-trivial element $g \in G_\Sigma$, represented by an immersed closed geodesic δ , is elliptic in the splitting defined by γ if and only if $\delta \cap \gamma = \emptyset$ or $\delta = \gamma$. Since any δ meets transversely some simple γ , this shows that 1 is the only universally elliptic element of G_Σ , so the JSJ decomposition of G_Σ is trivial and its vertex is flexible.

Example 7.20. Suppose that G is the pro- p completion of the fundamental group of the space consisting of three punctured tori Σ_i attached along their boundaries. A presentation of G is $\langle a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3, b_3 \mid [a_1, b_1] = [a_2, b_2] = [a_3, b_3] \rangle$. It is the fundamental group of a graph of groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) with one central vertex v and three terminal vertices v_i with e_i connecting v to v_i . More precisely, putting $c = [a_1, b_1] = [a_2, b_2] = [a_3, b_3]$ the tree of groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is as follows:



All edges, as well as v , carry the same cyclic group $C = \langle c \rangle$. We claim that (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is a JSJ decomposition of G , with 3 flexible vertices v_i .

Let us first show that (\mathcal{G}, Γ) is universally elliptic, i.e. that C is universally elliptic. Using Lemma 5.4, we consider a one-edge cyclic splitting of G over $\langle a \rangle$ in which C is not elliptic, and we argue towards a contradiction. The group G_{12} generated by $\langle a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \rangle$ is the fundamental pro- p group of a closed surface (of genus 2), in particular it is freely indecomposable. It follows that $\langle a \rangle$ has non-trivial intersection with some conjugate of G_{12} , so some a^k lies in a conjugate of G_{12} (where k is some power of p), i.e. w.l.o.g. we may assume that $a^k \in G_{12}$. We now consider the action of a^k on the standard pro- p tree T of (\mathcal{G}, Γ) . If a^k fixes an edge in T , then $\langle a^k \rangle$ has finite index in some conjugate of C , so C is elliptic in $G \amalg_{\langle a \rangle}$ by Corollary 2.5, a contradiction. Hence by Proposition 2.8 there exists the unique minimal a^k -invariant subtree $D(a^k)$ in T (if a^k is elliptic, $D(a^k)$ is unique because a does not fix an edge). Then $D(a^k)$ is contained in the minimal subtree of G_{12} , i.e. in the subtree $G\{e'_1, e'_2, v'_1, v'_2\}$ of G -translations of some lift $\{e'_1, e'_2, v'_1, v'_2\}$ of the spanning tree $[v_1, v_2]$ of v_1, v_2 . But $G\{e'_1, e'_2, v'_1, v'_2\}$ contains no lift of the vertex v_3 and hence so does not $D(a^k)$. Permuting indices shows that all vertices in $D(a^k)$ are lifts of v , so $D(a^k)$ is a single point (a lift of v) (since Γ is a tree). This implies that $\langle a^k \rangle$ has

finite index in some conjugate of C , which is again a contradiction. Thus C is universally elliptic in all cyclic splittings.

To prove maximality of the splitting (cf. Remark 6.2(i)), consider a universally elliptic tree S dominating T . If the domination is strict (i.e. S and T are in different deformation spaces), some $G(v_i)$ is non-elliptic in S . Being universally elliptic, C is elliptic in S , so by a standard fact combined with [Wilkes20, Theorem 4.6 (3)] the action of G_{v_i} on its minimal subtree in S comes from the splitting of the abstract surface group S_{12} whose pro- p completion is G_{12} . The splitting of S_{12} is associated to an essential simple closed curve $\gamma_i \subset \Sigma_i$. Let γ be a curve intersecting γ_i non-trivially. Considering the splitting of G defined by a curve $\gamma \subset \Sigma_i$ shows that S is not universally elliptic, a contradiction.

Remark 7.21. In Example 7.20 the element c can be replaced by the standard Demushkin relator $c = x_1^{p^r} [x_1, x_2] \cdots [x_{n-1}, x_n]$ if $p > 2$ and by $c = x_1^{2+2^f} [x_1, x_2] \cdots [x_{n-1}, x_n]$ or by $c = x_1^2 [x_1, x_2] x_3^{2^f} [x_3, x_4] \cdots [x_{n-1}, x_n]$, or by $c = x_1^2 x_2^{2^f} [x_2, x_3] \cdots [x_{n-1}, x_n]$ for $f \geq 2$ by [Wil19, Theorem 5.6] combined with [Wilkes20, Theorem 3.3].

8 A few useful facts

In this section, we first describe the behavior of the JSJ deformation space when we change the class \mathcal{E} of allowed edge groups. We then introduce the incidence structure inherited by a vertex group of a graph of groups, and we relate JSJ decompositions of G to JSJ decompositions of vertex groups relative to their incidence structure. We also discuss relative finite presentation of vertex groups. Finally, we give an alternative construction of relative JSJ decompositions, obtained by embedding G into a larger group.

8.1 Changing edge groups

We fix two families of subgroups \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{F} , with $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$, and we compare JSJ splittings over \mathcal{E} and over \mathcal{F} (universal ellipticity, and all JSJ decompositions, are relative to some fixed family \mathcal{K}).

For example:

- \mathcal{E} consists of the finitely generated abelian subgroups of G , and \mathcal{F} consists of the subgroups having no non-abelian free pro- p subgroups.
- Groups in \mathcal{F} are locally small (their finitely generated subgroups are small), and \mathcal{E} is the family of small subgroups.
- \mathcal{E} is the family of cyclic subgroups, and \mathcal{F} is the family of virtually cyclic subgroup.
- \mathcal{E} consists of the trivial group, or the finite subgroups of G (see Corollary 4.16).

There are now two notions of universal ellipticity, so we shall distinguish between \mathcal{E} -universal ellipticity (being elliptic in all $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees) and \mathcal{F} -universal ellipticity (being elliptic in all $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees). Of course, \mathcal{F} -universal ellipticity implies \mathcal{E} -universal ellipticity. Recall that two trees are compatible if they have a common refinement.

Proposition 8.1. *Assume $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$. Let $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ be a JSJ tree over \mathcal{F} with $T_{\mathcal{F}}/G$ finite.*

- (1) If there is a JSJ tree $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ over \mathcal{E} , then there is a pro- p JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ which is compatible with $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. It may be obtained by refining $T_{\mathcal{F}}$, and then collapsing all edges whose stabilizer is not in \mathcal{E} .
- (2) If every \mathcal{E} -universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -tree is \mathcal{F} -universally elliptic, the tree $\overline{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ obtained from $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ by collapsing all edges whose stabilizer is not in \mathcal{E} is a JSJ tree over \mathcal{E} .

Note that (2) applies if \mathcal{E} consists of finite groups (more generally, of groups with the pro- p version of Serre's property (FA)).

Proof. (1) Let $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ be a JSJ pro- p tree over \mathcal{E} . Since $\mathcal{F} \supset \mathcal{E}$, the tree $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ is elliptic with respect to $T_{\mathcal{E}}$. Let $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ be a standard refinement of $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ dominating $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ (see Proposition 4.9). Consider an edge e of $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ whose stabilizer is not in \mathcal{E} . Then G_e fixes a unique vertex v_e of $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ (if more than one, say $v, w \in V(T_{\mathcal{E}})$) then fixes an edge by Theorem 2.6). Hence $G_{d_0(e)}, G_{d_1(e)}$ fix v_e and so the group generated by them fixes v_e . It follows that the tree $\overline{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ obtained from $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ by collapsing all edges whose stabilizer is not in \mathcal{E} dominates $T_{\mathcal{E}}$: each new vertex stabilizer is the stabilizer of some vertex in $T_{\mathcal{E}}$ (we use here that the number of such edges is finite up to translation since $T_{\mathcal{F}}/G$ is finite; the argument also works if $\{e \in E(\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}})\}$ is open in $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$). Being \mathcal{E} -universally elliptic by Lemma 5.3 (2), it is a JSJ tree over \mathcal{E} .

For (2), first note that $\overline{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an \mathcal{E} -universally elliptic pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree. If T' is another one, it is \mathcal{F} -universally elliptic, hence dominated by $T_{\mathcal{F}}$. As above, the stabilizer of any edge e of $\widehat{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ not in \mathcal{E} fixes a unique vertex of $T_{\mathcal{E}}$, so $\overline{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ dominates T' . Thus $\overline{T}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a JSJ tree over \mathcal{E} . \square

8.2 Finiteness properties

In this subsection we show that G_v is finitely presented relative to incident edge groups if G is finitely presented and edge stabilizers are finitely generated (Proposition 8.10 below).

The part on finite generatedness of the next Proposition is [CAZ, Proposition 2.21].

Proposition 8.2. *Let $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be a finite graph of pro- p groups and D is a maximal subtree of Γ . Suppose G is finitely generated (resp. finitely presented). If $\mathcal{G}(e)$ is finitely generated (resp. finitely presented) for every $e \in E(\Gamma)$, then $G(v)$ are finitely generated (resp. finitely presented). Moreover, $d(\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, D)) \leq d(G) + \sum_{e \in \Gamma \setminus D} (d(\mathcal{G}(e)) - 1)$.*

Proof. Since Γ is finite, we can think of G as $G = HNN(\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, D), \mathcal{G}(e), t_e), e \in \Gamma \setminus D$.

Consider the Mayer-Vietoris sequence associated to (\mathcal{G}, Γ) with coefficients in \mathbb{F}_p :

$$\begin{aligned} \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_2(G(e)) &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_2(G(v)) \rightarrow H_2(G) \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(G(e)) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_1(G(v)) \rightarrow H_1(G). \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_1(G), H_1(G(e))$ (resp. $H_2(G), H_2(G(e))$) are finite, so are $H_1(G(v))$ (resp. $H_2(G(v))$). This proves the first statement.

The last statement is the subject of [CAZ, Proposition 2.21]. \square

Proposition 8.2 says that, if $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ and all edge groups are finitely generated (resp. finitely presented), then so are all vertex groups. The goal of this subsection is to extend these results to relative finite generation (resp. finite presentation), as we define below. This is not needed if all groups in \mathcal{E} are assumed to be finitely presented.

Relative finite generation and presentation

If we assume that G is finitely generated, or finitely presented, these properties are not always inherited by vertex groups. We therefore consider relative finite generation (or presentation), which behave better in that respect.

Let G be a pro- p group and \mathcal{K} be a continuous family of subgroups of G .

Definition 8.3. One says that G is finitely generated relative to \mathcal{K} if there exists a finite set $\Omega \subset G$ such that G is generated by $\Omega \cup \mathcal{K}$. Such a subset Ω is a relative generating set.

If G is finitely generated, then clearly it is finitely generated relative to any \mathcal{K} . If the pro- p groups in \mathcal{K} are finitely generated, relative finite generation is equivalent to finite generation. Note that relative finite generation does not change if one replaces the subgroups in \mathcal{K} by their conjugates or closes \mathcal{K} for conjugation.

Recall that a pro- p G -tree T is relative to \mathcal{K} if every $K \in \mathcal{K}$ is elliptic in T . We now consider relative finite presentation (see [Osi06] for the abstract case). Note that, if Ω is a relative finite generating set, then the natural morphism $F(\Omega) \amalg \coprod_{K \in \mathcal{K}} K \rightarrow G$ is an epimorphism (with $F(\Omega)$ the free pro- p group on Ω).

The next proposition gives the homological characterization of relative generation.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose \mathcal{K} is a continuous family of subgroups of a pro- p group G closed for conjugation. Then G is finitely generated relative to \mathcal{K} if and only if the image of the natural map $\bigoplus_{o \in \mathcal{K}/G} H_1(G, \mathbb{F}_p[[o]]) \rightarrow H_1(G, \mathbb{F}_p)$ is open.*

Proof. Just observe that $H_1(G) = G/\Phi(G)$. □

Definition 8.5. One says that a pro- p group G is finitely presented relative to a continuous family of subgroups \mathcal{K} closed for conjugation if the image of the natural map $\bigoplus_{o \in \mathcal{K}/G} H_2(G, \mathbb{F}_p[[o]]) \rightarrow H_2(G, \mathbb{F}_p)$ is open.

Remark 8.6. Suppose w.l.o.g. \mathcal{K} is closed for conjugation. The definition above of relative finite presentability is given in terms of the second homology because the map $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}/G$ does not always admit a continuous section (see [RZ10, Section 5.6]). When such section $\sigma : \mathcal{K}/G \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ exists, we can reduce \mathcal{K} to $\tilde{\mathcal{K}} = \sigma(\mathcal{K})$ and give the following equivalent similar to the abstract case definition: G is finitely presented relative to $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ if there exists a finite (*relative generating*) set $\Omega \subset G$, such that the natural epimorphism $f : F(\Omega) \amalg \coprod_{K \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}}} K \rightarrow G$ has finitely generated kernel as a normal subgroup. The equivalence of the definition in this case follows directly from 5-term Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence associated to the epimorphism f . In this case finite presentation is not affected if one replaces the subgroups $K \in \sigma(\mathcal{K}/G)$ by their conjugates.

One easily checks that relative finite presentation does not depend on the choice of Ω . If G is finitely presented, then it is finitely presented relative to any collection of subgroups. Conversely, if G is finitely presented relative to any finite collection of finitely presented subgroups, then G is finitely presented.

The following lemma will be used below.

Lemma 8.7. *Suppose that G is finitely presented relative to $\{K_1, \dots, K_p\}$, and $K_p \subset K_i$ for some $i < p$. Then G is finitely presented relative to $\{K_1, \dots, K_{p-1}\}$.*

Proof. Let $f : F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_p \rightarrow G$ be an epimorphism corresponding to the presentation of G relative to $\{K_1, \dots, K_p\}$ and

$$s : F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_{p-1} \rightarrow G$$

be the restriction of f to $F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_{p-1}$. Then f factors through the epimorphism $F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_p \rightarrow F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_{p-1}$ that sends K_p to its copy in K_i and the rest of the factors identically to their copies.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_p & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F(\Omega) \amalg K_1 \amalg \dots \amalg K_{p-1} \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow s \\ & G & \end{array}$$

Therefore the kernel of f is mapped onto the kernel of s and so the kernel of s is finitely generated as a normal subgroup. \square

Suppose that a finitely generated group G splits as a finite graph of pro- p groups. It follows from Proposition 8.2 that vertex groups are finitely generated if one assumes that edge groups are finitely generated, but this is false in general without this assumption. However, vertex groups are always finitely generated relative to the incident edge groups, and there is a similar statement for relative finite presentation (see below).

The abstract version of the following lemma can be found in [Gui, Lemmas 1.11, 1.12]. Note that it gives another proof of Proposition 8.2.

Lemma 8.8. *If a finitely generated pro- p group G acts on a pro- p tree T cofinitely, then every vertex stabilizer G_v is finitely generated relative to the incident edge groups. More generally, if G is finitely generated relative to \mathcal{K} , and T is a tree relative to \mathcal{K} , then G_v is finitely generated relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$.*

Proof. Let (\mathcal{G}, Γ) be the corresponding graph of pro- p groups with $\Gamma = T/G$. For every vertex v of Γ put $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \mathcal{G}(v) / \langle \mathcal{G}(e)^{\mathcal{G}(v)} \mid e \in E(d_0^{-1}(v) \cup d_1^{-1}(v)) \rangle$. Define the quotient graph of groups $(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ by putting $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v)$ on top of v and setting the edge groups to be trivial. Then from the presentation (1) for $\Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ (see Section 2.4) it follows that

$$\Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma) = \coprod_{v \in V(\Gamma)} \overline{\mathcal{G}}(v).$$

The natural morphism $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ induces then the epimorphism

$$G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \rightarrow \overline{G} = \Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma).$$

If G is finitely generated, then so is $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v)$ and therefore so is $\mathcal{G}(v)$ relative to

$$\{\mathcal{G}(e)^{\mathcal{G}(v)} \mid e \in E(d_0^{-1}(v) \cup d_1^{-1}(e))\}.$$

To show the second statement we use overline for the images of subgroups of G in \overline{G} . Note that if G is finitely generated relative to \mathcal{K} then $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ is finitely generated relative to $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$ and therefore so are $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v)$. Hence $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_v$ are finitely generated relative to

$$\{\mathcal{G}(e)^{\mathcal{G}(v)} \mid e \in E(d_0^{-1}(v) \cup d_1^{-1}(e))\} \cup \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}.$$

□

Remark 8.9. If $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, \dots, K_p\}$, then the family $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$ consists of at most p groups, each conjugate to some K_i .

There is a similar statement for relative finite presentation.

Proposition 8.10. *Let $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be the fundamental pro- p group of a finite graph of pro- p groups with finitely generated edge groups. If G is finitely presented, then every vertex group $G(v)$ is finitely presented relative to the incident edge groups. More generally, if G is finitely presented relative to \mathcal{K} , and $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is a splitting relative to \mathcal{K} , then G_v is finitely presented relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$.*

Proof. W.l.o.g we assume that \mathcal{K} is closed for conjugation in G . Consider the Mayer-Vietoris sequence:

$$\bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_2(G_e) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_2(G_v) \longrightarrow H_2(G) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(G_e).$$

As in the previous lemma for every vertex v of Γ put

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v) = \mathcal{G}(v) / \langle \mathcal{G}(e)^{\mathcal{G}(v)} \mid e \in E(d_0^{-1}(v) \cup d_1^{-1}(e)) \rangle.$$

Define the quotient graph of groups $(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ by putting $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(v)$ on top of v . Then from the presentation (1) (Section 2.4) for $\Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ it follows that

$$\Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma) = \coprod_{v \in V(\Gamma)} \overline{\mathcal{G}}(v).$$

The natural morphism $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \longrightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$ induces then the epimorphism

$$G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \longrightarrow \overline{G} = \Pi_1(\overline{\mathcal{G}}, \Gamma)$$

with the kernel $\langle \langle G(e) \mid e \in E(\Gamma) \rangle \rangle$. Let

$$H_2(G) \longrightarrow H_2(\overline{G}) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(G_e)$$

be the part of the 5-term Hochschild-Serre sequence for this epimorphism. The right part of it is finite. So from the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}} H_2(K) & \longrightarrow & H_2(G) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}} H_2(\overline{K}) & \longrightarrow & H_2(\overline{G}) \end{array}$$

it follows that $\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}} H_2(K) \longrightarrow H_2(G)$ has open image if and only if

$$\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}} H_2(\overline{K}) \longrightarrow H_2(\overline{G})$$

has open image. Similarly $\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{|G(v)}} H_2(K) \longrightarrow H_2(G(v))$ has open image if and only if $\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{|G(v)}} H_2(\overline{K}) \longrightarrow H_2(\overline{G}(v))$ has open image. Thus it suffices to prove the proposition when edge groups are trivial.

Assuming this the natural map $\bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_2(G_v) \longrightarrow H_2(G)$ is an isomorphism. As the image of $\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}} H_2(\overline{K})$ is open in $H_2(\overline{G})$, the image of $\bigoplus_{K \in \mathcal{K}_{|G(v)}} H_2(\overline{K})$ must be open in $H_2(\overline{G}(v))$ for every v . This finishes the proof. \square

8.3 Incidence structures of vertex groups

Given a vertex stabilizer G_v of a tree T , it is useful to consider splittings of G_v relative to incident edge stabilizers, as they extend to splittings of G if T/G is finite (Lemma 8.16 below). In this subsection we give definitions. We assume in this subsection until the rest of the section that \mathcal{K} does not have subgroups contained in edge stabilizers.

Definitions. Let T be a tree (minimal, relative to \mathcal{K} , with edge stabilizers in \mathcal{E}). Let v be a vertex, with stabilizer G_v .

Definition 8.11. (Incident edge groups Inc_v). Given a vertex v of a tree T we define Inc_v (or Inc_{G_v}) as the family of stabilizers G_e of edges incident to v . We call Inc_v the set of incident edge groups. It is a continuous family of subgroups of G_v closed for G_v -conjugation.

If T/G is finite, alternatively, one can define Inc_v from the quotient graph of groups $\Gamma = T/G$ as the image in G_v of the groups carried by all oriented edges incident to v .

Definition 8.12. Given v , consider the family of conjugates of groups in \mathcal{K} that fix v and no other vertex of T . We define the restriction $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$.

Definition 8.13. ($Inc_v^{\mathcal{K}}$). We define $Inc_v^{\mathcal{K}} = Inc_v \cup \mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$. We will sometimes write $Inc_{|Q}$ and $Inc_{\mathcal{K}|Q}$ rather than Inc_v and Inc_{G_v} , with $Q = G_v$.

We also view $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$ and $Inc_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ as families of subgroups of G_v , each well-defined up to conjugacy.

Remark 8.14. We emphasize that $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$ only contains groups having v as their unique fixed point. Two such groups are conjugate in G_v if and only if they are conjugate in G . In particular, the number of G_v -conjugacy classes of groups in $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$ is bounded by the number of G -conjugacy classes of groups in \mathcal{K} . Also note that any subgroup of G_v which is conjugate to a group of \mathcal{K} is contained (up to conjugacy in G_v) in a group belonging to $Inc_v^{\mathcal{K}}$, so is elliptic in any splitting of G_v relative to $Inc_v^{\mathcal{K}}$.

8.4 JSJ decompositions of vertex groups.

Given an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T with T/G finite, we compare splittings of G and relative splittings of vertex stabilizers G_v . Recall that $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ is the family of incident edge stabilizers together with $\mathcal{K}|_{G_v}$ (see Subsection 8.2), and assuming that G is finitely generated one has that G_v is finitely generated relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$, by Lemma 8.8. In particular, whenever G_v acts on an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree S_v relative to Inc_v with no global fixed point, there is a unique minimal G_v -invariant subtree $D(G_v) \subset S_v$ by Proposition 2.8. We view $D(G_v)$ as a tree with an action of G_v ; if G_v is elliptic in S_v , we let $D(G_v)$ be any fixed point.

Definition 8.15. (\mathcal{E}_v). We denote by \mathcal{E}_v the family consisting of subgroups of G_v belonging to \mathcal{E} . All splittings of G_v will be over groups in \mathcal{E}_v .

Lemma 8.16. *Let G_v be a vertex stabilizer of an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T and suppose that T/G is finite. Any splitting of G_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ extends (non-uniquely) to a splitting of G relative to \mathcal{K} . More precisely, given an $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -tree S_v , there exist an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree \hat{T} and a collapse map $p: \hat{T} \rightarrow T$ such that $p^{-1}(v)$ is G_v -equivariantly isomorphic to S_v .*

We say that \hat{T} is obtained by refining T at v using S_v . More generally, if T/G is finite, one may choose a splitting for each orbit of vertices of T , and refine T using them. Any refinement of T may be obtained by this construction (possibly with non-minimal trees S_v).

Proof. We construct \hat{T} as in the proof of Proposition 4.9, with $Y_v = S_v$. It is relative to \mathcal{K} because any group in K which is conjugate to a subgroup of G_v is conjugate to a subgroup of a group belonging to Inc^{G_v} . Non-uniqueness comes from the fact that there may be several ways of attaching edges of T to S_v . \square

Lemma 8.17. *Let G_v be a vertex stabilizer of a universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T with T/G finite.*

- *The groups in $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ are elliptic in every $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree S .*
- *A subgroup $K < G_v$ is $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -universally elliptic (as a subgroup of G) if and only if it is $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -universally elliptic (as a subgroup of G_v).*

The second assertion says that K is elliptic in every $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree on which G acts if and only if it is elliptic in every $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v \cup \mathcal{K}|_{G_v})$ -tree on which G_v acts. If this holds, we simply say that K is universally elliptic.

Proof. The first assertion is clear: S is relative to $\mathcal{K}|_{G_v}$, and also to Inc_v because T is universally elliptic.

Suppose that K is $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -universally elliptic, as a subgroup of G_v . Let S be any $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree. It is relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ by the first assertion. Let $S_v \subset S$ be a minimal G_v -invariant subtree. The action of G_v on S_v is an $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -tree, so by assumption K fixes a point in S_v , hence in S . We have proved the “if” direction in the second assertion, and the converse follows from Lemma 8.16. \square

Corollary 8.18. *Let G_v be a vertex stabilizer of a JSJ tree T_J such that T_J/G is finite.*

- (1) *G_v does not split over a universally elliptic subgroup relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$.*

(2) G_v is flexible if it splits relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$, rigid otherwise.

Proof. If there is a splitting as in (1), we may use it to refine T_J to a universally elliptic tree (see Lemma 8.16). This tree must be in the same deformation space as T_J , so the splitting of G_v must be trivial.

(2) follows from Lemma 8.17 applied with $K = G_v$ □

Proposition 8.19. *Let T be a universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree with T/G finite.*

- (1) *Assume that every vertex stabilizer G_v of T has a JSJ tree T_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$. One can then refine T using these decompositions so as to obtain a JSJ tree of G relative to \mathcal{K} .*
- (2) *Conversely, if T_J is a JSJ tree of G relative to \mathcal{K} , and G_v is a vertex stabilizer of T , one obtains a JSJ tree for G_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ by considering the action of G_v on its minimal subtree $T_v = D_{T_J}(G_v)$ in T_J (with T_v a point if G_v is elliptic in T).*

Proof. To prove (1), let \hat{T} be the tree obtained by refining T using the T_v 's as in Lemma 8.16. It is relative to \mathcal{K} , and universally elliptic by Lemma 8.16 since its edge stabilizers are edge stabilizers of T or of some T_v . To show maximality, we consider another universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T' , and we show that any vertex stabilizer H of \hat{T} is elliptic in T' . It is in a vertex stabilizer of some T_v , with v a vertex of T . If G_v is not elliptic in T' , its minimal subtree Y_v is a universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -tree (by Lemma 8.17). Since T_v is a JSJ tree, it dominates Y_v so H is elliptic in T' . This proves (1).

Now let T_J and $T_v \subset T_J$ be as in (2). By Lemma 8.16 T_v is relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$, and it is $(\mathcal{K}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -universally elliptic because its edge stabilizers are contained in edge stabilizers of T_J . To prove maximality of T_v , consider another universally elliptic pro- p tree S_v with an action of G_v which is relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ and universally elliptic. Use it to refine T to a tree \hat{T} as in Lemma 8.16. As above, \hat{T} is relative to \mathcal{K} , and universally elliptic by Lemma 8.16. Being a JSJ tree, T_J dominates \hat{T} . Vertex stabilizers of T_v are elliptic in T_J , hence in \hat{T} , hence in S_v , so T_v dominates S_v . This proves (2). □

The following corollary says that one may usually restrict to unsplittable pro- p groups over a finite subgroup when studying JSJ decompositions.

Corollary 8.20. *Suppose that \mathcal{E} contains all finite subgroups of G . If $\mathcal{K} = \emptyset$, refining a Grushko decomposition of G using JSJ decompositions of free factors yields a JSJ decomposition of G . Similarly, refining a decomposition of G over finite groups using JSJ decompositions of the vertex groups G_v yields a JSJ decomposition of G . If $\mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$, one must use relative free product JSJ decompositions or JSJ decompositions over finite groups, and JSJ decompositions of vertex groups G_v relative to $\mathcal{K}_{|G_v}$. Every flexible subgroup of G is a flexible subgroup of some G_v . As mentioned in Section 4, JSJ decompositions always exist under some accessibility assumption (see Section 4 for examples of accessibility).*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 8.19 since T is in the deformation space with \mathcal{E} consisting of either trivial or finite groups: finite groups are universally elliptic, and every splitting of G_v is relative to Inc_v . The assertion about flexible subgroups follows from Corollary 8.18. □

Remark 8.21. The results of this subsection remain true if one replace the hypothesis $|T/G| < \infty$ by G being finitely generated. Indeed, in the proof of Lemma 8.16 one just needs to use the proof of Proposition 4.12 instead of the proof of Proposition 4.9. We conclude this section stating it.

We begin restating Lemma 8.16

Lemma 8.22. *Let G_v be a vertex stabilizer of an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T and suppose that G is finitely generated. Any splitting of G_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ extends (non-uniquely) to a splitting of G relative to \mathcal{K} . More precisely, given an $(\mathcal{E}_v, \text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}})$ -tree S_v , there exist an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees \hat{S} and a collapse map $p : \hat{S} \rightarrow S$ to a pro- p tree S in the deformation space of T such that $p^{-1}(v)$ is G_v -equivariantly isomorphic to S_v .*

Now we restate Proposition 8.19.

Proposition 8.23. *Let G be finitely generated and T a universally elliptic $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree.*

- (1) *Assume that every vertex stabilizer G_v of T has a JSJ tree T_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$. One can then refine some pro- p tree S from the deformation space of T using these decompositions so as to obtain a JSJ tree of G relative to \mathcal{K} .*
- (2) *Conversely, if T_J is a JSJ tree of G relative to \mathcal{K} , and G_v is a vertex stabilizer of T , one obtains a JSJ tree for G_v relative to $\text{Inc}_v^{\mathcal{K}}$ by considering the action of G_v on its minimal subtree $T_v = D_{T_J}(G_v)$ in T_J (with T_v a point if G_v is elliptic).*

9 Trees of cylinders

Definition 9.1. Let X be a profinite space. An equivalence relation on X is called profinite if it is an intersection of clopen equivalence relations on X .

Lemma 9.2. *Let \mathcal{E} be a family of subgroups of a profinite group G closed in the étale topology of $\text{Subgr}(G)$ (see Subsection 2.3) and for conjugation. If G acts on a profinite space X , then $\{x \in X \mid G_x \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is a closed subset of X .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.14 $\{G_x \mid x \in X\}$ is a continuous family. Then by [R, Lemma 5.2.1 (c)] $\varphi : X \rightarrow \text{Subgr}(G)$ is continuous. Hence $\varphi^{-1}(E) = \{x \in X \mid G_x \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is a closed subset of X . □

Remark 9.3. There is a natural topology on $\text{Subg}(G)$ that we (following [HJ]) shall call strict topology. Its base of open subsets is given by inverse images of elements in the discrete space $\text{Subgr}(G/U)$ for all open normal subgroups of G . This topology is stronger than the étale topology and so the statement of Lemma 9.2 holds also under assumption that E is closed in the strict topology.

Lemma 9.4. *Let G be a profinite group acting on a profinite space X and \sim a profinite G -invariant equivalence relation on X . Let $X = \varprojlim_i X_i$ be a decomposition as a surjective inverse limit of finite G -quotient spaces X_i of X . Define an equivalence relation \sim_i on X_i putting $m_i \sim_i f_i$ if there are elements $m \sim f$ in the corresponding preimages of m_i and f_i in X respectively and then taking the transitive hull. Then $\sim = \varprojlim_i \sim_i$.*

Proof. As X_i is finite, \sim_i is clopen. Then its preimage \sim in X is also clopen. We just need to show that for not equivalent e, f there exists i such that $e_i \not\sim_i f_i$, where e_i, f_i are the images of e and f in X_i .

As \sim is profinite, it is the intersection of clopen equivalence relations R on X . Since $X = \varprojlim_i X_i$, for any such R there exists i such that for any element m_i in X_i and any elements m, e of its preimage in X one has eRm . This means that two not R -equivalent points of X have distinct images in X_i . Hence if $m_i \sim_i f_i$ then for some elements m, f of their preimages in X one has mRf (indeed, there exists a finite sequence of elements $m_i, m_{i1}, \dots, m_{in}, f_i$ such that any pair of consecutive elements have a pair of equivalent elements in their preimages in X and hence belong to the same R -equivalence class). Then by the choice of i , for any such elements m, f of preimages of m_i, f_i in X one has mRf . \square

Definition 9.5. (Admissible equivalence relation). Let G be a pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree T with closed $E(T)$. A profinite equivalence relation \sim on $E(T)$ is called admissible if the following axioms hold:

- (1) If $e \sim e'$ and $g \in G$, then $ge \sim ge'$ (invariance under translation).
- (2) If $G_e \subset G_{e'}$, then $e \sim e'$ (nesting of stabilizers implies equivalence).
- (3) If $f \sim f'$, then for each edge $e \subset [f, f']$ one has $e \sim f \sim f'$.

Lemma 9.6. Let G be a pro- p group acting on a profinite graph T . Let \sim be a G -invariant profinite equivalence relation on $E(T)$. Then

(i) The union of all elements of $E(T)$ in an equivalence class of it together with their vertices is a profinite subgraph D of T ; a connected component Y of it is a connected profinite graph and $E(Y)$ is called a cylinder of T .

(ii) If T is a pro- p tree and \sim is admissible then

- (a) D is a pro- p subtree of T and so coincides with Y ;
- (b) two distinct cylinders meet in at most one point.

Proof. (i) Let G_m be the stabilizer of an element $m \in T$. Since $\{f \in E(T) \mid f \sim m\}$ is closed, $Y = \{f \cup d_0(f) \cup d_1(f) \mid f \in E(T), f \sim m\}$ is a subgraph of T .

(ii) Suppose T is a pro- p tree.

(a) Let A and B be subgroups in \mathcal{E} . Then by axiom (3) for vertices v, w of D stabilized by A and B we have $[v, w] \subseteq D$ and so D is a pro- p subtree.

(b) If v, w are in a cylinder Y , then by Theorem 2.6 so is $[v, w]$; therefore if they belong to any other cylinder they can not be distinct, since otherwise any edge of $[v, w]$ belong to different equivalence classes, which is impossible. \square

Definition 9.7. (Graph of cylinders). Let G be a pro- p group. Given a connected profinite G -graph T with $E(T)$ compact and a G -invariant profinite equivalence relation \sim on $E(T)$, its graph of cylinders T_c is the bipartite profinite graph with vertex set $V_0(T_c) \cup V_1(T_c)$, where $V_0(T_c)$ is the set of vertices v of T , $V_1(T_c) = E(T)/\sim$ is the space of cylinders $E(Y)$ of T , and there is an edge $\epsilon = (v, E(Y))$ between v and $E(Y)$ in T_c if

and only if $v \in Y$ in T . Thus $V_1(T_c)$ is homeomorphic to $E(T)/\sim$ and the incident maps d_0, d_1 defined as $d_0(\epsilon) = v$, $d_1(\epsilon) = Y$ are continuous, because $E \rightarrow E/\sim$ and d_i are continuous. Equivalently, one obtains T_c from T by replacing each cylinder Y by the cone over the set of vertices $v \in Y$.

Remark 9.8. If $v \in V_0(T)$ then its stabilizer equals G_v . If $v \in V_1(T_c)$, i.e. $v = Y$ then its stabilizer is the set stabilizer G_Y of Y . Hence if $e = (v, Y)$ then its stabilizer is $G_v \cap G_Y$.

Proposition 9.9. *Suppose T/G is finite. Then T_c/G is finite.*

Proof. Indeed, $|V_1(T_c)/G| \leq |V(T)/G| = |(V_0(T_c)/G)|$ and $V_0(T/G) = V(T/G)$. So $V(T_c)/G$ is finite and hence so is T_c/G . □

Lemma 9.10. *Let Γ be a finite connected graph and \sim an equivalence relation on $E(\Gamma)$ such that for each equivalence class Y of it $d_0(Y) \cup d_1(Y)$ is a connected subgraph of Γ . Let Γ_c be the graph of cylinders with respect to this relation. Then $\pi_1(\Gamma) \geq \pi_1(\Gamma_c)$.*

Proof. Let Y be a cylinder of Γ with respect to \sim . By [R, Proposition 3.5.7]

$$\pi_1(\Gamma) = \pi_1(Y) \amalg L.$$

Observe that replacing the cylinder by its cone Γ_Y we replace $\pi_1(Y)$ by the fundamental group of the cone which is trivial and so the fundamental group of the resulting graph is L . Doing this for every cylinder and taking into account that Γ is finite we deduce the result. □

Corollary 9.11.

$$\pi_1(\Gamma) = \coprod_Y (\pi_1(Y)) \amalg \pi_1(\Gamma_c).$$

Given an admissible equivalence relation \sim on $E(T)$, we now associate a tree of cylinders T_c to any (G, \mathcal{E}) -tree T with compact $E(T)$.

Definition 9.12. (Tree of cylinders). Let G be a pro- p group. Given a pro- p (G, \mathcal{E}) -tree T with $E(T)$ compact and an admissible equivalence relation \sim on $E(T)$, its pro- p tree of cylinders (see Theorem 9.13) T_c is the bipartite tree with vertex set $V_0(T_c) \cup V_1(T_c)$, where $V_0(T_c)$ is the set of vertices v of T , $V_1(T_c) = E(T)/\sim$ is the space of cylinders $E(Y)$ of T , and there is an edge $\epsilon = (v, E(Y))$ between v and $E(Y)$ in T_c if and only if $v \in Y$ in T . Equivalently, one obtains T_c from T by replacing each cylinder $E(Y)$ by the cone over the set of vertices $v \in Y$. (Warning: T_c is not always an \mathcal{E} -tree).

Theorem 9.13. *T_c is a pro- p tree.*

Proof. Let $T = \varprojlim_i \Gamma_i$ be a decomposition as an inverse limit of finite G -quotient graphs Γ_i of T . Define an equivalence relation \sim_i on $E(\Gamma_i)$ putting $m_i \sim_i f_i$ if there are elements $m \sim f$ in the corresponding preimages of m_i and f_i respectively and then taking the transitive hull. By Lemma 9.4 $\sim = \varprojlim_i \sim_i$.

We deduce that $T/\sim = \varprojlim_i \Gamma_i/\sim_i$ and so $\pi_1(T) = \varprojlim_i \pi_1(\Gamma_i)$. Note that morphisms of the inverse system $\{\Gamma_i\}$ map cylinders into cylinders and so the homomorphisms of the inverse system $\{\pi_1(\Gamma_i)\}$ send the fundamental groups of cylinders into the fundamental groups of the cylinders. It follows that free factors corresponding to cylinders in Corollary 9.11 form the inverse system obtained by restricting inverse system $\{\pi_1(\Gamma_i)\}$ restricted to them. Then by Corollary 9.11 $\pi_1((\Gamma_i)_c)$ is a free factor of $\pi_1(\Gamma_i)$ and $\pi_1(T_c) = \varprojlim_i \pi_1((\Gamma_i)_c)$ is a surjective inverse limit. Thus we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 1 = \pi_1(T) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1(\Gamma_i) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \pi_1(T_c) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1((\Gamma_i)_c) \end{array}$$

Since $1 = \pi_1(T) = \varprojlim_i \pi_1(\Gamma_i)$ we deduce that the the right vertical maps are surjective, so is the left vertical map. Hence $\pi_1(T_c) = 1$, i.e. T_c is a pro- p tree. \square

Definition 9.14. If the set of edges of T_c with edge stabilizers not in \mathcal{E} is closed, then we construct the collapsed tree of cylinders T_c^* which is the pro- p tree obtained from T_c by collapsing all edges whose stabilizer does not belong to \mathcal{E} .

Proposition 9.15. *Let T be a pro- p (G, \mathcal{E}) -tree.*

- (1) T dominates T_c ;
- (2) If $H \leq G$ is a vertex stabilizer of T_c which is not elliptic in T , it is the stabilizer of the equivalence class $[Y]$ associated to some cylinder $Y \subseteq T$. If e is an edge of Y , the equivalence class of G_e is H -invariant ($hG_e h^{-1} \sim G_e$ for $h \in H$);
- (3) Suppose that the stabilizer of every equivalence class $[Y]$ belongs to \mathcal{E} . Then edge stabilizers of T_c belong to \mathcal{E} .

Proof. Consider a vertex v of T . Then it defines a vertex in $V_0(T_c)$, and this vertex is fixed by G_v . This shows that T dominates T_c . The second assertion follows from the previous sentence: the stabilizer of a vertex in $V_0(T_c)$ is a vertex stabilizer of T , the stabilizer of a vertex in $V_1(T_c)$ is the stabilizer of an equivalence class $[Y]$. Also note that (3) is clear since the stabilizer of an edge $e = (v, Y)$ of T_c is contained in the stabilizer of $[Y]$. \square

Example 9.16. Suppose \sim is defined by equality stabilizers, i.e. $e \sim f$ iff $G_e = G_f$ for $e, f \in E(T)$.

- (a) Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a free pro- p product with amalgamation. Hence G is the fundamental group of a tree with one edge.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_1 & \xrightarrow{H} & G_2 \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}$$

Then T_c/G is a tree with 3 vertices.

$$\bullet \longrightarrow \bullet \longleftarrow \bullet$$

The underlying graph of pro- p groups of the G -tree T_c is

$$\bullet \xrightarrow{G_1} \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(H)} \bullet \xleftarrow{N_G(H)} \xleftarrow{N_{G_2}(H)} \bullet \xleftarrow{G_2}$$

Indeed, denoting by $S = S(G)$ the standard pro- p tree of $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$, we see that the cylinder for H is $\{e \in E(S) \mid G_e = H\}$. But G_e is a conjugate gHg^{-1} of H and so if it contains H it equals H (one sees it looking at finite quotients). Thus the splitting of G acting on T_c is

$$G = G_1 \amalg_{N_{G_1}(H)} N_G(H) \amalg_{N_{G_2}(H)} G_2. \quad (2)$$

By Proposition 2.31 $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_2}(H)$. Hence G is the fundamental group of the following tree of pro- p groups

$$\bullet \xrightarrow{G_1} \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(H)} \bullet \xrightarrow{H} \bullet \xleftarrow{N_{G_2}(H)} \bullet \xleftarrow{N_{G_2}(H)} \bullet \xleftarrow{G_2}$$

and then collapsing the left and right edges we arrive at the original decomposition.

If G_1, G_2 are finite then the last and original splittings are JSJ splittings. This illustrates Subsection 7.2. Note also that if H is normal in G_1 and G_2 then T_c is totally reduced, i.e. after reduction we get the trivial graph of groups. This shows that if G_1, G_2 are finite, then the sequence $((T_c)_c)_\dots$ gives eventually graph of groups that admits complete reduction to the trivial graph of groups.

- (b) Suppose now that $G = G_1 \amalg_H$ is a pro- p HNN-extension. Then G is the fundamental pro- p group of the following graph of pro- p groups:

$$\begin{array}{c} G_1 \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowright \\ H \end{array}$$

In this case T_c/G is a graph with two vertices but the number of edges can be 1 and two. Denote by t the stable letter of G .

Case 1. H and H^t are not conjugate in G_1 . Then T_c/G has two edges.


$$\bullet \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{array} \bullet$$

The underlying graph of pro- p groups of the G -tree T_c then is

$$\bullet \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(H)^t} \\ \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(H)} \end{array} \bullet$$

where upper arrow embedding is the conjugation by the stable letter t .

By Proposition 2.31, in this case the normalizer splits as in the previous case: $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_1}(H^t)$ and so we can decompose the graph of groups as follows:




and then collapsing the upper and lower edges we arrive at the original decomposition.


Case 2. H and H^t are conjugate in G_1 say $H^{g_1} = H^t$ for some $g_1 \in G_1$. Then tg_1^{-1} normalizes H . In this case T_c/G has one edge.



The underlying graph of pro- p groups of the G -tree T_c then is




By Proposition 2.31 in this case $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H$ is an HNN-extension. So the graph of groups can be transformed as follows:




Collapsing the horizontal arrow we can get the original decomposition.

If G_1 is finite then in both cases the original and the last splitting is JSJ. This is another illustration of Subsection 7.2.

(c) In general, if we have the following graph of groups



and G is the fundamental group of it and if the images of H_0 in G_0 are not conjugate, then T_c/G is as follows:



where v_i belong to $V_0(T_c)$ and are the vertices that correspond to vertices under G_i in the original graph above.

If the images of H_0 in G_0 are conjugate then two vertical edges from v_0 down are replaced by one edge.

The vertex groups of v_i are $G(v_i)$, the edge group of an edge e incident to v_i is $N_{G(v_i)}(G(e))$ the vertex group of the cyclinder of e is $N_G(G(e))$.

Similarly as in case (a) that if all vertex groups are finite, then the sequence $((T_c)_c)...$ gives eventually graph of groups that admits complete reduction to the trivial graph of groups.

9.1 Algebraic Interpretation

Fix \mathcal{E} now closed in the étale topology of $\text{subgr}(G)$ and we as usual restrict to \mathcal{E} -trees. It is sandwich closed: if $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$ and $A < H < B$, then $H \in \mathcal{E}$.

Definition 9.17. (Admissible equivalence relation). An equivalence relation \sim on \mathcal{E} (relative to \mathcal{H}) is admissible if the following axioms hold for any $A, B \in \mathcal{E}$:

- (0) \sim is an intersection of clopen equivalence relations.
- (1) If $A \sim B$ and $g \in G$, then $gAg^{-1} \sim gBg^{-1}$ (invariance under conjugation).
- (2) If $A \subset B$, then $A \sim B$ (nesting implies equivalence).
- (3) Let T be a $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{H})$ -tree. If $A \sim B$, and A, B fix $v, w \in T$ respectively, then for each edge $e \subset [v, w]$ one has $G_e \sim A \sim B$.

The equivalence class of $A \in \mathcal{E}$ will be denoted by $[A]$. We let G act on \mathcal{E}/\sim by conjugation, and the stabilizer of $[A]$ will be denoted by $G_{[A]}$.

Lemma 9.18. If \sim satisfies 1,2 and axiom (3') below, then it is admissible.

(3'). Let T be an \mathcal{E} -tree. If $A \sim B$, and A, B are elliptic in T , then $\langle A, B \rangle$ is also elliptic in T .

Proof. We show axiom 3. Let v, w be vertices fixed by A and B respectively and let u be a vertex fixed by $\langle A, B \rangle$. Since $[v, w] \subset [v, u] \cup [u, w]$, one may assume $e \in [v, u]$. One has $A \leq G_e$ because A fixes $[v, u]$ (see Theorem 2.6), so that $G_e \sim A$ by axiom 2. \square

Here are some examples.

(1) If G is a CSA pro- p group (for instance a pro- p limit group, see Section 3 for definitions), we can take for \mathcal{E} the set of abelian subgroups, and for \sim the commutation relation: $A \sim B$ if $\langle A, B \rangle$ is abelian). Note that this relation is the intersection of open equivalence relations containing it, since the space of subgroups

$$\text{subgr}(G) = \varprojlim_{N \triangleleft_o G} \text{subgr}(G/N)$$

with *strict* topology (i.e. the topology coming from this inverse limit which is stronger than étale topology, see Remark 9.3) is profinite, and it is preserved by finite quotients. The set \mathcal{E} in this case is closed in the strict topology of $\text{subgr}(G)$. The group $G_{[A]}$ is the maximal abelian subgroup containing A .

(2) \mathcal{E} is a set of infinite cyclic-by bounded order subgroups, and \sim is the commensurability relation ($A \sim B$ if and only if $A \cap B$ has finite index in A and B). Note that \mathcal{E} is compact. Here again it is the intersection of clopen equivalence relations as one can check directly. The group $G_{[A]}$ is the closure of the commensurator of A . Note that the commensurator $G_{[A]}$ is closed in G if G is finitely generated (see Theorem 7.10) and otherwise it might not be.

(3) \mathcal{E} is a set of finite subgroups, and \sim is the equality relation ($A \sim B$ if and only if $A = B$). Suppose \mathcal{E} is compact (for example G is virtually torsion free). Here again it is the intersection of clopen equivalence relations as one can check directly. The group $G_{[A]}$ is the normalizer of A .

In fact, we are interested in restricting the equivalence relation on edge stabilizers, or more to the point to induce this relation on edges of T .

Given an admissible equivalence relation \sim on \mathcal{E} , we now associate a tree of cylinders T_c to any (G, \mathcal{E}) -tree T with compact $E(T)$. We declare elements $e, f \in E(T)$ to be equivalent (and write $e \approx f$) if $G_e \sim G_f$.

Lemma 9.19. *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a profinite graph T with closed $E(T)$ and \mathcal{E} be a family of subgroups of G closed in the étale topology of $\text{Subgr}(G)$ and for conjugation. Let \sim be an admissible equivalence relation on \mathcal{E} . Then*

- (i) $\{e \in E(T) \mid G_e \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is a closed subset of $E(T)$.
- (ii) The equivalence relation \approx on $E(T)$ is an admissible profinite equivalence relation.

Proof. (i) Follows from Lemma 9.2.

(ii) By hypothesis \sim is the intersection of clopen equivalence relations R on $\text{Subgr}(G)$. Then R determines on E the equivalence relation \sim_R by saying $e \sim_R f$ if $G_e R G_f$. Since $\{G_e \mid e \in E(T)\}$ is a continuous family, every equivalence class of \sim_R is clopen. Clearly $\approx = \bigcap_R \sim_R$. This shows that \approx is profinite.

Axiom 9.5(1) is clear.

Axiom 9.5(2) follows from Axiom 9.17(2) as well as Axiom 9.5(3) follows from Axiom 9.17(3.) \square

The equivalence class in \mathcal{E}/\sim containing Y will be denoted by $[Y]$.

Corollary 9.20. $E(T)/\approx$ is a profinite space.

Proof. As \approx is profinite by Lemma 9.19, \approx is the intersection of clopen equivalence relations R . Hence $E(T)/\approx = \varprojlim_R E(T)/R$ is profinite. \square

We record the following for future references.

Remark 9.21. Given an edge $\epsilon = (x, Y)$ of T_c , let e be an edge of Y adjacent to x in T . Then G_e is a representative of the class C of groups which are contained in $G_\epsilon = G_x \cap G_Y$. If G_ϵ belongs to \mathcal{E} , then it is in C by axiom 2 of admissible relations. Also note that G_Y represents C if $G_Y \in \mathcal{E}$.

Theorem 9.22. *If T, T' are reduced \mathcal{E} -trees belonging to the same deformation space such that T/G and T'/G are finite, then there is a canonical equivariant isomorphism between their trees of cylinders.*

Proof. If $v \in V(T)$ is a vertex of T fixed by G_v , then G_v fixes a unique vertex $v' \in V(T')$ up to conjugation. Indeed, if $w' \neq v'$ is another vertex fixed by G_v then $G_{v'}$ and $G_{w'}$ must fix gv and hw , since T is reduced; but then $G_{v'}^g, G_{w'}^h = G_v$ so $v' = kw'$ for some $k \in G$ since T' is reduced.

Thus we have a bijection $\bar{f} : V(T)/G \rightarrow V(T')/G$ between finite sets that sends the orbit vG of v to the orbit $v'G$ of a vertex in T' fixed by G_v . It induces G -equivariant continuous map $V(T) \rightarrow V(T')$.

We show now one-to-one correspondence between $E(T)/\sim$ and $E(T')/\sim$. If e is an edge of T with vertices v, w then G_v, G_w fix unique distinct vertices v', w' of T' and so G_e fixes $[v', w']$ (see Theorem 2.6). But similarly, any edge e' of the geodesic $[v', w']$ fixes an edge e_0 in T , so by condition (2) of Definition 9.17 $e \sim e_0$. It follows that the correspondence e to an edge in T' stabilized by G_e defines a bijection φ on the spaces of cylinders $\overline{E}(T)/\sim$ and $\overline{E}(T')/\sim$.

Now let $v \in V_0(T_c), v' \in V_0(T'_c)$ such that $G_v = G_{v'}$. Let $Y \in V_1(T_c)$ connected to v by ϵ . Let Y' be the corresponding cylinder of $V_1(T'_c)$, i.e. corresponding to the same class in \mathcal{E} . Then the map $(f, \varphi) : (v, Y) \rightarrow (v', Y')$ is a homeomorphism. This gives the required isomorphisms between T_c and T'_c which is clearly G -equivariant. \square

Theorem 9.22 says that if T is reduced then T_c depends only on the deformation space D containing T (we sometimes say that T_c is the tree of cylinders of D).

Theorem 9.22 also shows that the graph T_c can be defined purely in terms of the maximal elliptic subgroups (the vertex stabilizers), which are the same for T and T' .

If G is finitely generated then by Example 5.6 there is a reduced \mathcal{E} -tree in the same deformation space (but possibly we lose compactness of the space of edges). To keep compactness of the space of edges we need to assume that G is \mathcal{E} -accessible. In this case T_c/G is finite as we record in the following

Corollary 9.23. *Suppose G is \mathcal{E} -accessible. Then T_c/G is finite.*

Proof. By Corollary 6.13 there exists a JSJ-tree T such that T/G is finite. Then so is T_c/G by Proposition 9.9. □

Remark 9.24. Note that any admissible equivalence relation contains diagonal, i.e. the equality relation. Therefore T_c always factors through the pro- p tree of cylinders of the equality relation T_- . Thus constructing T_c we may assume that T/G has no loops (see Example 9.16(b), Case 2). This shows that the canonical G -isomorphism constructed in the proof of Theorem 9.22 is unique.

Depending on the context, it may be convenient to think of a cylinder either as set of edges $E(Y)$ of a subtree Y of T , or a vertex of T_c , or an equivalence class C . Similarly, there are several ways to think of $x \in V_0(T_c)$: as a vertex of T , a vertex of T_c , or an elliptic subgroup G_x . If x is a vertex of T belonging to two cylinders, then its stabilizer G_x is not contained in a group of \mathcal{E} : otherwise all edges of T incident to x would have equivalent stabilizers by axiom 2, and x would belong to only one cylinder. More generally, let v be any vertex of T whose stabilizer is not contained in a group of \mathcal{E} . Then G_v fixes v only, and is a maximal elliptic subgroup.

Conversely, let H be a subgroup of G which is elliptic in T , not contained in a group of \mathcal{E} , and maximal for these properties. Then H fixes a unique vertex v and equals G_v .

In the next theorem we are going to make the construction of the pro- p tree of cylinders in the case of non-compact space of edges assuming that G is finitely generated. We shall call it also the tree of cylinders as it will coincide with the tree of cylinders defined in this section for the compact set of edges. It has the same features in the sense that the space of vertices of it consists of vertices of original tree and the profinite space of cylinders in which the set of original cylinders is dense. Recall again that in this case there is always a reduced pro- p tree in the same deformation space with possibly not compact set of edges.

Theorem 9.25. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group acting on a pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T (with not obligatory compact $E(T)$). Then there exists a canonical pro- p tree of cylinders T_{cc} that depends on the deformation space of T only.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.26 G is the fundamental pro- p group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{G}, Γ) with vertex groups and edge groups being conjugates of vertex and edge stabilizers in G . By Lemma 2.25 $G = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} G/\tilde{U}$ and $G_U := G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ is the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of finite p -groups. Moreover, the inverse system $\{G/\tilde{U}, \pi_{VU}\}$ can be chosen in such a way that it is linearly ordered and for each $\{G/\tilde{V}\}$ of the system with $V \leq U$ there exists a natural morphism

$$(\eta_{VU}, \nu_{VU}) : (\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$$

where ν_{VU} is just a collapse of edges of Γ_V and $\eta_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m)) = \pi_{VU}(\mathcal{G}_V(m))$; the induced homomorphism of the pro- p fundamental groups coincides with the canonical projection $\pi_{VU} : G/\tilde{V} \longrightarrow G/\tilde{U}$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$. Let S_U be the standard pro- p tree for $G_U = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ and recall that $E(S_U)$ is compact (since S_U/G_U is finite). Then

$S = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} S_U$ and the projection $S \rightarrow S_U$ is a collapse of connected components of certain profinite subgraph of S .

Note that G_U has only finitely many edge stabilizers up to conjugation. Define an equivalence relation \sim_U on $E(S_U)$ putting $m_U \sim_U f_U$ if either the stabilizer of one of them contains the other or there are edges $m, f \in E(T)$ in the preimages of m_U, f_U respectively such that $G_m \sim G_f$. We show that this is admissible equivalence relation on $E(S_U)$. First observe that it is obviously G -invariant and so (i) of Definition 9.5 holds. Since S_U/G_U is finite, this implies that \sim_U is profinite. The nesting property (2) follows from the definition of \sim_U . To prove (iii) suppose $f_U \sim f'_U$ and $e_U \in [f_U, f'_U]$. If the stabilizer of f_U contains the stabilizer of f'_U or vice versa, then either $(G_U)_{f'_U} \leq (G_U)_{e_U} \leq (G_U)_{f_U}$ or $(G_U)_{f_U} \leq (G_U)_{e_U} \leq (G_U)_{f'_U}$ by Theorem 2.6, so that $e_U \sim f_U \sim f'_U$ by the nesting property; otherwise there are edges $f, f' \in E(T)$ such that $G_f \sim G_{f'}$. In the latter case, since $S \rightarrow S_U$ is a collapse map, there exists an edge $e \in [f, f']$ mapped to e_U and so $G_f \sim G_e \sim G_{f'}$; in this case then $f_U \sim e_U \sim f'_U$ by the definition of \sim_U . Thus \sim_U is admissible.

Let $(T_U)_c$ be the pro- p tree of cylinders for S_U (it exists as $E(T_U)$ is compact). Then for each $V \leq_o U$ normal in G , $e \sim_V e'$ implies $\pi_{VU}(e) \sim_U \pi_{VU}(e')$ and so we have a unique G -epimorphism $(T_V)_c \rightarrow (T_U)_c$ induced by a morphism $S(G_V) \rightarrow S(G_U)$. This means that $\{(T_U)_c \mid U \triangleleft_o G\}$ is an inverse system. The pro- p tree $T_{cc} = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} (T_U)_c$ is the desired pro- p tree of cylinders.

Now we shall prove the uniqueness. Suppose T' is from the same deformation space. Then similarly to the above $G = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} G/\bar{U}$, where \bar{U} means the subgroup of U generated by the stabilizers of vertices of T' , and $G/\bar{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}'_U, \Gamma'_U)$ is the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of finite p -groups. But G/\tilde{U} and G/\bar{U} have the same set of vertex stabilizers and so T/\tilde{U} and T/\bar{U} belong to the same deformation space. Hence by Theorem 9.22 there exists a canonical isomorphism $(T_c)_U \rightarrow (T'_c)_U$ (as vertex stabilizer determines uniquely the vertex by Remark 9.24) for every such U . This gives the isomorphism $T_{cc} \cong T'_{cc}$. \square

Example 9.26. If G is a torsion free CSA pro- p group (for instance a pro- p limit group, we can take for \mathcal{E} the set of abelian subgroups, and for \sim the commutation relation: $A \sim B$ if $\langle A, B \rangle$ is abelian. The group $G_{[A]}$ is the maximal abelian subgroup containing A . The T_c has maximal abelian subgroups as its edge stabilizers.

Example 9.27. We shall illustrate Theorem 9.25 recalling Example 7.4.

There was constructed the following JSJ graph of pro- p groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} G_1 & & G_2 & & G_3 & & \dots & & H_\omega \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{K_1} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{K_2} & \bullet & \dots & & & \bullet \end{array}$$

Let \sim be the equality. Then the underlying profinite graph of pro- p groups for T_{cc} is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} G_1 & & N_{\langle G_1, G_2 \rangle}(K_1) & & G_2 & & \dots & & H_\omega \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(K_1)} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{N_{G_2}(K_1)} & \bullet & \dots & & & \bullet \end{array}$$

The situation is similar as in Example 9.16. But in this case $N_{G_i}(K_i)$ coincides with G_i since K_i is normal in G_i . Hence we can reduce this graph of pro- p groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
N_{\langle G_1, G_2 \rangle}(K_1) & & N_{\langle G_2, G_3 \rangle}(K_2) & & N_{\langle G_3, G_4 \rangle}(K_1) & & H_\omega \\
\bullet & \xrightarrow{N_{G_2}(K_1)} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{N_{G_3}(K_2)} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet
\end{array}$$

Note that all vertex groups except the limit vertex group were finite in the original graph of groups, but in the reduced graph of cylinders all vertex groups are infinite. All edge groups remain finite.

Proposition 9.28. *Let G be a finitely generated or \mathcal{E} -accessible pro- p group acting on a pro- p tree G . Then*

- (1) T dominates T_c ;
- (2) If $H \leq G$ is a vertex stabilizer of T_c which is not elliptic in T , it is the stabilizer of a vertex in $V_1(T_c)$ associated to an equivalence class $[Y]$ of \mathcal{E} . If e is an edge of Y , the equivalence class of G_e is H -invariant ($hG_e h^{-1} \sim G_e$ for $h \in H$);
- (3) T_{cc} constructed in Theorem 9.25 depends only on the deformation space D containing T (we sometimes say that T_{cc} is the canonical pro- p tree of cylinders of D);
- (4) Suppose that the stabilizer of every equivalence class $[A]$ belongs to \mathcal{E} . Then edge stabilizers of T_c belong to \mathcal{E} .

Proof. Consider a vertex v of T . By Theorem 2.26 $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ is the fundamental group of a profinite graph of pro- p groups and the standard pro- p tree $S = S(G)$ lie in the same deformation space as T . Moreover, according to Lemma 2.25 $(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$, that induces $\Pi_1((\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)) = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ and $S = \varprojlim_{U \triangleleft_o G} S_U$, where S_U is the standard pro- p tree of $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$. So $V(S) = V_0(T_c)$ and so S and therefore T dominates T_c .

The second assertion follows from remarks made above: the stabilizer of a vertex in $V_0(T_c)$ is a vertex stabilizer of T , the stabilizer of a vertex v in $V_1(T_c)$ fixes the vertex v_U in $V_1(T_{cU})$ that corresponds to the equivalence class of \sim_U in G_U (see the proof of Theorem 9.25). Therefore to deduce the assertion about $V_1(T_c)$ we just need to show that \sim is the inverse limit of \sim_U . By [HZ, Construction 4.3] there exists a G -space $Y_{\mathcal{E}}$ such that the set of point stabilizers coincides with \mathcal{E} and similarly G_U -space Y_U whose set of point stabilizers coincides with the image \mathcal{E}_U of \mathcal{E} in $\text{Subgr}(G_U)$ and those spaces are functorial. This means that $Y_{\mathcal{E}} = \varprojlim Y_U$. Then the result follows from Lemma 9.4.

Also note that (4) is clear since the stabilizer of an edge $e = (v, Y)$ of T_c is contained in the stabilizer of $[Y]$.

(3) is the subject of Theorem 9.25 □

9.2 Automorphisms

Lemma 9.29. *Let G be a pro- p group acting on a reduced pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T . Suppose the set $\{G_v \mid v \in V(T)\}$ and \sim are invariant for any automorphism of G .*

- (i) If G is \mathcal{E} -accessible, then $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts on T_c .
- (ii) If G is a finitely generated, then $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts on T_{cc} .

Proof. (i) By Remark 2.17 we may assume that T is reduced. Then by Remark 9.24 we may assume that T/G have no loops and so a vertex stabilizer determines uniquely the vertex fixed by it. It follows that for $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$, defining $\alpha(v)$ to be the unique vertex whose stabilizer is $\alpha(G_v)$ if $v \in V_0(T_c)$ we get the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on $V_0(T_c)$. Let e be an edge of a cylinder Y , i.e. G_e belongs to the equivalence class $[Y]$ corresponding to Y (see Proposition 9.28). Then $\alpha(G_e) \in \alpha([Y])$ and so this defines the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on $V_1(T_c)$. Moreover, $\alpha(G_e) \in \alpha([Y])$ means that if the edge e connects v and Y then there is an edge that connects $\alpha(v)$ with $\alpha(Y)$ that we define as $\alpha(e)$. Thus we get an action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on T_c and we need to show that it is continuous.

We show first that it is continuous on $V_0(T_c)$. It suffices to show that for given $v \in V(T)$ the map $v \longrightarrow G_v$ is a homeomorphism from $V_0(T_c)$ to $\{G_v \mid v \in V_0(T_c)\}$ considered as a subspace in the strict topology of $\text{Subgr}(G)$. It is clearly a bijection, so one needs to show continuity only. Taking an open normal subgroup U of G we deduce that the preimage of $\{G_w \mid G_w \leq G_v U\}$ is open in $V_0(T_c)$ since $\{G_v \mid v \in V_0(T_c)\}$ is a continuous family by Lemma 2.14. This shows continuity of the map $v \longrightarrow G_v$.

Considering now $E(T)$ as a subspace of $V(T) \times V(T)$ and so \sim as the $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant equivalence relation on $V(T) \times V(T)$ we deduce that $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts continuously on $(V(T) \times V(T))/\sim$ and hence on the subspace of cylinders $E(T)/\sim$.

(ii) Suppose now that G is finitely generated. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U \triangleleft_o G\}$ be the family of all open characteristic subgroups of G . Then $\tilde{U} = \{U \cap G_v \mid v \in V(T)\}$ is characteristic in G and we can consider the action of $G_U = G/\tilde{U}$ on a pro- p tree T/\tilde{U} (see Proposition 2.2). Note that in Theorem 9.25 T_{cc} was defined as the inverse limit of $(T_U)_c$ arising from the action of G_U on standard pro- p trees $S(G_U)$ from the same deformation space as T_U . Since $S(G_U)/G_U$ are finite, we deduce from (i) that $\text{Aut}(G_U)$ acts continuously on $(T_U)_c$.

But $\text{Aut}(G) = \varprojlim_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \text{Aut}(G_U)$ and $T_{cc} = \varprojlim_{U \in \mathcal{U}} (T_U)_c$. Thus one has a continuous action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on T_{cc} . □

Theorem 9.30. *Let G be a finitely generated (resp. \mathcal{E} -accessible) pro- p group acting on a JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree T . Suppose \mathcal{E} is invariant for any automorphism of G . Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts on T_{cc} (resp. on T_c).*

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ be an automorphism. We can define another action of G on T by setting $g \cdot m = \alpha(g)m$ for $g \in G$, $m \in T$. We call the new G -tree T' and observe that T' is JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree. Hence $\alpha(G_v)$ must stabilize a vertex of T . Thus $\text{Aut}(G)$ leave vertex stabilizers invariant and so the result follows from Lemma 9.29. □

Corollary 9.31. *If G is \mathcal{E} -accessible (resp. finitely generated) and T is a JSJ $(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$ -tree, then T_c (resp. T_{cc}) and T_c^* (resp. T_{cc}^*) are invariant under any automorphism of G which preserves \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{K} .*

In the next theorem for a subgroup $K \leq G$ we use notation $\text{Aut}_G(K)$ to be the group of all automorphisms of G that leave K invariant.

Theorem 9.32. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a non-fictitious free pro- p product with amalgamation. Suppose that G_1 and G_2 are rigid. Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)),$$

where 1 can be replaced by 2.

Proof. Let $S = S(G)$ be the standard pro- p tree for $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$. We define \sim as in Example 9.16(a): edges are equivalent if their stabilizers are equal. Then T_c/G is a tree with 3 vertices. The underlying graph of pro- p groups of the G -tree T_c is

$$\bullet \xrightarrow{N_{G_1}(H)} \bullet \xrightarrow{N_{G_2}(H)} \bullet$$

(Example 9.16(a)). By Lemma 9.29 $\text{Aut}(G)$ acts on T_c . The outer automorphism group $\text{Out}(G)$ acts either trivially on $V(T_c)/G$ or by swapping two vertices of $V_0(T_c)/G$ (leaving the middle vertex $V_1(T_c)/G$ fixed). It follows that $T_c/\text{Aut}(G)$ is either T_c/G or a tree with two vertices only.

Case 1. $T_c/\text{Aut}(G) = T_c/G$. Lift it to a subtree $T' = \{v_1, v_2, w \in V(T_c), e_1, e_2 \in E(T_c)\}$ of T_c with $G_{v_1} = G_1$, $G_{v_2} = G_2$, $G_w = N_G(H)$ (w is the cylinder of H) e_1 connecting v_1 and w , e_2 connecting v_2 and w . Since $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ is non-fictitious, S is reduced and so $\text{Aut}(G)_{v_1} = \text{Aut}_G(G_1)$, $\text{Aut}(G)_{v_2} = \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$. Moreover, the cylinder is $N_G(H)$ and its stabilizer $\text{Aut}(G)_w = \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$. Hence $\text{Aut}(G)_{e_1} = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$, $\text{Aut}(G)_{e_2} = \text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$. So

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(G_2).$$

Case 2. $T_c/\text{Aut}(G) \neq T_c/G$ (in this case G_1 and G_2 are isomorphic). Lift it to a subtree $T' = \{v_1, w \in V(T_c), e \in E(T_c)\}$ of T_c with $G_{v_1} = G_1$, $G_w = N_G(H)$ (w is the cylinder of H) e connecting v_1 and w . Then $\text{Aut}(G)_{v_1} = \text{Aut}_G(G_1)$, $\text{Aut}(G)_w = \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$, $\text{Aut}(G)_{e_1} = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$. Thus $\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))$.

□

Remark 9.33. If H is normal in G then the splitting of the previous theorem is fictitious, since $\text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)) = \text{Aut}(G)$.

Corollary 9.34. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a free pro- p product of finite p -groups with amalgamation. Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_G(H)).$$

The second possibility occurs only if there exists an automorphism of G that swaps G_1 and a conjugate of G_2 .

Proof. We need to prove only the last statement of the corollary, because finite groups are rigid. But this is the subject of [BPZ, Proposition 3.3].

□

Next we refine Theorem 9.32 assuming that the amalgamated subgroup is malnormal.

Suppose first that H is malnormal, say in G_2 , and so $N_{G_2}(H) = H$. Then

$$N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H)$$

and so the statement of Theorem 9.32 reads as follows: $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_{G_1}(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_{G_1}(H)) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_2) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_{G_1}(H))} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(N_{G_1}(H))} \text{Aut}_G(N_{G_1}(H)),$$

where 1 can be replaced by 2.

However if H is malnormal in both G_1 and G_2 then $N_G(H) = H$. Moreover, $\text{Aut}_G(H) \leq \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$ since $G_1^{g_1} \cap G_2^{g_2} = H$ if and only if $g_1 \in G_1, g_2 \in G_2$. On the other hand if for $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ one has $\alpha(G_i) = G_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $\alpha(H) = \alpha(G_1 \cap G_2) = \alpha(G_1) \cap \alpha(G_2) = G_1 \cap G_2 = H$. Thus $\text{Aut}_G(H) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$ and the statement in this case reduces to the following

Corollary 9.35. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a non-fictitious free pro- p product with malnormal amalgamation. Suppose that G_1 and G_2 are rigid. Then $\text{Aut}(G)$ is either*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(H)} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)$$

or

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1),$$

where 1 can be replaced by 2.

Note that since H is malnormal, G has trivial center and so $\text{Inn}(G)$ is naturally isomorphic to G , i.e. we can identify them in $\text{Aut}(G)$. Thus $G \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_i) = G_i$. Hence $G \cap \text{Aut}_G(H) = G \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_2) = G_1 \cap G_2 = H$.

Thus we can deduce the following

Corollary 9.36. *If H is malnormal and G_1, G_2 , then*

$$\text{Out}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1)/G_1 \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(H)/H} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)/G_2$$

or

$$\text{Out}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1)/G_1$$

Remark 9.37. All results for amalgamated free product above hold the same way also for abstract amalgamated free product and profinite amalgamated free products (see the next section for details).

9.3 Applications

Proposition 9.38. *Let G be a CSA pro- p group and suppose that \mathcal{E} consists of abelian subgroups. Let \sim be the commutation relation. Then T_c is 2-acylindrical.*

Proof. As it is observed in Example (1) of Section 9.1 the cylinders are maximal abelian subgroups which are malnormal by hypothesis. Hence for any abelian group A containing in the maximal A_{max} the pro- p subtree fixed by A is the star of the vertex $v_{A_{max}}$ where A_{max} is the cylinder. □

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma)$ be a splitting of G as the fundamental group of a finite reduced graph of pro- p groups with abelian edge groups. Let T be a maximal subtree of Γ . By [CZ, Proposition 3.4] $|\Gamma \setminus T| \leq d(G)$ and so w.l.o.g. we may assume that $\Gamma = T$ is a tree. As $|E(T)| = |G(T)| - 1$ it suffices to bound $|V(T)|$. As G is SCA, every centralizer is abelian and so any abelian vertex group of (\mathcal{G}, T) has non-abelian neighbouring vertex group. Hence it suffices to bound the number of vertices of T whose vertex groups are non-abelian. By Proposition 9.38 the tree of cylinders T_c of the standard pro- p tree $S(G)$ is 2-acylindrical. Recall that $V(\Gamma) = V_0(T_c/G)$. Let T_{cr} be the reduced tree obtained from T_c . By Corollary 6.13 T_c/G is a finite and hence so is T_{cr}/G . As edge stabilizers of T_c are abelian the set of vertices V_{NA} of T whose vertex stabilizers are not abelian embeds into T_{cr} , so it suffices to bound $|V(T_{cr}/G)|$. But this follows from Theorem 3.4.

Theorem 9.39. *Let G be a finitely generated CSA pro- p group. Suppose G is indecomposable into a free pro- p product and \mathcal{E} consists of abelian subgroups. Let T be a JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree. Then T_c is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree relative to not virtually cyclic abelian subgroups.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.5 G is \mathcal{E} -accessible and so by Corollary 6.13 T/G is finite. Then by Corollary 9.23 T_c/G is finite.

Let us first show that T_c is universally elliptic. Let A be an edge stabilizer of T_c . We note that in this case G_Y is a maximal abelian subgroup. Let T' be a universally elliptic \mathcal{E} -tree for G relative to non cyclic abelian subgroups. If G_Y is not cyclic, then it stabilizes a vertex of T' since T' is relative to non-cyclic abelian subgroups and therefore so is A .

If G_Y is cyclic, then it is commensurable with an edge stabilizer of T (edge stabilizers of T cannot be trivial since G does not split as a free pro- p product) and so by Proposition 2.4 is elliptic in T' since T is universally elliptic. Thus T_c is universally elliptic.

We need to show now that T_c dominates T' . If $v \in V_0(T_c)$ then $v \in V(T)$ and so G_v is elliptic in T' since T is a JSJ pro- p \mathcal{E} -tree.

Suppose $v \in V_1(T_c)$. Then $v = T_Y$ and G_v is the set-stabilizer G_Y of the cylinder Y . But G_Y in this case is maximal abelian. So as in the preceding paragraph if it is cyclic it is commensurable with the stabilizer of an edge in T and so is elliptic. If it is abelian non-cyclic subgroup of G , then it stabilizes a vertex of T' by hypothesis. □

As limit pro- p groups are CSA we deduce the following

Corollary 9.40. *Let G be a pro- p limit group and \mathcal{E} be the set of abelian subgroups of G . Suppose that G is indecomposable into a free pro- p product. Then the pro- p tree of cylinders T_c is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree relative to not virtually cyclic abelian subgroups.*

Example 9.41. Let H be an infinite FA pro- p group and C is a malnormal infinite cyclic subgroup of H . Let G be a free pro- p product $H \amalg_C C \times \mathbb{Z}_p$. Note that there are even analytic pro- p CSA such groups H (see [MWZ]; also open pro- p subgroups of $SL_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ are FA and CA).

Then G is the pro- p fundamental group of the following graph of pro- p groups.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H & \xrightarrow{C} & C \curvearrowright t \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}$$

where t is a generator of \mathbb{Z}_p .

The quotient graph T_c/G then is the following graph of pro- p groups.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H & \xrightarrow{C} & C \times \mathbb{Z}_p & \xrightarrow{C} & C \\ \bullet & & \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}$$

Of course, the right edge of this graph of groups is fictitious and so can be collapsed.

We also can consider the extension of the centralizer above as HNN-extension $HNN(H, C, t)$. Then it is the fundamental pro- p group of the following graph of pro- p groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H & \curvearrowright_C & \\ \bullet & & \end{array}$$

It follows that T_c/G is the following graph of pro- p groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H & \xrightarrow{C} & C \times \mathbb{Z}_p \\ \bullet & & \bullet \end{array}$$

As H is FA, T_c is universally elliptic, and it is JSJ pro- p tree relative to non-cyclic abelian subgroups. Note that this tree of groups coincides with the previous tree of groups after collapsing the right edge.

10 Automorphisms

In this section we extend Corollary 9.35 to the pro- \mathcal{C} case, where \mathcal{C} is a class of finite groups closed for subgroups, quotients and extensions, assuming that the amalgamated subgroup is finite.

A pro- \mathcal{C} group will be called an *OE-group* if whenever it acts on a pro- \mathcal{C} tree with finite edge stabilizers, then it fixes a vertex.

We shall reformulate here Proposition 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 [BPZ] for our purpose adapting the proofs.

Proposition 10.1. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a proper pro- \mathcal{C} amalgamated free products of pro- \mathcal{C} groups with finite amalgamation. Suppose G_1 is an OE-group. Then for any automorphism $\psi \in \text{Aut}(G)$ there exists an inner automorphism τ such that $\tau\psi(G_1) = G_1$ (up to possibly interchanging G_1 and G_2 in G if $G_1 \cong G_2$).*

Proof. By [R, Example 6.3.1] $\psi(G_1)$ is conjugate into G_1 or G_2 , say $\psi(G_1) \leq G_1^w$ for some $w \in G$. Thus denoting by $\tau_{w^{-1}}$ the inner automorphism of conjugation by w^{-1} , if necessary, we get $\tau_{w^{-1}}\psi(G_1) \leq G_1$. But symmetrically $G_1 = \psi^{-1}(G_1^w)$ is in G_1^g for some $g \in G$ and so $G_1 = G_1^g$ and hence $\psi(G_1) = G_1^w$. Thus $\tau_{w^{-1}}\psi(G_1) = G_1$. \square

Corollary 10.2. *Suppose in addition that G_2 is a pro- \mathcal{C} OE-group. Then for any automorphism $\psi \in \text{Aut}(G)$ there exists an inner automorphism τ such that $\tau\psi(H) = H$, $\tau\psi(G_1) = G_1$ and $\tau\psi(G_2) = G_2^g$ for some $g \in G$ (up to possibly interchanging G_1 and G_2 in G if $G_1 \cong G_2$).*

Proof. By Proposition 10.1 we may assume that $\psi(G_1) = G_1$. Similarly as in the proof of Proposition 10.1 $\psi(G_2)$ is conjugate into G_1 or G_2 . But G_1 and G_2 are not conjugate, since otherwise by [R, Corollary 7.1.5 (b)] or [ZM-88, Corollary 3.13] G_1 is conjugate to H and so G is fictitious. Thus $\psi(G_2) \leq G_2^b$ for some $b \in G$ (cf. [R, Example 6.3.1]). Then symmetrically $\psi^{-1}(G_2^b)$ is in G_2^g for some $g \in G$. But $\psi^{-1}\psi(G_2) = G_2$ and so we deduce as in the previous proposition that $\psi(G_2) = G_2^b$.

By [R, Corollary 7.1.5 (b)] or [ZM-88, Corollary 3.13] we have:

$$\psi(H) = G_1 \cap G_2^b \leq H^{b_1} \quad (b_1 \in G_1) \quad (1)$$

Similarly we have $\psi^{-1}(H) \leq H^{g_1}$ for some $g_1 \in G_1$. Since H is finite we have $\psi(H) = H^{b_1}$, $b_1 \in G_1$. Thus we get $\tau_{b_1^{-1}} \circ \psi(H) = H$. \square

Corollary 10.3. *Suppose H is malnormal. Then τ can be chosen such that in addition $\tau\psi(G_2) = G_2$ (up to possibly interchanging G_1 and G_2 in G if $G_1 \cong G_2$).*

Proof. By Corollary 10.2 we may assume that $\psi(H) = H$, $\psi(G_1) = G_1$ and $\psi(G_2) = G_2^g$ for some $g \in G$. Then Equation (1) reads as

$$H = \psi(H) = G_1 \cap G_2^g \leq H^{b_1} \quad (b_1 \in G_1, g \in G).$$

From malnormality of H we deduce $b_1 \in H$. So denoting by e the edge of the standard profinite tree $S(G)$ stabilized by H and by v_1, v_2 its vertices stabilized by G_1 and G_2 respectively we have that H fixes $[v_1, gv_2]$ and so this geodesic contains only one edge e , i.e. $gv_2 = v_2$ and $g \in G_2$. \square

We denote by $\text{Aut}_{G_i}(H)$ and $\text{Aut}_{\widehat{G}_i}(H)$ the subgroups that leave H invariant and by $\overline{\text{Aut}}_{G_i}(H)$, $\overline{\text{Aut}}_{\widehat{G}_i}(H)$ their images in $\text{Aut}(H)$.

Theorem 10.4. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a free pro- \mathcal{C} product of OE pro- \mathcal{C} groups $G_1 \not\cong G_2$ with finite malnormal amalgamation. Then*

$$\text{Aut}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1) \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(H)} \text{Aut}_G(G_2).$$

Proof. Since $G_1 \not\cong G_2$ an automorphism interchanging G_1 and G_2 does not exist. So by Corollary 10.3 for any $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ one has $\alpha(G_1) = G_1^{g_1}$, $\alpha(G_2) = G_2^{g_2}$ and $\alpha(H) = H^{g_3}$ for some $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$. But $G_1^{g_1}, G_2^{g_2}$ stabilize unique vertices v_1, v_2 in the standard pro- \mathcal{C}

tree $S = S(G)$ for $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ and so $\alpha(H) = G_1^{g_1} \cap G_2^{g_2}$ fixes the geodesic $[v_1, v_2]$. Since H is malnormal in G this geodesic has only one edge e' that connects v_1 and v_2 . Moreover if for $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(G)$ one has $\alpha(G_i) = G_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $\alpha(H) = \alpha(G_1 \cap G_2) = \alpha(G_1) \cap \alpha(G_2) = G_1 \cap G_2 = H$ and so $\overline{\text{Aut}}_G(G_1) \cap \overline{\text{Aut}}_G(G_2) = H$.

Thus if w_1, w_2 , are vertices stabilized by G_1 and G_2 respectively, we can define the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on S by setting $\alpha(w_1) = v_1$, $\alpha(w_2) = v_2$ and $\alpha(e_0) = e'$ where e_0 is an edge connecting w_1 and w_2 (stabilized by H). We need to show that this action is continuous.

Since d_1, d_2 are continuous, it suffices to show that the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on $E(S)$ is continuous. Since $\text{Inn}(G)$ acts transitively on $E(S)$, so is $\text{Aut}(G)$. If e is the edge stabilized by H then the stabilizer of it in $\text{Aut}(G)$ is $\text{Aut}_G(H)$. Hence $\text{Aut}(G)$ -space $E(S)$ is naturally equivariantly homeomorphic to $\text{Aut}(G)$ -space $\text{Aut}(G)/\text{Aut}_G(H)$. This can be checked by factoring both spaces modulo open subgroups U of $\text{Aut}(G)$ containing $\text{Aut}_G(H)$ and then taking the inverse limit of the natural equivariant bijections. This proves that the action of $\text{Aut}(G)$ on $E(S)$ is continuous as needed.

Finally observing as in the previous section that the vertex stabilizer of w_i in $\text{Aut}(G)$ is $\text{Aut}_G(G_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$ we get the result. \square

Note that since H is malnormal then H is self-normalized and so $N_{G_i}(H) = H$. Since H is malnormal, G has trivial center and so $\text{Inn}(G)$ is naturally isomorphic to G , i.e. we can identify them in $\text{Aut}(G)$. Thus $G \cap \text{Aut}_G(G_i) = G_i$. Thus we can deduce the following

Corollary 10.5.

$$\text{Out}(G) = \text{Aut}_G(G_1)/G_1 \amalg_{\text{Aut}_G(H)/H} \text{Aut}_G(G_2)/G_2.$$

Observe that all results above hold the same way also for abstract amalgamated free product. Hence we deduce the following

Corollary 10.6. *Suppose $G_1 \not\cong G_2$ are finite and H is malnormal. Let $G^{abs} = G_1 *_H G_2$ be a free amalgamated product. Then $\text{Aut}(\widehat{G^{abs}}) = \widehat{\text{Aut}(G^{abs})}$ and $\text{Out}(\widehat{G^{abs}}) = \widehat{\text{Out}(G^{abs})}$.*

Remark 10.7. The congruence problem for the automorphism group of a finitely generated residually finite group asks whether $\widehat{\text{Aut}(G)} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\widehat{G})$ is injective and if it is not to describe the kernel (the congruence kernel). The previous corollary solves it for free product of finite groups with malnormal amalgamation, i.e. this homomorphism is injective.

In general, the subgroup theorem for normal subgroups (cf. [Zal95]) gives the structure of the congruence kernel for $\text{Aut}(G)$ as in Theorem 10.4

11 Compatibility

Recall that two G -trees T_1 and T_2 are compatible if they have a common refinement. In other words, there exists a tree T with collapse maps $T \rightarrow T_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 11.1. (Universally compatible). A pro- p tree T is universally compatible (over \mathcal{E} relative to \mathcal{K}) if it is compatible with every $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree.

In particular, this means that any pro- p $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T' can be obtained from T by refining and collapsing. When T' is a one-edge splitting, either T' coincides with the splitting associated to one of the edges of T/G , or one can obtain T'/G by refining T/G at some vertex v using an one-edge splitting of G_v relative to the incident edge groups, and collapsing all the original edges of T/G .

Definition 11.2. We say that a G -tree T is maximal for domination if any G -tree dominating it belongs to the same deformation space as T .

Definition 11.3. (Compatibility JSJ deformation space). If, among deformation spaces containing a universally compatible tree, there is one which is maximal for domination, we denote it by D_{co} and called it the compatibility JSJ deformation space of G over \mathcal{E} relative to \mathcal{K} .

Theorem 11.4. D_{co} exists and unique.

Proof. Existence. Compatible $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees form naturally an inverse system. Hence inverse limit of them is the $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree maximal for domination.

Uniqueness. Let T_1, T_2 be maximal for domination universally compatible $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -trees. As they are compatible there exists a tree T with collapse maps $T \rightarrow T_i$, $i = 1, 2$. As they are maximal for domination they belong to the same deformation space. \square

The uniqueness of an inverse limit shows that a maximal for domination universally compatible $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree is unique. We state it as a

Corollary 11.5. A maximal for domination universally compatible $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree T_{co} is unique. It is fixed under any automorphism of G that leaves D_{co} invariant. In particular, any pro- p subgroup of $\text{Aut}(G)$ that preserves \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{K} acts on T_{co} .

Note that if T_{co}/G is finite or G is finitely generated then T_{co} may be refined to a JSJ $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree (Proposition 6.16).

Clearly, a universally compatible tree is universally elliptic. This implies that D_{co} is dominated by D_{JSJ} . Also note that, if T is universally compatible and J is an edge stabilizer in an arbitrary $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree, then J is elliptic in T (i.e. any $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree is elliptic with respect to T).

Examples in the next subsection show that in general it is difficult to find non-trivial example of a splitting having only one reduced JSJ tree. We give below several examples where T_{co} does not exist contrasting corresponding abstract examples, where such a tree exists. In the pro- p case, for such examples one should look at k -acylindrical splittings.

We shall need the following

Proposition 11.6. Let T_1, T_2 be compatible G -trees with $|T_i/G| < \infty$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then there exists a finite refinement T of T_i such that $|T/G| < \infty$.

Proof. Let S be a common refinement of T_1 and T_2 . Then the corresponding collapse maps $f_i : S \rightarrow T_i$ induce the collapse maps $\bar{f}_i : S/G \rightarrow T_i/G$ on the quotient sets. Since T_i/G is finite the corresponding equivalence relations are clopen, i.e. there are clopen subgraphs

Γ_i of S/G with finitely many connected components such that \bar{f}_i is the collapse of these finitely many connected components of Γ_i . Then $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$ is a clopen subgraph of S/G with finitely many connected components. Thus the collapse of these connected components $S/G \rightarrow \Gamma$ gives a finite graph Γ . Let Δ be a preimage of $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$ in S . Then collapse of all connected components of Δ is the G -equivariant collapse map $S \rightarrow T$ with $T/G = \Gamma$. Thus T is the desired refinement. \square

11.1 Examples

11.1.1 Free pro- p groups

When \mathcal{E} is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant, the compatibility JSJ tree T_{co} is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant (cf. Corollary 11.5). This sometimes forces it to be trivial.

Proposition 11.7. *If G is a free pro- p group and \mathcal{E} is $\text{Aut}(G)$ -invariant, then T_{co} is trivial.*

Proof. If $F = F(x_1 \dots x_n)$ is a free pro- p group on the basis x_1, \dots, x_n then the automorphisms that send x_i to $x_i x_j$ ($i \neq j$) and leave the rest of generators give the set of F -trees such that the only compatible tree for all of them is the trivial one. \square

11.1.2 Free pro- p products

Here we assume that G is finitely generated. In this case a Grushko decomposition always exists and $\text{Aut}(G)$ is profinite and virtually pro- p (cf. [RZ10, Corollary 4.4.4 and Lemma 4.5.5]).

Proposition 11.8. *Let \mathcal{E} consist only of the trivial group. Let*

$$G = G_1 \amalg \dots \amalg G_p \amalg F_q$$

be a Grushko decomposition (G_i is non-trivial, not \mathbb{Z}_p , and freely indecomposable, F_q is free pro- p of rank q). Then T_{co} is trivial.

Proof. Note that T_{co} is, of course, trivial also if G is freely indecomposable or free of rank ≥ 2 (cf. Proposition 11.7).

Write $G = A \amalg B$, where A, B are non-trivial and $A = G_1$. Let T be a standard pro- p tree of this decomposition. Given a non-trivial $g \in G$, the subgroup $gAg^{-1} \amalg B$ is the image of $A \amalg B$ by an automorphism α_g that sends A to gAg^{-1} and fixes B . Let S be the standard pro- p tree of this decomposition. If there exists a common refinement of T and S , then by Proposition 11.6 there exists a common refinement D of T and S with D/G finite. Then collapsing fictitious edges we may assume that D is reduced. But reduced G -tree whose vertex groups are two free factors up to conjugation is a pro- p tree with one edge and two vertices up to translation. This contradicts that D/G is a refinement. \square

This contrasts with the abstract situation where T_{co} exists for Grushko decompositions whose tree have one edge only up to translation (see [GL, Section 11.2]).

Example 11.9. Let $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$ and \mathcal{E} consists of the trivial group. The unique reduced G -tree is the Cayley graph $\Gamma(G)$ with respect to a generator. However $\text{Aut}(G) = \mathbb{Z}_p \times C_{p-1}$ for p odd and $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times C_2$ for $p = 2$ (the group of units). This group can not act on $\Gamma(G)$ because any automorphism fixes trivial element of G and sends the generator to another unit of \mathbb{Z}_p .

11.1.3 Free product with amalgamation

Example 11.10. Let $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$ be a non-fictitious free pro- p product of FA pro- p groups with amalgamated subgroup H . By Proposition 2.31 $N_G(H) = N_{G_1}(H) \amalg_H N_{G_2}(H)$. Assume that H is not self-normalized in each factor (this is always the case if G_i are finite for example). For any $g \in N_G(H) \setminus G_2 G_1$ putting $G'_2 = G_2^g$ we get the splitting $G = G_1 \amalg_H G'_2$ (cf. [BPZ, Proposition 5.1]). To see this just observe that denoting by $H_1 \leq G_1, H_2 \leq G_2$ the identified copies of H we can change identification $h_1 = h_2$ by $h_1 = h_2^g \in G_2^g$ to obtain the equivalent presentation for G . We show that the standard pro- p tree T' for the splitting $G = G_1 \amalg_H G'_2$ is not compatible with T . As in the case of free pro- p products if there exists a common refinement, then by Proposition 11.6 there exists a common refinement D of T and T' with D/G finite. Then collapsing fictitious edges we may assume that D is reduced. But reduced G -tree whose vertex groups are two free factors (of an amalgamated free pro- p product) up to conjugation is a pro- p tree with one edge and two vertices up to translation. This contradicts that D/G is a refinement.

Next we show that if on the contrary H is malnormal in, say, G_2 , then T_{co} is actually the standard pro- p tree $S(G)$ for $G = G_1 \amalg_H G_2$. Indeed, as in preceding paragraph one shows that any non-trivial reduced pro- p G -tree T can be identified with standard pro- p tree of the splitting G as a free product with amalgamation $G'_1 \amalg_{H'} G'_2$, where G'_i are conjugates of G_1 and G_2 , and so we may assume w.l.o.g that $G_1 = G'_1$. As $G'_2 = G_2^g$ for some $g \in G$, G'_2 fixes a vertex gG_2 in $S(G)$. But $S(G)$ is 2-acylindrical, because H is malnormal in G_2 . Therefore, if $g \notin G_2 G_1$ then $G_1 \cap G'_2 = 1$ and so $G \cong G_1 \amalg G'_2$, a contradiction. Hence $g = g_1 g_2 \in G_1 G_2$ and so T is G -isomorphic to $S(G)$. Indeed, the G -isomorphism $S(G) \rightarrow T$ is defined by sending $1H$ to the edge that connects the vertex stabilized by G_1 and the vertex stabilized by $g_1 G'_2 g_1^{-1}$.

11.1.4 Poincaré duality pro- p groups

Let G be a Poincaré duality group of dimension n . Recall that a pro- p group is VPC_n (resp. $VPC_{\leq n}$) if it is virtually polycyclic of Hirsch length n (resp $\leq n$). We consider the family \mathcal{E} consisting of malnormal $VPC_{\leq n-1}$ -subgroups. By [CAZ, Theorem 1.2] there exists a unique JSJ \mathcal{E} -tree for G . So by Corollary 11.5 it coincides with T_{co} .

Examples of JSJ-decompositions of PD^3 pro- p groups can be obtained by the pro- p completion of abstract JSJ-decomposition of some 3-manifolds (see [Wilkes17]). The pro- p completion of PD^n groups in general were studied in [KZ, Weigel, HK, HKL].

Note that by [WZ, Lemma 1.6 and Theorem 1.7], if PD^n pro- p group G splits over a virtually solvable subgroup H , then H is VPC_{n-1} (solvable pro- p groups of finite cohomological dimension are polycyclic). This is a pro- p version of the Kropholler [Kropholler, Theorem A2]. The abstract analogue of existence and uniqueness of the JSJ-decomposition

for PD^n group is the Kropholler theorem [Kropholler, Theorem A2] that gives also information on vertex groups of a JSJ-splitting.

12 Compatibility and free constructions of free pro- p groups

12.1 Free pro- p groups

We start this section by showing that any splitting of a free pro- p group admits a free pro- p product refinement. The next proposition is a pro- p version of the result of Shenitzer [She].

Definition 12.1. Let F be a free pro- p group and $\overline{A} \leq H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p) = F/\Phi(F)$ be a subgroup of its Frattini quotient. Let B_A be a basis of \overline{A} and $s : F/\Phi(F) \rightarrow F$ a continuous section. Then $A = \langle s(B_A) \rangle$ is a free pro- p group on $s(B_A)$ and it is a free factor of F that we shall call a lift of \overline{A} to F .

Proposition 12.2. Let $G = F_1 \amalg_C F_2$ be a free amalgamated product of free pro- p groups and suppose G is free pro- p . Then C splits as a free pro- p product $C = C_1 \amalg C'_2 = C'_1 \amalg C_2 = C'_1 \amalg C'_2 \amalg C'$ such that C_i is a free factor of F_i and C'_i is a (possibly trivial) free factor of C_i .

Proof. Denote by $cor_i : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F_i, \mathbb{F}_p)$ the corestriction, $i = 1, 2$. Since G is free, $H_2(G, \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$ and so one deduces from the Mayer-Vietoris sequence (cf. [RZ10, Proposition 9.2.13]) that the natural map

$$cor_1 \oplus cor_2 : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F_1, \mathbb{F}_p) \oplus H_1(F_2, \mathbb{F}_p)$$

is injective. Then one has $ker(cor_1) \cap ker(cor_2) = 0$. Therefore $(cor_2)|_{ker(cor_1)}$ and $(cor_1)|_{ker(cor_2)}$ are injections. It follows that

$$H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) = ker(cor_1) \oplus \overline{C}_2 \text{ and } H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) = ker(cor_2) \oplus \overline{C}_1,$$

where $\overline{C}_2 \cong im(cor_1)$ is the complement of $ker(cor_1)$ in $H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p)$ containing $ker(cor_2)$ and $\overline{C}_1 \cong im(cor_2)$ is the complement of $ker(cor_2)$ in $H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p)$ containing $ker(cor_1)$. Let C_i be a lift of \overline{C}_i to C and C'_i be a lift of $ker(cor_i)$ to C_i . Note that C'_i is a free factor of C_i and C_i is a free factor of F_i . Then

$$C = C_1 \amalg C'_2 = C'_1 \amalg C_2 = C'_1 \amalg C'_2 \amalg C'$$

as

$$H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) = \overline{C}_1 \oplus ker(cor_2) = \overline{C}_2 \oplus ker(cor_1) = ker(cor_1) \oplus ker(cor_2) \oplus \overline{C}'$$

for some \overline{C}' .

□

Corollary 12.3. Let $G = F_1 \amalg_C F_2$ be a free pro- p product of free pro- p groups F_1, F_2 with cyclic amalgamation C . Then G is free pro- p if and only if C is a free factor of F_1 or F_2 .

Proof. 'only if'. In this case either $C_1 = C$ or $C_2 = C$ in Proposition 12.2 and so the result follows from this proposition.

'if'. If C is a free factor of, say, F_1 , i.e. $F_1 = L \amalg C$, then $G = L \amalg F_2$ is a free pro- p product of free pro- p groups and therefore is free pro- p . \square

The next proposition is the pro- p analogue of [Swa, Theorem 1].

Proposition 12.4. *Let $G = \text{HNN}(F, C, t)$ be a pro- p HNN-extension of a free pro- p group and suppose G is free pro- p . Then F and C split as a free pro- p product $F = F_1 \amalg F_2$, $C = C_1 \amalg C_2$ such that C_1 is a free factor of F_1 and C_2^t is a free factor of F_2 (where one of C_1, C_2 can be trivial).*

Proof. Let $\text{cor} : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p)$, $\text{cor}_t : H_1(C^t, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p)$ be the corestrictions. Since G is free, $H_2(G, \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$ and so one deduces from Mayer-Vietoris sequence ([RZ10, Proposition 9.4.2]) that the natural map $f : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p)$ given by $\text{cor}(c) - \text{cor}_t(c^t)$ is injective and so $\ker(\text{cor}) \cap \ker(\text{cor}_t \circ \tau) = 0$, where τ is the conjugation by t . Hence $H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) = \overline{C}_1 \oplus \overline{C}_2$, where \overline{C}_2 is the kernel of the corestriction $\text{cor} : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p)$ and \overline{C}_1 is its complement. As C is free pro- p , $C = C_1 \amalg C_2$ is a free pro- p product of lifts of \overline{C}_i in C .

Let $H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p) = \overline{F}_1 \oplus \overline{F}_2$ be a direct sum decomposition with $\text{cor}(\overline{C}_1) \leq \overline{F}_1$ and $\text{cor}(\overline{C}_2^t) \leq \overline{F}_2$. Then one can choose lifting of \overline{F}_i containing C_i . So $F = F_1 \amalg F_2$ is a free pro- p product and C_1 is a free factor of F_1 and C_2^t is a free factor of F_2 (possibly trivial). \square

Corollary 12.5. *Let $G = \text{HNN}(F, C, t)$ be a pro- p HNN-extension of a free pro- p group F with cyclic associated subgroup C . Then G is free pro- p if and only if either C or C^t is a free factor of F and $C\Phi(F) \neq C^t\Phi(F)$.*

Proof. 'Only if'. In this case either $C_1 = C$ or $C_2 = C$ in Proposition 12.4 say $C = C_1$. Then by Proposition 12.4 C_1 is a free factor of F . As was already mentioned in the proof of Proposition 12.4 the natural map $f : H_1(C, \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(F, \mathbb{F}_p)$ given by $\text{cor}(c) - \text{cor}_t(c^t)$ is injective and so $C\Phi(F) \neq C^t\Phi(F)$ as required.

'if'. Suppose say C is a free factor of F , i.e. F decomposes as a free pro- p product $F = C \amalg L$.

Case 1. Both $C, C^t \not\leq \Phi(F)$. Since $C\Phi(F) \neq C^t\Phi(F)$, L can be chosen such that $C^t \leq L$. In this case $G = L \amalg \langle t \rangle$ and the result follows.

Case 2. One of C, C^t is contained in $\Phi(F)$, say $C^t \leq \Phi(F)$. Then $G = \langle L, t \rangle$. Denote by c a generator of C , so that $c^t = c' \in \Phi(F)$ and let X be a basis of L . Since $[t, c] \notin \Phi(F)$ the presentation $G = \langle C, X, t \mid c^t = c' \rangle$ just identifies the free generator $c^t c'^{-1} = [t, c]$ with the trivial element. So G is a free pro- p group $L \amalg \langle t \rangle$ again. \square

The next example shows that [Wilton, Theorem 18] as well as [Toi, Corollary 1.5] does not hold in the pro- p case.

Example 12.6. Let $G = HNN(F(a, b), \langle b \rangle, t)$ with $b^t = a^p[a, b]$.


1. G is a two generated free pro- p group generated by a and t . This follows from Corollary 12.5.

2. $G = HNN(F(a, b), \langle b \rangle, t)$ is proper. Indeed, if G were not proper, then the image of $F(a, b)$ in $F(a, t)$ would be cyclic, equal to $\langle a \rangle$ and so b would be a super natural power a^α of a . Putting it into the relation we get $(a^{-\alpha})^t a^p[a, a^\alpha] = (a^{-\alpha})^t a^p = 1$. It follows then that G is the Bamslag-Solitar pro- p group (see Section 7.5) that have a non-trivial normal subgroup, contradicting that G is non-abelian free pro- p .

3. $F(a, b)$ does not split relative to $\langle a^p[a, b] \rangle$. Indeed, if $\langle a^p[a, b] \rangle$ is contained in a free factor C of F , then $F/\langle\langle a^p[a, b] \rangle\rangle \cong C/\langle\langle a^p[a, b] \rangle\rangle \amalg \mathbb{Z}_p$. But $F/\langle\langle a^p[a, b] \rangle\rangle = \mathbb{Z}_p \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_p$ is a soluble Demushkin group that is not cyclic and torsion free, a contradiction.

Definition 12.7. Suppose \mathcal{E} consist of the trivial subgroup and \mathcal{K} a set of subgroups of a second countable pro- p group G . If T is an $(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{K})$ -tree, and there exists a continuous section $V(T)/G \rightarrow V(T)$ then by [R, Theorem 9.6.1] G splits as a free pro- p product of its vertex stabilizers. In this case we shall say that G splits as a free pro- p product relative to \mathcal{K} .

Proposition 12.8. Let F be a free pro- p group written as the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ of a finite star of pro- p groups, i.e. $d_0(\Gamma) = v_0$ is one vertex. Then each edge group $F(e)$ splits as a free pro- p product $F(e) = F_0(e) \amalg F_1(e)$ (with one of them possibly trivial as well as possibly $F_0(e) = F_1(e)$) such that each pending vertex group $F(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $F_1(e)$ for e incident to v and $F(v_0)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $F_0(e)$ for all $e \in E(\Gamma)$ and to $F_1(e)$ for all e that are loops.



Proof. Let $cor_i : H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow H_1(G(d_i(e)), \mathbb{F}_p)$ be the corestriction. Since F is free, $H_2(F, \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$ and so the natural map

$$f : \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_1(F(v), \mathbb{F}_p), f = cor_1(g) - cor_0(g)$$

from the Mayer-Vietoris sequence (cf. [R, Section 9.4]) is injective; so

$$\ker(cor_0) \cap \ker(cor_1) = 0$$

for each e . Then $H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p)$ splits as a direct sum $H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p) = \overline{C}_0(e) \oplus \overline{C}_1(e)$ with $\overline{C}_1(e) = \ker(cor_0)$ and $\overline{C}_0(e)$ its complement. Since $\ker(cor_0) \cap \ker(cor_1) = 0$ for each e , cor_1 restricts injectively on $\overline{C}_1(e)$. Lift $\overline{C}_i(e)$ to $F_i(e) \leq F(e)$. Then $F(e) = F_0(e) \amalg F_1(e)$.

Consider the composite

$$\alpha : \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_1(F(v), \mathbb{F}_p) \longrightarrow H_1(F(v_0), \mathbb{F}_p)$$

of f with the natural projection of $\bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_1(F(v), \mathbb{F}_p)$ onto $H_1(F(v_0), \mathbb{F}_p)$.

Let $E(\Gamma) = E_n \cup E_l$ be a union, where E_n is the set of not loops and E_l is the set of loops. Note that $\bigoplus_{e \in E_n} H_1(F_1(e), \mathbb{F}_p)$ is the kernel of α and so α is injective on

$$\bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(F_0(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \oplus \bigoplus_{e \in E_l} H_1(F_1(e), \mathbb{F}_p).$$

Consider a free pro- p product

$$G = \coprod_{e \in E_n} F_0(e) \amalg \coprod_{e \in E_l} F(e)$$

and note that

$$H_1(G, \mathbb{F}_p) = \bigoplus_{e \in E_n} H_1(F_0(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \oplus \bigoplus_{e \in E_l} H_1(F_1(e), \mathbb{F}_p).$$

Define $\beta_e : F_0(e) \longrightarrow F$ to be the natural embedding. Let $\beta : G \longrightarrow F(v_0)$ be a homomorphism induced by $\beta_e, e \in E(\Gamma)$, and $\beta_e(f)^{t_e}$ for $f \in F_1(e)$ if $e \in E_l$. Then the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{\beta} & F(v_0) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_1(G, \mathbb{F}_p) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & H_1(F(v_0), \mathbb{F}_p) \end{array}$$

is commutative. As α is split injective and $G, F(v_0)$ are free pro- p , β is split injective and so we may consider G as a free factor of $F(v_0)$, unless β is surjective. This finishes the proof for $F(v_0)$.

Similarly $F_1(e)$ embeds as a free factor to its pending vertex group $F(v)$ if e is not a loop. This finishes the proof. □


Remark 12.9. Note that in Proposition 12.8 $F_i(e)$ is trivial if and only if $\partial_i(F(e)) \leq \Phi(F_{d_i(e)})$.

Corollary 12.10. *Let F be a free pro- p group written as the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ of a star of pro- p groups, i.e. $d_0(\Gamma) = v_0$ is one vertex. Suppose all edge groups $F(e)$ are infinite cyclic. Then $F(v_0)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $\{\partial_i(G(e)) \mid d_i(e) = v_0, \partial_i(G(e)) \not\leq \Phi(G(v)), i = 0, 1\}$.*

Proof. Follows from Proposition 12.8 and Remark 12.9 □

Theorem 12.11. *Let F be a non-abelian free pro- p group written as the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ of a finite injective graph of pro- p groups. Then for a vertex v of Γ each incident edge group $F(e)$ splits as a free pro- p product $F(e) = F_0(e) \amalg F_1(e)$ and $F(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $F_0(e)$ for all $e \in E(\Gamma)$ with $v = d_0(e)$ and to $F_1(e)$ for all e with $d_1(e) = v$. (Here $F_0(e)$ and $F_1(e)$ can coincide or be trivial).*


Proof. Let Σ be the star of v and (\mathcal{F}, Σ) the subgraph of pro- p groups restricted to Σ . By changing orientation if necessary we may assume that $d_0(e) = v$ for every edge e incident to v . Then by Proposition 12.8 each incident edge group $F(e)$ to v splits as a free pro- p product $F(e) = F_0(e) \amalg F_1(e)$ and $F(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $F_0(e)$ for all $e \in E(\Gamma)$ and to $F_1(e)$ for all e that are loops.



□

Corollary 12.12. *Any decomposition of a free pro- p group as the fundamental group of a finite graph of pro- p groups $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ is compatible with some nontrivial free pro- p product decomposition.*

Proof. We first insert artificial edges for each $F_i(e)$ with e incident to v and then using Theorem 12.11 and its notation, we can blowup the vertex v and vertex group $F(v)$ into a free pro- p product.



Here F_0 is the remaining free factor that can be trivial.

Then the collapse of new edges gives back the graph of groups (\mathcal{F}, Γ) and the collapse of edges with non-trivial edge groups gives a free pro- p product decomposition.

□

Using Corollary 12.10 we deduce

Corollary 12.13. *Let F be a non-abelian free pro- p group written as the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ of a finite injective graph of pro- p groups with cyclic edge groups. Then for any vertex v of Γ the vertex group $G(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to $\{\partial_i(G(e) \mid d_i(e) = v, \partial_i(G(e)) \not\leq \Phi(G(v))\}$.*

Example 12.6 shows that to get a splitting of a vertex group relative to incident edge groups we need to put the hypothesis that underline graph has no cycles. We do it in the next

Corollary 12.14. *Let F be a non-abelian free pro- p group written as the fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{F}, \Gamma)$ of a finite injective tree of pro- p groups with cyclic edge groups. Then there exists a vertex v of Γ such that the vertex group $G(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to the incident edge groups of v .*

Proof. We use induction on Γ . If Γ has one edge only the result is the subject of Corollary 12.3.

Note that G splits as a free amalgamated pro- p product $G = G_1 \amalg_{G(e)} G(w)$ over an edge group $G(e)$, where e is an edge incident to a pending vertex w and we assume w.l.o.g that $d_1(e) = w$. Let $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \{e, w\}$. By the induction hypothesis there exists $v \in V(\Gamma_1)$ such that $G(v)$ splits as a free pro- p product relative to incident edge groups of v in Γ_1 . If v is not incident to e we are done.

Suppose e is incident to v . If $\partial_1(G(e)) \not\leq \Phi(G(w))$ then $\partial_1(G(e))$ is a free factor of $\Phi(G(w))$ and so w is the needed vertex.

Since $H_2(F) = 0$ the map

$$f : \bigoplus_{e \in E(\Gamma)} H_1(F(e), \mathbb{F}_p) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{v \in V(\Gamma)} H_1(F(v), \mathbb{F}_p), f = cor_1(g) - cor_0(g)$$

from the Mayer-Vietoris sequence (cf. [R, Section 9.4]) is injective and so if $\partial_1(G(e)) \leq \Phi(G(w))$ then $\partial_0(G(e)) \not\leq \Phi(G(w))$. Then the result follows from Corollary 12.13. \square

12.2 Cyclic amalgamations or HNN-extensions of free pro- p groups decomposable as free pro- p products

If we drop the assumption of freeness of G but assume that C is cyclic in Corollary 12.3 we get the same conclusion.

Proposition 12.15. *Let $G = F_1 \amalg_C F_2$ be a free amalgamated pro- p product of free pro- p groups over infinite cyclic subgroup C . Then G splits as a non-trivial free pro- p product if and only if C belongs to a free factor of F_1 or F_2 .*

Proof. Suppose G splits as a non-trivial free pro- p product $G = \coprod_{i=1}^n H_i$. If G is free pro- p then the result follows from Corollary 12.3. Otherwise, at least one H_i , say H_1 , is not free pro- p and so by [ZM-88, 2.7] H_1 intersects a conjugate of C non-trivially (since if H_1 acts on the standard pro- p tree $S(G)$ of $G = F_1 \amalg_C F_2$ with trivial edge stabilizers it is free pro- p). Thus we may assume that $H_1 \cap C \neq 1$. But the centralizer of any element of H_1 is in H_1 (see [RZ-00, Theorem 9.1.12]), so $C \leq H_1$. Note that $F_i \cap H_1$ is a free factor of F_i , $i = 0, 1$ by [RZ-00, Corollary 9.1.10]. Write $F_i = (F_i \cap H_1) \amalg L_i$, $i = 1, 2$. If $L_1 = L_2 = 1$, then $G \leq H_1$, a contradiction. Thus C is in a non-trivial free factor $F_i \cap H_1$ of F_i for $i = 1$ or 2 .

Conversely, if C is in a non-trivial free factor L_1 of F_1 , i.e. $F_1 = K_1 \amalg L_1$ then $G = K_1 \amalg (L_1 \amalg_C F_2)$ is a free pro- p product. \square

An element g of a pro- p group G is called a test element if any endomorphism α of G with $\alpha(g) = g$ is an automorphism. It is proved by Snopce and Tanushevski [ST] that an element of a free pro- p group is test if and only if it does not belong to any proper free factor. Thus we can deduce the following

Corollary 12.16. *Let F_1, F_2 be free pro- p groups and $c_1 \in F_1, c_2 \in F_2$ be test elements. Then $G = F_1 \amalg_{c_1=c_2} F_2$ does not split as a free pro- p product.*

Proposition 12.17. *Let $G = HNN(F, C, t)$ be an HNN-extension of a free pro- p group over infinite cyclic subgroup C . If G splits as a non-trivial free pro- p product, then C or C^t belongs to a free factor of F .*

Proof. Suppose G splits as a non-trivial free pro- p product $G = \coprod_{i=1}^n H_i$. If G is free pro- p then the result follows from Corollary 12.5. Thus we may assume that some of H_i , say H_1 is not free. Let $S(G)$ be a standard pro- p tree for $G = HNN(F, C, t)$. If H_1 intersects all conjugates of C trivially then by [ZM-88, 2.7] H_1 is free pro- p , so H_1 intersects a conjugate of C non-trivially. Therefore we may assume that $H_1 \cap C \neq 1$ and prove that statement for C . But the centralizer of any element of H_1 is in H_1 (see [RZ-00, Theorem 9.1.12], so $C \leq H_1$. Note that $F \cap H_1$ is a free factor of F , by [RZ-00, Corollary 9.1.10]. Write $F = (F \cap H_1) \amalg L$. If $L = 1$, then $F \leq H_1$ and $C = F \cap F^t \leq H_1 \cap H_1^t \neq 1$ implying that $t \leq H_1$ by [RZ10, Theorem 9.1.12]. So $G \leq H_1$, a contradiction. Thus C is in a non-trivial free factor $F \cap H_1$ of F . □

12.3 Virtually free pro- p products

We shall extend the situation above to virtually free pro- p products of pro- p groups. To do this we need the generalization of [WEZ-16, Theorem 3.6]. We shall make before the following

Remark 12.18. Let $G = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \Gamma, v_0)$ be the pro- p fundamental group of a finite graph of finite p -groups, and let U be an open and normal subgroup of G . Then $\tilde{U} = \langle U \cap \mathcal{G}(v)^g \mid g \in G, v \in V(\Gamma) \rangle$ is a closed normal subgroup of G . By [RZ-14, Prop. 1.10], one has a natural decomposition of G/\tilde{U} as the pro- p fundamental group $G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma, v_0)$ of a finite graph of finite p -groups (\mathcal{G}_U, Γ) , where the vertex and edge groups satisfy $\mathcal{G}_U(x) = \mathcal{G}(x)\tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$, $x \in V(\Gamma) \sqcup E(\Gamma)$. Thus we have a morphism $\eta: (\mathcal{G}, \Gamma) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma)$ of graphs of groups such that the induced homomorphism on the pro- p fundamental groups coincides with the canonical projection $\varphi_U: G \rightarrow G/\tilde{U}$.

Theorem 12.19. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group containing an open normal subgroup H and a G -invariant collection \mathcal{K} of subgroups of H such that H has a non-trivial decomposition as a free pro- p product $H = F \amalg H_1 \amalg \cdots \amalg H_s$, where F is a free pro- p subgroup of rank r and all subgroups of \mathcal{K} are conjugate into H_i for some i . Suppose $\{H_i^h \mid h \in H, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ is G -invariant. Then G splits as the pro- p fundamental group of a finite graph (\mathcal{G}, Γ) of pro- p groups relative to $\mathcal{K} \cup \{H_i^h \mid h \in H, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ with finite edge stabilizers of order not exceeding $[G : H]$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, $s + r \geq 2$. By construction, one has for all $g \in G$ and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ that H_i^g is a free factor of H .

Step 1: Let \mathcal{B} be a basis of neighbourhoods of $1_G \in G$ consisting of open normal subgroups U of G which are contained in H with $H_i \not\subseteq U$ for every $i = 1, \dots, s$. For $U \in \mathcal{B}$ put

$$\tilde{U} = \langle U \cap H_i^g \mid g \in G, 1 \leq i \leq s \rangle = \langle U \cap H_i^h \mid h \in H, 1 \leq i \leq s \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Then \tilde{U} is a closed normal subgroup of H , and

$$H/\tilde{U} = F \amalg H_1\tilde{U}/\tilde{U} \amalg \dots \amalg H_s\tilde{U}/\tilde{U} \quad (4)$$

(cf. [Me, Prop. 1.18]). The group G/\tilde{U} contains the open normal subgroup H/\tilde{U} which is a finitely generated, virtually free pro- p group (since U/\tilde{U} is free pro- p by in [ZM-88, Theorem 2.6]), and thus G/\tilde{U} is a finitely generated, virtually free pro- p group.

Step 2: By [HZ-13, Theorem 1.1], G/\tilde{U} is isomorphic to the pro- p fundamental group $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U, v_U)$ of a finite graph of finite p -groups. Although neither the finite graph Γ_U nor the finite graph of finite p -groups \mathcal{G}_U are uniquely determined by U (resp. \tilde{U}), the index U in the notation shall express that both these objects are depending on U . By Remark 2.17 we may assume that $(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U)$ is reduced. Hence from now on we may assume that for every $U \in \mathcal{B}$ the vertex groups of $G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_U, \Gamma_U, v_U)$ are representatives of the G/\tilde{U} -conjugacy classes of maximal finite subgroups. Note that by [WEZ-16, Proposition 3.2 (a)], one has $\mathcal{G}_U(e) \cap H/\tilde{U} = 1$ and so $|\mathcal{G}_U(e)| \leq [G : H]$. Moreover, as all subgroups K of H from \mathcal{K} are elliptic in H , $K\tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$ are elliptic (and so are finite) in H/\tilde{U} . As virtually elliptic group is elliptic, for any subgroup K of G from \mathcal{K} the quotient group $K\tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$ is elliptic (and so is finite) in G/\tilde{U} .

Step 3: By Remark 12.18, for $V \subseteq U$ both open and normal in G the decomposition $G/\tilde{V} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V, v_V)$ gives rise to a natural decomposition of G/\tilde{U} as the fundamental group $G/\tilde{U} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_{V,U}, \Gamma_V, v_V)$ of a finite graph of pro- p groups $(\mathcal{G}_{V,U}, \Gamma_V)$, where vertex and edge groups are natural images of the vertex and edge groups of $G/\tilde{V} = \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V, v_V)$ in G/\tilde{U} . Moreover, by [WEZ-16, Lemma 3.4], if $(\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V)$ is reduced, then $(\mathcal{G}_{V,U}, \Gamma_V)$ is reduced. Thus in this case one has a morphism $\eta: (\mathcal{G}_V, \Gamma_V) \rightarrow (\mathcal{G}_{V,U}, \Gamma_V)$ of reduced graph of groups such that the induced homomorphism on the pro- p fundamental groups coincides with the canonical projection $\varphi_{UV}: G/\tilde{V} \rightarrow G/\tilde{U}$.

Step 4: By [WEZ-16, Proposition 3.2], the number $|V(\Gamma_U)| + |E(\Gamma_U)|$ is bounded by $4(r + s) - 1$. So we have only finitely many graphs Γ_U up to isomorphism, when U runs. It follows that there is a finite graph Γ such that Γ_U is isomorphic to Γ for infinitely many U 's. Therefore, by passing to a cofinal system \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{B} if necessary, we may assume that $\Gamma_U = \Gamma$ for each $U \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, by [WEZ-16, Corollary 3.3], the number of isomorphism classes of finite reduced graphs of finite p -groups (\mathcal{G}'_U, Γ) which are based on Γ satisfying $G/\tilde{U} \simeq \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}'_U, \Gamma, v_0)$ is finite. Suppose that Ω_U is a set containing a copy of every such isomorphism class. For $V \in \mathcal{C}$, $V \subseteq U$, one has a map $\omega_{V,U}: \Omega_V \rightarrow \Omega_U$ (cf. Step 3). Hence $\Omega = \varprojlim_{U \in \mathcal{C}} \Omega_U$ is non-empty. Let $(\mathcal{G}'_U, \Gamma)_{U \in \mathcal{C}} \in \Omega$. Then (\mathcal{G}', Γ) given by $\mathcal{G}'(x) = \varprojlim \mathcal{G}'_U(x)$ if x is either a vertex or an edge of Γ , is a reduced finite graph of finitely generated pro- p groups satisfying $G \simeq \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}', \Gamma, v_0)$. By [WEZ-16, Proposition 3.2 (a)], $\mathcal{G}'(e)$ is finite and in fact $|\mathcal{G}'(e)| \leq [G : H]$ for every edge e of Γ , since this is the case in every G_U . Moreover,

as K/\tilde{U} is elliptic for each subgroup $K \in \mathcal{K}$ of G , K is elliptic in $\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}', \Gamma)$. This yields the claim. \square

In the proof of Theorem 12.19 we needed that $\{H_i^h \mid h \in H, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ is G -invariant. If $H = F \amalg H_1 \amalg \dots \amalg H_s$ is the Grushko decomposition relative to \mathcal{K} (see the last paragraph of Section 7.2), then this is automatic. Thus we can state the following

Theorem 12.20. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group containing an open normal subgroup H and a G -invariant collection \mathcal{K} of subgroups of H such that H has a non-trivial Grushko decomposition as a free pro- p product $H = F \amalg H_1 \amalg \dots \amalg H_s$, relative to \mathcal{K} (i.e. F is a free pro- p subgroup of rank r , and the H_i are \amalg -indecomposable relative to \mathcal{K} and all subgroups of \mathcal{K} are conjugate into H_i for some i). Then G splits as the pro- p fundamental group of a finite graph (\mathcal{G}, Γ) of pro- p groups relative to $\mathcal{K} \cup \{H_i^h \mid h \in H, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ with finite edge stabilizers whose order does not exceed $[G : H]$.*

Proof. Since H_i is indecomposable relative to \mathcal{K} , we deduce from Proposition 7.2 that the indecomposable non-free subgroup H_i^g of H equals H_j^h for some $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Thus $\{H_i^g \mid g \in G, 1 \leq i \leq s\} = \{H_i^h \mid h \in H, 1 \leq i \leq s\}$, i.e. $\{H_i^h \mid h \in H, 1 \leq i \leq s\}$ is G -invariant and the result follows from Theorem 12.19. \square

Suppose \mathcal{K} is closed for open normal subgroups. Then we can drop the assumption of normality for H .

Corollary 12.21. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group containing an open subgroup H and a G -invariant collection \mathcal{K} of subgroups of G closed for taking open normal subgroups, such that H has a non-trivial Grushko decomposition as a free pro- p product $H = F \amalg H_1 \amalg \dots \amalg H_s$, relative to \mathcal{K} . Then G splits as the pro- p fundamental group of a finite graph (\mathcal{G}, Γ) of pro- p groups relative to $\mathcal{K} \cup \{H_i^h \mid h \in H, i = 1, \dots, k\}$ with finite edge groups of order not exceeding $[G : H]$.*

Proof. By replacing H by the core of H in G and applying the Kurosh subgroup theorem for open subgroups (cf. [RZ10, Thm. 9.1.9]), we may assume that H is normal in G . Refining the free decomposition if necessary and collecting free factors isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_p we obtain a Grushko free decomposition relative to \mathcal{K}

$$H = F \amalg H_1 \amalg \dots \amalg H_s, \quad (5)$$

i.e. a decomposition where F is a free subgroup of rank r , and the H_i are \amalg -indecomposable relatively to \mathcal{K} finitely generated subgroups which are not isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_p . Then the result follows from Theorem 12.20. \square

12.4 Virtually free pro- p groups

We start with free pro- p products with cyclic amalgamation.

Theorem 12.22. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_C G_2$ be a (non-fictitious) free product with infinite cyclic amalgamation. Suppose G is finitely generated virtually free pro- p . Then either G_1 or G_2 splits as a free pro- p product relative to C . Moreover, C is a free factor of G_1 or G_2 .*

Proof. Let F be a maximal open normal free pro- p subgroup of G . Then by Corollary 2.28 F is the fundamental pro- p group of a finite graph of pro- p groups (\mathcal{F}, Δ) whose vertex and edge stabilizers are intersections of conjugates of $G(v)$ and $\mathcal{G}(e)$ with F . Moreover, by Remark 2.17 we may assume that (\mathcal{F}, Δ) is reduced. In particular F splits as a free pro- p product with amalgamation $F_1 \amalg_{C^g \cap F} F_2$ or pro- p HNN-extension $HNN(F_1, C^g \cap F, t)$ over an edge group of (\mathcal{F}, Δ) , where F_1 is the fundamental pro- p group of a subgraph (\mathcal{F}, Δ_1) of pro- p groups restricted to a subgraph Δ_1 of Δ (and a similar situation happens with F_2). Assume w.l.o.g. that this edge group is $F \cap C$ over the edge e that connects $G_1 \cap F$ with $G_2 \cap F$. Then by Corollary 12.2 $C \cap F$ is a free factor of F_1 or F_2 (in the case of amalgamation) or by Corollary 12.4 either $C \cap F$ or $C^t \cap F$ is a free factor of F_1 (in the case of HNN-extension). Suppose w.l.o.g. $C \cap F$ is a free factor of F_1 and note that $G_1 \cap F \leq F_1$. Then $C \cap F \not\leq \Phi(F \cap G_1)$ and so $G_1 \cap F$ can not be cyclic as our edge e is not fictitious. Note also that the edge groups of $G_1 \cap F$ are G_1 -invariant, so by Theorem 12.19 G_1 is the fundamental group of a finite graph $(\mathcal{G}_1, \Gamma_1)$ of pro- p groups relative to C with finite edge groups.

Let w be a vertex of Γ_1 such that $C \leq G_1(w)$. If $G_1(w) \neq C$ we can apply the same argument to $G_1(w) \amalg_C G_2$. Then repeating the process, i.e. refining the graph of groups $(\mathcal{G}_1, \Gamma_1)$ this way, we arrive eventually at situation when C is equal to a vertex group of $(\mathcal{G}_1, \Gamma_1)$ and so is a free factor of its fundamental group (note that the process stops after finitely many steps because $F \cap G_1$ is finitely generated and $F \cap G_1(w)$ is a free factor of it). Thus C is a free factor of G_1 or G_2 . \square

Now we deal with HNN-extension.

Theorem 12.23. *Let $G = HNN(G_1, C, t)$ be an HNN-extension with infinite cyclic associated subgroup. Suppose G is finitely generated having open free pro- p group H . Then C or C^t is a free factor of G_1 .*

Proof. Note that $\langle G_1, G_1^{t^{-1}} \rangle = G_1 \amalg_C G_1^{t^{-1}}$. This subgroup satisfies the premises of Theorem 12.22 and so C is a free factor of G_1 or $G_1^{t^{-1}}$. In the latter case C^t is a free factor of G_1 . \square

12.5 General case

The next lemma uses [GJ] to show that being a free factor is preserved by the inverse limits.

Lemma 12.24. *Let G be a finitely generated pro- p group and H a finitely generated subgroup of G . Let $G = \varprojlim_i G_i$ be a decomposition of G a surjective inverse limit and H_i is the image of H in G_i . If H_i is a free factor of G_i for all i then so is H of G .*

Proof. We use [GJ, Proposition 3.1]. Let K be a finite p -group. Since G is finitely generated, $\text{Hom}(G, K)$ is finite and therefore so is the number $h(G, H, \gamma, K)$ of extensions of a homomorphism $\gamma : H \rightarrow K$ to a homomorphism $G \rightarrow K$. Let H_i be the image of H in G_i . As any homomorphism $G \rightarrow K$ factors through some G_i (and consequently γ factors through some $\gamma_i : H_i \rightarrow K$) we achieve the equalities

$$|\text{Hom}(G, K)| = |\text{Hom}(G_i, K)| \text{ and } h(G, H, \gamma, K) = h(G_i, H_i, \gamma_i, K)$$

for some i . As H_i is a free factor of G_i , by [GJ, Proposition 3.1]

$$h(G_i, H_i, \gamma_i, K) = h(G_i, H_i, \kappa_i, K)$$

for every $\kappa_i \in \text{Hom}(H_i, K)$. Hence $h(G, H, \gamma, K) = h(G, H, \kappa, K)$ for every $\kappa \in \text{Hom}(H, K)$. Since K was chosen arbitrary, by [GJ, Proposition 3.1] H is a free factor of G . \square

Theorem 12.25. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_C G_2$ be a finitely generated free pro- p product with cyclic amalgamation. Then G splits as a free pro- p product if and only if C belongs to a free factor of G_1 or G_2 .*

Proof. If G is free pro- p , the result is the subject of Proposition 12.15. Otherwise, consider the Grushko decomposition $G = \coprod_{i=1}^n H_i \amalg F$ as a free pro- p product of non-cyclic \amalg -indecomposable pro- p groups H_i and a free pro- p group F .

Case 1. At least one of the conjugates of H_i , say H_1 intersects a conjugate of C . Then w.l.o.g. we may assume that $H_1 \cap C \neq 1$. Since the centralizer of any element of H_1 is in H_1 (cf. [RZ-00, Theorem 9.1.12]), $C \leq H_1$. Note that $G_i \cap H_1$ is a free factor of G_i by the pro- p version of the Kurosh subgroup theorem (see Theorem 2.30). Write $G_i = (G_i \cap H_1) \amalg L_i$. If $L_1 = L_2 = 1$, then $G \leq H_1$, a contradiction. Therefore L_1 or L_2 is non-trivial and therefore C is in a non-trivial free factor of G_1 or G_2 .

Case 2. Suppose now that all H_i s intersect conjugates of C trivially. Then C is infinite cyclic and acts freely on the standard pro- p tree $S = S(G)$ corresponding to these free pro- p product. Since H_i acts on S with trivial edge stabilizers, by [R, Theorem 9.6.1] H_i splits as a free pro- p product of its vertex stabilizers and a free pro- p group, so from the assumption on H_i one deduces that all H_i are conjugate into G_1 or G_2 . Let U be an open normal subgroup of G and \tilde{U} the normal subgroup generated by the intersections $U \cap H_i^g, i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $G_U := G/\tilde{U} = \coprod_{i=1}^n H_i \tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$ and for some U the image of C in G_U is infinite cyclic and acts freely on S/\tilde{U} . As every H_i is conjugate into G_1 or G_2 , so are the intersections $U \cap H_i^g, i = 1, \dots, n$, therefore denoting the image of C in G_U by the same letter we can write $G_U = G_{1U} \amalg_C G_{2U}$, where $G_{iU} = G_i \tilde{U}/\tilde{U}$. Since G_U is virtually free pro- p (U/\tilde{U} is free pro- p), by Theorem 12.22 C is a free factor of G_{iU} for $i = 1$ or 2 , say C is a free factor of G_{1U} . Since $G = \varprojlim_U G_U$, by Lemma 12.24 C is a free factor of G_1 .

Conversely, if C is in the free factor L_i of G_i , i.e. $G_i = K_i \amalg L_i$ then $G = K_i \amalg (L_i \amalg_C G_2)$ is a free pro- p product. \square

Corollary 12.26. *Let $G = G_1 \amalg_C G_2$ be a finitely generated free pro- p product with cyclic amalgamation C . If $C \leq \Phi(G_1) \cap \Phi(G_2)$ then G does not split as a free pro- p product.*

Corollary 12.27. *Let $G_1 \amalg_C G_2$ be a finitely generated free pro- p product with infinite virtually cyclic amalgamation C . If G splits as an amalgamated free pro- p product or pro- p HNN-extension over a finite p -group K , then G_1 or G_2 splits as an amalgamated free pro- p product or pro- p HNN-extension over a finite p -group relative to C .*

Proof. Let H be a maximal open normal subgroup of G intersecting K trivially such that $C \cap H$ is infinite cyclic. Then by Corollary 2.28 $H = H_1 \amalg H_2$ is a non-trivial free pro- p product. As $H_1 \cap H_2^g = 1$ for any $g \in G$ (see [RZ10, Theorem 9.1.12]) we deduce that

either $G_1 \cap H$ or $G_2 \cap H$, say $G_1 \cap H$ is not contained in the conjugate of H_i for $i = 1, 2$ and so by the Kurosh subgroup theorem (Theorem 2.30) $G_1 \cap H$ splits as a non-trivial free pro- p product. Now considering $(G_1 \cap H) \amalg_{(C \cap H)} (G_2 \cap H)$ we can apply Theorem 12.25 to deduce that $C \cap H$ is a free factor of $G_1 \cap H$ and clearly $\{(H \cap C)^h \mid h \in H \cap G_1\}$ is G_1 -invariant (since G_1 leaves invariant the set of conjugates of C). Then by Theorem 12.19 G_1 splits as a finite graph of pro- p groups with finite edge groups relative to C . \square

We finish with considering an HNN-extension.

Theorem 12.28. *Let $G = \text{HNN}(G_1, C, t)$ be a finitely generated HNN-extension with cyclic associated subgroup C . If G splits as a free pro- p product $G = H_1 \amalg H_2$ then C or C^t belongs to a free factor of G_1 .*

Proof. Note that $\langle G_1, G_1^{t^{-1}} \rangle = G_1 \amalg_C G_1^{t^{-1}}$. The normal closure of G_1 in G can not belong to a free factor H_i of G since a free factor is self-normalized (see [RZ10, Theorem 9.1.12]). Hence there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\langle G_1^{t^n}, G_1^{t^{n+1}} \rangle$ not in a free factor H_i of G (indeed $\langle G_1^n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle$ is dense in the normal closure $\langle\langle G_1 \rangle\rangle$ of G_1 in G). Hence $\langle G_1, G_1^{t^{-1}} \rangle = G_1 \amalg_C G_1^{t^{-1}}$ does not belong to a free factor H_i of G .

Thus by the pro- p version of the Kurosh subgroup theorem (see Theorem 2.30) this subgroup satisfies the premises of Theorem 12.22 and so C is a free factor of G_1 or $G_1^{t^{-1}}$. In the latter case C^t is a free factor of G_1 . \square

Corollary 12.29. *Let $G = \text{HNN}(G_1, C, t)$ be a finitely generated HNN-extension with cyclic associated subgroup C . If $C, C^t \leq \Phi(G_1)$ then G does not split as a free pro- p product.*

References

- [And] I. V. Andozhskii, On subgroups of demushkin groups, Mathematical notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Volume 4, pages 701–704, (1968).
- [AG] M. Aguiar and P. A. Zalesskii, Generalized Stallings decomposition theorems for pro- p groups. Annali Scuola Normale Superiore - Classe di Scienze v. 25, p. 2149-2172, 2024.
- [AZ] M. Aguiar, and P.A. Zalesskii, The profinite completion of the fundamental group of infinite graphs of groups. Israel J. Math. Volume 250, pages 429–462, (2022). arXiv:2010.12720v2 [math.GR]
- [AH] M. Abert and P. Hegedüs, On the number of generators needed for free profinite products of finite groups. Israel Journal of Mathematics volume 162, pages 81–92 (2007).
- [AGM-16] I. Agol, D. Groves, and J. Manning An alternate proof of Wise’s malnormal special quotient theorem. *Forum Math. Pi*, 4(e1):54 pp., 2016.

- [AWF-15] M. Aschenbrenner, S. Friedl and Henry Wilton, 3-manifold groups, EMS Series of Lectures in Mathematics. European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich, 2015. xiv+215 pp.
- [Bass-93] H. Bass, Covering theory for graphs of groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **89** (1993), no. 1-2, 3–47.
- [BZ] Jesus Berdugo, Pavel Zalesskii, Pro- \mathbb{C} Generalized Baumslag-Solitar groups and profinite commensurators. Submitted.
- [BPZ] V.R. de Bessa, A.L.P. Porto, P.A. Zalesskii. *The profinite completion of accessible groups*. Monatsh. Math. v. 202 (**2**) (2022) 217-227.
- [BF] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn. Bounding the complexity of simplicial group actions on trees. *Invent. Math.*, 103(3):449–469, 1991.
- [Boston] N. Boston, Reducing the Fontaine-Mazur Conjecture to Group Theory. Proceedings of Thompson’s 70th Birthday Conference in ”Progress in Galois Theory”, (2005), 39-50.
- [B-98] B. H. Bowditch, Cut points and canonical splittings of hyperbolic groups. *Acta Math.*, 180(2):145–186, 1998.
- [B-12] B. H. Bowditch Relatively hyperbolic groups *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 22(3):66 pp., 2012.
- [CPZ] M. Casals-Ruiz, M. Pintonello and P. Zalesskii, Pro- \mathbb{C} RAAGs. *Journal of Algebra* Volume 664, Part A, 15 February 2025, pp., 177-208
- [CAZ] I. Castellano and P. Zalesskii, A pro- p version of Sela’s accessibility and Poincaré duality pro- p groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* 18 (2024), no. 4, pp. 1349–1368.
- [CZ] Z. Chatzidakis and P. Zalesskii, Pro- p groups acting on trees with finitely many maximal vertex stabilizers up to conjugation. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* Volume 247, pages 593–634, (2022).
- [CB-13] O. Cotton-Barratt, Detecting ends of residually finite groups in profinite completions. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* **155** (2013) 379–389.
- [DS99] M. J. Dunwoody and M. E. Sageev, JSJ-splittings for finitely presented groups over slender groups. *Invent. Math.*, 135(1):25–44, 1999.
- [DS00] M. J. Dunwoody and E. L. Swenson, The algebraic torus theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 140(3):605–637, 2000.
- [EM-72] B. Evans and L. Moser Solvable fundamental groups of compact 3-manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 168:189–210, 1972.

- [Forester] M. Forester. Deformation and rigidity of simplicial group actions on trees. *Geom. Topol.*, 6, 219–267 (electronic), 2002.
- [FP06] K. Fujiwara and P. Papasoglu, JSJ-decompositions of finitely presented groups and complexes of groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 16(1):70–125, 2006.
- [Gabriel] P. Gabriel, Des catégories abéliennes, *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, 90, (1962), 323–448.
- [GJ] A. Garrido, A. Jaikin-Zapirain, Free Factors and Profinite Completions, *International Mathematics Research Notices*, Volume 2023, Issue 24, December 2023, pp., 21320–21345.
- [GR] D. Gildenhuys and L. Ribes, Profinite groups and Boolean graphs, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 12, Issue 1, 1978, pp., 21–47
- [Gui] V. Guirardel, Actions of finitely generated groups on \mathbb{R} -trees. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 58(1):159–211, 2008.
- [GL11] V. Guirardel and G. Levitt, Trees of cylinders and canonical splittings. *Geom. Topol.*, 15(2):977–1012, 2011.
- [GL] V. Guirardel and Gilbert Levitt, JSJ decomposition of groups. *Astérisque* Volume: 395; 2018; 165 pp.
- [HK-06] Th. Hahn and H. Klapper, Names and symbols of the 32 crystal classes in *International Tables for Crystallography* (2006). Vol. A, ch. 10.1, p. 794.
- [HWZ-13] Emily Hamilton, Henry Wilton, and Pavel A. Zalesskii, Separability of double cosets and conjugacy classes in 3-manifold groups. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 87(1):269–288, 2013.
- [HJ] D. Haran and M. Jarden, *The absolute Galois group of a semi-local field*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, 2021.
- [HZ] D. Haran and P. A. Zalesskii. Relatively projective pro- p groups. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 257, pages 313–352, (2023). arXiv:2208.12982.
- [HZ-08] W. Herfort and P. A. Zalesskii, Virtually free pro- p groups whose torsion elements have finite centralizer. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 40(6):929–936, 2008.
- [HZ-13] [Herfort-Zalesskii-2013] W. Herfort and P. A. Zalesskii, Virtually free pro- p groups, *Publ. Math. IHES* **118** (2013) 193–211.
- [HK] J. Hillman and D. Kochloukova, Pro- p completions of PD^n -groups. *Isr. J. Math.* (2024). arXiv:2205.06155.
- [HKL] J. Hillman, D. Kochloukova, I. Lima, Pro- p completions of Poincaré duality groups, *Israel J. Math.*, 200:1–17, 2014.

- [JS] William H. Jaco and Peter B. Shalen, Seifert fibered spaces in 3-manifolds. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 21(220):viii+192, 1979.
- [Jaikin] A. Jaikin-Zapirain, Zeta function of representations of compact p -adic analytic groups. Journal of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 19, Number 1, Pages 91–118, 2005.
- [Joh] Klaus Johannson, Homotopy equivalences of 3-manifolds with boundaries, volume 761 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 1979.
- [KZ] D.H. Kochloukova and P.A. Zalesskii, Profinite and pro- p completions of Poincaré duality groups of dimension 3. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360:1927–1949, 2008.
- [KZ] D. Kochloukova and P. Zalesskii, On pro- p analogues of limit groups via extensions of centralizers, Math. Z. **267** (2011) 109–128.
- [KZ-23] D. Kochloukova and P. Zalesskii, Finitely generated normal pro- \mathcal{C} subgroups in right angled Artin pro- \mathcal{C} groups. Journal of Algebra Volume 666, 15 March 2025, Pages 475–506.
- [Kropholler] P. H. Kropholler, An analogue of the torus decomposition theorem for certain Poincaré duality groups. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 60(3):503–529, 1990.
- [KR] P. H. Kropholler and M.A. Roller, Splittings of Poincaré Duality Groups. Math. Z. 197:421–438, 1988.
- [McZ-17] J. MacQuarrie and P.A. Zalesskii, Second countable virtually free pro- p groups whose torsion elements have finite centralizer. *Selecta Mathematica* **23** (2017) 101–115.
- [Me] O.V. Mel’nikov, Subgroups and the homology of free products of profinite groups. Math. USSR-Izv., **34**, p. 97–119, 1990.
- [MWZ] L. Mendonça, Th. S. Weigel and Th. Zapata, Compact p -adic analytic groups in which centralizers are abelian. <https://arxiv.org/html/2411.03880v1>.
- [NS-07] N. Nikolov and D. Segal, On finitely generated profinite groups. II. Products in quasisimple groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **165** (2007), 239–273.
- [R] L. Ribes, Profinite graphs and groups. Springer-Verlag **66**, 2017.
- [Ribes] L. Ribes, On amalgamated products of profinite groups, Math. Z. **123** (1971) 357–364.
- [RZ-00] L. Ribes and P. Zalesskii, Pro- p trees and applications. In *New horizons in pro- p groups*, volume 184 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 75–119. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2000.

- [RZ10] L. Ribes and P. Zalesskii, *Profinite groups*, volume 40 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2010.
- [RZ-14] L. Ribes, P.A. Zalesskii, Normalizers in groups and their profinite completions, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* **30** (2014) 165–190.
- [RS] E. Rips and Z. Sela, Cyclic splittings of finitely presented groups and the canonical JSJ decomposition. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 146(1):53–109, 1997.
- [S-83] P. Scott, The geometries of 3-manifolds. *The Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 15(5):401–487, 1983.
- [Se] Z. Sela, Structure and rigidity in (Gromov) hyperbolic groups and discrete groups in rank 1 Lie groups. II. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(3):561–593, 1997.
- [Serre-80] J-P. Serre, *Trees*, Springer, Heidelberg, 1980.
- [She] A. Shenitzer, Decomposition of a group with a single defining relation into a free product. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 6:273–279, 1955.
- [ST] Ilir Snopce and Slobodan Tanushevski, Test Elements in Pro- p Groups with Applications in Discrete Groups, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 219 (2017), 783–816.
- [SZ-14] I. Snopce, P.A. Zalesskii *Subgroup properties of pro- p extensions of centralizers*. *Selecta Mathematica*, vol. 20, issue 2, 2014, pp. 465–489.
- [SZ] I. Snopce, P.A. Zalesskii, Right-Angled Artin pro- p groups. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 54, Issue 5, October 2022, Pages 1904–1922.
- [Swa] G.A. Swarup, Decompositions of free groups. *Journal of Pure and Appl. Algebra* **40** (1986) 99–102.
- [Tits] J. Tits, Sur le groupe des automorphismes d’un arbre, from: “Essays on Topology and Related Topics: Memoires dédiés ’a Georges de Rham”, (A Haefliger, R. Narasimhan, editors), Springer (1970) 188–211.
- [Toi] N. Touikan, On the one-endedness of graphs of groups. *Pacific J. of Math.* Vol. 278, No. 2, 2015. arXiv:1403.6452.
- [Weigel] T. Weigel, On profinite groups with finite abelianizations, *Selecta Math.* (N.S.) 13(1), 175–181, 2007.
- [WEZ-16] Th. Weigel and P. A. Zalesskii, Virtually free pro- p products. *Israel J. Math.* **221** (2017) 425–434.

- [Wilk] G. Wilkes, Profinite rigidity of graph manifolds and JSJ decompositions of 3-manifolds. *Journal of Algebra* Volume 502, 15 May 2018, Pages 538-587. [arXiv:1605.08244v2](#), 2017.
- [Wilkes] G. Wilkes, Profinite Groups and Residual Finiteness. MS Press is an imprint of the European Mathematical Society - EMS - Publishing House GmbH, 2025.
- [Wilkes20] G. Wilkes, Classification of pro- p PD^2 pairs and the pro- p curve complex. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* Volume 4, Issue 3, October 2020.
- [wilk] G. Wilkes, On accessibility for pro- p groups. *J. Algebra* (Volume 525, May 2019).
- [Wilkes17] G. Wilkes, Virtual pro- p properties of 3-manifold groups. *J. Group Theory*, 20(5):999–1023, 2017.
- [Wil19] G. Wilkes, Relative cohomology theory for profinite groups. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 223(4):1617–1688, April 2019.
- [Wilson] J. Wilson, Profinite groups. A Clarendon Press Publication London Mathematical Society Monographs.
- [Wilton] H. Wilton, One-ended subgroups of graphs of free groups with cyclic edge groups. *Geom. Topol.* **16** (2012) 665-683.
- [WZ] H. Wilton and P. A. Zalesskii, Profinite detection of 3-manifold decompositions, *Composition Mathematica*, v. 155, p. 246-259, 2019.
- [WZ-10] H. Wilton and P. Zalesskii, Profinite properties of graph manifolds. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 147(1):29—45, 2010.
- [WZ-17] H. Wilton and P. A. Zalesskii, Distinguishing geometries using finite quotients, *Geometry and Topology* **21** (2017) 345-384.
- [WZ18] H. Wilton and P. Zalesskii, Pro- p subgroups of profinite completions of 3-manifold groups. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 96(2):293–308, 2018.
- [Wolf-11] J. A. Wolf, *Spaces of constant curvature*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [Z-92] P. A. Zalesskii, Open subgroups of free profinite products. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Algebra, Part 1 (Novosibirsk, 1989)*, volume 131 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 473–491. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1992.
- [Z-05] P. A. Zalesskii, Profinite surface groups and the congruence kernel of arithmetic lattices in $SL_2(R)$, *Israel J. Math.* **146** (2005), 111-123.
- [Z-16] P. A. Zalesskii, Virtually free pro- p products, *J. Group Theory* **19** (2016), 97-110.

- [Z-19] P.A. Zalesskii, Infinitely generated virtually free pro- p groups and p -adic representations. *J. Topology* **12** (2019) 79–93.
- [Z] P.A. Zalesskii, Relatively projective profinite groups. *European Journal of Mathematics*, 9, 111, 2023. arXiv:2209.14648.
- [Zal90] P. A. Zalesskii. Profinite groups, without free nonabelian pro- p -subgroups, that act on trees. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 181(1):57–67, 1990.
- [Zal95] P.A. Zalesskii, *Normal divisors of free constructions of profinite groups, and the congruence kernel in the case of a positive characteristic*, *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, **59** (1995), no. 3, 59–76.
- [ZM-88] P. A. Zalesskii and O. V. Mel’nikov. Subgroups of profinite groups acting on trees. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 135(177)(4):419—439, 1988.
- [ZM-89] P. A. Zalesskii and O. V. Mel’nikov. Fundamental groups of graphs of profinite groups. *Algebra i Analiz*, 1(4):117—135, 1989.

Pavel A. Zalesski,
 Universidade de Brasília,
 Departamento de Matemática,
 70910-900 Brasília DF, Brazil.
Email address: pz@mat.unb.br.