

Strong bolicity and the Baum-Connes conjecture for relatively hyperbolic groups

Hermès Lajoinie-Dodel *

December 2025

ABSTRACT. We construct a *strongly bolic metric* for a certain class of *relatively hyperbolic groups*, which includes those with *CAT(0) parabolics and virtually abelian parabolics*. If we further assume that the parabolics satisfy *(RD)*, applying a theorem of Lafforgue, we deduce the Baum-Connes conjecture for these groups. One of the key ingredients in our construction is the use of random coset representatives called *masks*, developed by Chatterji and Dahmani.

1 Introduction

Originally formulated by Baum and Connes in 1982 in a paper that was eventually published in 2000 in [BC00], and later revisited by Baum, Connes, and Higson in 1994 in [BCH94], the Baum-Connes conjecture establishes a bridge between commutative and noncommutative geometry. More precisely, it states that for any locally compact group G , the G -equivariant K -homology of the classifying space for proper G -actions is isomorphic to the K -theory of the group reduced C^* -algebra. The particular case of discrete groups is already very interesting and highly nontrivial.

Proving the Baum-Connes conjecture for a given group G implies several famous conjectures in topology, geometry, and functional analysis. For instance, the injectivity of the Baum-Connes map implies the celebrated Novikov conjecture [Lan15], while its surjectivity implies according to [GAJV19] the Kaplansky–Kadison conjecture, which states that when G is torsion-free, its reduced C^* -algebra contains no nontrivial idempotent.

According to Higson and Kasparov in [HK97], the Haagerup property implies the Baum-Connes conjecture. Consequently, the conjecture holds for groups that act properly on a tree, or more generally on a median metric space [CDH10]. However, this criterion does not allow one to prove it for infinite groups having Kazhdan Property (T) . The first examples of infinite groups with Property (T) satisfying the Baum-Connes conjecture are due to the remarkable work of Vincent Lafforgue, notably through the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. [Laf02]

Let G be a finitely generated group satisfying the following.

- G has the rapid decay property.
- G acts properly by isometries on a uniformly locally finite, strongly bolic, weakly geodesic metric space.

*Hermès Lajoinie-Dodel, lajoinie@math.uni-bielefeld.de, Universität Bielefeld, Germany

Keywords : Relatively hyperbolic groups, Baum-Connes conjecture, strong bolicity, Gromov hyperbolicity. **AMS codes**: 20F65, 20F67, 58B34.

Then G satisfies the Baum-Connes conjecture.

The (RD) property is a property of the group reduced C^* -algebra. It holds when the operator norm can be controlled by a simpler norm. In particular, this property is satisfied, among others, by hyperbolic groups according to results due to de la Harpe [dlH88] and Jolissaint [Jol90]. In our work, we focus on the second point of the theorem.

Bolic metric spaces were defined by Kasparov and Skandalis in [KS03], [KS94] in connection with the Novikov conjecture, and were later strengthened by Lafforgue in the context of Theorem 1.1. A metric space is said to be strongly bolic when its balls satisfy a smoothness and convexity condition. In most cases, strongly bolic metrics take non-integer values, which prevents them from being realized as graph metrics. Examples of such metric spaces include $CAT(0)$ spaces as well as L^p spaces for $1 < p < \infty$.

Using Theorem 1.1, Vincent Lafforgue showed that “classical” hyperbolic groups, i.e. uniform lattices in simple Lie groups of rank 1 satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture. Therefore, the uniform lattices in $Sp(n, 1)$ constitute the first example of infinite groups with Property (T) satisfying the Baum-Connes conjecture.

This result was later generalized by Mineyev and Yu in [MY02] to all hyperbolic groups, proving that they satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture, although it is unknown whether these groups are $CAT(0)$.

A natural question then is to ask to which generalizations of hyperbolic groups this result can be extended. In this paper, we focus on relatively hyperbolic groups. Relative hyperbolicity was defined by Gromov in 1987 in [Gro87]. It is a geometric generalization to hyperbolic groups for a larger class of groups. The rough idea is that a group G is hyperbolic relative to a family of subgroups \mathcal{P} if the geometry of G is hyperbolic outside of \mathcal{P} . Among the many definitions of these groups, we will here use only Bowditch’s definition [Bow12], which involves the coned-off graph and requires that this graph be hyperbolic and fine.

According to [DS05], the (RD) property is well understood for relatively hyperbolic groups. Indeed, a group that is hyperbolic relative to groups satisfying the (RD) property also satisfies (RD) . Therefore, we focus on the second point of Theorem 1.1, namely the construction of a strongly bolic metric. The strongest result we can hope for is for groups hyperbolic relatively to subgroups with a strongly bolic action.

In this article, we provide a partial answer to this question in the case where the parabolic subgroups are $CAT(0)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let G be a group hyperbolic relative to $CAT(0)$ subgroups. Then G admits a metric \hat{d} satisfying the following properties:*

- \hat{d} is invariant under the action of G , i.e., $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$ for all $g \in G$ and $x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- the metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

As a consequence, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 1.3. *Let G be a group hyperbolic relatively to $CAT(0)$ subgroups with the (RD) property. Then G satisfies the Baum-Connes conjecture.*

More precisely, we obtain the following corollary for families of $CAT(0)$ groups that have (RD) property.

Corollary 1.4. *Groups hyperbolic relatively to following groups:*

- virtually abelian,

- *cocompactly cubulated,*
- *Coxeter groups,*

and their subgroups satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture.

This result applies in particular to the fundamental groups of finite-volume real hyperbolic manifolds. In this way, we re-establish that these groups satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture.

In our article, we provide a new proof that hyperbolic groups admit a strongly bolic metric. Our metric has the advantage of being relatively simple to define. It uses a notion of angle for hyperbolic spaces introduced in [CDHL20] (see Proposition 3.5), which generalizes the visual angles of $CAT(-1)$ spaces. In the relatively hyperbolic case, our metric builds on the construction for hyperbolic groups presented in Section 4, as well as on a notion of random representatives, called masks, introduced by Chatterji and Dahmani in [CD20].

It is important to note that independently and simultaneously in a recent preprint, Nishikawa and Petrosyan obtained in [NP25], by different methods, a stronger version of the Baum-Connes conjecture for a very significant class of relatively hyperbolic groups. This class includes groups all lattices in rank one Lie groups, which are not covered by our theorem. We nevertheless believe that our work is of interest in its geometric nature.

Structure of the article. Section 2 is a quick overview on the Baum-Connes conjecture with an emphasis on strong bolicity.

Section 3 is dedicated to hyperbolic geometry and relatively hyperbolic groups in particular.

In Section 4, we give a new proof of the fact that hyperbolic groups admit a strongly bolic metric.

To conclude, in Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.2. As explained above, the main ingredient is the notion of masks, developed by Dahmani and Chatterji in [CD20], which we present here.

Acknowledgements. This article is part of the author’s PhD thesis. The author would like to thank Rémi Coulon and Mikael de la Salle, as thesis reviewers, for their detailed reading of the article, which greatly contributed to its improvement. The author also sends warm thanks to Moulay Tahar Benammeur for engaging and insightful discussions, as well as for agreeing to serve on the thesis jury. The author is grateful to Indira Chatterji and François Dahmani for accepting to be members of the jury. The author also thanks Ashot Minasyan for pointing out reference [UM25]. Finally, the author warmly thanks Thomas Haettel for his support, availability, and numerous careful readings of this text.

2 Baum-Connes conjecture and strong bolicity

In this section, we provide a brief introduction to this conjecture. For more general references, we refer to [Val02] and [GAJV19].

2.1 Quick presentation of the conjecture

The Baum-Connes conjecture is part of Alain Connes’ “noncommutative geometry” program. The Baum-Connes conjecture was formulated in [BC00] in 1982 in an article finally published in 2000. The modern version comes from the article [BCH94] of Baum, Connes and Higson. This conjecture builds a bridge between geometry/topology on one hand and analysis on the other hand.

In fact, for every locally compact group G , there is a Baum-Connes conjecture. For every locally compact group G , we can always associate four abelian groups $K_*^{top}(G)$ and $K_*(C_r^*(G))$ (with $*$ = 0, 1). We can also construct two group morphisms:

$$\mu_r : K_*^{top}(G) \rightarrow K_*(C_r^*(G)).$$

The Baum-Connes conjecture states that μ_r is an isomorphism for $* = 0, 1$.

Conjecture 2.1. (*Baum-Connes conjecture*)

Let G be a locally compact group. The assembly map:

$$\mu_r : K_*^{top}(G) \rightarrow K_*(C_r^*(G))$$

is an isomorphism for $* = 0, 1$.

The left-hand side $K_*^{top}(G)$ is mentioned as the *geometric*, *topological* or the *commutative* side. It involves a space \underline{EG} , the classifying space for proper action of G , and $K_*^{top}(G)$ is the G -equivariant K -homology of \underline{EG} .

The right-hand side, $K_*(C_r^*(G))$ is mentioned as the *analytic* side or the *non-commutative* side. $C_r^*(G)$ is the *reduced C^* -algebra* of G , which is the C^* -algebra generated by G in its left regular representation on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(G)$.

The assembly map μ_r is defined with Kasparov KK -theory and is related to index theory.

The Baum-Connes Conjecture implies various other famous conjectures. We cite these conjectures here without providing precise statements. For a more precise discussion about the consequences of the Baum-Connes conjecture, see [GAJV19, Section 4.5.]

It is often said that the surjectivity of μ_r has implication in analysis, while injectivity has implication in topology.

The injectivity of the assembly map implies the Novikov conjecture according to [Lan15]. We refer to [FRR95] for a survey on this conjecture.

The injectivity of the assembly map implies also the Gromov-Lawson-Rosenberg conjecture, this fact is proved in [BCH94], see [RS95] for a discussion on the Gromov-Lawson-Rosenberg conjecture.

The surjectivity implies the Kadison-Kaplansky conjecture, which we state now.

Conjecture 2.2. If G is torsion-free, then $C_r^*(G)$ has no idempotents except 0 and 1.

A weaker conjecture, formulated by Kaplansky, states that the group algebra does not have trivial idempotents. For a proof of the fact that the surjectivity of the assembly map implies the Kaplansky-Kadison conjecture, see [GAJV19, Proposition 4.20.].

The surjectivity of the assembly map implies also the vanishing of a topological Whitehead group. We refer to [BMV05] for the definitions and a proof of this fact.

2.2 Status of the conjecture

To begin, let us remark that no-counter example of the Baum-Connes conjecture is known.

We give here two ways to prove the Baum-Connes conjecture.

The first way is the Haagerup Property.

Theorem 2.3. [HK97]

Discrete groups with the Haagerup Property satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture.

The Baum-Connes conjecture is therefore satisfied by amenable groups [BCV95], $SO(n, 1)$ [VGG74], $SU(n, 1)$ and their lattices [VGG73]. The conjecture is also verified for groups acting properly on trees and, more generally, on median spaces according to [CDH10]. It is for this reason that Property (T) is identified as a difficulty in proving the Baum-Connes conjecture. The first examples of infinite groups with Property (T) that satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture were given by Vincent Lafforgue using the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4. [Laf02] Let G be a finitely generated group satisfying the following.

- G has the rapid decay property.

- G acts properly by isometries on a uniformly locally finite, strongly bolic, weakly geodesic metric space.

Then G satisfies the Baum-Connes conjecture.

We will discuss more specifically later on property (RD) and strongly bolic metric spaces.

Thanks to Theorem 1.1, Lafforgue proves the Baum-Connes conjecture for cocompact lattices in simple Lie groups of rank 1. Cocompact lattices of $Sp(n, 1)$ provide the first examples of infinite Property (T) groups which satisfies the Baum-Connes conjecture. This result was then generalized to all hyperbolic groups according to de la Harpe [dlH88] and Mineyev and Yu [MY02].

Using different methods, Vincent Lafforgue proved in [Laf12] a stronger version of the Baum-Connes conjecture for hyperbolic groups, the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients.

It should be noted that the Baum-Connes conjecture remains open for the non-uniform lattices of $Sp(n, 1)$ until the work of [NP25].

Vincent Lafforgue identified in [Laf10] the strong Property (T) as a very important difficulty for proving the Baum-Connes conjecture, more specifically for proving the surjectivity of the assembly map. The only results are known for cocompact lattices in $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$, $SL_3(\mathbb{C})$, $SL_3(\mathbb{H})$ and $E_6(-26)$. For example, the surjectivity is open for $SL_3(\mathbb{Z})$.

Although it remains an open problem whether the Baum-Connes conjecture is inherited by subgroups in general, Lafforgue Theorem 1.1 pass to subgroups, since the first point of the theorem clearly does so, and property (RD) is also stable under passage to subgroups.

According to Oyono [OO01], the Baum-Connes conjecture is stable under free or amalgamated products and HNN extensions.

2.3 Rapid decay Property

We will be very brief regarding the rapid decay property (RD). Introductions to this topic are [Cha17] and [Sap15].

The (RD) property is a property of the reduced group C^* -algebra. It holds when the operator norm can be bounded in terms of a simpler, more manageable norm. This property was studied by Jolissaint in [Jol90], before being used by Connes and Moscovici to prove the Novikov conjecture for hyperbolic groups [CM90]. The recent interest in this property is Theorem 1.1 due to Lafforgue in [Laf02], showing that it is one of the two conditions that allow to prove the Baum-Connes conjecture.

According to [Jol90] and [dlH88], hyperbolic groups satisfy also the Rapid decay property. For relatively hyperbolic groups, it was first shown by Chatterji and Ruane in [CR05a] for rank-1 lattices, before being generalized by Drutu and Sapir to groups that are hyperbolic relatively to subgroups with property (RD) [DS05]. For a more comprehensive list of groups that do or do not satisfy the (RD) property, we refer to [Cha17].

More generally property (RD) is satisfied by groups admitting a nice definition of quasi-center for triangles, this property is called the *centroid property* in [Sap15].

2.4 Strong bolicity

Strong bolicity Kasparov and Skandalis defined bolicity in their work on the Novikov conjecture [KS03], [KS94]. Vincent Lafforgue strengthened this notion in connection with the Baum-Connes conjecture and Theorem 1.1. For a more general introduction to this notion and related properties, see [BK02].

Definition 2.5. Let $\eta \geq 0$. A metric space (X, d) is said to be η -weakly geodesic, if for all $x, y \in X$, for all real $t \in [0, d(x, y)]$, there exists $z \in X$ such that $d(x, z) \leq t + \eta$ and $d(z, y) \leq d(x, y) - t + \eta$.

For all $x, y \in X$, z belongs to the η -geodesic interval between x and y if:

$$d(x, z) + d(z, y) \leq 2\eta.$$

For all $x, y \in X$, a η -weak-geodesic between x and y is a map $\sigma : [0, d(x, y)] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that for all $t \in [0, d(x, y)]$:

- $d(x, \sigma(t)) \leq t + \eta$,
- $d(\sigma(t), y) \leq d(x, y) - t + \eta$.

(X, d) is said to be weakly-geodesic if there exists $\eta \geq 0$ such that (X, d) is η -weakly geodesic.

Geodesic metric spaces are 0-weakly geodesic. A geodesic between two points is a 0-weak-geodesic between those two points.

Let (X, d) , for $x \in X, r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $B(x, r)$ will denote the closed ball centered at x of radius r .

Definition 2.6. A metric space is said to be uniformly locally finite if for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $x \in X$, $B(x, r)$ contains at most K points.

Simplicial graphs of bounded valency are particular examples of uniformly locally finite graphs.

Definition 2.7. (Strong bolicity) A metric space (X, d) is called strongly bolic if the following two conditions hold :

- strongly- $B1$, if for all $\eta, r > 0$, there exists $R = R(\eta, r) \geq 0$ such that for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d(x_1, y_1), d(x_1, y_2), d(x_2, y_1), d(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d(x_1, x_2), d(y_1, y_2) \leq r$, we have:

$$|d(x_1, y_1) + d(x_2, y_2) - d(x_1, y_2) - d(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

- weakly- $B2'$, if there exists $\eta > 0$ and a map $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$, such that:

– m is a η -middle point map, that is for all $x, y \in X$,

$$|2d(x, m(x, y)) - d(x, y)| \leq 2\eta,$$

$$|2d(y, m(x, y)) - d(x, y)| \leq 2\eta,$$

– for all $x, y, z \in X$,

$$d(m(x, y), z) \leq \max(d(x, z), d(y, z)) + 2\eta,$$

– for every $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists $N(p) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $N \geq N(p)$, with $d(x, z) \leq N$, $d(y, z) \leq N$ and $d(x, y) > N$, we have:

$$d(m(x, y), z) \leq N - p.$$

The $B1$ -condition is a smoothness condition of the distance see Figure 1, whereas the $B2$ -condition refers to convexity see Figure 2.

Examples of strongly bolic metric spaces include L^p spaces for $1 < p < \infty$ as well as $CAT(0)$ spaces. More recently, Haettel, Hoda and Petyt showed in [HHP25, Theorem 4.18] that under certain conditions, a cell complex equipped with the piecewise ℓ^p metric, $1 < p < \infty$, is strongly bolic.

Using the fact that $CAT(0)$ spaces are strongly bolic, we know that $CAT(0)$ groups admit a strongly bolic action. As explained in [Val02, Chapter 2], this class of groups contains, in particular, groups, which act properly, cocompactly, isometrically on either a Euclidean building, or Riemannian symmetric space. Thus, Vincent Lafforgue noted that 'classical' hyperbolic groups, i.e cocompact lattices of rank-one simple Lie groups ($SO(n, 1), SU(n, 1), Sp(n, 1), F_{4(-20)}$) admit a strongly bolic action.

To apply Theorem 1.1, we need to find a strongly bolic, weakly geodesic metric. Let us note here that being weakly geodesic implies the existence of quasi-midpoints.




Figure 1: $B1$ condition: smoothness




Figure 2: Part of $B2'$ condition: convexity

Proposition 2.8. *Let $\eta \geq 0$, let (X, d) be a η -weakly geodesic metric space, then (X, d) admits η -midpoints.*

Proof. For every $x, y \in X$, there exists z such that:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{d}(x, z) - \frac{\hat{d}(x, y)}{2}| &\leq \eta, \\ |\hat{d}(z, y) - \frac{\hat{d}(x, y)}{2}| &\leq \eta, \end{aligned}$$

this implies directly that (X, \hat{d}) admits a η -midpoint map. □

Strong bolicity for hyperbolic groups. A very interesting class of groups admitting a strongly bolic action are hyperbolic groups. Mineyev and Yu [MY02] showed that for any hyperbolic group G and any of its Cayley graphs X , X can be equipped with a strongly bolic G -equivariant metric. Moreover, this metric is quasi-isometric to the graph metric of X . This result implies the Baum-Connes conjecture for hyperbolic groups and their subgroups. A simpler proof of this fact was given by Haïssinsky and Matthieu [Mat11]. Their proof uses the Green function associated to a random walk on the Cayley graph and the fact that for this metric, the Gromov boundary and the horofunction bordification are the same. Another proof of this fact is given by Lafforgue in [Laf12] where he proves that hyperbolic groups satisfy a stronger version of the Baum-Connes conjecture, the Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients.

In Section 4, we will give a new proof of the fact that hyperbolic groups admit a strongly hyperbolic metric using Proposition 3.5. Then, we will generalize this method to relatively hyperbolic groups whose parabolic subgroups are $CAT(0)$.

Obstruction for actions on strongly bolic metric spaces. By studying, once again, the relation between the Gromov boundary and the horofunction bordification, Haettel, Hoda and Petyt identified in [HHP25] an obstruction to the existence of a semi-simple action on a strongly bolic metric space.

This is a splitting result that generalizes a well-known property of $CAT(0)$ -spaces [BH99, Theorem 6.12].

Theorem 2.9. *Let G be a finitely generated group acting by semi-simple isometries on X , a strongly bolic metric space. If z is a central element in G , then some finite index subgroup of G admits $\langle z \rangle$ as a direct factor.*

As a corollary [HHP25, Corollary 4.20.], mapping class groups of surfaces of genus at least 3 do not act by semi-simple isometries on strongly bolic metric spaces.

In the same way, nilpotent groups do not act by semi-simple isometries on a strongly bolic space. Indeed, the Heisenberg group with integer coefficients $H_3(\mathbb{Z})$ is nilpotent, has \mathbb{Z} as its center, but does not virtually split. Thus, to generalize the proof of Section 5 to the non-uniform lattices of $SU(n, 1), Sp(n, 1), F_{4(-20)}$, it would be necessary to construct non-semi-simple actions of the parabolic subgroups.

3 Hyperbolicity and relatively hyperbolic groups

In this section, we recall the notions of hyperbolicity and relative hyperbolicity used in this work.

3.1 Gromov hyperbolicity

Let (X, d) be metric space and $x, y \in X$, a geodesic from x to y is a map $\phi : I \mapsto X$, where $I = [a, b]$ is an interval of \mathbb{R} such that ϕ is an isometry, $\phi(a) = x$ and $\phi(b) = y$. We will often denote by $[x, y]$ a geodesic between x and y , even if it is not necessarily unique.

A metric space (X, d) is said to be geodesic if for all $x, y \in X$, there exists a geodesic from x to y . Let assume that (X, d) is geodesic, for all $x, y, z \in X$ a geodesic triangle is the union of three geodesics $[x, y] \cup [y, z] \cup [z, x]$ between those three points. We will often denote by $[x, y, z]$ a geodesic triangle between x, y and z even if it is not necessarily unique.

Definition 3.1. *A geodesic metric space (X, d) is δ -hyperbolic for some $\delta \geq 0$ if all geodesic triangles $[x, y, z]$ are δ -thin, i.e. every side of the triangle is contained in the δ -neighbourhood of the union of the other two sides.*

A geodesic metric space X is said to be hyperbolic if there exists $\delta \geq 0$ such that X is δ -hyperbolic.

The assumption of being geodesic is not mandatory to define hyperbolicity. We recall the definition of the Gromov-product, let X be a metric space and $x, y, z \in X$,

$$(x, z)_y = \frac{1}{2}(d(x, y) + d(y, z) - d(x, z)).$$

Note that the Gromov products are 1-Lipschitz in the three variables.

Definition 3.2. *Let $\delta > 0$, a metric space X is δ -hyperbolic in the sense of Gromov if for all four points $x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3 \in X$,*

$$(x_1, x_3)_{x_0} \geq \min((x_1, x_2)_{x_0}, (x_2, x_3)_{x_0}) - \delta.$$

According to [GdlH90, Proposition 21.], for a geodesic metric space (X, d) , if triangles in X are δ -thin then it is 8δ -hyperbolic in the sense of Gromov and conversely if X is δ -hyperbolic in the sense of Gromov, triangles are 4δ -thin. From now on, we will speak almost exclusively of geodesic spaces.

Note that the Gromov product between three points has a particular interpretation in a geodesic hyperbolic space. For all $x, y, z \in X$ in a hyperbolic geodesic metric space, $(x, y)_z$ is roughly the distance from z to a geodesic between x and y .

Lemma 3.3. [DK18, Lemma 11.22]

Let X be a geodesic δ -hyperbolic space. For every $x, y, z \in X$ and every geodesic $[x, y]$, we have :

$$(x|y)_z \leq d(z, [x, y]) \leq (x|y)_z + 2\delta.$$

In Section 4 and Section 5, we will also use the following lemma about geodesics in hyperbolic space.

Lemma 3.4. [BH99, Lemma 1.15]

Let X be a geodesic space such that geodesic triangles are δ -thin. Let $\gamma, \gamma' : [0, T] \rightarrow X$ be geodesics with $\gamma(0) = \gamma'(0)$. If $d(\gamma(t_0), \gamma'(t_0)) \leq K$, for some $K > 0$ and $t_0 \in [0, T]$, then $d(\gamma(t), \gamma'(t)) \leq 2\delta$ for all $t \leq t_0 - K - \delta$.

3.2 Visual pseudo-metric in hyperbolic spaces

Here we describe a less conventional property of hyperbolic spaces, which will be used in Section 4. To metrize ∂X , the metric traditionally used is the visual metric, which is a metric comparable to $e^{-\varepsilon(x|y)_o}$, where o is a base point and ε is a parameter. The result we will mention here is a generalization of [AL18] and allows to construct a visual metric on an entire hyperbolic space, not just on its boundary. This notion of angle generalizes the angle of hyperbolic manifolds coming from their CAT(0) geometry.

Proposition 3.5. [CDHL20, Proposition 3.2.]

Fix a δ -hyperbolic geodesic space X , and choose $\varepsilon, D > 0$ such that $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq \frac{\log(2)}{\delta+D}$. Let $\alpha = De^{-2D\varepsilon}$ and $\beta = \frac{8}{\varepsilon}$. For any $a \in X$, there exists a pseudo-distance d_ε^a on X such that :

- $d_\varepsilon^a(x, y) \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon(x|y)_a}$ for all $x, y \in X$,
- $\alpha e^{-\varepsilon(x|y)_a} \leq d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)$ for every $x, y \in X$ with $d(x, y) \geq 2D$,
- for all $g \in \text{Isom}(X)$, for all $x, y \in X$, $d_\varepsilon^{g \cdot a}(g \cdot x, g \cdot y) = d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)$.

3.3 Relatively hyperbolic groups

In this subsection, we will describe some useful tools to work on relatively hyperbolic groups.

3.3.1 Fine graphs and relatively hyperbolic groups

In this paragraph, we give a definition of relatively hyperbolic groups owing to Farb [Far98] and Bowditch [Bow12]. The definition is based on a graph constructed from the Cayley graph, the coned-off graph.

Definition 3.6. (Coned-off graph)

Let G be a finitely generated group and H_1, \dots, H_k subgroups of G . We consider $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ a Cayley graph of G with respect to a finite generating set S . The coned-off of G relatively to the subgroups H_1, \dots, H_k is the graph constructed as follows : for each i and for each left coset gH_i of H_i , add a vertex $\underline{gH_i}$ and for each $h \in H_i$, add an edge starting at $\underline{gH_i}$ and ending at gh . We denote this graph by $\overline{\text{Cay}}(G, S)$.

Let us remark that, when the subgroups H_i are infinite, the coned-off graph is locally infinite, see Figure 3.

Informally speaking, if the subgroups H_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and their cosets are the only obstructions of G to be hyperbolic, then this graph must be hyperbolic because each translate of H_i has a diameter 2 for the metric of the new graph. However, in the definition of relatively hyperbolic, we require an additional combinatorial condition on the coned-off graph, called *uniformly finesse*.




Figure 3: Coned-off graph

Definition 3.7. (Fine graph) [Bow12, Proposition 2.1.]

A graph is fine if for every edge e , for all $L \geq 0$, the set of simple simplicial loops of length at most L which contain e is finite.

It is uniformly fine if this set has cardinality bounded above by a function depending only on L . We denote by φ this function of uniform finesse.

The followings graph are examples of uniformly fine graphs.

Example 3.8. • Any locally finite graph is fine.

- Trees are fine, since they have no loops.

We remark that finesse is not invariant by quasi-isometry. In fact, $\widehat{\text{Cay}}(G, S)$ is quasi-isometric to $\text{Cay}(G, S \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_k)$ which is not uniformly fine. Thanks to this quasi-isometry, $\text{Cay}(G, S \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_k)$ is hyperbolic if and only if $\widehat{\text{Cay}}(G, S)$ is hyperbolic. Therefore, $\text{Cay}(G, S \cup H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_k)$ is sometimes used as a model of the coned-off graph, for example, in [Osi06].

Let us give now Bowditch's definition [Bow12, Theorem 7.10.] of relative hyperbolicity.

Definition 3.9. A pair (G, H_1, \dots, H_k) of a finitely generated group G and a collection of proper subgroups is relatively hyperbolic, if one (or equivalently every) coned-off Cayley graph $\widehat{\text{Cay}}(G)$ over H_1, \dots, H_k is hyperbolic and uniformly fine.

The uniform finesse condition can be replaced by the Bounded Coset Penetration (BCP) defined in [Far98].

When the coned-off Cayley-graph is hyperbolic but not uniformly fine (or does not satisfy the (BCP) property), we refer to weakly relatively hyperbolic groups in [Far98]. An interesting example of a weakly relatively hyperbolic group is the mapping class group of a finite type surface. According to Masur and Minsky [MM99, Theorem 1.3.], the coned-off graph of the mapping class groups with respect to a finite collection of stabilizers of curves is hyperbolic, however it is not uniformly fine, if the surface is not a one-punctured torus or a four-times punctured sphere. Moreover, the article [AAS07, Proposition 10] shows that the mapping class group is not relatively hyperbolic with respect to any finite set of infinite-index subgroups. One difficulty of working on relatively hyperbolic groups comes from the fact that these graphs are not locally finite. Angles and cones, which we define in Paragraph 3.3.2, allow us to solve this difficulty.

3.3.2 Angles and cones

In the next two paragraphs, we return to uniformly fine graphs. We begin by discussing very important objects in these graphs: angles and cones. Cones will play the role of neighborhoods in uniformly fine graphs, with the advantage that their cardinality is uniformly controlled. The majority of the results presented here come from [CD20], and we prove some other. We start with the definition of angles.

Definition 3.10. (Angle)

Let X be a graph. Given a vertex $v \in X^{(0)}$ and two unoriented edges $e_1 = \{v, w\}$ and $e_2 = \{v, w'\}$ such that $v \in e_1 \cap e_2$, the angle between e_2 and e_1 at v , denoted by $\angle_v(w, w')$, is defined as follows :

$$\angle_v(e_1, e_2) = d_{X \setminus \{v\}}(w, w').$$

In other words, the angle between $e_1 = \{v, w\}$ and $e_2 = \{v, w'\}$ at v is the infimum of length of paths from w to w' that avoid v . In particular, the angle could be equal to $+\infty$.

By convention, we will use the following abuse of notation : if x_1, x_2 and v are vertices of X , distinct from v , we say that $\angle_v(x_1, x_2) > \theta$ if there exist two edges e_1, e_2 , such that $v \in e_1 \cap e_2$, with e_i on a geodesic between v and x_i ($i = 1, 2$) and such that $\angle_v(e_1, e_2) > \theta$. We say that $\angle_v(x_1, x_2) \leq \theta$ otherwise, i.e. for all geodesics between v and x_i ($i = 1, 2$) and starting by the edges e_i ($i = 1, 2$) such that $v \in e_1 \cap e_2$, then $\angle_v(e_1, e_2) \leq \theta$.




Figure 4: Angles between $e_1 = \{v, w\}$ and $e_2 = \{v, w'\}$ seen from v

It should be noted that the angle between two points a and b viewed from c depends only on the first edge of the geodesics connecting a to c and, respectively, connecting b to c .

Proposition 3.11. (Triangle inequality for angles)

For all edges e_1, e_2 and e_3 and vertex v such that $v \in e_1 \cap e_2 \cap e_3$, we have:

$$\angle_v(e_1, e_3) \leq \angle_v(e_1, e_2) + \angle_v(e_2, e_3).$$

Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)} \setminus \{v\}$, we have also:

$$\angle_v(a, b) \leq \angle_v(a, c) + \angle_v(c, b).$$

Proof. The first property comes directly from the triangle inequality in $X \setminus \{v\}$.

To deduce the second inequality with vertices, we just have to come back to the definition of angle and use the first point.

□

In a δ -hyperbolic graph, large angles at a vertex force geodesics to pass through this vertex.

Proposition 3.12. [CD20, Proposition 1.2] Let X be a δ -hyperbolic graph and a, b, c vertices in X , $a, b \neq c$.

- if $\angle_c(a, b) > 12\delta$, then every geodesic between a and b goes through c ;
- if e_1, e_2 are two edges such that $c \in e_1 \cap e_2$ and that are on geodesics from c to a , then $\angle_c(e_1, e_2) \leq 6\delta$;

- for any $\theta \geq 0$, if $\angle_c(a, b) > \theta + 12\delta$ then for all choice of edges e_1, e_2 at c starting geodesics respectively to a and b , $\angle_c(e_1, e_2) \geq \theta$.

Following Chatterji and Dahmani in [CD20], let us define cones.

Definition 3.13. (Cone)

Let X be a graph. Let e be an edge and a number $\theta > 0$.

The cone of parameter θ around the edge e , denoted by $\text{Cone}_\theta(e)$, is the subset of vertices and edges of X , v and e' such that there is a path of length at most θ from e to e' and for which two consecutive edges make an angle at most θ , i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cone}_\theta(e) = & \{e' \mid \exists e_0 = e, e_1, \dots, e_n = e' \\ & \text{such that } n \leq \theta, \forall i, \exists v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1} \text{ and } \angle_{v_i}(e_i, e_{i+1}) \leq \theta\} \\ & \cup \{v \mid \exists e' = \{v, w\} \text{ and } e_0 = e, e_1, \dots, e_n = e' \\ & \text{such that } n \leq \theta, \forall i, \exists v_i \in e_i \cap e_{i+1} \text{ and } \angle_{v_i}(e_i, e_{i+1}) \leq \theta\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.14. [CD20, Proposition 1.10] In a fine graph, cones are finite.

If the graph is uniformly fine, for all $e \in X^{(1)}$ and $\theta > 0$, the cardinality of $\text{Cone}_\theta(e)$ can be bounded above by a function f of θ , called function of uniforme finesse of X .

The following property allows to use cones in relatively hyperbolic groups as a sort of finite neighborhoods of geodesics in the definition of thin triangles.

Proposition 3.15. [CD20, Proposition 1.10] (Cones and triangles)

In a δ -hyperbolic graph, geodesic triangles are conically fine, i.e. for any geodesic triangle $[a, b, c]$, every edge e on $[a, b]$ is contained in a cone of parameter 50δ around an edge e' that is either on $[a, c]$ at the same distance of a than e , either on $[b, c]$ at the same distance of b than e .

A corollary of this proposition is the fact that in a uniformly fine graph intervals are uniformly finite even if the graph is not locally finite. Let us recall, that for a simplicial graph X and two vertices x, x' , $I(x, x')$ is the set of vertices which belong to geodesic between x and x' , in other words $I(x, x') = \{u \in X \mid d(x, u) + d(u, x') = d(x, x')\}$.

Corollary 3.16. In a uniformly fine and δ -hyperbolic graph X , for all $x, x' \in X$, the cardinality of $I(x, x')$ is bounded above by a function depending of $d(x, x')$, of δ and of the function of uniform finesse f .

3.3.3 Distance formula

In this section, we discuss about the distance formula for relatively hyperbolic groups, proved by Sisto in [Sis13]. We give the version presented in [CD20]: the word metric is equivalent to the coned-off metric to which we add the sum of angles at infinite valence vertices.

Proposition 3.17. [CD20, Proposition 1.6.]

Let G be a group hyperbolic relative to (H_1, \dots, H_k) , let d_G denote the word metric, for a finite generating set.

Let X_c denote its coned-off graph with respect to the same generating set, with d_c its associated graph metric.

There are $A, B > 1$ for which, for all $g, h \in G$, for each choice of geodesic $[g, h]_c$ in X_c , if $\Theta(g, h)$ denotes the sum of angles of edges of $[g, h]_c$ at vertices of infinite valence, then :

$$\frac{1}{A} d_G(g, h) - B \leq d_c(g, h) + \Theta(g, h) \leq A d_G(g, h) + B.$$

We will use in Section 5 the following reformulation of the distance formula.

Corollary 3.18. *Let G be a group hyperbolic relative to (H_1, \dots, H_k) , let d_G denote the word metric, for a finite generating set.*

Let X_c denote its coned-off graph with respect to the same generating set, with d_c its associated graph metric.

Let $M > 0$. For all $g, h \in G$, $\Theta(g, h)$ denotes the sum of angles of edges of a geodesic $[g, h]_c$ at vertices of infinite valence and $\Theta_{>M}(g, h)$ denotes the sum of angles greater than M of edges of $[g, h]_c$ at vertices of infinite valence.

Then $d_c + \Theta_{>M}$ is quasi-isometric to d_G .

Proof. We will compare $d_c + \Theta_{>M}$ with $d_c + \Theta$ and conclude with Proposition 3.17.

Obviously, for all $g, h \in G$:

$$d_c(g, h) + \Theta_{>M}(g, h) \leq d_c(g, h) + \Theta(g, h).$$

On the other hand, if $\Theta_{\leq M}(g, h)$ denotes the sum of angles of edges of $[g, h]_c$ at vertices of infinite valence lower than M , we have:

$$\Theta_{\leq M}(g, h) \leq M d_c(g, h).$$

Therefore:

$$d_c(g, h) + \Theta(g, h) \leq d_c(g, h) + M d_c(g, h) + \Theta_{>M}(g, h) \leq M(d_c(g, h) + \Theta_{>M}(g, h)).$$

Then, according to Proposition 3.17, $d_c + \Theta_{>M}$ is quasi-isometric to d_G . □

The following proposition shows that for two vertices of the coned-off graph, the sum of the angles along two geodesics differs linearly, this will be used in Section 5.

Proposition 3.19. *Let G be a relatively hyperbolic group and X_c one of its coned-off graph. For any $M > 0$, there exists $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2 > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X_c$ and any two geodesics γ and ω between those two points, if we denote by:*

- $\Theta_\gamma(x, y), \Theta_\omega(x, y)$ the sum of angles along γ, ω respectively,
- $d'_\gamma(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta_\gamma(x, y), d'_\omega(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta_\omega(x, y),$
- $\Theta_{>M, \gamma}(x, y), \Theta_{>M, \omega}(x, y)$ the sum of angles greater than M along γ, ω respectively,
- $d'_{>M, \gamma}(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta_{>M, \gamma}(x, y), d'_{>M, \omega}(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta_{>M, \omega}(x, y).$

We have:

- $\frac{1}{\alpha_1} d'_\omega(x, y) \leq d'_\gamma(x, y) \leq \alpha_1 d'_\omega(x, y).$
- $\frac{1}{\alpha_2} d'_{>M, \omega}(x, y) - \beta_2 \leq d'_{>M, \gamma}(x, y) \leq \alpha_2 d'_{>M, \omega}(x, y) + \beta_2.$

Proof. Let us denote $n := d_c(x, y)$. We order the two geodesics in the following way:

- $[x, y]_{c, \gamma} = \{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ with $u_0 = x, u_n = y$ and $d_c(u_i, u_{i+1}) = 1$, for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$,
- $[x, y]_{c, \omega} = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ with $v_0 = x, v_n = y$ and $d_c(v_i, v_{i+1}) = 1$, for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

Let $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$, there are two cases to consider.

- Either $u_{i_0} = v_{i_0}$, then according to the second point of Proposition 3.12, we have:

$$\angle_{u_{i_0}}(u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0+1}) \leq \angle_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0-1}, v_{i_0+1}) + 12\delta.$$

- Otherwise $u_{i_0} \neq v_{i_0}$, then according to the first point of Proposition 3.12, we have: $\angle_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0-1}, v_{i_0+1}) \leq 12\delta$ and $\angle_{u_{i_0}}(u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0+1}) \leq 12\delta$.

Then, for all $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, we have:

$$\angle_{u_{i_0}}(u_{i_0-1}, u_{i_0+1}) \leq \angle_{v_{i_0}}(v_{i_0-1}, v_{i_0+1}) + 12\delta,$$

and therefore:

$$\Theta_\gamma(x, y) \leq \Theta_\omega(x, y) + 12\delta.$$

Thus:

$$d'_\gamma(x, y) \leq 13\delta d'_\omega(x, y).$$

Then by symmetry we get:

$$\frac{1}{13\delta} d'_\omega(x, y) \leq d'_\gamma(x, y) \leq 13\delta d'_\omega(x, y),$$

and $\alpha_1 = 13\delta$.

For the second point, we conclude with an application of Corollary 3.18. □

3.3.4 Triangles and angles

In this paragraph, we will mention the existence of a particular geodesic triangle between any three points in a fine and hyperbolic graph. Throughout this paragraph, X denotes a δ -fine hyperbolic graph.

Proposition 3.20. [LD25, Proposition 4.18]

Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)}$, we consider the set of points v with the following properties:

- v is contained in every geodesic between a and b and between a and c ,
- $\angle_v(a, b) > 50\delta$,
- $\angle_v(a, c) > 50\delta$.

If this set is not empty, it contains a unique point at maximal distance of a .

Definition 3.21. [LD25, Definition 4.19] Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)}$, according to Proposition 3.20, we define \tilde{a} as the furthest point from a among the points v with the following properties:

- v is contained in every geodesic between a and b and between a and c ,
- $\angle_v(a, b) > 50\delta$,
- $\angle_v(a, c) > 50\delta$.

If the set of points following these three properties is empty, we set $\tilde{a} = a$.

We define \tilde{b} and \tilde{c} in the same way.

Proposition 3.22. [LD25, Proposition 4.20] (see Figure 5)

Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)}$, we have $d(a, \tilde{a}) \leq d(a, \tilde{c})$. In other words, when we travel along a geodesic from a to c , we pass through a, \tilde{a}, \tilde{c} and c in this order.




Figure 5: \tilde{a} is closer to a than \tilde{c}

Theorem 3.23. [LD25, Theorem 4.21] (see Figure 6)

Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)}$ and a geodesic $[a, b]$ between a and b . There exists a triangle $[a, b, c]$ whose side between a and b is $[a, b]$ such that :

- the sides $[a, b]$ and $[a, c]$ coincide between a and \tilde{a} ,
- the sides $[b, c]$ and $[b, a]$ coincide between b and \tilde{b} ,
- the sides $[c, a]$ and $[c, b]$ coincide between c and \tilde{c} ,
- for each $v \in]\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}[$, if we denote by e_1 and e_2 the two different edges of $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ such that $v \in e_1 \cap e_2$ then $\angle_v(e_1, e_2) \leq 100\delta$ and similarly this property is also true for $]\tilde{a}, \tilde{c}[$ and $]\tilde{b}, \tilde{c}[$.

It should be noted in the proof of [LD25, Theorem 4.21] that one can prescribe a side of the triangle.




Figure 6: Particular geodesic triangle between the three points a, b, c with $\angle_v(e_1, e_2) \leq 100\delta$

Proposition 3.24. Let $a, b, c \in X^{(0)}$ such that $\tilde{a} \neq \tilde{b} \neq \tilde{c}$ and $[a, b, c]$ a triangle as in Theorem 3.23. We set e_1 the edge on $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2 the edge on $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{c}]$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2$. We have:

$$\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2) \leq 12\delta.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.15 (see [CD20]). □

4 Strong Bolicity for hyperbolic groups

We will reprove in this section the fact that hyperbolic groups admit a strongly bolic metric. It is one of the two key steps to prove the Baum-Connes conjecture without coefficient, according to Theorem 1.1 of Lafforgue [Laf02].

The fact that hyperbolic groups satisfy the rapid decay property was proved by de la Harpe and Jolissaint in [dlH88] and [Jol90].

For the fact that hyperbolic groups admit a strongly bolic metric, the following theorem was proved by Mineyev and Yu [MY02]. This result was reproved by Haïssinsky and Matthieu in [Mat11] using random walks and the Green metric.

Theorem 4.1. [MY02, Theorem 17] *Every hyperbolic group G admits a metric \hat{d} with the following properties.*

- \hat{d} is G -invariant, i.e. $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$, for all $g, x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- The metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

To reprove Theorem [MY02], we will use the following notion of an angle defined in Proposition 3.5.

In any graph (X, d) , a projection of a vertex x on a closed subset $F \subset X$ is a vertex $t \in F$ such that $d(x, F) = d(x, t)$.

In the rest of the section, G will denote an hyperbolic group and X will denote a Cayley graph of G over a finite generating set. We set d the metric on G , δ the hyperbolic constant of X , τ the exponential growth rate of X , i.e. $\tau = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln |B_X(x, n)|}{n}$ where $|B_X(x, n)|$ denotes the number of vertices in $B_X(x, n)$. For all $x, y \in X$, $[x, y]$ will denote a geodesic between x and y . For all $x, y, z \in X$, $[x, y, z]$ will denote a geodesic triangle between x , y and z i.e. a choice of three geodesics between each of these three points. For every closed set

We choose $\eta > 0$. We fix $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{\log(2)}{\delta + \eta}$. According to Proposition 3.5, for any $a \in X$, there exists a pseudo-metric d_ε^a on X comparable to $e^{-\varepsilon(x|y)_a}$. Let us choose p such that $p\varepsilon > \tau$. We fix $\tau' \in (\tau, p\varepsilon)$, so that there exists $C > 0$, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $x \in X$, $|B_X(x, n)| \leq Ce^{\tau' n}$.

We will need the following counting lemmas to prove further results.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists $C > 0$, such that for all $x, y \in X$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:*

$$|\{g \in G \mid d(g.o, [x, y]) = n\}| \leq Cd(x, y)e^{\tau' n}.$$

Proof. The result is clear with the following inclusion :

$$\{g \in G \mid d(g.o, [x, y]) = n\} \subset \bigcup_{x_i \in [x, y]} (B(x_i, n) \cap G.o).$$

We deduce that :

$$|\{g \in G \mid d(g.o, [x, y]) = n\}| \leq Cd(x, y)e^{\tau' n}.$$

□

Lemma 4.3. *There exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for all $x \in X$:*

$$\sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, x)} \leq \kappa.$$

Proof. Let $x \in X$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, x)} &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, x) = n\}} e^{-\varepsilon p n} \\
&\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C e^{\tau' n} e^{-\varepsilon p n} \\
&\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C e^{(\tau' - \varepsilon p) n} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{1 - e^{\tau' - \varepsilon p}} \quad (\text{since } \tau' - \varepsilon p < 0).
\end{aligned}$$

With $\kappa = \frac{C}{1 - e^{\tau' - \varepsilon p}}$, we get the desired result. \square

Here, we define D , which will be the strongly bolic metric up to a constant.

Proposition 4.4. *For all $x, y \in X$,*

$$D(x, y) := \sum_{a \in X} d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p$$

is finite.

Moreover, there exist $A, B > 0$ such that, for all $x, y \in X$:

$$\frac{1}{A} d(x, y) - B \leq D(x, y) \leq A d(x, y) + B.$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$:

$$\begin{aligned}
D(x, y) &= \sum_{a \in X} d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in X} \beta e^{-\varepsilon p(x|y)_a} \quad (\text{according to the first point of Proposition 3.5}) \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in X} \beta e^{-\varepsilon p(d(a, [x, y]) - 2\delta)} \quad (\text{according to Lemma 3.3}) \\
&\leq \beta e^{2p\delta\varepsilon} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, y]) = n\}} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, [x, y])} \\
&\leq \beta e^{2p\delta\varepsilon} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} e^{-\varepsilon p n} C d(x, y) e^{\tau' n} \quad (\text{according to Lemma 4.2}) \\
&\leq \beta e^{2p\delta\varepsilon} \frac{C}{1 - e^{\tau' - \varepsilon p}} d(x, y) \\
&< \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $D(x, y)$ is finite and:

$$D(x, y) \leq \beta e^{2p\delta\varepsilon} \kappa d(x, y),$$

with $\kappa = \frac{C}{1 - e^{\tau' - \varepsilon p}}$ like in Lemma 4.3.

For the other inequality, we remark that for all $a \in [x, y]$, $(x|y)_a = 0$.

Moreover, according to Proposition 3.5, for every $x, y \in X$ with $d(x, y) \geq 2D$, and every $a \in X$, we have that $d_\varepsilon^a(x, y) \geq \alpha e^{-\varepsilon(x|y)_a}$. Then if $d(x, y) \geq 2D$, and $a \in [x, y]$, we get $d_\varepsilon^a(x, y) \geq \alpha$.

From this fact, we deduce that for every $x, y \in X$ such that $d(x, y) \geq 2D$, we have that:

$$D(x, y) \geq d(x, y) \alpha^p.$$

Then, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X$:

$$D(x, y) \geq \alpha^p d(x, y) - K.$$

If we set $A := \max(\beta e^{2p\delta\varepsilon} \kappa, \frac{1}{\alpha^p})$ and $B := K$, we get the desired inequalities of the proposition. \square

The next lemmas will be useful in the rest of the section. The first is an application of the mean value theorem.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $t, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then for all $p > 1$, we have the following:*

$$|t^p - s^p| \leq p \max(t^{p-1}, s^{p-1})|t - s|.$$

Proof. For all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, if $t < s$, according to the mean value theorem there exists $c \in (t, s)$ such that:

$$|t^p - s^p| = pc^{p-1}|t - s|.$$

Then clearly,

$$|t^p - s^p| \leq p \max(t^{p-1}, s^{p-1})|t - s|.$$

\square

We will now prove some lemmas from hyperbolic geometry.

For every $x, y, z, a \in X$, when z is close to a geodesic between x and y , we prove that when the projection of a onto $[x, z] \cup [z, y]$ lies in $[x, z]$, then the projection of a onto $[z, y]$ is close to z .




Figure 7: The projection of a lies in $[x, z]$ then $d(a, [z, y])$ is close to $d(a, z)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $D \geq 0$. Let $x, y, z \in X$ such that $d(z, [x, y]) \leq D$. For every $a \in X$ such that $d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])$, we have:*

- $d(a, [z, y]) \leq d(a, z) \leq 5\delta + 4D + d(a, [z, y])$,
- $(z|y)_a \leq d(a, z) \leq 7\delta + 4D + (z|y)_a$.

Proof. Let $a \in X$ such that $d(a, [x, y] \cup [y, z]) = d(a, [x, z])$. We will first prove that:

$$d(a, [z, y]) \leq d(a, z) \leq 5\delta + 4D + d(a, [z, y]).$$

The inequality on the left is clear. See Figure 7, let u be a projection of a on $[x, z]$, let v be a projection of a on $[z, y]$. With the assumption that $d(a, [x, y] \cup [y, z]) = d(a, [x, z])$, we know that $d(a, v) \geq d(a, u)$.

According to [DK18, Lemme 11.4], there exists $u', z', v' \in [x, y]$, such that: $d(u, u') \leq 2(D + \delta)$, $d(z, z') \leq 2(D + \delta)$, $d(v, v') \leq 2(D + \delta)$ and u', z', v' are arranged in this order on $[x, y]$.

The thin triangle property applied to a geodesic triangle $[a, u', v']$ which contains z' , gives the fact that $d(z', [a, u']) \leq \delta$ or $d(z', [a, v']) \leq \delta$. Therefore, we get with another use of the thin triangle property that $d(z, [a, u]) \leq 4D + 5\delta$ or $d(z, [a, v]) \leq 4D + 5\delta$. Therefore we get:

$$d(a, z) \leq d(a, v) + 4D + 5\delta \leq d(a, [z, y]) + 4D + 5\delta.$$

To conclude, we just have to combine this inequality with the inequalities of Lemma 3.3. □

In the following lemma, we show that if a point a projects to z on a geodesic $[x, y]$, then z is close to being a quasi-center of the triangles $[x, z, a]$ and $[y, z, a]$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $a, x, y \in X$ and z a projection of a on $[x, y]$ then:*

$$d(a, x) \geq d(a, z) + d(z, x) - 24\delta.$$

Proof. Let us consider a geodesic triangle $[a, x, z]$. We denote by t a quasi-center of this triangle, u a vertex in $[x, a]$, v a vertex in $[x, y]$ and w a vertex in $[a, x]$ such that $d(t, u) \leq 4\delta, d(t, v) \leq 4\delta, d(t, w) \leq 4\delta$.

We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, z) &\leq d(a, v) \text{ (since } v \in [x, y]) \\ &\leq d(a, w) + 8\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$d(w, z) \leq 8\delta \text{ (since } w \in [a, z]).$$

And thus:

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, x) &= d(a, u) + d(u, x) \text{ (since } u \in [a, x]) \\ &\geq d(a, z) + d(z, x) - 2d(u, z) \\ &\geq d(a, z) + d(z, x) - 24\delta. \end{aligned}$$

□




Figure 8: z the projection of a on $[x, y]$ is a quasi-center of the triangle $[x, a, z]$

Lemma 4.8. Let $x, y, z \in X$, a geodesic $[x, y]$ between x and y such that $d(z, [x, y]) \leq 8\delta$, and two geodesics $[x, z]$ and $[z, y]$ between x, z and z, y respectively then:

$$\forall a \in X, d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) - 11\delta \leq d(a, [x, y]) \leq d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) + 11\delta.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 3.4, each vertex of $[x, y]$ is at a distance of at most 11δ from a point on $[x, z] \cup [z, y]$, and vice versa.

Then the inequalities of the lemma follow directly. \square

To show that D is almost a metric, we will need an inequality close to the triangular inequality. This proposition will be crucial to prove this and crucial to prove that this metric is weakly geodesic.




Figure 9: a projects onto z_i on $[x, z] \cup [z, y]$

Proposition 4.9. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X$ and $z \in X$, such that $d(z, [x, y]) \leq 8\delta$, we have the following:*

$$|D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y)| \leq C.$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in X$ and $z \in X$ such that $d(z, [x, y]) \leq 8\delta$. We fix two geodesics $[x, z]$ between x and z and $[z, y]$ between z and y . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y)| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in X} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\ & \quad + \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [z, y])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p|. \end{aligned}$$

We will bound from above the two obtained sums, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p| + d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p| \\ & \quad + \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p. \end{aligned}$$

For $a \in X$ such that $d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p & \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon p(z|y)_a} \\ & \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon p(d(a, z) - 23\delta)} \text{ (according to Lemma 4.6).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p & \leq \beta e^{3\delta p\varepsilon} \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z)} \\ & \leq \beta e^{23\delta p\varepsilon} \sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z)} \\ & \leq \beta e^{23\delta p\varepsilon} \kappa \text{ (according to Lemma 4.3) } \\ & \leq K_1. \end{aligned}$$

with $K_1 = 4\beta e^{23\delta p\varepsilon} \kappa$.

We will bound the sum $\sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p|$.

Let us denote $N := d(x, z)$. We order $[x, z]$ in the following sense: $[z, x] = \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ with $z_0 = z$, $z_N = x$ and $d(z_i, z_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$, see Figure 9.

Let $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, such that $d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z]) = d(a, z_i)$. Thus $(x|z)_a \geq d(a, z_i) - 2\delta$ and $(x|y)_a \geq d(a, z_i) - 13\delta$ according to Lemmas 3.3 and 4.8.

Moreover, the assumption $d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z]) = d(a, z_i)$ implies that we can apply Lemma 4.7 to a, z_i and z , therefore:

$$d(a, z) \geq d(a, z_i) + d(z_i, z) - 24\delta \geq d(a, z_i) + i - 24\delta.$$

Then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
|d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p| &\leq p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^{p-1}) |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y) - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)| \text{ (according to Lemma 4.5) } \\
&\leq p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(y, z) \\
&\leq p \beta^2 \max(e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x|y)_a}, e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x|z)_a}) e^{-\varepsilon(y|z)_a} \\
&\leq p \beta^2 e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(d(a, z_i) - 13\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, z) - 2\delta)} \\
&\leq p \beta^2 e^{p\varepsilon 13\delta} e^{\varepsilon 13\delta} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, z_i) + i - 26\delta)} \\
&\leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon 13\delta(p+1)} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, z_i)\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, z_i)\}} p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon 13\delta(p+1)} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon i} \\
&\leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon 13\delta(p+1)} \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z_i)} \\
&\leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon 13\delta(p+1)} \kappa \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \\
&\leq K_2.
\end{aligned}$$

with $K_2 = p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon 13\delta(p+1)} \kappa \frac{1}{1-e^{-\varepsilon}}$.

To conclude, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y)| \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in X} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\
&\leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [x, z])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\
&+ \sum_{\{a \in X \mid d(a, [x, z] \cup [z, y]) = d(a, [z, y])\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x, y)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x, z)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(z, y)^p| \\
&\leq 2K_1 + 2K_2.
\end{aligned}$$

and with $C := 2K_1 + 2K_2$ we get the desired result. \square

The next proposition shows that D satisfies a coarse triangular inequality.

Proposition 4.10. *There exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that, for all $x, y, z \in X$, we have the following:*

$$D(x, y) \leq D(x, z) + D(z, y) + C'.$$

Proof. Consider $[x, y, z]$ a geodesic triangle between x, y, z . According to hyperbolicity, every triangle admits a 4δ -quasi-center therefore, there exists $u \in [x, y]$ such that:

$$d(u, [x, z]) \leq 8\delta, d(u, [y, z]) \leq 8\delta,$$

see Figure 10.




Figure 10: u is at distance 8δ from the three sides of the triangle

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D(x, y) - D(x, z) + D(z, y) \\
 & \leq D(x, u) + D(u, y) + C \\
 & - D(x, u) - D(u, z) + C - D(z, u) - D(u, y) + C \text{ (according to Proposition 4.9) } \\
 & \leq 3C.
 \end{aligned}$$

with $C' := 3C + 2(A8\delta + B)$, we get the desired result. \square

Definition 4.11. For all $\varepsilon > \tau$, we define the function $\hat{d}: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by:

$$\hat{d}(x, y) = \begin{cases} D(x, y) + C' & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y. \end{cases}$$

where C' is the constant of Proposition 4.10.

Proposition 4.12. The function \hat{d} of Definition 4.11 is a metric on X .

Proof. By definition, \hat{d} is symmetric and $\hat{d}(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$.

The triangle inequality is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.10. \square

The rest of the section will be dedicated to a proof of the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.13. The metric \hat{d} satisfies the following properties.

- \hat{d} is G -invariant, i.e. $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$, for all $g, x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- The metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

We already have all the material to prove the first two points.

Proposition 4.14. \hat{d} is G -invariant, uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric.

Proof. The fact that \hat{d} is G -invariant comes directly from the definition of D and \hat{d} and the fact that the family pseudo-distance d_ε^a are G -equivariant according to Proposition 3.5.

According to Proposition 4.4, there exist $A, B > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X$:

$$\frac{1}{A}d(x, y) - B \leq D(x, y) \leq Ad(x, y) + B.$$

Therefore, for all $x, y \in X$:

$$\frac{1}{A}d(x, y) - B + C' \leq \hat{d}(x, y) \leq Ad(x, y) + B + C'.$$

Thus:

$$\frac{1}{A}d(x, y) - B - C' \leq \hat{d}(x, y) \leq Ad(x, y) + B + C',$$

and \hat{d} is quasi-isometric to d .

Since d is uniformly locally finite, \hat{d} is also uniformly locally finite. \square

Proposition 4.15. *The metric space (X, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic.*

Proof. Applying Proposition 4.9 and 4.14, the proof of the fact that (X, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic, follows easily and it is the same proof as in [MY02][Proposition 14]. Let us recall it for the reader's convenience.

Let $x, y \in X$ and $z \in [x, y]$, according to Proposition 4.9, we have:

$$\hat{d}(x, z) + \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(x, y) \leq C + C',$$

where C is the constant of Proposition 4.9 and C' the constant of Definition 4.11.

It follows that:

$$\hat{d}(x, z) \leq \hat{d}(x, y) + C + C'$$

hence the image of the map:

$$\hat{d}(x, \cdot) : [x, y] \rightarrow]0, +\infty[$$

is contained in $[0, \hat{d}(x, y) + C + C']$. Moreover, the image contains 0 and $\hat{d}(x, y)$.

By Proposition 4.14, there exists $M \geq 0$ such that, we have:

$$|\hat{d}(x, z) - \hat{d}(x, z')| \leq M$$

when $d(z, z') = 1$. This together with the fact that $[x, y]$ is a geodesic gives the fact that the image of $[x, y]$ by the map $\hat{d}(x, \cdot)$ is M -dense in $[0, \hat{d}(x, y)]$, i.e. for every $t \in [0, \hat{d}(x, y)]$, there exists $z \in [x, y]$ such that :

$$|\hat{d}(x, z) - t| \leq M.$$

Then $-\hat{d}(x, z) \leq M - t$.

By Proposition 4.9, we get the following:

$$\hat{d}(z, y) \leq \hat{d}(x, y) - t + M + C + C'.$$

Then (X, \hat{d}) is weakly η -geodesic for $\eta = M + C + C'$. \square

Since hyperbolicity is invariant by quasi-isometry for weakly geodesic metric spaces (see [Laf08]), we get as a corollary that (X, \hat{d}) is hyperbolic.

From this, we deduce that (X, \hat{d}) verifies the weak- $B2'$ condition.

Corollary 4.16. *There exists $\delta_3 \geq 0$ such that (X, \hat{d}) is δ_3 - $B2'$.*

Proof. According to [BK02][Proposition 11], hyperbolic metric spaces which admit a midpoint map are bolic, therefore they satisfy δ_3 - $B2'$ for some $\delta_3 \geq 0$.

(X, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and admits a midpoint map according to 2.8, therefore it satisfies δ_3 - $B2'$ for some $\delta_3 \geq 0$. \square

The last thing to prove is the fact that (X, \hat{d}) satisfies the strong- $B1$ condition.

The next lemma will be used to compare the projections of a point a onto the geodesics determined by four points in the $B1$ configuration. We state the inequalities directly in terms of the Gromov product.




Figure 11: Projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]$ and on $[x_2, y_1]$

Lemma 4.17. Consider $r \geq 0$ and $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$ such that $d(x_1, x_2), d(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Then for every $a \in X$, we have:

- $(x_1|y_1)_a - r \leq (x_2|y_1)_a \leq (x_1|y_1)_a + r$,
- $(x_1|y_1)_a - r \leq (x_1|y_2)_a \leq (x_1|y_1)_a + r$,
- $(x_1|y_1)_a - 2r \leq (x_2|y_2)_a \leq (x_1|y_1)_a + 2r$.

Proof. For the first point, we have on one side:

$$(x_2|y_1)_a \leq (x_1|y_1)_a + |(x_2|y_1)_a - (x_1|y_1)_a| \leq (x_1|y_1)_a + r.$$

And on the other side:

$$(x_2|y_1)_a \geq (x_1|y_1)_a - |(x_2|y_1)_a - (x_1|y_1)_a| \geq (x_1|y_1)_a - r.$$

The second point is direct by symmetry of the role of x_1, x_2 and y_1, y_2 .

The third point follows directly by applying the argument of the first point twice. \square

Lemma 4.18. Consider $r \geq 0$ and $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$ such that $d(x_1, x_2), d(y_1, y_2) \leq r$.

Then for every $a \in X$, we have:

- $d(a, [x_1, y_1]) - (r + \delta) \leq d(a, [x_2, y_1]) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_1]) + (r + \delta)$,
- $d(a, [x_1, y_1]) - (r + \delta) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_2]) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_1]) + (r + \delta)$,
- $d(a, [x_1, y_1]) - 2(r + \delta) \leq d(a, [x_2, y_2]) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_1]) + 2(r + \delta)$.

Proof. For the first point. Consider a geodesic triangle $[x_1, x_2, y_1]$ and a vertex $u \in [x_1, y_1]$ such that $d(a, u) = d(a, [x_1, y_1])$. According to δ -thinness, there exists $v \in [x_2, y_1]$ such that $d(u, v) \leq r + \delta$. Indeed, there exists $w \in [x_1, x_2] \cup [x_2, y_1]$ such that $d(u, w) \leq \delta$. If $w \in [x_2, y_1]$, then we take $v = w$, in the other case w is at a distance less than r from y_1 , and then $d(u, y_1) \leq r + \delta$.

Therefore:

$$d(a, [x_2, y_1]) \leq d(a, v) \leq d(a, u) + d(u, v) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_1]) + (r + \delta).$$

By the symmetry of the roles of $[x_1, y_1]$ and $[x_2, y_1]$, we get the reverse inequality.

The second point is clear by symmetry of the roles of $[x_1, y_2]$ and $[x_2, y_1]$.

For the third point, the same proof applied to the triangle $[x_1, x_2, y_2]$ gives that:

$$d(a, [x_1, y_2]) - (r + \delta) \leq d(a, [x_2, y_2]) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_2]) + (r + \delta),$$

and combining it with the second point, we get that:

$$d(a, [x_1, y_1]) - 2(r + \delta) \leq d(a, [x_2, y_2]) \leq d(a, [x_1, y_1]) + 2(r + \delta),$$

which is the third point. \square

Theorem 4.19. The metric space (X, \hat{d}) satisfies strong-B1.

Proof. According to Proposition 4.14, the fact that (X, \hat{d}) satisfies strong-B1 is equivalent to the fact that for all $r > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, there exists $R = R(\eta, r) \geq 0$ such that for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d(x_1, y_1), d(x_1, y_2), d(x_2, y_1), d(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d(x_1, x_2), d(y_1, y_2) \leq r$, we have :

$$|\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

We will choose $R \in \mathbb{N}$ even and large enough later. We denote by m a vertex in $[x_1, y_1]$ such that $d(x_1, m) \geq \frac{R}{2}$ and $d(m, y_1) \geq \frac{R}{2}$. For all $a \in X$, $\pi(a)$ denotes the projection of a onto $[x_1, y_1]$ that is closest to x_1 . More precisely, this means that $\pi(a) \in [x_1, y_1]$, $d(a, [x_1, y_1]) = d(a, \pi(a))$, for all $u \in [x_1, y_1]$, such that $d(a, [x_1, y_1]) = d(a, u)$, we have: $d(x_1, u) \geq d(x_1, \pi(a))$. The fact that $\pi(a)$ is the projection of a closest to x_1 is used only to define the projection of a in $[x_1, y_1]$ without ambiguity, see Figure 12.




Figure 12: $\pi(a)$ is the projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]$

We fix $\eta, r > 0$. Consider $R > 0$ and four points $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d(x_1, y_1), d(x_1, y_2), d(x_2, y_1), d(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d(x_1, x_2), d(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. In particular, we remark that $\hat{d}(x_1, y_1), \hat{d}(x_1, y_2), \hat{d}(x_2, y_1), \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) > 0$. Therefore, for all $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$, $\hat{d}(x_i, y_j) = D(x_i, y_j) + C'$, we have the following:

$$|\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| = |D(x_1, y_1) + D(x_2, y_2) - D(x_1, y_2) - D(x_2, y_1)|.$$

Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |D(x_1, y_1) + D(x_2, y_2) - D(x_1, y_2) - D(x_2, y_1)| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in X} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^p + d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^p + d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p| \\ & + \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^p + d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p|. \end{aligned}$$

The goal now is to bound from above by some constant the two obtained sums, when R is great enough:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^p + d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p| + |d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \\ & + \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2). \end{aligned}$$

We will start to bound from above the sum:

$$\sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2).$$

Let us denote $N := d(m, y_1)$. We order $[m, y_1]$ in the following sense: $[m, y_1] = \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ with $z_0 = m$, $z_N = y_1$ and $d(z_i, z_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq N - 1$, see Figure 13.




Figure 13: $\pi(a) = z_i \in [m, y_1]$

According to the definition of z_i , we have $d(x_1, z_i) \geq \frac{R}{2} + i$.
 Let $a \in X$ such that $\pi(a) = z_i$, then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) \\
 & \leq \beta \max(e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x_1|y_1)_a}, e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x_2|y_1)_a}) \\
 & \leq \beta \max(e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(d(a, z_i) - 2\delta)}, e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(d(a, z_i) - 2\delta - r)}) \text{ (according to Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.17)} \\
 & \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we have:

$$\max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)}. \quad (1)$$

Still in the case where $\pi(a) = z_i$, according to Lemma 4.7, we have:

$$d(a, x_1) \geq d(a, z_i) + d(z_i, x_1) - 24\delta \geq d(a, z_i) + \frac{R}{2} + i - 24\delta.$$

Moreover, we remark according to the triangular inequality that:

$$(x_1, x_2)_a \geq d(a, x_1) - d(x_1, x_2).$$

Therefore, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) & \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon(x_1, x_2)_a} \\
 & \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, x_1) - d(x_1, x_2))} \\
 & \leq \beta e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, z_i) + \frac{R}{2} + i - r - 24\delta)} \\
 & \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(r+24\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} e^{-\varepsilon i} e^{-\varepsilon d(a, z_i)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we get:

$$d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(r+24\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} e^{-\varepsilon i} e^{-\varepsilon d(a, z_i)}. \quad (2)$$

Putting this together, we can bound the sum:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \\ & \leq p \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \\ & \leq p \beta^2 \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, z_i) + \frac{R}{2} + i - r - 24\delta)} \text{ (according to Equations 1 and 2)} \\ & \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(pr+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon i} \\ & \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(pr+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon p d(a, z_i)} \\ & \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(pr+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} \kappa \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \text{ (according to Lemma 4.3)} \\ & \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(pr+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} \kappa \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\varepsilon}} \\ & \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(pr+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} \kappa \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore for $R \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough and even, $e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}}$ is arbitrarily small and the sum is also arbitrarily small.

Now, we will bound from above the sum:

$$\sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2).$$

For all a such that $\pi(a) = z_i$, we still have according to Equation 2:

$$d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(r+24\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon \frac{R}{2}} e^{-\varepsilon i} e^{-\varepsilon d(a, z_i)}.$$

For all a such that $\pi(a) = z_i$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) \\ & \leq \beta \max(e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x_2|y_2)_a}, e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(x_1|y_2)_a}) \\ & \leq \beta \max(e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(d(a, z_i) - 2\delta - 2r)}, e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)(d(a, z_i) - 2\delta - r)}) \text{ (according to Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.17)} \\ & \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+2r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

To summarize, we have:

$$\max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) \leq \beta e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+2r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)}. \quad (3)$$

Putting this together we can bound the sum:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]\}} p \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \\
& \leq p \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} \max(d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^{p-1}, d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^{p-1}) d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, x_2) \\
& \leq p \beta^2 \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} e^{\varepsilon(p-1)(2\delta+2r)} e^{-\varepsilon(p-1)d(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon(d(a, z_i) + \frac{R}{2} + i - r - 24\delta)} \text{ (according to Equations 2 and 3)} \\
& \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(p2r+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon\frac{R}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) = z_i\}} e^{-\varepsilon pd(a, z_i)} e^{-\varepsilon i} \\
& \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(p2r+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon\frac{R}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \sum_{a \in X} e^{-\varepsilon pd(a, z_i)} \\
& \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(p2r+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon\frac{R}{2}} \kappa \sum_{i=0}^N e^{-\varepsilon i} \text{ (according to Lemma 4.3)} \\
& \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(p2r+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon\frac{R}{2}} \kappa \frac{1 - e^{-\varepsilon(N+1)}}{1 - e^{-\varepsilon}} \\
& \leq p \beta^2 e^{\varepsilon(p2r+2p\delta+22\delta)} e^{-\varepsilon\frac{R}{2}} \kappa \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\varepsilon}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Like in the previous case, the sum is arbitrarily small when R is arbitrarily big.

To conclude the proof of the Theorem, we need to bound from above by η the sum:

$$\sum_{\{a \in X \mid \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]\}} |d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_1^p) + d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_1, y_2)^p - d_\varepsilon^a(x_2, y_1)^p|.$$

Even if the definition of $\pi(a)$ is not symmetric in x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 , in the previous case, we just use the fact that $\pi(a)$ is a closest point projection on the geodesic $[x_1, y_1]$ to bound the sum for $a \in X$ such that $\pi(a) \in [m, y_1]$, therefore the same proof will work in the case where $\pi(a) \in [x_1, m]$ and the proof is complete. \square

We summarize the results of this section with the proof of Theorem 4.13.

Proof. of Theorem 4.13

Every hyperbolic group admits a metric \hat{d} which is defined in Definition 4.11.

This metric is G -invariant, uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric according to the Proposition 4.14.

According to Proposition 4.15, the metric space (X, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic.

According to Corollary 4.16, (X, \hat{d}) verifies δ -B2 for some δ and according to Theorem 4.19, (X, \hat{d}) satisfies strong-B1, thus (X, \hat{d}) is strongly bolic. \square

5 Strong Bolicity for relatively hyperbolic groups

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Every relatively hyperbolic group with $CAT(0)$ parabolics G admits a metric \hat{d} with the following properties.*

- \hat{d} is G -invariant, i.e. $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$, for all $g, x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- the metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

More precisely, we prove this theorem for a broader class of relatively hyperbolic groups, defined in Section 5.2. We will also show that it includes also virtually abelian parabolics according to [UM25, Proposition 8.1].

Corollary 5.2. *Groups hyperbolic relatively to $CAT(0)$ parabolics with the (RD) property and their subgroups satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture.*

More precisely, we obtain the following corollary for families of $CAT(0)$ groups that have (RD) property.

Corollary 5.3. *Groups that are hyperbolic relatively to following classes of groups and their subgroups:*

- virtually abelian,
- cocompactly cubulated,
- Coxeter groups,

satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture.

Corollary 5.4. *Fundamental groups of complete real hyperbolic manifolds admits a strongly bolic metric.*

Structure of Section 5.

- Subsection 5.1 is dedicated to notations.
- In Subsection 5.2, we precisely define the class of admissible parabolics subgroups that interest us and show that this class includes $CAT(0)$ groups and virtually abelian groups.
- In Subsection 5.3, we discuss a notion of random representatives on the parabolics, namely masks, defined by Dahmani and Chatterji in [CD20]. Most of the properties cited come from [CD20], while some are new.
- In Subsection 5.4, we define for all vertices of the coned-off graph, a pseudo-metric, related to the masks. These pseudo-metrics will play, in the definition of strongly bolic metric for relatively hyperbolic groups, the role that angles of Proposition 3.5 played in the definition of the strongly bolic metric for hyperbolic groups. We prove an important control result for these pseudo-metrics.
- In Subsection 5.5, we prove that for points of infinite valence, the pseudo-metrics are comparable to the angles of Definition 3.10 in the coned-off graph.
- Subsection 5.6 is dedicated to the definition of the metric \hat{d} , which will be the strongly bolic metric. In this subsection, we prove that this is a metric.
- In Subsection 5.7, we prove that \hat{d} is quasi-isometric to the group metric.

- In Subsection 5.8, we prove that the metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly-geodesic.
- In Subsection 5.9, we prove that \hat{d} satisfies the weak- $B2'$ condition.
- In Subsection 5.10, we prove that \hat{d} satisfies the strong- $B1$ condition.
- Subsection 5.11 is a conclusion, we summarize all the previous results. We combined Theorem 4.13 and Theorem 1.1 to prove the Baum-Connes conjecture for relatively hyperbolic with finitely generated $CAT(0)$ with (RD) property and virtually abelian parabolics.

5.1 Notations

In the whole section, G will denote a group hyperbolic relatively to proper subgroups P_1, \dots, P_n . We assume further that all P_1, \dots, P_n are infinite and finitely generated.

Let d_G denote a word-distance on G with respect to a finite generating set. Let X_c denote a coned-off graph, defined in Definition 3.6 of G relative to P_1, \dots, P_n with the same generating set. Let d_c will denote the graph metric of X_c , and for all $x, y \in X_c$, $[x, y]_c$ will denote a geodesic for d_c between x and y . We denote by X_c^∞ the set of vertices of infinite valence of X_c . We will denote by $I_c(x, y) = \{z \in X_c \mid d_c(x, y) = d_c(x, z) + d_c(z, y)\}$ the geodesic interval between x and y in X_c . Let us denote δ the hyperbolicity constant of X_c and we assume that δ is an integer. In what follows, since parabolics subgroups are assumed to be infinite, we overlook the distinction between G and $X_c \setminus X_c^\infty$.

For all $x, y \in X_c$, we denote $\Theta'(x, y)$ the minimal sum of angles at infinite valence vertices on a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ and for all $M > 0$, $\Theta'_{>M}(x, y)$ the minimal sum of angles at infinite valence vertices on a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ greater than M . We define $d' : X_c \times X_c \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $d'(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta'(x, y)$. We recall that its restriction to G is a metric quasi-isometric to the word metric according to Proposition 3.17. For all $M > 0$, we define, in the same way $d'_{>M} : X_c \times X_c \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as $d'_{>M}(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta'_{>M}(x, y)$. According to Corollary 3.18, on G , d'_M is also quasi-isometric to d_G .

Let H be a finitely generated group with a fixed generating set, let $C > 0$ be a constant, we denote by $\text{Proba}_C(H)$ the set of finitely supported probability measures on H with support of diameter at most C . We observe that H embeds into $\text{Proba}_C(H)$ through Dirac measures.

We define the norm $\|\eta\|$ of a measure on a discrete space X as its ℓ^1 -norm $\|\eta\| := \sum_{x \in X} |\eta(x)|$. Moreover, we set $\|\eta \Delta \eta'\| := \|\eta - \eta'\|$.

For all $K > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we set:

$$[x]_K := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \leq K \\ x & \text{if } x > K. \end{cases}$$

5.2 Assumptions on parabolics

In this section, we describe the parabolic subgroups for which our result is applicable. We begin by stating the assumptions we require for the parabolics. We then show that $CAT(0)$ groups satisfy these assumptions.

The following two properties are strengthening of the conditions of the weakly- $B2'$ property. We need to assume that the metric defined on the parabolic subgroups satisfies these two properties in order to establish the weakly- $B2'$ property for the relatively hyperbolic group.

The first property, which we call η -peakless, means that the distance from a point to a geodesic reaches its maximum at the ends of the geodesic, up to a constant η .

Definition 5.5. (η_2 -peakless) Let $\eta_1 \geq 0$ and $\eta_2 \geq 0$. Let (X, d) be a η_1 -weakly geodesic metric space, we say that (X, d) is η_2 -peakless, if there exists $\eta_2 > 0$ such that, for all $x, y, z \in X$, there exists a η_1 -weak geodesic $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ from x to y , such that for $t \in [0, 1]$, we have:

$$d(z, \sigma(t)) \leq \max(d(x, z), d(y, z)) + \eta_2.$$

The second property, named η -strongly convex, is a non-symmetric reinforcement, up to an additive constant, of classical uniform convexity. In fact, given three points x , y , and z , rather than requiring that z be closer to the midpoint of the geodesic between x and y than to x and y , we require here that z be closer to every point on the geodesic that lies sufficiently far from both x and y .

Definition 5.6. (η_2 -strongly-convex) Let $\eta_1 \geq 0$ and $\eta_2 \geq 0$. Let (X, d) be a η_1 -weakly geodesic metric space, we say that (X, d) is η_2 -strongly-convex, if for all $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{2}$, for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such for all $x, y, z \in X$, with $d(x, z) \leq N$, $d(z, y) \leq N$ and $d(x, y) > \varepsilon N$, there exists a η_1 -weak geodesic $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ from x to y , such that for all $t \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$, we have:

$$d(z, \sigma(t)) \leq N(1 - \delta) + \eta_2.$$

We remark directly from the definition that a geodesic metric space (X, d) , which is η_1 -strongly-convex and η_2 -peakless for some $\eta_1 \geq 0$ and $\eta_2 \geq 0$, satisfies weakly- $B2'$.

Definition 5.7. A finitely generated group P is said to be admissible, if for all $C > 0$, $\text{Proba}_C(P)$ admits a P -invariant pseudo-metric, denoted d_b , such that:

- d_b is weakly geodesic,
- d_b is η -peakless and η -strongly-convex for some $\eta > 0$ and for the same choice of weak geodesic,
- d_b verifies strong- $B1$, weakly- $B2'$,
- the inclusion map from (P, d_P) to $(\text{Proba}_C(P), d_b)$ via the Dirac masses is a quasi-isometry,
- for all $\mu, \nu \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \cap \text{supp}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$, we have: $d_b(\mu, \nu) \leq 2C\|\mu \Delta \nu\|$.

The rest of Section 5 will be dedicated to the proof of the following theorem. We will provide the proof precisely in Subsection 5.11.

Theorem 5.8. Every group G hyperbolic relatively to admissible subgroups admits a metric \hat{d} with the following properties.

- \hat{d} is G -invariant, i.e. $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$, for all $g, x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- the metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

We show in the remainder of this section that $\text{CAT}(0)$ groups are admissible.

We prove here that (\mathbb{R}^n, ℓ^2) is 0-peakless. In what follows, $\|\cdot\|$ will denote the Euclidean norm and d_{ℓ^2} the Euclidean distance.

Lemma 5.9. For all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have:

$$d_{\ell^2}(z, (1 - t)x + ty) \leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(z, x), d_{\ell^2}(z, y)).$$

Proof. By applying a translation, we can suppose that $z = 0$. Therefore, it is equivalent to prove that for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have:

$$\|(1 - t)x + ty\| \leq \max(\|x\|, \|y\|).$$

This is true for every norm, then this proves the lemma. □

As a corollary $\text{CAT}(0)$ spaces are 0-peakless.

Corollary 5.10. $\text{CAT}(0)$ spaces are peakless.

Proof. Let (X, d) a $CAT(0)$ space. Let $x, y, z \in X$ and we consider $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in (\mathbb{R}^2, d_{\ell^2})$ a comparison triangle.

Let p be a point on the geodesic between x and y and \tilde{p} a comparison point, i.e. a point on the geodesic between \tilde{x}, \tilde{y} such that $d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) = d(p, x)$ and $d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{p}, \tilde{y}) = d(p, y)$.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} d(z, p) &\leq d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{p}) \text{ (according to the } CAT(0) \text{ inequality)} \\ &\leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{x}), d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y})) \text{ (according to Lemma 5.9)} \\ &\leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(z, x), d_{\ell^2}(z, y)) \text{ (according to the definition of a comparison triangle).} \end{aligned}$$

□

We prove here that (\mathbb{R}^n, ℓ^2) is 0-strongly-convex.

Lemma 5.11. *For all $\eta \in (0, 1)$, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $d_{\ell^2}(x, y) \geq \varepsilon \max(d_{\ell^2}(x, z), d_{\ell^2}(z, y))$, we have for all $t \in (\eta, 1 - \eta)$:*

$$d_{\ell^2}(z, (1-t)x + ty) \leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(x, z), d_{\ell^2}(z, y))(1 - \delta).$$

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, by applying a translation we assume that $z = 0$. Let us assume that $\|x\| \leq \|y\|$ and $\|x - y\| \geq \varepsilon \|y\|$.

We will use the following variation of the median identity, for all $t \in (0, 1)$:

$$\|(1-t)x + ty\|^2 + t(1-t)\|x - y\|^2 = (1-t)\|x\|^2 + t\|y\|^2.$$

We get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|(1-t)x + ty\|^2 &= (1-t)\|x\|^2 + t\|y\|^2 - t(1-t)\|x - y\|^2 \\ &\leq (1-t)\|y\|^2 + t\|y\|^2 - \varepsilon t(1-t)\|y\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \varepsilon t(1-t))\|y\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 - \varepsilon\eta(1-\eta))\|y\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\|(1-t)x + ty\| \leq \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon\eta(1-\eta)}\|y\|,$$

and since $\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon\eta(1-\eta)} \in (0, 1)$, we set:

$$\delta := 1 - \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon\eta(1-\eta)},$$

and we get the desired result.

□

As a corollary, $CAT(0)$ spaces are strongly-convex.

Corollary 5.12. *$CAT(0)$ spaces are strongly-convex.*

Proof. Let $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $x, y, z \in X$ such that $d(x, y) \geq \varepsilon \max(d(x, z), d(z, y))$. We consider $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z} \in (\mathbb{R}^2, d_{\ell^2})$ a comparison triangle for x, y, z and we remark that this points satisfy the assumptions of Lemma 5.11. Let σ the geodesic in X between x and y and $\tilde{\sigma}$ the geodesic between \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} . For all $t \in [0, 1]$, by definition of a comparison point, a comparison point for $\sigma(t)$ is $\tilde{\sigma}(t)$.

According to Lemma 5.11, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $t \in (\eta, 1 - \eta)$, we have:

$$d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{\sigma}(t)) \leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}), d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}))(1 - \delta).$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
d(z, \sigma(t)) &\leq d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{\sigma}(t)) \text{ (according to the } CAT(0) \text{ inequality)} \\
&\leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}), d_{\ell^2}(\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}))(1 - \delta) \text{ (according to the previous remark)} \\
&\leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(x, z), d_{\ell^2}(z, y))(1 - \delta) \text{ (according to the definition of a comparison triangle).}
\end{aligned}$$

□

In order to prove that $CAT(0)$ groups are admissible, we will use barycenter of measures on $CAT(0)$ spaces.

Proposition 5.13. [Stu03, Proposition 4.3.]

Let (X, d) be a $CAT(0)$ metric space and $\mu := \sum_{x \in X} \mu_x \delta_x$ a finitely supported measure on X , with $\sum_{x \in X} \mu_x = 1$ and the family of positive reals $(\mu_x)_{x \in X}$ is almost zero.

The function $z \mapsto \sum_{x \in X} \mu_x d^2(z, x)$ admits a unique minimum, called its barycenter.

To verify the last condition for admissible groups in the $CAT(0)$ setting, we will use the L^1 Wasserstein metric, which we define here.

Definition 5.14. [Stu03, Definition 4.1.]

Let (X, d) be a $CAT(0)$ space, let $\mu = \sum_{x \in X} \mu_x \delta_x$ and $\nu = \sum_{x \in X} \nu_x \delta_x$ be two finitely supported probability measures on X , where $(\mu_x)_{x \in X}$ and $(\nu_x)_{x \in X}$ are almost zero families of real numbers such that $\sum_{x \in X} \mu_x = \sum_{x \in X} \nu_x = 1$.

A coupling Π between μ and ν is probability measure on X^2 such that the marginals are μ and ν , i.e. $\Pi = \sum_{x, y \in X} \Pi_{x, y} \delta_{(x, y)}$ where for all $x \in X$, $\sum_{y \in X} \Pi_{x, y} = \mu_x$ and for all $y \in X$, $\sum_{x \in X} \Pi_{x, y} = \nu_y$. The cost of a transport plan Π denoted by $c(\Pi)$ is defined as: $c(\Pi) := \sum_{x, y \in X} \Pi_{x, y} d(x, y)$.

The Wasserstein distance between μ and ν is defined as follow:

$$d^W(p, q) = \inf\{c(\Pi) : \Pi \text{ is a coupling between } \mu \text{ and } \nu\}.$$

The following result, due to [Stu03], allows us to control the difference between barycenters in terms of the Wasserstein distance.

Theorem 5.15. [Stu03, Theorem 6.3]

Let (X, d) be a $CAT(0)$ metric space.

Let μ, ν two finitely supported measures on (X, d) . We have:

$$d(Bar(\mu), Bar(\nu)) \leq d^W(\mu, \nu).$$

Lemma 5.16. Let (X, d) be a $CAT(0)$ metric space. Let $C > 0$. Let μ, ν two finitely supported probability measure on X of support diameter bounded by C and let assume further that $supp(\mu) \cap supp(\nu) \neq \emptyset$.

Then:

$$d(Bar(\mu), Bar(\nu)) \leq 2C \|\mu \Delta \nu\|.$$

Proof. Let μ and ν be two finitely supported measure of support of diameter bounded by C . We assume that $supp(\mu) \cap supp(\nu) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, we can write:

- $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \delta_{x_i} + \sum_{i>p} \mu_i \delta_{x_i}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i + \sum_{i>p} \mu_i = 1$,
- $\nu = \sum_{i=1}^p \nu_i \delta_{y_i} + \sum_{i>p} \nu_i \delta_{y_i}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^p \nu_i + \sum_{i>p} \nu_i = 1$,

if we allow the x_i and the y_i to not all be distinct.

We set the following transport plan on $X \times X$:

$$\Pi = \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i \delta_{(x_i, x_i)} + \frac{1}{1 - \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i} \sum_{i>p}^n \sum_{j>p}^m \mu_i \nu_j \delta_{(x_i, y_j)}.$$

An easy computation shows that Π is in fact a transport plan between μ and ν .

We set $a := \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_i$.

An easy computation shows that:

$$\|\mu \Delta \nu\| = 2 - a$$

With another easy computation, we get:

$$c(\Pi) \leq 2C \frac{1}{1-a} \sum_{i>p}^n \sum_{j>p}^m \mu_i \nu_j \leq 2C(1-a) \leq 2C(2-a),$$

thus $c(\Pi) \leq 2C\|\mu \Delta \nu\|$.

According to Theorem 5.15 and Definition 5.14, we get that:

$$d(\text{Bar}(\mu), \text{Bar}(\nu)) \leq 2C\|\mu \Delta \nu\|.$$

□

We show here that $CAT(0)$ groups are admissible.

Proposition 5.17. *$CAT(0)$ groups are admissible.*

Proof. Let P be a $CAT(0)$ group. By definition, there exists (X, d) a $CAT(0)$ metric space such that P acts properly and cocompactly by isometries on it. Moreover, there exists φ a P -invariant quasi-isometry between P equipped with the word metric and (X, d) .

Let $C > 0$, let $\mu, \nu \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$. We define $\text{Proba}_C(X)$, the set of finitely supported probability measure of diameter bounded by C on X . We define φ^* , the map between $\text{Proba}_C(P)$ and $\text{Proba}_C(X)$ defined by φ and by extension on the dirac masses.

We set:

$$d_b(\mu, \nu) = d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu)), \text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu))).$$

We will prove the d_b satisfies all the assumption of Definition 5.7. d_b is clearly a pseudo-metric on $\text{Proba}_C(P)$.

As P acts by isometries on (X, d) , d_b is clearly P invariant.

As φ is a quasi-isometry between P and (X, d) . There exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $x \in X$, there exists $h \in P$ such that $d(x, \varphi(h)) \leq \eta$. We will show that d_b is η -weakly geodesic.

Let $\mu, \nu \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$. We denote by γ the unique geodesic between $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu))$ and $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu))$ in (X, d) .

For all $t \in [0, 1]$, there exists $\tilde{\gamma}(t)$ such that $d(\gamma(t), \varphi(\tilde{\gamma}(t))) \leq \eta$. Thus $\delta_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)} \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$ and we have:

- $d_b(\mu, \delta_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)}) = d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu)), \gamma(t)) \leq d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu)), \gamma(t)) + \eta \leq t + \eta$,
- $d_b(\delta_{\tilde{\gamma}(t)}, \nu) = d(\tilde{\gamma}(t), \text{Bar}(\nu)) \leq \eta + d(\gamma(t), \text{Bar}(\nu)) \leq d_b(\mu, \nu) - t + \eta$.

Then d_b is η -weakly geodesic.

We will show that d_b is peakless. To begin, according to Corollary 5.12, we know that for all $x, y, z \in X$ and γ the unique geodesic between x and y , we have, for all $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$d(z, \gamma(t)) \leq \max(d_{\ell^2}(z, x), d_{\ell^2}(z, y)).$$

Let $\mu, \nu, \lambda \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$, let γ be the unique geodesic between $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu))$ and $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu))$, let σ be a weak geodesic between μ and ν defined as before. We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(\lambda, \sigma(t)) &\leq d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\lambda)), \gamma(t)) + \eta \\ &\leq \max(d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\lambda)), \text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu))), d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\lambda)), \text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu)))) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Then d_b is η -peakless.

We will show that d_b is strongly-convex. Let $\eta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}), \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $N \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$. Let $\mu, \nu, \lambda \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$, with $d_b(\mu, \lambda) \leq N, d_b(\lambda, \nu) \leq N$ and $d_b(\mu, \nu) \geq \varepsilon N$. Let γ be the unique geodesic between $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu))$ and $\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu))$, let σ be a weak geodesic between μ and ν defined as before. According to Corollary 5.12, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $t \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$:

$$d(\lambda, \gamma(t)) \leq N(1 - \delta).$$

Therefore, for all $t \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_b(\lambda, \sigma(t)) &= d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\lambda)), \sigma(t)) \\ &\leq d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\lambda)), \gamma(t)) + \eta \\ &\leq N(1 - \delta) + \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, d_b is η -strongly-convex.

As d_b is weakly η -geodesic, η -peakless and η -strongly-convex, it satisfies weakly- $B2'$ according .

As (X, d) is a $CAT(0)$ metric space, $(\text{Proba}_C(P), d_b)$ satisfies clearly strongly- $B1$.

Let $g, h \in P$. We have by definition: $d_b(\delta_g, \delta_h) = d(\varphi(g), \varphi(h))$. Therefore as φ is quasi-isometry, the inclusion from (P, d_P) to $(\text{Proba}_C(P), d_b)$ via the Dirac masses is a quasi-isometry

Finally, let $\mu, \nu \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$ with $\text{supp}(\mu) \cap \text{supp}(\nu) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\text{supp}(\varphi^*(\mu)) \cap \text{supp}(\varphi^*(\nu)) \neq \emptyset$, therefore according to Lemma 5.16, we get that, we have:

$$d_b(\mu, \nu) = d(\text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\mu)), \text{Bar}(\varphi^*(\nu))) \leq 2C\|\mu\Delta\nu\|.$$

□

We deduce now that finitely virtually abelian parabolics are admissible.

Corollary 5.18. *Virtually abelian parabolics are admissible.*

The rest of the article will be dedicated to the proof of the following Theorem.

Theorem 5.19. *Every relatively hyperbolic group with admissible parabolics G admits a metric \hat{d} with the following properties.*

- \hat{d} is G -invariant, i.e. $\hat{d}(g.x, g.y) = \hat{d}(x, y)$, for all $g, x, y \in G$,
- \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite and quasi-isometric to the word metric,
- the metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic.

5.3 The masks

In this subsection, we discuss an important notion in our proof defined by Dahmani and Chatterji in [CD20, Section 2], namely the masks.

To define masks we need to recall the definition of flow for a uniformly locally fine graph defined also in [CD20]. This concept generalizes the notion of flow introduced by Alvarez and Lafforgue in [AL17] in the context of uniformly finite hyperbolic graphs. The flow takes an initial point and a target point and moves the initial point towards the target along "acceptable" paths. In Alvarez-Lafforgue, the acceptable paths are the α -geodesics of coarse neighborhoods of geodesics. These are not suitable for uniformly fine graphs because they are not finite. Here, they are replaced by conical α -geodesic cones, which behave similarly, but whose cardinality is really well controlled. The final step of the flow is a uniformly bounded support measure contained within the 1-neighborhood of the target point, called the mask. The idea behind this name is that the support of the mask represents "the set of points that the target point must hide in order to hide the initial point." Masks will also play the role of random representative of cosets.

The most important property of masks is that they converge exponentially fast, i.e., for any pair of nearby points, the difference between their masks is exponentially small in terms of the distance from the source points to the target point.

Most of the results in this section come from [CD20]; however, we prove certain properties of the masks. We first recall the definition of α -geodesic and conical α -geodesic.

Definition 5.20. [CD20]

Let X be graph, d its graph metric and $\alpha \geq 0$. For any two vertices $x, a \in X$, t belongs to an α -geodesic between x and a if :

$$d(x, t) + d(t, a) \leq d(x, a) + \alpha.$$

Definition 5.21. [CD20, Definition 1.12.]

Let X be a graph, and $x, a \in X^{(0)}$. For $\rho \geq 0$ we denote by $\mathcal{E}_{a,x}(\rho)$ the set of edges e with $d(a, e) = \rho$ that are contained in a geodesic from a to x . We say that $t \in X$ belongs to an α -conical-geodesic between x and a if t is on an α -geodesic, $d(a, t) \leq d(a, x)$, and :

$$t \in \bigcap_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{a,x}(d(a, t))} \text{Cone}_{40\alpha}(e).$$

We denote by $U_\alpha[a, x]$ the set of points belonging to an α -conical-geodesic between x and a .

For each $\rho \geq 0$, we denote $\mathcal{S}_{a,x}(\rho)$ the slice of $U_\alpha[a, x]$ at distance ρ from a , that is the set :

$$\mathcal{S}_{a,x}(\rho) = \{t \in U_\alpha[a, x] \mid d(t, a) = \rho\}$$

of points in $U_\alpha[a, x]$ at distance ρ from a .

In the rest of the text, we set $\alpha = 2\delta$.

The following proposition shows that geodesics are included in the conical α -geodesics.

Proposition 5.22. [CD20, Proposition 1.13.(3)] For every $\rho \geq 0$, for all $v \in I_c(x, a)$ with $d_c(v, a) = \rho$, we have:

$$v \in \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(\rho).$$

Let us denote by $\text{Proba}(X_c)$ the set of finitely supported probability measure supported on the vertex of X_c .

We recall the definition of the flow step:

$$T : \begin{cases} \text{Proba}(X_c) \times X_c^{(0)} & \rightarrow \text{Proba}(X_c) \times X_c^{(0)} \\ (\eta, a) & \mapsto (T_a(\eta), a) \end{cases}$$

We recall here that δ is assumed to be an integer. Given a and x , we say that the step T_a at x is:

- *initial* if $d_c(a, x) > 5\delta$ is not a multiple of 5δ ,
- *regular* if $d_c(a, x) > 5\delta$ and $d(a, x)$ is a multiple of 5δ ,
- *ending* if a is of infinite valence and $1 < d_c(a, x) \leq 5\delta$, or if a has finite valence, $d_c(a, x) \leq 5\delta$ and there exists u such that $\alpha_u(a, x) > 1000\delta$,
- *stationary* in all other cases, i.e. in any of the following three cases:
 - $x = a$,
 - a is of infinite valence and x is a neighbor of a ,
 - a is of finite valence, $d_c(a, x) \leq 5\delta$ and for all u , $\alpha_u(a, x) \leq 1000\delta$.

We denote by δ_x the Dirac mass at x and define the flow step T by defining $T_a(\delta_x)$, for a, x two vertices of X and then extend by linearity on probability measures :

$$T_a\left(\sum_x \lambda_x \delta_x\right) = \sum_x \lambda_x T_a(\delta_x).$$

Definition 5.23. [CD20, Definition 2.1.] Let $a, x \in X_c^{(0)}$. We set $r_{a,x}$ to be the largest integer r such that $5\delta r < d_c(a, x)$.

- If the step T_a at x is either initial or regular, then $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(5\delta r_{a,x})$ as in Definition 5.21,
- If the step T_a at x is ending, and a has infinite valence then $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(1)$ at distance 1 from a . If the step is ending and a has finite valence, then $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the Dirac mass supported on the unique c minimizing $d_c(a, c)$ such that $\alpha_c(a, x) > 900\delta$,
- If the step T_a at x is stationary, then $T_a(\delta_x) = \delta_x$ (and $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \{x\}$).

See Figure 14.

This proposition shows that the flow is eventually constant.

Proposition 5.24. [CD20, Proposition 2.2.]

For all $a, x \in X_c^{(0)}$, the flow step from 5.23 is stationary in k : if $k > r_{a,x} + 1$, one has $T_a^{r_{a,x}+1}(\delta_x) = T_a^k(\delta_x)$.

The stationarity of the flow allows to define limits, the masks.

Definition 5.25. [CD20, Definition 2.3.]

Given any two vertices a and x of X_c , the mask of a for x is the probability measure given by:

$$\mu_x(a) = T_a^{R(a,x)}(\delta_x) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_a^k(\delta_x),$$

where $R(a, x)$ the minimal number of iterations of T_a on δ_x so that the stationary step is reached.

For $x \in X_c$, $a \in X_c^\infty$, $\mu_x(a)$ will play the role of a random representative of x on the coset associated to a .

Lemma 5.26. [CD20, Lemma 2.6.] Let $x, y \in X_c$, $a \in X_c$ and $d_c(a, x) = d_c(a, y)$.

If $d_c(x, y) \leq 8\delta$ and assume for both of them, the flow step is regular. Then we have:

$$\text{supp}(T_a(\delta_x)) \cap \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_y)) \neq \emptyset.$$

The following proposition shows that masks have uniformly bounded diameter, see Figure 14.

Proposition 5.27. [CD20, Proposition 2.4.]

For all $x \in X_c$, for all $a \in X_c^\infty$, $a \neq x$, the measure $\mu_x(a)$ is supported by the 1-neighborhood of a . Moreover, if e is the first edge of a geodesic segment $[a, x]_c$, the measure $\mu_x(a)$ is supported by $\text{Cone}_{160\delta}(e)$.

For all $x \in X_c$, for all $a \in X_c \setminus X_c^\infty$, $\mu_x(a)$ is supported by $\text{Cone}_{1160\delta}(a)$.

In particular, the supports of the masks are uniformly bounded. To be more precise, we set $C = \text{diam}(\text{Cone}_{1160\delta}(e))$, and we have $\text{diam}(\mu_x(a)) \leq \text{diam}(\text{Cone}_{1160\delta}(e)) \leq C$.




Figure 14: The mask of x on a

In the rest of the section, C will denote the constant of Proposition 5.27 when we talk about $\text{Proba}_C(P_i)$.

The following proposition says that when the flow passes a large angle, this large angle acts as a check point.

Proposition 5.28. [CD20, Proposition 2.7.]

Let a, x be vertices in X_c . If there exists $u \in I_c(a, x)$ such that $\angle_u(a, x) > (2000\delta)^2$, then for any y at distance 1 from x , we have that :

$$\mu_x(a) = \mu_y(a) = \mu_u(a).$$

The next proposition shows that for two sources of the flow, any point on a geodesic between those two sources has disjoint masks for each of those sources.

Proposition 5.29. [CD20, Proposition 2.12.]

If $d_c(x, y) \geq 10\delta$ and if $a \in G$, at distance at least 5δ from both x and y , and $a \in [x, y]_c$ for some geodesic,

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| = 2.$$

With the following crucial property, we can control in terms of angle the difference between the masks of two points x and y close to each other at a point a far away from them.

Proposition 5.30. [CD20, Proposition 2.11.]

There exist two constants $\kappa < 1$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that, for all $a \in X_c$, for every $x_1, x_2 \in X_c$ such that $d_c(x_1, x_2) = 1$, if x is among x_1, x_2 , closer to a , then for all geodesic $[x, a]_c$, if $\Theta(x, a)$ denotes the sum of angles on the geodesic $[x, a]_c$, then if

$$d_c(a, x) + \Theta(x, a) \geq R_0,$$

one has:

$$\|\mu_{x_1}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_2}(a)\| \leq \kappa^{d_c(a,x)+\Theta(a,x)}.$$

The following corollary is a reformulation of Proposition 5.30.

Corollary 5.31. *There exists a constant $\kappa < 1$ and $R_0 > 0$ such that, for all $x, y \in X_c$ at distance 1 from each other, for all $a \in X_c$ and for all geodesics $[x, a]_c, [y, a]_c$, if $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a), \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(y, a)$ denotes respectively the sum of angles greater than $(2000\delta)^2$ on the geodesic $[x, a]_c, [y, a]_c$.*

For any $R \geq R_0$, if $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) + d_c(x, a) \geq R$ one has:

- $\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \leq \kappa^{R-1}$,
- and $\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \leq \kappa^{\min(\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) + d_c(x, a), \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(y, a) + d_c(y, a))}$.

Proof. We fix two geodesics $[x, a]_c$ and $[y, a]_c$. We set $\Theta(x, a)$ the sum of angles on the geodesic $[x, a]_c$, respectively $\Theta(y, a)$ for the geodesic $[y, a]_c$.

If $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) > 0$, then there exists $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $\angle_u(a, x) > (2000\delta)^2$, then according to Proposition 5.28:

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| = 0.$$

The same holds for y , so let us assume that $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) = 0$ and $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(y, a) = 0$.

We take R_0 as in Proposition 5.30 and $R \geq R_0$, therefore we get what follows.

If x is closer to a than y , then:

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \leq \kappa^{d_c(a,x)+\Theta(a,x)} \leq \kappa^{d_c(a,x)+\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a,x)} \leq \kappa^{R-1}.$$

If y is closer to a than x , then $d_c(a, x) + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, y) = d_c(a, y) + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, x) - 1 \geq R - 1$ and:

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \leq \kappa^{d_c(a,y)+\Theta(a,y)} \leq \kappa^{d_c(a,y)+\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a,y)} \leq \kappa^{R-1}.$$

Moreover, we remark that:

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \leq \kappa^{\min(\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) + d_c(x, a), \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(y, a) + d_c(y, a))}.$$

□

The following proposition will be crucial for defining the strongly bolic metric. It shows that for p large enough, for all $x, y \in X_c$ the difference of masks of x and y belongs to l_p .

Proposition 5.32. *There exists $p_0 > 1$ such that for all $p > p_0$ and for all $x, y \in X_c$:*

$$\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^p$$

is convergent.

Proof. According to [CD20, Corollary 2.13.], the proposition is true for $x \in G$ and $y \in X_c$.

Let assume that $x, y \in X_c^\infty$. Let $x_0 \in G$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} &\leq \left(\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_{x_0}(a)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \left(\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_{x_0}(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &< \infty \quad (\text{according to [CD20, Corollary 2.13.]}) \end{aligned}$$

This proves the proposition. □

The following proposition shows that, for neighbors, there is a uniform bound on this sum. Although this result is used in [CD20], it is not stated explicitly; we include a proof here for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 5.33. *Let p_0 as in Proposition 5.3. For all $p > p_0$, there exists $D > 0$, which depends only on p such that for all $x, y \in X_c$ with $d_c(x, y) = 1$, we have:*

$$\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a) \Delta \mu_y(a)\|^p \leq D.$$

Proof. By Definition 3.6 of the coned-off graph, two adjacent vertices cannot both have finite valence. Let assume that $x \in G, y \in X_c$ and that $d_c(x, y) = 1$. For all $a \in X_c$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_x(a) \Delta \mu_y(a)\| &= \|x \cdot \mu_1(x^{-1}a) \Delta x \mu_{x^{-1}y}(x^{-1}a)\| \\ &= \|\mu_1(x^{-1}a) \Delta \mu_{x^{-1}y}(x^{-1}a)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the inequality of the proposition is equivalent to the fact that for all $x \in X_c$, such that $d_c(1, x) = 1$, there exists $D > 0$ independent of x such that:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_1(a) \Delta \mu_x(a)\|^p \leq D.$$

Similarly to the proof of Corollary 2.13. in [CD20], we consider the set $S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(R, G) = \{g \in G, d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(1, g) = R\}$. Since $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}$ is quasi-isometric to d_G , there exists $A \geq 1$ and $\gamma_G > 1$ such that $S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(R, G)$ has cardinality less than $A\gamma_G^R$. We denote by $S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(R)$ the union of $S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(R, G)$ and of vertices $x \in X_c^\infty$ such that $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(1, g) = R$. Its cardinality is at most $A'\gamma_G^R$ for a certain A' related to the number of parabolic subgroups.

κ denotes the constant of Proposition 5.30 and Corollary 5.31. Then using Corollary 5.31, for R large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{a \in S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(R)} \|\mu_1(a) \Delta \mu_x(a)\|^p \leq (\kappa^{R-1})^p A' \gamma_G^R.$$

This inequality with the fact that p is chosen in Proposition 5.3 such that moreover $\kappa^p \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_G}$, proves that the sum $\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_1(a) \Delta \mu_x(a)\|^p$ converges and does not depend on x . \square

The next lemma will be useful to describe the vertices of infinite valence, for which masks of neighbors do not intersect. We recall that for all $x, y \in X_c$,

$$I_c(x, y) := \{z \in X_c \mid d_c(x, y) = d_c(x, z) + d_c(z, y)\}.$$

Lemma 5.34. *For all $x \in X_c$ and all $a \in X_c^\infty$ with $a \neq x$, for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$, we have:*

$$u \in \text{supp}(\mu_x(a)).$$

Proof. There are four cases to consider:

1. If $d_c(a, x) = 1$, x is the only vertex in $I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, x) = 1$, so $u = x$. The first step is stationary, thus $\mu_a(x) = \delta_x$ and $x \in \text{supp}(\mu_x(a))$.
2. If $1 < d_c(a, x) \leq 5\delta$, then the first step of the flow is ending. Therefore $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(1)$ and according to Proposition 5.22, for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$, we have $u \in \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(1)$ so:

$$u \in \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_x)).$$

For the next steps the flow is stationary, therefore for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$, we have:

$$u \in \text{supp}(\mu_x(a)).$$

Let us assume now that $d_c(a, x) > 5\delta$. We set $r_{a,x}$ as in Definition 5.23 to be the largest integer r such that $5\delta r < d_c(a, x)$.

3. If the first step of the flow is regular. We can show by induction that for all $k \in \{0, \dots, r_{a,x} - 1\}$, for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = (r_{a,x} - k)5\delta$, we have:

$$u \in \text{supp}(T_a^{k+1}(\delta_x)).$$

For the initialization, $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(5\delta r_{a,x})$. Thereby for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$, $d_c(a, u) = 5\delta r_{a,x}$, we have:

$$u \in \text{supp}(T_a^1(\delta_x)).$$

Let us assume that the results hold for some $k \in \{0, \dots, r_{a,x} - 2\}$. Then for all $v \in I_c(a, x)$ with $d_c(a, v) = (r_{a,x} - k)5\delta$, we have:

$$v \in \text{supp}(T_a^{k+1}(\delta_x)).$$

A new step of the flow gives the fact that, for all $v \in I_c(a, x)$ with $d_c(a, v) = (r_{a,x} - k)5\delta$, for all $u \in I_c(a, v)$ with $d_c(a, u) = (r_{a,x} - (k+1))5\delta$:

$$u \in \text{supp}(T_a^1(\delta_v)) \subset \text{supp}(T_a^{k+2}(\delta_x)).$$

To conclude the proof of the induction, we just have to remark that the set of such u with $d_c(a, u) = (r_{a,x} - (k+1))5\delta$ and such that there exists $v \in I_c(a, x)$ with $d_c(a, v) = (r_{a,x} - k)5\delta$ with $u \in I_c(a, v)$ is exactly the set of $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = (r_{a,x} - (k+1))5\delta$.

Then, for all $v \in I_c(a, x)$ with $d_c(a, v) = 5\delta$, we have:

$$v \in \text{supp}(T_a^{r_{a,x}}(\delta_x)),$$

and therefore $\text{supp}(\mu_v(a)) \subset \text{supp}(\mu_x(a))$ for such v .

A new use of the first point of the proof gives the fact that for all $v \in I_c(a, x)$ with $d_c(a, v) = 5\delta$, for all $u \in I_c(v, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$:

$$u \in \text{supp}(\mu_v(a)).$$

To conclude, we only have to remark that the set of such u is exactly the set of $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$.

4. If the first step of the flow is initial, then $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(5\delta r_{a,x})$, therefore, for all $v \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, v) = 5\delta r_{a,x}$, we have:

$$v \in \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_x)),$$

and in the limit we get:

$$\text{supp}(\mu_v(a)) \subset \text{supp}(\mu_x(a)).$$

The previous point gives the fact that for all $v \in I_c(v, a)$ such that $d_c(a, v) = 5\delta r_{a,x}$, and for all $u \in I_c(v, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$, we have:

$$u \in \text{supp}(\mu_v(a)).$$

To conclude, we have to remark that the set of such u is exactly the set of $u \in I_c(x, a)$ such that $d_c(a, u) = 1$.

□

Here, we provide a description of the vertices for which the masks of neighboring points do not intersect.

Proposition 5.35. *Let $x, y \in X_c$ with $d_c(x, y) = 1$, for all $a \in X_c^\infty$ with:*

$$\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) = \emptyset,$$

we have:

$$a \in \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(\{x, y\}).$$

Proof. Let $a \in X_c^\infty$. If $a = x$ or $a = y$, the result is clear, so we assume that $a \neq x, a \neq y$.

If $d_c(x, a) \neq d_c(y, a)$, we can assume that $d_c(x, a) > d_c(y, a)$. Since $d_c(x, y) = 1$, we know that $y \in I_c(x, a)$. According to Proposition 5.34, for all $u \in I_c(y, a)$ and $d_c(a, u) = 1$, we have:

$$u \in \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)).$$

Moreover, $u \in I_c(y, a) \subset I_c(x, a)$, so $u \in \text{supp}(\mu_x(a))$ and then:

$$\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore, we can assume that $d_c(x, a) = d_c(y, a)$. We can also assume that the angles between a and x , and between a and y are bounded above by $(2000\delta)^2$. Otherwise, a use of Proposition 5.28 will give that $\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) = \text{supp}(\mu_y(a))$. Therefore, to prove the proposition, we just have to prove that:

$$d_c(a, x) \leq (2000\delta)^2.$$

We will, in fact, prove that $d_c(a, x) \leq 10\delta$.

Let us assume that $d_c(a, x) > 10\delta$. We will show that $\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) \neq \emptyset$. We have two cases to consider.

- If the flow step for x and y is regular. Since $d_c(x, y) = 1 \leq 8\delta$ and $d_c(x, a) = d_c(y, a)$, we can apply Lemma 5.26 to see that:

$$\text{supp}(T_a(\delta_x)) \cap \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_y)) \neq \emptyset,$$

thus we deduce that $\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) \neq \emptyset$.

- If the flow step for x and y is initial. Since $d_c(a, x) > 10\delta$, there exists $k > 1$ such that $T_a(\delta_x)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,x} = \mathcal{S}_{a,x}(5k\delta)$ and $T_a(\delta_y)$ is the uniform probability measure supported by the slice $\mathcal{S}_{a,y} = \mathcal{S}_{a,y}(5k\delta)$.

Let us consider $x' \in I_c(x, a)$ and $y' \in I_c(y, a)$ such that $d_c(x', a) = d_c(y', a) = 5k\delta$, we know that $x' \in \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_x))$ and that $y' \in \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_y))$. Moreover, by δ -hyperbolicity, we remark that $d_c(x', y') \leq 2\delta + 1 \leq 8\delta$. Since $k > 1$, the flow step for x' and y' is regular, then a new use of Lemma 5.26 give that:

$$\text{supp}(T_a(\delta_{x'})) \cap \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_{y'})) \neq \emptyset.$$

Since $\text{supp}(T_a(\delta_{x'})) \cap \text{supp}(T_a(\delta_{y'})) \subset \text{supp}(T_a^2(\delta_x)) \cap \text{supp}(T_a^2(\delta_y))$, we conclude that:

$$\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore, we know that $d_c(a, x) \leq 10\delta \leq (2000\delta)^2$ and thus $a \in \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(\{x, y\})$.

□

With the following corollary, we count the number of masks that do not intersect for each pair of points.

Corollary 5.36. *Let us fix $x, y \in X_c$. Let us assume that $d_c(x, y) = n$.*

Consider a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between x and y in X_c .

We order $[x, y]_c$ in the following sense: $[x, y]_c = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $d_c(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

We set:

$$\mathcal{A} := \{a \in X_c^\infty \mid \exists i_0 \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\} \text{ such that } \text{supp}(\mu_{x_{i_0}}(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_{x_{i_0+1}}(a)) = \emptyset\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)$ and therefore there exists a constant $L > 0$, which depends on the hyperbolicity constant and on the function of uniform finesse of X_c only, such that :

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq L d_c(x, y).$$

Proof. Let $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then by definition there exists $i_0 \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ such that:

$$\text{supp}(\mu_{x_{i_0}}(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_{x_{i_0+1}}(a)) = \emptyset.$$

According to Proposition 5.35, we have:

$$a \in \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(\{x_{i_0}, x_{i_0+1}\}).$$

According to Proposition 3.14, there exists $L > 0$ such that, for all $e \in X_c^{(1)}$:

$$|\text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(e)| \leq L.$$

Thereby :

$$\mathcal{A} \subset \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}) = \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c).$$

And to conclude :

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \left| \bigcup_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}(\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}) \right| \leq L n \leq L d_c(x, y).$$

□

5.4 Definition of pseudo-metric associated to every vertex of the coned-off graph

In the rest of the text, G will denote a group hyperbolic relative to admissible subgroups 5.7. Let X_c denote one of its coned-off graphs. Let d_b denote the strongly bolic pseudo-distance in the set of probability measures with support of diameter at most C , without distinction in the parabolic P_i , where C is the constant of Proposition 5.27. Let P_i be a parabolic subgroup, $g \in G$, $\mu, \nu \in \text{Proba}_C(gP_i)$, we set:

$$d_b(\mu, \nu) := d_b(g^{-1}\mu, g^{-1}\nu).$$

This is well defined since d_b is P_i -invariant.

For all $a \in X_c$, we will define a pseudo-metric, which will serve as a crucial tool in the construction of the strongly bolic metric.

Definition 5.37. *Let $x, y \in G$ we set:*

- when $a \in X_c^\infty$, $d_a(x, y) := d_b(\mu_x(a), \mu_y(a))$, where d_b is the strongly bolic metric on the associated parabolic,

- when $a \in X_c \setminus X_c^\infty$, $d_a(x, y) := \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|$.

In particular, for all $a \in X_c$, the associated function d_a is a pseudo-metric.

The following lemma will be used to prove the crucial result that allows us to have precise control on d_a .

We recall that for all $x, y \in X_c$, for all $M > 0$, $\Theta'(x, y)$ denotes the minimal sum of angles on a geodesic between x and y and $\Theta'_{>M}(x, y)$ denotes the minimal sum of angles greater than M on a geodesic between x and y .




Figure 15: Angles on the sides of triangles $[\tilde{a}, t, \tilde{u}]$ are bounded by 100δ .

Lemma 5.38. *Let $[x, y]_c$ be a geodesic in X_c , $u \in [x, y]_c$ and $a \in X_c$, and $M > 100\delta$. Let $t \in X_c$ be a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$.*

There exist two geodesics $[u, a]_c$, $[t, a]_c$ such that:

$$\Theta'_{>M}(a, u) \geq \Theta'_{>M}(a, t) - 12\delta,$$

where $\Theta'_{>M}(a, u)$, $\Theta'_{>M}(a, t)$ denotes the sum of angles greater than M on $[a, u]_c$, $[a, t]_c$ respectively. In particular, we have:

$$\Theta'_{>M}(a, u) \geq \Theta'_{>M}(a, t) - 12\delta,$$

Proof. We can assume that $u \in [y, t]_c$. We choose a geodesic triangle $[u, a, t]_c$ as in Theorem 3.23 in which the triangle $[\tilde{u}, \tilde{a}, \tilde{t}]_c$ fits nicely and is such that $[u, t]_c \subset [x, y]_c$, see Figure 15.

To begin, let us note that $\tilde{t} \in [y, t]_c \subset [x, y]_c$ and $\tilde{t} \in [t, a]_c$ then $\tilde{t} = t$ since t is a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$.

In the case, where t, \tilde{a}, \tilde{u} are not all different, we have $[a, t]_c \subset [a, u]_c$ and the result follows directly.

Let us assume that t, \tilde{a}, \tilde{u} are all different. Let us denote, $\Theta'_{>M}(a, u)$ the sum of angles greater than M on $[a, u]_c$. In the case where $a \neq \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge of $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$. We denote by e_2 the edge of $[\tilde{a}, t]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2$ and e'_2 the edge of $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e'_2$. In the same way, we denote by f_1 the edge of $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}]_c$ such that $\tilde{u} \in f_1$ and in the case where $\tilde{u} \neq u$, f_2 the edge of $[\tilde{u}, u]_c$ with $\tilde{u} \in f_2$. According to Theorem 3.23, the angles along $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}]$ are bounded by 100δ , and therefore:

- $\Theta'_{>M}(a, u) = \Theta'_{>M}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)]_{>M} + [\angle_{\tilde{u}}(f_1, f_2)]_{>M} + \Theta'_{>M}(\tilde{u}, u),$
- and $\Theta'_{>M}(a, t) = \Theta'_{>M}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)]_{>M},$

with the convention that the angles $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2), \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2), \angle_{\tilde{a}}(f_1, f_2)$ are equal to zero when e_1, e_2, f_1 are not defined.

According to the triangular inequality and to Proposition 3.24, we have:

$$|\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2) - \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)| \leq \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_2, e'_2) \leq 12\delta.$$

This gives the first inequality of the proposition, the last point follows directly. \square

The following counting lemma will be useful later on.

Lemma 5.39. *There exists a constant $A \geq 1$ and $\gamma_G > 1$, such that for all $x \in G$, for all integer n :*

$$|\{a \in X_c \mid d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(x, a) \leq n\}| \leq A\gamma_G^n.$$

Proof. The argument is similar to the proof of Proposition 5.33 combined with Corollary 3.18. \square

This lemma shows that if a point a belongs to a cone around a geodesic, the sum of the angles between the point a and its projection onto the geodesic is uniformly bounded.

Lemma 5.40. *Let $x, y \in X_c$ and $a \in X_c$, and $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$, there exists an integer $C_0 > 0$ such that $a \in \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)$ implies that:*

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \leq C_0.$$

Proof. Since $a \in \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)$, we know that $d_c(a, t) \leq (2000\delta)^2$.

Moreover, there exists a point $u \in [x, y]_c$ and a geodesic from u to a such that all angles in this geodesic are bounded by $(2000\delta)^2$.

Therefore, according to Lemma 5.38, we get that:

$$\Theta'_{(2000\delta)^2}(t, a) \leq 12\delta.$$

Hence:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \leq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta,$$

and with $C_0 = (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$ we get the desired result. \square

With this proposition, we can control the difference between two consecutive masks on a geodesic toward a point a using the distance from a to this geodesic.

Proposition 5.41. *Let $x, y \in G$ and $a \in X_c$. We choose a geodesic $[x, y]_c = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $d_c(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, with $n = d_c(x, y)$. Let $i_0 \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ such that x_{i_0} is projection of a on $[x, y]_c$. If $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x_{i_0}) \geq R_0$, with R_0 the constant of Corollary 5.31, we have the following, for all $i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$:*

$$\|\mu_{x_i}(a) \Delta \mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)\| \leq \kappa^{-24\delta} \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) + |i - i_0|},$$

where κ denotes the constant of Proposition 5.30.

Proof. Let $i \in \llbracket 0, i_0 - 1 \rrbracket$. If $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x_{i_0}) \geq R_0$, according to Lemma 5.38, there are two geodesics from a to x_i and from a to x_{i+1} respectively, such that the sums of angles greater than $(2000\delta)^2$ on these geodesics are equal to $\Theta'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x_{i_0})$.

Therefore, according to the second point of Corollary 5.31, we have the following:

$$\|\mu_{x_i}(a) \Delta \mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)\| \leq \kappa^{\Theta'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x_{i_0}) + \min(d_c(a, x_i), d_c(a, x_{i+1}))}.$$

According to Lemma 4.7, since x_{i_0} is the projection of a on $[x, y]_c$, we have the following:

- $d_c(a, x_i) \geq d_c(a, x_{i_0}) + d_c(x_{i_0}, x_i) - 24\delta \geq d(a, x_{i_0}) + i_0 - i - 24\delta$,
- $d_c(a, x_{i+1}) \geq d_c(a, x_{i_0}) + d_c(x_{i_0}, x_{i+1}) - 24\delta \geq d_c(a, x_{i_0}) + i_0 - (i+1) - 24\delta$.

Thus $\min(d_c(a, x_i), d_c(a, x_{i+1})) \geq d_c(a, x_{i_0}) + i_0 - i - 24\delta$ and we have:

$$\|\mu_{x_i}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)\| \leq \kappa^{-24\delta} \kappa^{-d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a,t)-(i_0-i)}.$$

The same proof applies when $i \in \llbracket i_0, n-1 \rrbracket$. \square

The following theorem is the most important result of the section. For all $x, y \in G$ and for all $a \in X_c^\infty$ sufficiently far from $[x, y]_c$, it allows us to control $d_a(x, y)$ by a decreasing exponential of the distance in the group from a to the geodesic $[x, y]_c$.

Theorem 5.42. *Let $x, y \in G$ and $a \in X_c$, we choose a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between x and y . Let $t \in X_c$ be a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$. There exists $C_1 > 0$ and $K_1 > 0$ such that $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) > C_1$ implies that:*

$$d_a(x, y) \leq K_1 \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a,t)},$$

where κ denotes the constant of Proposition 5.30.

Proof. Let us denote $n := d_c(x, y)$. We order $[x, y]_c$ in the following sense: $[x, y]_c = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $d_c(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Let $i_0 \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket$ such that $t = x_{i_0}$. We will start to prove that for all $a \in X_c$ such that for $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) > C_0$, with C_0 the constant of Lemma 5.40, we have:

$$d_a(x, y) \leq C(\|\mu_{x_0}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_1}(a)\| + \dots + \|\mu_{x_{n-1}}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_n}(a)\|),$$

with C the constant of Proposition 5.27.

If a is of finite valence, this is clear. Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} d_a(x, y) &= \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| \\ &\leq \|\mu_{x_0}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_1}(a)\| + \dots + \|\mu_{x_{n-1}}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_n}(a)\| \\ &\leq C(\|\mu_{x_0}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_1}(a)\| + \dots + \|\mu_{x_{n-1}}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_n}(a)\|) \text{ (since } C \geq 1\text{).} \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $a \in X_c^\infty$, if $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) > C_0$, we know according to Lemma 5.40, that $a \notin \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)$. Therefore, according to Corollary 5.36, for all $i \in \llbracket 0, n-1 \rrbracket$, $\text{supp}(\mu_{x_i}(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)) \neq \emptyset$ and according to Definition 5.7, we have:

$$d_a(x_i, x_{i+1}) \leq C\|\mu_{x_i}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)\|.$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} d_a(x, y) &\leq d_a(x_0, x_1) + \dots + d_a(x_{n-1}, x_n) \\ &\leq C(\|\mu_{x_0}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_1}(a)\| + \dots + \|\mu_{x_{n-1}}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_n}(a)\|). \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume further that $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) > R_0$, the constant of Proposition 5.41. We can apply Proposition 5.41 to get what follows.

$$\begin{aligned} d_a(x, y) &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|\mu_{x_i}(a)\Delta\mu_{x_{i+1}}(a)\| \right) \text{ (since } C \geq 1\text{)} \\ &\leq C \kappa^{-24\delta} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a,t)+|i-i_0|} \text{ (Proposition 5.41)} \\ &\leq C \kappa^{-24\delta} \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a,t)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{i_0} \kappa^i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-i_0-1} \kappa^i \right) \\ &\leq C \kappa^{-24\delta} \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a,t)} \frac{2}{1-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$

Then with $C_1 = \max(C_0, R_0)$ and $K_1 = C \kappa^{-24\delta} \frac{2}{1-\kappa}$, we get the desired result. \square

5.5 Comparison between angles and masks at vertices of infinite valence

In this section, we show that for points x, y in the coned-off graph, for all $a \in X_c^\infty$, d_a is quasi-isometric to the angle between x and y as seen from a .

Proposition 5.43. *There exist $A, B > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in X_c$ and $a \in X_c^\infty$, $a \neq x, y$:*

$$\frac{1}{A}d_a(x, y) - B \leq \angle_a(x, y) \leq Ad_a(x, y) + B.$$

Proof. We will start to prove that for all $u, v \in X_c$ and $a \in X_c^\infty$ such that $d_c(u, a) = 1$ and $d_c(v, a) = 1$, there exist $A > 0$ such that :

$$\frac{1}{A}d_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) \leq \angle_a(x, y) \leq Ad_b(\delta_u, \delta_v).$$

If we denote gH the parabolic coset associated to a for $g \in G$ and H a subgroup of G , we denote by d_H the graph distance in H . Therefore $d_H(u, v)$ is the length of the shortest path in the 1-neighborhood of a between u, v in X_c .

We set the two edges $e = \{a, u\}$ and $f = \{a, v\}$. This path avoids a , then by definition of angles:

$$\angle_a(e, f) \leq d_H(u, v).$$

Moreover, according to Definition 5.7, there exists $\beta > 1$, such that :

$$\frac{1}{\beta}d_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) - \beta \leq d_H(u, v) \leq \beta d_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) + \beta.$$

Therefore,

$$\angle_a(e, f) \leq \beta d_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) + \beta.$$

For the converse inequality, assume that $\angle_a(u, v) = n$ and denote by u_1, \dots, u_n the vertices on a shortest path from u to v that avoids a . Let us denote \tilde{u}_i the projection of each u_i on gH . Then looking at the triangle $[\tilde{u}_i, u_i, \tilde{u}_{i+1}]$, we get a path of length smaller than $8\delta + 2$, which avoids a , then $\angle_a(\tilde{u}_i, u_i, \tilde{u}_{i+1}) \leq 8\delta + 2$. Using the fact that X_c is uniformly fine, there are finitely many transitions $\tilde{u}_i^{-1}u_i\tilde{u}_{i+1}$. Thus, there exists $K > 0$, such that $d_H(\tilde{u}_i, u_i, \tilde{u}_{i+1}) \leq K$. Thus, $d_H(u, v) \leq nK \leq \angle_a(u, v)K$.

With the first point, we conclude that there exists $A > 1$ such that:

$$\frac{1}{A}d_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) - A \leq \angle_a(u, v) \leq Ad_b(\delta_u, \delta_v) + A.$$

In particular, the inequalities apply for all $x, y \in X_c$, for all $a \in X_c^\infty$ and for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ and $v \in I_c(y, a)$ such that $d_c(u, a) = d_c(v, a) = 1$.

Moreover, according to Definition 5.23, $\delta_u = \mu_u(a)$ since the first of the flow is stationary and according to Lemma 5.34, $u \in \text{supp}(\mu_x(a))$. Therefore, by Definition 5.7, we have:

$$d_b(\delta_u, \mu_x(a)) \leq 2C.$$

In the same way, we have $d_b(\delta_v, \mu_y(a)) \leq 2C$, then for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ and $v \in I_c(y, a)$ such that $d_c(u, a) = d_c(v, a) = 1$, we have:

$$\frac{1}{A}d_b(\mu_x(a)\mu_y(a)) - \frac{1}{A}2C - A \leq \angle_a(u, v) \leq Ad_b(\mu_x(a)\mu_y(a)) + A2C + A.$$

Since this inequality is true, for all $u \in I_c(x, a)$ and $v \in I_c(y, a)$ such that $d_c(u, a) = d_c(v, a) = 1$, we have:

$$\frac{1}{A}d_a(x, y) - B \leq \angle_a(x, y) \leq Ad_a(x, y) + B,$$

with for some B and $d_a(x, y) = d_b(\mu_x(a), \mu_y(a))$ by Definition 5.37.

□

5.6 The strongly bolic metric

In this subsection, we will define the strongly bolic metric and prove that it is indeed a metric.

We need some preliminary lemmas before defining it.

Lemma 5.44. *Let $M > 6\delta$. Let $x, y \in X_c$, a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between x and y and $z \in \text{Cone}_M([x, y]_c)$. Then for all $v \in X_c$, $v \neq x, y, z$, we have:*

- $\alpha_v(x, z) \leq 2M$,
- or $\alpha_v(z, y) \leq 2M$.

Proof. We will prove by contradiction that there exists no v such that:

- $\alpha_v(x, z) > 2M$,
- $\alpha_v(z, y) > 2M$.

In the case, where $z \in [x, y]_c$, if there exists a such v this means according to Proposition 3.5 that $v \in [x, z]_c \cap [z, y]_c$, which is not possible.

Suppose that $z \notin [x, y]_c$, we denote by t a projection of z on $[x, y]_c$. Since $z \in \text{Cone}_M([x, y]_c)$, for all $v \neq t$, we have:

$$\alpha_v(z, t) \leq M,$$

moreover we have:

$$\alpha_t(x, z) \leq M, \alpha_t(z, y) \leq M.$$

This implies directly that $t \neq v$. We apply the triangle inequality two times and we get:

- $2M < \alpha_v(x, z) \leq \alpha_v(x, t) + \alpha_v(t, z)$,
- $2M < \alpha_v(y, z) \leq \alpha_v(y, t) + \alpha_v(t, z)$.

Therefore, we find again according to Proposition 3.5 that $v \in [x, t]_c \cap [t, y]_c$, which is a contradiction. \square

The following lemma is an analogue of Lemma 4.6 in the coned-off graph for the coned-off distance plus the sum of angles along a geodesic.




Figure 16: The projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$ lies in $[x, z]$, t is the projection of a on $[z, y]_c$.

Lemma 5.45. Let $x, y \in X_c$, we choose $[x, y]_c$ a geodesic between x and y . Let $z \in \text{Cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$, we choose two geodesics $[x, z]_c$ and $[z, y]_c$ between x, z and z, y respectively. Let $a \in X_c$ such that $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$. We denote by $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[z, y]_c$. Then there exists a constant $V \geq 0$ independent of x, y, z, a such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - V - \angle_t(a, z),$$

where α_2^2 is the constant defined in Proposition 3.19.

Proof. We choose $x, y, z, a, t \in X_c$ under the same assumptions as in the lemma. The result is clear when $z = t$, so we suppose that $z \neq t$. We know according to Lemma 4.6 with the right constant that there exists $V > 0$, that $d_c(a, t) \geq d_c(a, z) - V$. We consider a triangle $[a, z, t]_c$ as in Theorem 3.23. We can choose the side $[z, t]_c$ so that $[z, t]_c \subset [z, y]_c$. We note that as t is the projection of a on $[z, y]_c$, $\tilde{t} = t$ (see Figure 16). We denote by $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t)$, $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, z)$ the sum of angles greater than $2000\delta^2$ on $[a, t]_c, [a, z]_c$ respectively. There are two cases to consider.

In the first case, we assume that \tilde{a}, \tilde{z}, t are all different. If $a \neq \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge on $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2, e'_2 the edges of $[\tilde{a}, t]_c, [\tilde{a}, z]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2 \cap e'_2$. If $z \neq \tilde{z}$, we denote by f_1, f_2 the edges of $[a, \tilde{z}]_c, [z, \tilde{z}]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{z} \in f_1 \cap f_2$, see Figure 16. We consider $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2), \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2), \angle_{\tilde{z}}(f_1, f_2)$ with the convention that the angles are equal to zero in the cases where the edges are not defined.

Then according to Theorem 3.23, we have:

- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2},$
- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + [\angle_{\tilde{z}}(f_1, f_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{z}, z).$

To begin, let us remark that:

$$|\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2) - \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)| \leq \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_2, e'_2) \leq 12\delta,$$

according to Proposition 3.24.

We will show now by contradiction that:

$$[\angle_{\tilde{z}}(f_1, f_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{z}, z) = 0.$$

Therefore, we assume that:

- there exists $v \in]z, \tilde{z}[$, such that $\angle_v(z, a) > (2000\delta)^2$.
- or $\angle_{\tilde{z}}(f_1, f_2) > (2000\delta)^2$.

We denote by u a projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, let us recall that $u \in [x, z]_c$. Assume that we are in the first case, then there exists $v \in]z, \tilde{z}[$ such that:

$$\angle_v(z, y) > (2000\delta)^2.$$

Since u is a projection of z on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, we also have the following:

$$\angle_v(a, u) \leq 12\delta.$$

By the triangular inequality, we get the following:

$$\angle_v(u, z) \geq 2000\delta - 12\delta.$$

Since $u \in [x, z]_c$, we have:

$$\angle_v(x, z) \geq 2000\delta - 12\delta.$$

Then we get a contradiction with Lemma 5.44.

In the case where $\angle_{\tilde{z}}(f_1, f_2) > (2000\delta)^2$, we have $\angle_{\tilde{z}}(z, a) > (2000\delta)^2$. By definition of \tilde{z} , we have $\angle_{\tilde{z}}(z, y) > (2000\delta)^2 - 12\delta$ according to Proposition 3.24. Since u is the projection of $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, we have:

$$\angle_{\tilde{z}}(a, u) \leq 12\delta.$$

Therefore:

$$\angle_{\tilde{z}}(z, u) \geq 2000\delta - 12\delta,$$

and since $u \in [x, z]_c$, we get,

$$\angle_{\tilde{z}}(x, u) \geq 2000\delta - 12\delta$$

then we get a contradiction according to Lemma 5.44.

We conclude by applying Proposition 3.19.

In the second case, the triangle $[z, a, t]_c$ is a tripod, since t is a projection of a on $[z, y]_c$, we have $t \in [a, z]_c$. Therefore:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) + [\angle_t(z, a)]_{(2000\delta)^2}.$$

We conclude again by an application of Proposition 3.19. □

This lemma allows us to control the angle $\angle_t(a, z)$ from the Lemma 5.45.

Lemma 5.46. *Let $x, y \in X_c$, we choose $[x, y]_c$ a geodesic between x and y . Let $z \in \text{Cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$, we choose two geodesics $[x, z]_c$ and $[z, y]_c$ between x, z and z, y respectively. Let $a \in X_c$ such that $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$. We denote by $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[z, y]_c$. If $\angle_t(z, a) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$ then:*

$$|\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| = 0.$$

Proof. We will use Proposition 5.28 to prove that in this case:

$$\mu_x(a) = \mu_z(a).$$

According to 5.28, we have $\mu_z(a) = \mu_t(a)$.

We denote by $u \in [x, z]_c$ a projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$. Therefore, we have:

$$\angle_t(a, u) \leq 12\delta.$$

Therefore:

$$\angle_t(z, u) \geq (2000\delta)^2,$$

and since $u \in [x, z]_c$, we get,

$$\angle_t(x, u) \geq (2000\delta)^2.$$

Then another use of Proposition 5.28 gives:

$$\mu_x(a) = \mu_t(a).$$

Therefore, we finally have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ &= |\theta(d_b(\mu_t(a), \mu_y(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_t(a), \mu_y(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_t(a), \mu_t(a)))| \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following lemma is an analog of Lemma 4.7 in the coned-off graph for the coned-off distance plus the sum of angles along a geodesic.

Lemma 5.47. *There exists a constant $W \geq 0$ such for all $x, y \in X_c$, every geodesic $[x, y]_c$, for all $a \in X_c$, let $t \in X_c$ be a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$, for all $z \in [x, y]_c$ we have:*

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} (d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) + d_c(t, z)) - W,$$

where α_2 is a constant defined in Proposition 3.19.

Proof. According to Lemma 4.7, we have:

$$d_c(a, z) \geq d_c(a, t) + d_c(t, z) - 24\delta.$$

Then, according to Lemma 5.38, there exist two geodesics $[a, t]_c, [a, z]_c$ such that:

$$\Theta_{(2000\delta)^2}(z, a) \geq \Theta_{(2000\delta)^2}(t, a) - 12\delta,$$

where $\Theta_{(2000\delta)^2}(z, a)$ and $\Theta_{(2000\delta)^2}(t, a)$ denotes the sum of angles greater than $(2000\delta)^2$ on these two geodesics.

Then, we conclude by an application of Proposition 3.19. \square

The following lemma is an analogue of Lemma 4.8 in the framework of relatively hyperbolic groups.

Lemma 5.48. *Let be $x, y \in X_c$, we choose $[x, y]_c$ a geodesic between x and y . Let be a vertex $z \in \text{cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$. We choose two geodesics between $[x, z]_c$ and $[z, y]_c$ between x, z and z, y respectively.*

Let $a \in X_c, u \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$ and $v \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$. There exists $Z > 0$ which depends only on δ , such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) - Z - \alpha_u(a, v).$$

Proof. According to Lemma 4.8 with the appropriate constant, there exists $Z > 0$ which depends on δ only such that:

$$d_c(a, u) \geq d_c(a, v) - Z.$$

To conclude the proof of the lemma, we need to prove for all $w \in X_c, w \neq v, u$ that:

$$\alpha_w(u, v) \leq 300\delta$$

First let us prove this fact.

Let t denote a projection of z on $[x, y]_c$.

We start by proving by contradiction that:

$$\alpha_z(u, v) \leq 300\delta.$$

Let assume that:

$$\alpha_z(u, v) > 300\delta.$$

Since v is the projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, we have that:

$$\alpha_z(a, v) \leq 12\delta.$$

Let us assume that $v \in [x, z]_c$ without loss of generality, then we get:

$$\alpha_z(u, x) > 300\delta,$$

this implies that $z \in [x, u]_c \subset [x, y]_c$. To conclude, according to the triangle inequality, we have:

$$\angle_z(a, u) \geq \angle_z(u, v) - \angle_z(a, v) > 12\delta,$$

which contradicts the fact that u is a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$. With the same idea, we have also that:

$$\angle_t(u, v) \leq 300\delta.$$

When $w \neq z, t$, we will bound the angles between u and t , the angles between v and z and conclude thanks to the triangle inequality and the fact that the angles between z and t are bounded.

Let assume that there exists $w \neq v, w \neq z$ such that:

$$\angle_w(v, z) > 100\delta.$$

According to Proposition 3.5, this implies that $w \in [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$. Moreover, since v is the projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, we have that:

$$\angle_w(a, v) \leq 12\delta.$$

Let assume without loss of generality that $v \in [x, z]_c$, then we get that:

$$\angle_w(x, z) > 100\delta.$$

Thus:

$$\angle_w(x, t) \geq \angle_w(x, z) - \angle_w(x, t) \geq 100\delta - (26\delta + 2) > 12\delta.$$

Therefore $w \in [x, t]_c \subset [x, y]_c$.

However:

$$\angle_w(a, u) \geq \angle_w(u, v) - \angle_w(a, v) > 12\delta,$$

which contradicts the fact that u is a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$. In the same way every angle between u and t is bounded by 100δ . Thus for all $w \neq z, t$, we have:

$$\angle_w(u, v) \leq \angle_w(u, t) + \angle_w(t, z) + \angle_w(z, v) \leq 300\delta.$$

We now show that this fact allows us to conclude. Let us consider a triangle $[a, u, v]$ as in Theorem 3.23. Let assume first that this triangle is a tripod. If $u \in [a, v]_c$, we have:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) + [\angle_u(a, v)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(u, v) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) + [\angle_u(a, v)]_{(2000\delta)^2},$$

according to Inequality 5.6 and we conclude according to Proposition 3.19.

If $u \notin [a, v]_c$, we denote by w the center of the tripod and we have:

- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, w) + [\angle_w(a, v)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(w, v)$
- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, w) + [\angle_w(a, u)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(w, u)$

According to Inequality 5.6, we have $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(w, v) = 0$. To control $[\angle_w(a, v)]_{(2000\delta)^2}$, we apply the triangular inequality to get:

$$|\angle_w(a, v) - \angle_w(a, u)| \leq \angle_w(u, v),$$

and we use again Inequality 5.6.

Let assume now that $[a, u, v]$ is not a tripod, then $\tilde{a}, \tilde{u}, \tilde{v}$ are all different. If $a \neq \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge on $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2, e'_2 the edges of $[\tilde{a}, v]_c$, $[\tilde{a}, u]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2 \cap e'_2$. If $v \neq \tilde{v}$, we denote by f_1, f_2 the edges of $[a, \tilde{v}]_c$, $[\tilde{v}, \tilde{v}]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{v} \in f_1 \cap f_2$. We consider $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)$, $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)$, $\angle_{\tilde{v}}(f_1, f_2)$ with the convention that the angles are equal to zero in the cases where the edges are not defined. We get:

- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2},$
- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + [\angle_{\tilde{v}}(f_1, f_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{v}, v).$

According to Inequality 5.6, we have:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{v}, v) = 0.$$

According to Proposition 3.24, $|\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2) - \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)|$ is bounded. and finally according to Proposition 3.24, $\angle_{\tilde{v}}(f_1, f_2)$ is close to $\angle_{\tilde{v}}(v, u)$, which is bounded according to Equation 5.6.

We conclude by an application of Proposition 3.19. \square

This lemma allows us to control the angle $\angle_u(v, a)$ from the Lemma 5.48.

Lemma 5.49. *Let be $x, y \in X_c$, we choose $[x, y]_c$ a geodesic between x and y . Let be a vertex $z \in \text{cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$. We choose two geodesics between $[x, z]_c$ and $[z, y]_c$ between x, z and z, y respectively.*

Let $a \in X_c$, $u \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$ and $v \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$. If $\angle_u(a, v) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$ then:

$$|\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| = 0.$$

Proof. We assume whiteout loss of generality that $v \in [x, z]_c$. We will use Proposition 5.28 to prove that in this case:

$$\mu_x(a) = \mu_z(a).$$

According to the triangular inequality for angles, we have:

$$\angle_u(a, x) \geq \angle_u(a, v) - \angle_u(v, x).$$

In the case where $\angle_u(v, z) \geq 12\delta$, this implies that $u \in [v, x]_c$ and then the case that $\angle_u(a, v) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$ is in contradiction with the fact that v is the projection of a on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$. Thus:

$$\angle_u(a, x) \geq (2000\delta)^2.$$

According to Proposition 5.28, we get that $\mu_x(a) = \mu_u(a)$.

The same idea applies to prove that $\mu_z(a) = \mu_u(a)$.

Therefore, we finally have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ &= |\theta(d_b(\mu_u(a), \mu_y(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_u(a), \mu_y(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_u(a), \mu_u(a)))| \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proposition 5.50. *There exists a real number $P \geq p_0 > 1$, where p_0 is the real number of Proposition 5.3 and a constant $\sigma > 0$ such that for all $x \in G$:*

$$\sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha_2^4} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x)} \leq \sigma.$$

where κ is the constant of Proposition 5.30, α_2 the constant of Proposition 3.19.

Proof. We fix $x \in X_c$.

According to Lemma 5.39, there exist $A \geq 1$ and $\gamma_G > 1$ independent of x such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the set, $S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(n) = \{a \in X_c, d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x) = n\}$ has cardinality less than $A\gamma_G^n$ according to Lemma 5.39. Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $P \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\sum_{a \in S_{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}}(n)} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, x)} \leq \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha^2} n} A\gamma_G^n.$$

We choose P such that $\kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha^2}} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_G}$, therefore the sum converges and does not depend on x . \square

We define here a function from \mathbb{R}_+ to \mathbb{R}_+ which is equal to the identity up to a multiplicative constant for large values and equal to $t \mapsto t^P$ for small values. The strongly bolic metric will be defined as the sum of the d_a , for all $a \in X_c$, to which we apply this function. The idea is that when the contribution of a parabolic is small, the metric will be similar to the one in the hyperbolic case. When the contribution of a parabolic is large, we will rely on the strong bolicity of d_a .

Definition 5.51. Let t_0 be a constant with $t_0 \geq A((2000\delta)^2 + 18\delta) + AB + 2$, where A, B the constants of Proposition 5.43.

We define $\theta : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as:

$$\theta(t) = \begin{cases} t^P & \text{if } t \leq t_0 \\ t_0^{P-1}t & \text{if } t \geq t_0 \end{cases}$$

where P is the real number of Proposition 5.50.

Let us check that θ is a lipschitz function.

Lemma 5.52. θ is Pt_0^{P-1} -lipschitz.

Proof. θ is differentiable everywhere except at t_0 and $|\theta'| \leq Pt_0^{P-1}$.

θ is clearly Pt_0^{P-1} -lipschitz on $[0, t_0]$ and on $[t_0, \infty[$.

Let $s < t_0 < t$.

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(t) - \theta(s) &= \theta(t) - \theta(t_0) + \theta(t_0) - \theta(s) \\ &\leq Pt_0^{P-1}(t - s). \end{aligned}$$

\square

We notice here that for all $a \in X_c$, $x, y \in G$ when the value $d_a(x, y)$ is large then a has infinite valence.

Lemma 5.53. Let $x, y \in G$ and $a \in X_c$ such that $d_a(x, y) \geq t_0$, then:

- $a \in X_c^\infty$,
- $\angle_a(x, y) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 18\delta$ and in particular every geodesic between x and y goes through a .

Proof. Let $x, y \in G$ and $a \in X_c$, $d_a(x, y) \geq t_0 \geq A((2000\delta)^2 + 18\delta) + AB$ with A, B the constant of Proposition 5.43. By definition, for all $a \in G$, for all $x, y \in G$, $d_a(x, y) \leq 2$. As $t_0 \geq 2$, $a \in X_c^\infty$.

Moreover, according to Proposition 5.43, we have $\angle_a(x, y) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 18\delta$.

Finally, this fact implies that a belongs to every geodesic between x and y according to Proposition 3.12. \square

Lemma 5.54. For all $x, y \in G$, the sum

$$\sum_{a \in X_c} d_a(x, y)^P,$$

is finite.

Proof. According to Proposition 5.3, for all $x, y \in X_c$, there is a finite number of $a \in X_c$ such that :

$$\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| = 2.$$

Otherwise the sum $\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^{p_0}$ would diverge, with p_0 the integer of Proposition 5.3.

Then the set $\mathcal{E}_{x,y} := \{a \in X_c \mid \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| = 2\}$ is finite.

Moreover, for all $a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{E}_{x,y}$, we have $\text{supp}(\mu_x(a)) \cap \text{supp}(\mu_y(a)) \neq \emptyset$, then according to Definition 5.7:

$$d_a(x, y) \leq C \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|.$$

Therefore :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a \in X_c} d_a(x, y)^P &= \sum_{a \in \mathcal{E}_{x,y}} d_a(x, y)^P + \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{E}_{x,y}} d_a(x, y)^P \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{E}_{x,y}} d_a(x, y)^P + C^P \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{E}_{x,y}} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^P \quad (\text{according to the previous remark}) \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{E}_{x,y}} d_a(x, y)^P + C^P \sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^P \\ &< \infty \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.3 and the fact that } P \geq p_0). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. □

Just as in the case of hyperbolic groups, we define here a function which will be the metric up to a constant.

Proposition 5.55. *For all $x, y \in G$,*

$$D(x, y) := \sum_{a \in X_c} \theta(d_a(x, y))$$

is finite.

Proof. Let $x, y \in G$, let $[x, y]_c$ be a geodesic between x and y . Let $a \in X_c$ such that $d_a(x, y) \geq t_0$, then according to Lemma 5.53, we have $a \in [x, y]_c$.

Therefore we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} D(x, y) &= \sum_{a \in [x, y]_c} \theta(d_a(x, y)) + \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus [x, y]_c} \theta(d_a(x, y)) \\ &= \sum_{a \in [x, y]_c} \theta(d_a(x, y)) + \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus [x, y]_c} d_a(x, y)^P \quad (\text{according to the previous remark}) \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in [x, y]_c} \theta(d_a(x, y)) + \sum_{a \in X_c} d_a(x, y)^P \\ &< \infty \quad (\text{according to Lemma 5.54 and the fact that } [x, y]_c \text{ is finite.}) \end{aligned}$$

□

The following property is crucial, as it will allow us to show that D satisfies a coarse triangular inequality. It will also be used to prove that the strongly bolic metric is weakly geodesic. The outline of the proof is very similar to the proof of Proposition 4.9 in the case of hyperbolic groups, with some additional technical difficulties. The next proposition applies in particular for two vertices $x, y \in G$ and every $z \in G \cap I_c(x, y)$.




Figure 17: If $a_0 \in \mathcal{B}$, then a_0 is a checkpoint and $\mu_z(a) = \mu_y(a)$.




Figure 18: a projects onto z_i on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$

Proposition 5.56. *There exists $\nu > 0$, such that for all $x, y \in G$ and all geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between x and y and for all $z \in G$ such that $z \in \text{Cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$, we have:*

$$|D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y)| \leq \nu.$$

Proof. Let $x, y \in G$ and $z \in G$ under the assumption of the proposition. We will show that there exists $\nu > 0$ such that:

$$|D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y)| \leq \sum_{a \in X_c} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \leq \nu.$$

Let us remark first that as $z \in \text{Cone}_{26\delta+2}([x, y]_c)$, according to Lemma 5.44, for all $a \in X_c$, we have:

$$d_a(x, z) < t_0 \text{ or } d_a(z, y) < t_0,$$

with t_0 the constant of Definition 5.51.

Therefore for all $a \in X_c$, assuming without loss of generality that $d_a(z, y) < t_0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| &\leq Pt_0^{P-1}|d_a(x, y) - d_a(x, z)| + \theta(d_a(z, y)) \text{ (according to Lemma 5.52)} \\ &\leq Pt_0^{P-1}d_a(z, y) + d_a(z, y)^P \\ &\leq (P+1)t_0^P, \end{aligned}$$

with P the real number of Proposition 5.50.

Let us denote by \mathcal{B} the set of $a \in X_c$ such that:

- $d_a(x, y) \geq t_0$,
- or $d_a(x, z) \geq t_0$,
- or $d_a(z, y) \geq t_0$.

We will start to show that:

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \leq 4t_0^P(P+1).$$

We consider a triangle $[x, y, z]_c$ as in Theorem 3.23.

According to Equation 5.6, we have that:

- $\mathcal{B} \cap [z, \tilde{z}] = \emptyset$,
- and $\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{B}$ implies that $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x} = \tilde{y}$.

Therefore, we have:

$$\mathcal{B} \subset ([x, \tilde{x}]_c \cup [\tilde{y}, y]_c) \cap X_c^\infty.$$

If $\mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c \neq \emptyset$, we define a_0 as the point in $\mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c$ closest to \tilde{x} , see Figure 17. We will show that, for all $a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c, a \neq a_0$, we have:

$$\mu_z(a) = \mu_{a_0}(a) \text{ and } \mu_y(a) = \mu_{a_0}(a),$$

and this will imply that:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ &= |\theta(d_b(\mu_x(a), \mu_{a_0}(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_x(a), \mu_{a_0}(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_{a_0}(a), \mu_{a_0}(a)))| \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

To do so, we will show that, for such a , we have $\alpha_{a_0}(a, z) \geq (2000\delta)^2$, and $\alpha_{a_0}(a, y) \geq (2000\delta)^2$ and we will apply Proposition 5.28. Since $a_0 \in [x, \tilde{x}]_c$, we know that $a_0 \notin [z, y]_c$, then according to Lemma 5.53, we know that $d_{a_0}(z, y) < t_0$. Then $a_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ implies that $d_{a_0}(x, y) \geq t_0$ or $d_{a_0}(z, y) \geq t_0$.

In the case where $d_{a_0}(x, y) \geq t_0$, we know according to Lemma 5.53, that $\alpha_{a_0}(x, y) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 6\delta$. As $a \in I_c(x, a_0)$, $\alpha_{a_0}(a, y) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta > (2000\delta)^2$ according to the second point of Proposition 3.12. Thus, we deduce that:

$$\alpha_{a_0}(a, z) \geq \alpha_{a_0}(a, y) - \alpha_{a_0}(y, z) \geq (2000\delta)^2,$$

since $a_0 \notin [y, z]_c$. We proceed in the same way for the case $d_{a_0}(x, z) \geq t_0$.

Therefore, when $\mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c \neq \emptyset$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ & \leq |\theta(d_{a_0}(x, y)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(x, z)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(z, y))| + |\theta(d_{\tilde{x}}(x, y)) - \theta(d_{\tilde{x}}(x, z)) - \theta(d_{\tilde{x}}(z, y))| \\ & \leq 2(P+1)t_0^P. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality is trivially true when $\mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c = \emptyset$, with the same computation for $\mathcal{B} \cap [\tilde{y}, y]_c$, we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ & = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x, \tilde{x}]_c} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ & + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [\tilde{y}, y]_c} |\theta(d_a(x, y)) - \theta(d_a(x, z)) - \theta(d_a(z, y))| \\ & \leq 4t_0^P(P+1). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we will show that there exists a constant ν_1 such that:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P| \leq \nu_1.$$

We have :

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P| \\ & + \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [z, y]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P|. \end{aligned}$$

We will bound from above the first sum, the same idea will apply to the second sum. For all $a \in X_c$ such that $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$, we denote by t a projection of a on $[z, y]_c$. We can suppose that $\alpha_t(a, z) < (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$, otherwise, according to Lemma 5.46, we have:

$$|d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P| = 0.$$

Then according to Lemma 5.45, there exists $V > 1$, independant of a , (up to a change of V), such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - V. \quad (4)$$

In the same way, with u a projection of a on $[x, y]_c$ and v a projection on $[x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c$, we can always suppose according to Lemma 5.49, that $\alpha_u(a, v) \leq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta$. According to the Lemma 5.45, there exists a constant $Z > 1$ (up to a change of Z), such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) - Z. \quad (5)$$

We obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P| \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P| + d_a(z, y)^P \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P| \\ & + \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} d_a(z, y)^P. \end{aligned}$$

To start with, we bound from above the sum:

$$\sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} d_a(z, y)^P.$$

Let $a \in X_c$ such that $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$. Let us denote $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[z, y]_c$. We have as noted in Inequality 4:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - V.$$

Then there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) \geq C_2 \implies d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq C_1.$$

Moreover, according to Corollary 3.18, as $z \in G$, the set $\{a \in X_c \mid d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) \leq C_2\}$ has cardinality less than $A\gamma_G^{C_2}$.

Thus, according to Theorem 5.42 and Lemma 5.45, for all $a \in X_c$ with $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$ and $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) \geq C_2$, we have:

$$d_a(z, y)^P \leq \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - PV} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, according to Lemma 5.53, for all $a \in X_c$ such that $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)$, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} d_a(z, y)^P \\ & \leq \sum_{\{a \in X_c \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} d_a(z, y)^P \\ & \leq A\gamma_G^{C_2} t_0^P + \sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - PV} \\ & \leq A\gamma_G^{C_2} t_0^P + \kappa^{-PV} \sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z)} \\ & \leq A\gamma_G^{C_2} t_0^P + \kappa^{-PV} \sigma \text{ (according to Proposition 5.50).} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Now, we will bound from above the sum:

$$\sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P|.$$

Let us denote $N := d_c(x, z)$. We order $[z, x]_c$ in the following sense: $[z, x]_c = \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ with $z_0 = z$, $z_N = x$ and $d_c(z_i, z_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq N-1$, see Figure 18.

Let us remark that, for all $a \in X_c$ with $d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, z_i)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) & \geq d_c(a, z) \\ & \geq d_c(a, z_i) + d_c(z_i, z) - 24\delta \\ & \geq d_c(a, z_i) + i - 24\delta \\ & \geq i - 24\delta. \end{aligned}$$

and also according to Lemma 5.47, on the geodesic $[x, z]_c$, we have:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} (i + d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)) - W.$$

Moreover, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, N\}$, for all $a \in X_c$, there exists a constant $C_3 \geq C_1$ such that for all $a \in X_c$, $d_c(a, z_i) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c)$ and $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i) \geq C_3$, we have according to Theorem 5.42 and to Inequality 5:

$$d_a(x, y) \leq \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i) - Z} \text{ and } d_a(x, z) \leq \kappa^{d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)}. \quad (8)$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, [x, z]_c)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, z_i)\}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P| \\ & \leq P \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, z_i)\}} \max(d_a(x, y)^{P-1}, d_a(x, z)^{P-1}) d_a(z, y) \text{ (according to the mean value theorem)} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_3} t_0^P \\ & + P \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{\{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B} \mid d_c(a, [x, z]_c \cup [z, y]_c) = d_c(a, z_i)\}} \max(d_a(x, y)^{P-1}, d_a(x, z)^{P-1}) \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z) - V} \text{ (according to Inequality 7)} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_3} t_0^P + P\kappa^{-V} t_0^{P-1} A \gamma_G^{C_1} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha^2}} + P\kappa^{\frac{-W}{V} - (P-1)Z - V} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha^2}} \sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\left(\frac{P-1}{\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{\alpha^4}\right) d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)} \text{ (according to Inequalities 8)} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_3} t_0^P + P\kappa^{-V} t_0^{P-1} A \gamma_G^{C_1} \frac{1 - \kappa^{\frac{N+1}{\alpha^2}}}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}} + P\kappa^{\frac{-W}{V} - (P-1)Z - V} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha^4}} \sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha^4} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)} \text{ (according to Proposition 5.50)} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_2} t_0^P + P\kappa^{-V} t_0^{P-1} A \gamma_G^{C_3} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}} + P\kappa^{\frac{-W}{\alpha^2} - (P-1)Z - V} \sigma \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha^2}} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_3} t_0^P + P\kappa^{-V} t_0^{P-1} A \gamma_G^{C_1} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}} + P\kappa^{\frac{-W}{\alpha^2} - (P-1)Z - V} \sigma \frac{1 - \kappa^{\frac{N+1}{\alpha^4}}}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^4}}} \\ & \leq PA\gamma_G^{C_3} t_0^P + P\kappa^{-V} t_0^{P-1} A \gamma_G^{C_1} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^2}}} + P\kappa^{\frac{-W}{\alpha^2} - (P-1)Z - V} \sigma \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha^4}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combined with Inequality 7, the sum:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x, y)^P - d_a(x, z)^P - d_a(z, y)^P|,$$

is bounded by a constant independent of x, y and z . This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

The next proposition shows that for two neighboring points of the same parabolic a , D is comparable to d_a .

Proposition 5.57. *There exists a constant $\Lambda > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in G$ and $a_0 \in X_c^\infty$, with $d_c(x, a_0) = d_c(a_0, y) = 1$, we have:*

$$|D(x, y) - t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y)| \leq \Lambda.$$

Proof. To begin, we remark that:

$$|\theta(d_{a_0}(x, y)) - t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y)| \leq 2t_0^P.$$

In fact, if $\theta(d_{a_0}(x, y)) = t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y)$, it is trivially true. When $\theta(d_{a_0}(x, y)) = d_{a_0}(x, y)^P$, then:

$$|\theta(d_{a_0}(x, y)) - t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y)| \leq d_{a_0}(x, y)^P + t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y) \leq 2t_0^P.$$

Moreover, according to Lemma 5.53, for all $a \in X_c, a \neq a_0$, we have: $\theta(d_a(x, y)) = d_a(x, y)^P$. Then:

$$|D(x, y) - t_0^{P-1} d_{a_0}(x, y)| \leq 2t_0^P + \sum_{a \in X_c, a \neq a_0} d_a(x, y)^P.$$

We will bound the last sum from above by a constant. Let us choose a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between x and y . According to Corollary 5.36, if $a \notin \text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)$, we have, for all $a \neq a_0$:

$$d_a(x, y) \leq d_a(x, a_0) + d_a(a_0, y) \leq C(\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_{a_0}(a)\| + \|\mu_{a_0}(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|).$$

As $d_c(x, y) \leq 2$, there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$ independent of x and y such that:

$$|\text{Cone}_{(2000\delta)^2}([x, y]_c)| \leq \lambda.$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in X_c, a \neq a_0} d_a(x, y)^P \\ & \leq \lambda t_0^P + \sum_{a \in X_c} C^P (\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_{a_0}(a)\| + \|\mu_{a_0}(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|)^P \\ & \leq \lambda t_0^P + C^P \left[\left(\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_{a_0}(a)\|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}} + \left(\sum_{a \in X_c} \|\mu_{a_0}(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^P \right)^{\frac{1}{P}} \right]^P \\ & \leq \lambda t_0^P + C^P 2^{\frac{1}{P}} D \text{ (according to Proposition 5.33).} \end{aligned}$$

With $\Lambda := t_0^P(\lambda + 2) + C^P 2^{\frac{1}{P}} D$, we get the desired inequality. \square

To conclude this subsection, it remains to show that D satisfies a coarse triangular inequality. The next lemma will be used to prove it.




Figure 19: Angles between u and v and between u and w are bounded

Lemma 5.58. *Let us consider $x, y, z \in X_c$ such that $I_c(x, y) \cap I_c(y, z) \cap I_c(z, x) = \emptyset$. Let $[x, y, z]_c$ be a triangle between x, y and z . There exists $u \in [x, y]_c \cap G$ such that:*

- $u \in \text{Cone}_{26+2}([x, z]_c)$,
- $u \in \text{Cone}_{26+2}([z, y]_c)$.

Proof. Since $I_c(x, y) \cap I_c(y, z) \cap I_c(z, x) = \emptyset$ are all different, a triangle $[x, y, z]_c$ is not a tripod. According to δ -hyperbolicity of X_c and [GdlH90, Proposition 21], $[x, y, z]_c$ admits a 4δ -quasicenter. Up to choosing neighbors, we can find:

- $u \in G \cap [x, y]_c$,
- $v \in [z, x]_c$,
- and $w \in [z, y]_c$,
- such that $d_c(u, v), d_c(u, w), d_c(v, w) \leq 8\delta + 1$,

see Figure 19.

Moreover, we could choose u, v, w such that:

- $|d_c(u, x) - d_c(v, x)| \leq 1$,
- $|d_c(u, y) - d_c(w, y)| \leq 1$,
- $|d_c(v, z) - d_c(w, z)| \leq 1$.

We will show that every angle between u and v is bounded, the proof is similar to the proof of [CD20, Proposition 1.10]. Let us denote by σ_0 a geodesic between u and v . Let us denote by σ_1 the subsegment of $[x, y]_c$ obtained from u and extended by 3δ in the direction of x , unless it reaches x before. (Otherwise, following the geodesics $[x, y]_c$ and $[x, z]_c$ provides a path of length at most $14\delta + 2$). Denote $\sigma_1^0 = u$ its initial point and σ_1^1 its endpoint. By hyperbolicity, there exists a segment at least 2δ long, σ_2 from σ_1^1 to $[x, z]_c$. Let us denote σ_3 , the subsegment of $[x, z]_c$ that closes the loop $\sigma_0\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3$. By the triangular inequality, σ_3 is at least of length $13\delta + 1$. This gives a loop of length $26\delta + 2$, then all the angles between u and v are bounded by $26\delta + 2$. The same proof applies to prove that $\angle_v(x, u) \leq 26\delta + 2$, $\angle_v(u, y) \leq 26\delta + 2$. We conclude by symmetry of the roles of u, v, w . □

We now prove that D satisfies a coarse triangular inequality.




Figure 20: Case where $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}$ are not all different and $t \in X_c^\infty$.

Proposition 5.59. *There exists a constant $C_{triangle} > 0$ such that for all $x, y, z \in G$:*

$$D(x, y) \leq D(x, z) + D(z, y) + C_{triangle}.$$

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in X_c$. We consider a triangle $[x, y, z]_c$. There are two cases to consider whether $I_c(x, y) \cap I_c(y, z) \cap I_c(z, x)$ is empty or not.

1. Let us assume that $I_c(x, y) \cap I_c(y, z) \cap I_c(z, x) \neq \emptyset$. There exists a vertex t belonging to the three intervals.

- In the case where $t \in G$, we can apply Proposition 5.56. Then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y) \\ & \leq D(x, t) + D(y, t) + \nu \\ & - D(x, t) - D(t, z) + \nu - D(y, t) - D(t, z) + \nu \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.56}) \\ & \leq 3\nu. \end{aligned}$$

- In the case where $t \in X_c^\infty$, we will apply Proposition 5.57 and the fact that for all $a \in X_c$, d_a verifies the triangular inequality. We denote t_x as the neighbor of t on $[x, t]_c$, t_y as the neighbor on $[t, y]_c$, and t_z as the neighbor on $[z, t]_c$, see Figure 20. Then, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y) \\ & \leq D(x, t_x) + D(t_x, t_y) + D(t_y, y) + 2\nu \\ & - D(x, t_x) - D(t_x, t_z) - D(t_z, z) + 2\nu \\ & - D(y, t_y) - D(t_y, t_z) - D(t_z, z) + 2\nu \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.56 applied three times}) \\ & \leq D(t_x, t_y) - D(t_y, t_z) - D(t_z, t_x) + 6\nu \\ & \leq t_0^{p'-1} d_a(t_x, t_y) + \Lambda - t_0^{p'-1} d_a(t_x, t_z) \\ & + \Lambda - t_0^{p'-1} d_a(t_y, t_z) + \Lambda + 6\nu \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.57}) \\ & \leq \Lambda t_0^{p'-1} (d_a(t_x, t_y) - d_a(t_x, t_z) - d_a(t_z, t_y)) + 6\nu \\ & \leq 6\nu \quad (\text{according to the triangular inequality for } d_a). \end{aligned}$$

2. Let us now assume that $I_c(x, y) \cap I_c(y, z) \cap I_c(z, x) = \emptyset$. According to Lemma 5.58, see Figure 19, there exist: $u \in G \cap [x, y]_c, v \in [x, z]_c$ such that:

- $u \in Cone_{26+2}([x, z]_c)$,
- $u \in Cone_{26+2}([z, y]_c)$.

According to Proposition 5.56, we have:

- $|D(x, y) - D(x, u) - D(u, y)| \leq \nu$,
- $|D(x, z) - D(x, u) - D(u, z)| \leq \nu$,
- $|D(z, y) - D(z, u) - D(u, y)| \leq \nu$

and thus:

$$\begin{aligned} & D(x, y) - D(x, z) - D(z, y) \\ & \leq D(x, u) + D(u, y) + \nu \\ & \quad - D(x, u) - D(u, z) + \nu - D(y, u) - D(u, z) + \nu \text{ (according to Proposition 5.56)} \\ & \leq 3\nu. \end{aligned}$$

With $C_{\text{triangle}} = 6\nu$, we get the result. □

Definition 5.60. We define the function $\hat{d}: G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by:

$$\hat{d}(x, y) = \begin{cases} D(x, y) + C_{\text{triangle}} & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y. \end{cases}$$

where C_{triangle} is the constant of Proposition 5.59.

Proposition 5.61. The function \hat{d} of Definition 5.60 is a metric on X_c .

Proof. By definition, \hat{d} is symmetric and $\hat{d}(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$.

The triangle inequality is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.59. □

The rest of the article will be dedicated to the proof of

5.7 The bolic metric is comparable to the group metric

In this section, we will show that the metric \hat{d} is coarsely smaller than the group metric, that is, there exists an increasing and unbounded function ρ_1 such that for all $x, y \in G$:

$$\rho_1(d_G(x, y)) \leq \hat{d}(x, y).$$

For the reverse inequality, since d is G -invariant G is finitely generated, we directly know that \hat{d} is smaller than G with linear control.

The fact that the strongly bolic metric is coarsely bigger than the group metric will be used to show that this metric is uniformly locally finite. The other inequality will be used to prove that the strongly bolic metric verifies the strongly- $B1$ condition.

In Subsection 5.8, we will use the fact that these two metrics are weakly geodesic to show that these two metrics are in fact quasi-isometric.

Proposition 5.62. There exists $M > 0$, such that for all $x, y \in G$:

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq M d_G(x, y).$$

Proof. We set S a generating of G associated to d_G . We set $M := \max_{s \in S} \hat{d}(1, s)$.

Let $x, y \in G$. Let $n := d_G(x, y)$. Then there exists $s_1, \dots, s_n \in S$ such that $x^{-1}y = s_1, \dots, s_n$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}(x, y) &= \hat{d}(1, x^{-1}y) \\ &\leq \hat{d}(1, s_1) + \hat{d}(1, s_2) + \dots + \hat{d}(1, s_n) \\ &\leq M d_G(x, y).\end{aligned}$$

□

We prove now the reverse inequality.

Proposition 5.63. *There exists an increasing and unbounded function ρ_1 such that, for all $x, y \in G$:*

$$\rho_1(d_G(x, y)) \leq \hat{d}(x, y).$$

Proof. Let $a \in X_c^\infty$, according to Proposition 5.43,

$$\angle_a(x, y) \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow d_a(x, y) \rightarrow \infty.$$

We fix a geodesic $[x, y]_c$. In the construction of the coned-off graph, two vertices of infinite valence cannot be adjacent, therefore:

$$|[x, y]_c \cap G| \geq \frac{1}{2} d_c(x, y).$$

Moreover, according to Proposition 5.29, if $d_c(x, y) \geq 10\delta$, for all $a \in [x, y]_c$ at distance at least 5δ from x and y , we have $\|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\| = 2$. Thus, if we suppose that $d_c(x, y) \geq 10\delta$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}D(x, y) &\geq \sum_{a \in [x, y]_c \cap G} \theta(d_a(x, y)), \\ &\geq \sum_{a \in [x, y]_c \cap G} \|\mu_x(a)\Delta\mu_y(a)\|^p \text{ (according to Definition 5.37),} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} d_c(x, y) 2^p - 10\delta \text{ (according to Proposition 5.29).}\end{aligned}$$

Then:

$$d_c(x, y) \rightarrow \infty \Rightarrow D(x, y) \rightarrow \infty.$$

To conclude, we use Theorem 3.17, the distance formula and Definition 5.60, to show that there exists an increasing and unbounded function ρ_1 , such that for all $x, y \in G$:

$$\rho_1(d_G(x, y)) \leq \hat{d}(x, y).$$

□

5.8 Weak geodesicity and quasi-isometry with d_G

In this section, we will show that the metric \hat{d} is weakly geodesic. We will use this fact and Subsection 5.7 to show that \hat{d} and d_G are, in fact, quasi-isometric.

Recall that a metric space (X, d) is said to be weakly geodesic if there exists $\eta \geq 0$ such that, for every pair of points $x, y \in X$ and every $t \in [0, d(x, y)]$, there exists a point $z \in X$ such that $d(x, z) \leq t + \eta$ and $d(z, y) \leq d(x, y) - t + \eta$.

Recall that the parabolic subgroups of G are admissible as in Definition 5.7. Therefore, we have assumed that for all parabolic subgroups P , for all $C > 0$, $\text{Proba}_C(P)$ admits a strongly bolic metric and these metrics are weakly geodesic. Thus, by taking the maximum of the weak geodesicity constants, we can assume that there exists $\varepsilon \geq 0$ such that d_b is ε -weakly geodesic, where d_b denotes the

associated strongly bolic metric, without distinction on the parabolic.

According to Proposition 5.56, for any pair of vertices $x, y \in X_c$, and for any geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between these two points, a vertex $z \in G \cap [x, y]_c$ satisfies the equality case of the triangle inequality for \hat{d} up to a bounded error.

However, this is not sufficient to show the weak-geodesicity of \hat{d} , since two adjacent vertices u and v of a parabolic vertex a can be at an arbitrarily large distance for \hat{d} . In this case, we will use the weak-geodesicity of d_b . The projection of the weak geodesic between u and v on the 1-neighborhood of a will allow us to construct a path in X_c between u and v for which the steps are bounded for \hat{d} and whose vertices satisfy the equality case of the triangle inequality up to a bounded error.

Proposition 5.64. *For all $a \in X_c^\infty$, for all $x, y \in G$ with $d_c(x, a) = d_c(a, y) = 1$, for all $t \in [0, d_a(x, y)]$, there exists $u \in G$ with $d_c(u, a) = 1$ such that:*

- $d_a(x, u) \leq t + 4C + \varepsilon$,
- $d_a(u, y) \leq d_a(x, y) - t + 4C + \varepsilon$,
- and $\angle_a(x, u) \geq 12\delta$, $\angle_a(u, y) \geq 12\delta$,

where ε is the weak geodesic constant of d_b and C is the constant of Proposition 5.27.

Proof. After applying a translation if needed, we denote by P the parabolic associated to a . Let $x, y \in G$ under the assumptions of the proposition. Recall that $d_a(x, y) = d_b(\delta_x, \delta_y)$. According to the ε -weak geodesicity of d_b , for $t \in [0, d_a(x, y)]$, there exists $\lambda \in \text{Proba}_C(P)$ such that:

- $d_b(\delta_x, \lambda) \leq t + \varepsilon$,
- $d_b(\lambda, \delta_y) \leq d_a(x, y) - t + \varepsilon$.

Furthermore, by adjusting ε if necessary, we can assume that:

$$d_b(\delta_x, \lambda) \geq A12\delta - AB + 2C, \quad d_b(\lambda, \delta_y) \geq A12\delta - AB + 2C,$$

where A, B are the constants of Proposition 5.43.

Let $u \in \text{supp}(\lambda)$, then $u \in G$ and according to the last point of Definition 5.7, we have:

$$d_b(\lambda, \delta_u) \leq 4C.$$

Therefore, we have:

- $d_b(\delta_x, \delta_u) \leq t + 4C + \varepsilon$,
- $d_b(\delta_u, \delta_y) \leq d_a(x, y) - t + 4C + \varepsilon$,
- $d_b(\delta_x, \delta_u) \geq A12\delta - AB$, $d_b(\delta_u, \delta_y) \geq A12\delta - AB$.

According to Proposition 5.43, the third point gives the following:

$$\angle_a(x, u) \geq 12\delta, \quad \angle_a(u, y) \geq 12\delta.$$

□

The next definition describes the weak geodesic in a parabolic or equivalently in the 1-neighborhood of a vertex of infinite valency.

Definition 5.65. (Privileged weak geodesic in a parabolic)

Let $a \in X_c^\infty$ and P the associated parabolic subgroup, for all $x, y \in G$ with $d_c(x, a) = d_c(a, y) = 1$, we call a privileged weak geodesic, denoted by $[x, y]_{d_a}$, a set of vertices in the 1-neighborhood of a with the following properties:

- $x, y \in [x, y]_{d_a}$,
- $[x, y]_{d_a}$ is a $(4C + \varepsilon)$ -weak geodesic,
- for all $u \in [x, y]_{d_a}, u \neq x, y$,

$$\angle_a(x, u) \geq 12\delta, \quad \angle_a(u, y) \geq 12\delta.$$

- $[x, y]_{d_a}$ is η -peakless and η -strongly-convex for some $\eta \geq 0$.

According to Proposition 5.64, for all $a \in X_c^\infty$, for all $x, y \in G$ with $d_c(x, a) = d_c(a, y) = 1$, there exists such a set of vertices $[x, y]_{d_a}$.

Definition 5.66. Let $x, y \in G$, such that $d_c(x, y) = n$. We consider a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between those two vertices ordered as follows $[x, y]_c = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $d_c(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$.

We set, (even if its depend on the choice of a geodesic):

$$[x, y]_{\hat{d}} := ([x, y]_c \cap G) \cup \bigcup_{x_i \in X_c^\infty} [x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]_{d_{x_i}}.$$




Figure 21: Weak geodesic between x and y with 3 points of infinite valency

Proposition 5.67. *The metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic.*

Proof. We will show that the set defined in Definition 5.66 is a weak geodesic between x and y .

Let $x, y \in G$, such that $d_c(x, y) = n$. We consider a geodesic $[x, y]_c$ between those two vertices ordered as follows $[x, y]_c = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ with $x_0 = x$, $x_n = y$ and $d_c(x_i, x_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. We consider the associated set $[x, y]_{\hat{d}} := ([x, y]_c \cap G) \cup \bigcup_{x_i \in X_c^\infty} [x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]_{d_{x_i}}$.

Let $z \in [x, y]_c \cap G$, according to Proposition 5.56, we have:

$$\hat{d}(x, z) + \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(x, y) \leq \nu + 2C_{triangle}.$$

Let $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $x_{i_0} \in X_c^\infty$. Let $z \in [x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}]_{d_{x_{i_0}}}$. According to Definition 5.65, we have:

$$\angle_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0-1}, z) \geq 12\delta, \quad \angle_{x_{i_0}}(z, x_{i_0+1}) \geq 12\delta.$$

Therefore, since $x_{i_0-1} \in I_c(x, x_{i_0})$ and $x_{i_0+1} \in I_c(x_{i_0}, y)$, we get that:

$$\angle_{x_{i_0}}(x, z) \geq 12\delta, \quad \angle_{x_{i_0}}(z, y) \geq 12\delta.$$

Thus, according to Proposition 3.12, we get that:

- $x_{i_0-1} \in I_c(x, z)$,
- and $x_{i_0+1} \in I_c(z, y)$.

We get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{d}(x, z) + \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(x, y) \\ & \leq D(x, x_{i_0-1}) + D(x_{i_0-1}, z) + D(z, x_{i_0+1}) + D(x_{i_0+1}, y) \\ & \quad - D(x, x_{i_0-1}) - D(x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}) - D(x_{i_0+1}, y) + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle} \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.56}) \\ & \leq D(x_{i_0-1}, z) + D(z, x_{i_0+1}) - D(x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}) + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle} \\ & \leq t_0^{P-1}(d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0-1}, z) + d_{x_{i_0}}(z, x_{i_0+1}) - d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1})) \\ & \quad + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle} \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.57}) \\ & \leq t_0^{P-1}(4C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle} \quad (\text{according to Definition 5.65}). \end{aligned}$$

Then for all $z \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$, we have:

$$\hat{d}(x, z) + \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(x, y) \leq t_0^{P-1}(2C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle}.$$

Hence, the image of map:

$$\hat{d}(x, \cdot) : [x, y]_{\hat{d}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

is contained in $[0, \hat{d}(x, y) + t_0^{P-1}(2C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle}]$, it contains 0 and $\hat{d}(x, y)$.

Let $z \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$. If $z \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}} - (\bigcup_{x_i \in X_c^\infty} [x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]_{d_{x_i}})$, there exists $z' \in [x, y]_c \cap G$ with $d_c(z, z') = 1$. According to Proposition 5.62, there exists $\tau > 0$ such that for all $z, z' \in G$ with $d_c(z, z') = 1$, we have:

$$|\hat{d}(x, z) - \hat{d}(x, z')| \leq \hat{d}(z, z') \leq \tau.$$

If $z \in \bigcup_{x_i \in X_c^\infty} [x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}]_{d_{x_i}}$, there exists $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, such that $x_{i_0} \in [x, y]_c \cap X_c^\infty$ and $z \in [x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}]_{d_{x_{i_0}}}$. According to Definition 5.65 of $[x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}]_{d_{x_{i_0}}}$, there exists $z' \in [x_{i_0-1}, x_{i_0+1}]_{d_{x_{i_0}}}$ such that:

$$|d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0-1}, z) - d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0-1}, z')| \leq 4C + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{d}(x, z) - \hat{d}(x, z')| & \leq |\hat{d}(x_{i_0}, z) - \hat{d}(x_{i_0}, z')| + 2\nu \\ & \leq t_0^{P-1}|d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0}, z) - d_{x_{i_0}}(x_{i_0}, z')| + 2\Lambda + 2\nu \\ & \leq t_0^{P-1}2C + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the image of the map:

$$\hat{d}(x, \cdot) : [x, y]_{\hat{d}} \rightarrow [0, \hat{d}(x, y) + t_0^{P-1}(4C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle}],$$

is $\max(\tau, t_0^{P-1}2K + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu)$ -dense in $[0, \hat{d}(x, y)]$, i.e. for every $t \in [0, \hat{d}(x, y)]$, there exists $z \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$ such that:

$$|\hat{d}(x, z) - t| \leq \max(\tau, t_0^{P-1}4C + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu).$$

It follows that $\hat{d}(x, z) \leq t + \max(\tau, t_0^{P-1}4C + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu)$, and according to the previous discussion, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(z, y) &\leq \hat{d}(x, y) - \hat{d}(x, z) + t_0^{P-1}(4C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle} \\ &\leq \hat{d}(x, y) - t + \max(\tau, t_0^{P-1}4C + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu) + t_0^{P-1}(4C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle}. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude (G, \hat{d}) is η -weakly geodesic for

$$\eta := \max(\tau, t_0^{P-1}4C + \varepsilon + 2\Lambda + 2\nu) + t_0^{P-1}(4C + \varepsilon) + 3\Lambda + 4\nu + 2C_{triangle}.$$

□

The fact that (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic allows us to improve the coarse equivalence between \hat{d} and d_G into a quasi-isometry.

Proposition 5.68. (G, \hat{d}) and (G, d_G) are quasi-isometric.

Proof. According to Proposition 5.62, there exists $M > 0$ such that for all $x, y \in G$, we have:

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \leq M d_G(x, y).$$

For the converse inequality, we use that \hat{d} is ε -weakly geodesic for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Let us consider a weak geodesic $\gamma = \{w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m\}$ between x and y , with $w_0 = x$, $w_m = y$. We assume further that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that $\hat{d}(w_i, w_{i+1}) \in [\beta, 2\beta]$ for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$. We remark that:

$$\hat{d}(x, y) \geq \sum_{i=0}^m \hat{d}(w_i, w_{i+1}) - m\varepsilon \geq m(\beta - \varepsilon).$$

Then:

$$m \leq \frac{1}{\beta - \varepsilon} \hat{d}(x, y).$$

Moreover, according to Proposition 5.63, there exists $\alpha_2 \geq 0$, such that for all $u, v \in G$ with $\hat{d}(u, v) \leq 2\beta$, we have:

$$d_G(u, v) \leq \alpha_2.$$

Thus:

$$d_G(x, y) \leq \sum_{i=0}^m d_G(w_i, w_{i+1}) \leq m\alpha_2 \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{\beta - \varepsilon} \hat{d}(x, y).$$

□

5.9 \hat{d} verifies weak- $B2'$

In this subsection, we will show that \hat{d} verifies weak- $B2'$. We recall, according to Definitions 5.7 and 5.65, there exists $\eta > 0$, such that for all $a \in X_c^\infty$, d_a satisfies $\eta - B2'$, and for all $x, y \in X_c$ with $d_c(x, a) = d_c(a, y) = 1$, there exists $[x, y]_{d_a}$ a sequence of vertices in the 1-neighborhood of a , such that $[x, y]_{d_a}$ is a η -weak geodesic, η -peakless and η -weakly convex.

Proposition 5.69. *Let $x_1, y_1 \in G$ and $x_2, y_2 \in G$ such that $x_2, y_2 \in I_c(x_1, y_1)$. There exists a geodesic between x_1 and y_1 and a geodesic between x_2 and y_2 in X_c , such that the associated weak geodesic $[x_1, y_1]_{\hat{d}}$ and $[x_2, y_2]_{\hat{d}}$ satisfy:*

$$[x_2, y_2]_{\hat{d}} \subset [x_1, y_1]_{\hat{d}}.$$

Proof. Let $x_1, y_1 \in G$, such that $d_c(x_1, y_1) = n$, $x_2, y_2 \in G$ such that $d_c(x_1, x_2) = l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $d_c(x_1, y_2) = k$. We consider a geodesic $[x_1, y_1]_c$ between those two vertices which contains x_2, y_2 between those two vertices ordered as follows $[x_1, y_1]_c = \{z_0, \dots, z_l, \dots, z_k, \dots, z_n\}$ with $z_0 = x_1$, $z_l = x_2$, $z_k = y_2$ $z_n = y_1$ and $d_c(z_i, z_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$.

We set the associated weak geodesic sequence as in Definition 5.66:

$$[x_1, y_1]_{\hat{d}} = ([x_1, y_1]_c \cap G) \cup \bigcup_{z_i \in X_c^\infty} [z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}]_{d_{z_i}},$$

with $[z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}]_{d_{z_i}}$ a weak geodesic sequence as in Definition 5.65.

Then $[x_2, y_2]_{\hat{d}} = ([x_2, y_2]_c \cap G) \cup \bigcup_{z_i \in X_c^\infty, i \in \{k, \dots, l\}} [z_{i-1}, z_{i+1}]_{d_{z_i}}$ is a weak geodesic sequence, according to Proposition 5.67 and is included in $[x_1, y_1]_{\hat{d}}$. □

Lemma 5.70. *Let $x, y \in G$, we denote by $[x, y]_c$ a geodesic between x and y and $[x, y]_{\hat{d}}$ the weak geodesic sequence associated to $[x, y]_c$ as in Definition 5.66. Let $z \in G$, we set $t \in X_c$ a projection of z on $[x, y]_c$. We set also $t_x, t_z \in [x, t]_c$ such that $d_c(t, t_x) = 1$ and $t_z \in [t, z]_c$ such that $d_c(t, t_z) = 1$. We have the following:*

- if $t \in G$, then $\hat{d}(z, x) \geq \hat{d}(z, t) + \hat{d}(t, x) - \nu - C_{triangle}$,
- otherwise $t_x, t_z \in G$ and $\hat{d}(z, x) \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_x) + \hat{d}(t_x, x) - \nu - C_{triangle}$,

where ν is the constant of Proposition 5.56 and $C_{triangle}$ is the constant of Proposition 4.10.

Proof. If $t \in G$, there are two cases to consider.

If $\angle_t(x, z) > 12\delta$, then t belongs to every geodesic between x and z , then $\hat{d}(z, x) \geq \hat{d}(z, t) + \hat{d}(t, x) - \nu - C_{triangle}$ according to Proposition 5.56. Otherwise, we set a the triangle $[x, z, t]$. We notice that angles between t and its projection on $[x, z]_c$ are bounded by $26\delta + 2$, then $t \in cone_{26\delta+2}([x, z]_c)$, then it satisfies again the assumptions of Proposition 5.56.

If $t \notin G$, we apply the same method to prove that $t_x, t_z \in cone_{26\delta+2}([x, z]_c)$ and we conclude according to Proposition 5.56. □

We prove here that \hat{d} satisfies weak- $B2'$. We conjecture the stronger property that \hat{d} is also η -strongly convex for some $\eta \geq 0$.

Proposition 5.71. *(G, \hat{d}) verifies weak $B2'$, i.e. there exists $\eta_1 \geq 0$ and a map $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$, such that:*

- m is a η_1 -middle point map, that is for all $x, y \in X$,

$$|2\hat{d}(x, m(x, y)) - \hat{d}(x, y)| \leq 2\eta_1,$$

$$|2\hat{d}(y, m(x, y)) - \hat{d}(x, y)| \leq 2\eta_1,$$

- for all $x, y, z \in X$,

$$\hat{d}(m(x, y), z) \leq \max(\hat{d}(x, z), \hat{d}(y, z)) + 2\eta_1,$$

- for every $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists $N(p) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $N \geq N(p)$, with $\hat{d}(x, z) \leq N$, $\hat{d}(y, z) \leq N$ and $\hat{d}(x, y) > N$, we have:

$$\hat{d}(m(x, y), z) \leq N - p.$$

Proof. According to Proposition 5.67 and 2.8, for all $x, y \in G$, there exists $m \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$ such that:

$$|2\hat{d}(x, m) - \hat{d}(x, y)| \leq 2\eta,$$

$$|2\hat{d}(y, m) - \hat{d}(x, y)| \leq 2\eta.$$

We will start to prove the first point, i.e there exists $\eta_1 \geq 0$ such that for all $x, y, z \in G$,

$$\hat{d}(m, z) \leq \max(\hat{d}(x, z), \hat{d}(y, z)) + 2\eta_1. \quad (9)$$

We denote by t a projection of z on $[x, y]_c$.




Figure 22: Case where t as finite valence

1. To begin, let us assume that $t \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$ see Figure 22. In this case $t \in G$ and we choose the right geodesics such that the associated weak-geodesic of Definition 5.66 satisfies $[x, y]_{\hat{d}} = [x, t]_{\hat{d}} \cup [t, y]_{\hat{d}}$, according to Proposition 5.69. By the symmetry of the roles of x and y , we can assume that $m \in [t, y]_{\hat{d}}$. In this case, we remark that $\hat{d}(z, y) \geq \hat{d}(z, t) + \hat{d}(t, y) - \nu - C_{triangle}$ according to Lemma 5.70. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(z, y) &\geq \hat{d}(z, t) + \hat{d}(t, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} \\ &\geq \hat{d}(z, t) + \hat{d}(t, m) + \hat{d}(m, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta \\ &\geq \hat{d}(z, m) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta. \end{aligned}$$

2. We assume in this case that $t \notin [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$, i.e. $t \in [x, y]_c \cap X_c^\infty$. We set t_x the vertex of $[x, t]_c$ such that $d_c(t_x, t) = 1$, t_y the vertex of $[t, y]_c$ such that $d_c(t_y, t) = 1$ and t_z the vertex of $[t, z]_c$ such that $d_c(t, t_z) = 1$.

- Let us assume that $d_c(m, t) = 1$ and $m \notin [x, y]_c$ see Figure 23. Equivalently this means that $m \in [t_x, t_y]_{\hat{d}}$.




Figure 23: Case where t has infinite valence and m is close to t

In this case, as d_t is peakless according to Definition 5.7, we have:

$$d_t(t_z, m) \leq \max(d_t(t_z, t_x), d_t(t_z, t_y)) + \eta.$$

Let us assume without loss of generality that:

$$d_t(t_z, m) \leq d_t(t_y, t_z) + \eta.$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{d}(z, y) \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle} \\ & \quad (\text{according to Lemma 5.70 applied two times}) \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + t_0^{P-1} d_t(t_z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle} - \Lambda \\ & \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.57}) \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + t_0^{P-1} d_t(m, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle} - \Lambda - 2t_0^{P-1}\eta \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(m, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle} - 2\Lambda - 2t_0^{P-1}\eta \\ & \quad (\text{according to Proposition 5.57}) \\ & \geq \hat{d}(m, z) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle} - 2\Lambda - 2t_0^{P-1}\eta. \end{aligned}$$

- Let us assume that $d_c(m, t) > 1$ or $m \in [x, y]_c$ in this case see Figure 24. We can assume by the symmetry of the roles between x and y that $m \in [t_y, y]_{\hat{d}}$. In this case we apply Lemma 5.70 to t_y and we get $\hat{d}(z, y) \geq \hat{d}(z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - \nu - C_{triangle}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(z, y) & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, m) + \hat{d}(m, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta \\ & \geq \hat{d}(z, m) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta. \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we have:

$$\hat{d}(z, m) \leq \max(\hat{d}(x, z), \hat{d}(y, z)) + 2\nu + 2C_{triangle} + 2\Lambda + 2t_0^{P-1}\eta.$$

Then \hat{d} satisfies Inequality 9 for some $\eta_1 > 0$.




Figure 24: Case where t as infinite valence and m far from t

We will now show that for every $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, there exists $N(p) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $N \geq N(p)$, with $\hat{d}(x, z) \leq N$, $\hat{d}(y, z) \leq N$ and $\hat{d}(x, y) > N$, we have :

$$\hat{d}(m, z) \leq N - p.$$

We will apply the same disjunction as the previous point. We still denote by t a projection of z on $[x, y]_c$.

1. Let us assume in this case that $t \in [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$, i.e $t \in G$. We assume without loss of generalities that $m \in [t, y]_{\hat{d}}$. Thus, according to a previous computation:

$$\hat{d}(z, y) \geq \hat{d}(z, m) + \hat{d}(m, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta.$$

By definition of m , we have:

$$\hat{d}(y, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta.$$

Then:

$$\hat{d}(z, m) \leq \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(m, y) + \nu + C_{triangle} + \eta \leq N - \frac{N}{2} + \nu + C_{triangle} + 2\eta.$$

Then for every $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, if we take N large enough, we have:

$$\hat{d}(z, m) \leq N - p.$$

2. Let us assume in this case that $t \notin [x, y]_{\hat{d}}$. We set t_x the vertex of $[x, t]_c$ such that $d_c(t_x, t) = 1$, t_y the vertex of $[t, y]_c$ such that $d_c(t_y, t) = 1$ and t_z the vertex of $[t, z]_c$ such that $d_c(t, t_z) = 1$.

- Let us assume that $d_c(m, t) > 1$ or $m \in [x, y]_c$ in this case. We can assume that $m \in [t_y, y]_{\hat{d}}$. This case is similar as the previous one. According to a previous computation, we have:

$$\hat{d}(z, y) \geq \hat{d}(z, m) + \hat{d}(m, y) - \nu - C_{triangle} - \eta.$$

We still have:

$$\hat{d}(y, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta.$$

Then again:

$$\hat{d}(z, m) \leq N - \frac{N}{2} + \nu + C_{triangle} + 2\eta.$$

Then for every $p \in \mathbb{R}_+$, if we take N large enough, we have:

$$\hat{d}(z, m) \leq N - p.$$

- Let us assume that $d_c(m, t) = 1$ and $m \notin [x, y]_c$. In this case, we have $m \in [t_x, t_y]_{\hat{d}}$. We rewrite $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \hat{d}(x, y)]$ the weak geodesic $[t_x, t_y]_{d_t}$. Let $p > 0$. Let us assume further that $\hat{d}(t_z, t_y) \geq \hat{d}(t_z, t_x)$, then according to the fact that \hat{d} satisfies Inequality 9 for some $\eta_1 > 0$, we have $\hat{d}(t_z, m) \leq \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \eta_1$.

If we assume that $\hat{d}(y, t_y) > p + 2C_{triangle} + 2\nu + \eta_1$.

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(z, m) &\leq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, m) \\ &\leq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \eta_1 \\ &\leq \hat{d}(z, y) - \hat{d}(y, t_y) + 2C_{triangle} + 2\nu + \eta_1 \\ &\leq N - p. \end{aligned}$$

If we assume that $\hat{d}(x, t_x) > \hat{d}(t_x, m) + p + C_{triangle} + \nu$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(z, m) &\leq \hat{d}(z, t_x) + \hat{d}(t_x, m) \\ &\leq \hat{d}(z, x) - \hat{d}(x, t_x) + C_{triangle} + \nu + \hat{d}(t_x, m) \\ &\leq N - p. \end{aligned}$$

Let us assume now that $\hat{d}(y, t_y) \leq p + 2C_{triangle} + 2\nu$ and $\hat{d}(x, t_x) \leq \hat{d}(t_x, m) + p + C_{triangle} + \nu$. We will use in the case the fact that d_t is η_2 -strongly convex for some $\eta_2 > 0$.

By definition of m , we have $\hat{d}(y, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta$.

Then:

$$\hat{d}(t_y, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta - \hat{d}(y, t_y) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta - p - 2C_{triangle} - 2\nu.$$

For the same reason, $\hat{d}(x, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta$. Thus:

$$2\hat{d}(t_x, m) + p + C_{triangle} + \nu \geq \hat{d}(x, t_x) + \hat{d}(t_x, m) \geq \frac{N}{2} - \eta,$$

then:

$$\hat{d}(t_x, m) \geq \frac{N}{4} - \frac{C_{triangle}}{2} - \frac{\nu}{2} - \frac{p}{2} - \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

Then for N large enough, there exists $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $m = \sigma(t)$, $t \in [\eta, 1 - \eta]$.

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}(t_x, t_y) &\geq \hat{d}(t_x, m) + \hat{d}(m, t_y) - C_{triangle} - \nu \\ &\geq \frac{3}{4}N - \frac{3}{2}(\eta + p) - \frac{5}{2}(C_{triangle} + \nu). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for N large enough, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$, we have:

$$\hat{d}(t_x, t_y) \geq \varepsilon(N + 2\nu + 2C_{triangle}).$$

In this case:

$$\hat{d}(z, y) \geq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - 2\nu - 2C_{triangle}.$$

Therefore:

$$\hat{d}(t_z, t_y) \leq N + 2\nu + 2C_{triangle}$$

Then:

$$\hat{d}(t_x, t_y) \geq \varepsilon \hat{d}(t_z, t_x).$$

Then, according to the fact that d_t is η_2 -peakless, there exists $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that we have:

$$\hat{d}(t_z, m) \leq (1 - \delta)\hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \eta_2.$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\hat{d}(t_z, t_y) &\geq \hat{d}(t_x, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) \\ &\geq \hat{d}(t_x, t_y) \\ &\geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}N. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for N large enough, we have:

$$\hat{d}(t_z, m) \leq \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) - p.$$

To conclude, we remark that:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{d}(z, m) &\leq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, m) \\ &\leq \hat{d}(z, t_z) + \hat{d}(t_z, t_y) + \hat{d}(t_y, y) - p \\ &\leq N - p.\end{aligned}$$

This proves finally that \hat{d} satisfies weakly- $B2'$.

5.10 \hat{d} verifies strong- $B1$

In this subsection, we prove that \hat{d} verifies strong-*B1*. We need some preliminary lemmas.

This lemma corresponds to Lemma 4.18 in the relatively hyperbolic context, as it takes angles into account.




Figure 25: Comparison of projections onto the geodesics $[x_1, y_1]_c$ and $[x_1, y_2]_c$ when the angle at y_1 is large.

Lemma 5.72. Let $r \geq 0$. Let $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in G$ such that $d'(x_1, x_2), d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Let $a \in X_c$ and let us denote:

- $t \in [x_1, y_1]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]_c$,
- $u \in [x_1, y_2]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_1, y_2]_c$,
- $v \in [x_2, y_1]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_2, y_1]_c$,
- $w \in [x_2, y_2]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_2, y_2]_c$.

There exists $\lambda_1 \geq 0$, which depends on r and δ only, such that:

- $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) - \angle_u(a, t) - \lambda_1$,
- $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, v) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) - \angle_v(a, t) - \lambda_1$,
- $d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, w) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) - \angle_w(a, t) - \lambda_1$,

where α_2 is the constant of Proposition 3.19.

Proof. We consider the geodesics $[x_1, y_1]_c$ and $[x_1, y_2]_c$. According to Lemma 4.18, we have that:

$$d_c(a, u) \geq d_c(a, t) - (r + \delta).$$

To conclude we need to control the sum of angles greater than $(2000\delta)^2$ between a and u by the sum of angles greater than $(2000\delta)^2$ between a and t .

1. If $\angle_{y_1}(x_1, y_2) \leq \max(r, 12\delta)$, we have $y_2 \in \text{cone}_{\max(r, 12\delta)}([x_1, y_1]_c)$. In this case, we apply the same proof as in Lemma 5.48, with x_1 playing the role of x , y_1 the one y and y_2 the one of z . We get a constant λ_1 which depends on r and δ only such that:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) - \angle_u(a, t) - \lambda_1,$$

where α_2 is the constant of Proposition 3.19.

2. It remains the case where $\angle_{y_1}(x_1, y_2) > \max(r, 12\delta)$, in this case $y_1 \in [x_1, y_2]_c$ according to Proposition 3.12 and $t \notin I_c(a, u)$. We consider a triangle $[a, u, t]$ as in Theorem 3.23 with the side $[t, u]_c \subset [x_1, y_2]_c$. As u is a projection of a on $[x_1, y_2]_c$, $\tilde{u} = u$.

- In the case where $[a, u, t]$ is a tripod, we have $u \in [a, t]_c$, therefore:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) + \angle_t(a, u) + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(u, t).$$

For all $w \in [u, t]_c$, we have the following. If $w \in [y_1, y_2]_c$, then $\angle_w(u, t) \leq r$. If $w \in [x_1, y_1]_c$, we will show by contradiction that $\angle_w(u, t) < (2000\delta)^2$. Let us assume then that $\angle_w(u, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2$. Since $w \in [x_1, y_1]$ and t is a projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]_c$, we have $\angle_w(a, t) \leq 12\delta$ according to Proposition 3.12. This implies that:

$$\angle_w(a, u) \geq \angle_w(u, t) - \angle_w(t, u) > 12\delta,$$

which is in contradiction with the fact that $w \in [x_1, y_2]_c$ and that u is a projection of a on $[x_1, y_2]_c$. Thus:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(u, t) \leq r^2.$$

- Let assume now that $[a, u, t]$ is not a tripod, then \tilde{a}, u, \tilde{t} are all different (see Figure 25). If $a \neq \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge on $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2, e'_2 the edges of $[\tilde{a}, t]_c$, $[\tilde{a}, u]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2 \cap e'_2$. If $t \neq \tilde{t}$, we denote by f_1, f_2 the edges of $[a, \tilde{t}]_c$, $[\tilde{t}, \tilde{t}]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{t} \in f_1 \cap f_2$. We consider $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)$, $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)$, $\angle_{\tilde{t}}(f_1, f_2)$ with the convention that the angles are equal to zero in the cases where the edges are not defined. We get:

$$\begin{aligned} - \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, u) &\geq \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2}, \\ - \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) &= \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + [\angle_{\tilde{t}}(f_1, f_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{t}, t). \end{aligned}$$

In the same way as the previous case, we have $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{t}, t) \leq r^2$. According to Proposition 3.24, we have:

$$|\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2) - \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)| \leq 12\delta.$$

According to Proposition 3.24 again, $\angle_{\tilde{t}}(f_1, f_2)$ is 12δ closed to $\angle_{\tilde{t}}(t, u)$ which is smaller than r .

We conclude with an application of Proposition 3.19. □

The following lemma allows us to handle the case where the angle between the two projections is large in Lemma 5.72.

Lemma 5.73. *Let $r \geq 0$. Let $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in G$ such that $d'(x_1, x_2), d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Let $a \in X_c$, we set:*

- let $t \in [x_1, y_1]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]_c$,
- $u \in [x_1, y_2]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_1, y_2]_c$,
- $v \in [x_2, y_1]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_2, y_1]_c$,
- $w \in [x_2, y_2]_c$ a projection of a on $[x_2, y_2]_c$.

If one of the following conditions holds:

- $\angle_u(a, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta + \max(r, 12\delta)$,
- $\angle_v(a, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta + r + \max(r, 12\delta)$,
- $\angle_w(a, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta + r + \max(r, 12\delta)$,

we have:

$$|\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| = 0.$$

Proof. Let us assume that $\angle_u(a, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + r$, the other cases will follow by symmetry between x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 . We will prove using Proposition 5.28 that:

$$\mu_{x_1}(a) = \mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_{y_2}(a).$$

Let us remark first by contradiction that $\angle_u(t, x_1) \leq 12\delta$. Indeed, if we have $\angle_u(t, x_1) > 12\delta$, this implies that $u \in [x_1, t]_c \subset [x_1, y_2]_c$, in contradiction with the fact that $\angle_u(a, t) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + r \geq 12\delta$ and the fact that t is a projection of a on $[x_1, y_1]_c$.

Thus we deduce that:

$$\angle_u(a, x_1) \geq \angle_u(a, t) - \angle_u(t, x_1) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + \max(r, 12\delta) \geq (2000\delta)^2,$$

which implies that $\mu_{x_1}(a) = \mu_u(a)$ according to Proposition 5.28.

In the same way, one can prove that $\angle_u(a, y_2) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + r$ and that $\mu_{y_2}(a) = \mu_u(a)$.

From this we deduce that:

$$\angle_u(a, y_1) \geq \angle_u(a, y_2) - \angle_u(y_1, y_2) \geq (2000\delta)^2,$$

since $d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Therefore, $\mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_u(a)$.

We finally have $\mu_{x_1}(a) = \mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_{y_2}(a)$ and this implies that:

$$|\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| = 0.$$

□

Lemma 5.74. *Let $r \geq 0$, $y_1, y_2 \in G$ such that $d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Let $a \in X_c$ and $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[y_1, y_2]_c$, then there exists $\lambda_2 \geq 0$ which depends only on r and δ such that:*

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \geq \frac{1}{\alpha_2^2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) - \angle_t(a, y_1) - \lambda_2,$$

with α_2 the constant of Proposition 3.19.

Proof. To begin we remark that:

$$d_c(a, t) \geq d_c(a, y_1) - r.$$

We need now to control the difference between large angles from a to t and large angles from a to y_1 . In the case where $t \in [a, y_1]_c$, we have:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) + [\angle_t(a, y_1)]_{>(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(t, y_1).$$

The fact that $d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$ implies that $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(t, y_1) \leq r^2$ then:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \geq \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) - \angle_t(a, y_1) - r^2.$$

Proposition 3.19 gives the desired inequality for some λ_2 which depends on δ and r only.

In the case where $t \notin [y_1, a]_c$, we consider a triangle $[y_1, t, a]_c$ as in Theorem 3.23 where the side $[t, y_1]_c$ is a subset of $[y_1, y_2]_c$. As t is a projection of a on $[y_1, y_2]_c$, we have $t = \tilde{t}$ and t, \tilde{y}_1 and a are all different. If $a \neq \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge on $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2, e'_2 the edges of $[\tilde{a}, y_1]_c, [\tilde{a}, t]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2 \cap e'_2$. If $y_1 \neq \tilde{y}_1$, we denote by f_1, f_2 the edges of $[a, \tilde{y}_1]_c, [y_1, \tilde{y}_1]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{y}_1 \in f_1 \cap f_2$. We consider $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2), \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2), \angle_{\tilde{y}_1}(f_1, f_2)$ with the convention that the angles are equal to zero in the cases where the edges are not defined. If $a = \tilde{a}$, we denote by e_1 the edge on $[a, \tilde{a}]_c$ such that $\tilde{a} \in e_1$ and e_2, e'_2 the edges of $[\tilde{a}, y_1]_c, [\tilde{a}, t]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{a} \in e_2 \cap e'_2$. If $y_1 \neq \tilde{y}_1$, we denote by f_1, f_2 the edges of $[a, \tilde{y}_1]_c, [y_1, \tilde{y}_1]_c$ respectively such that $\tilde{y}_1 \in f_1 \cap f_2$. We consider $\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2), \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2), \angle_{\tilde{y}_1}(f_1, f_2)$ with the convention that the angles are equal to zero in the cases where the edges are not defined. We get:

- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2},$
- $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) = \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, \tilde{a}) + [\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + [\angle_{\tilde{y}_1}(f_1, f_2)]_{(2000\delta)^2} + \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{y}_1, y_1).$

As in the previous case, we have $\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(\tilde{y}_1, y_1) \leq r^2$. Moreover according to Proposition 3.24, we have:

$$|\angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e'_2) - \angle_{\tilde{a}}(e_1, e_2)| \leq 12\delta.$$

Again according to Proposition 3.24, the angle $\angle_{\tilde{y}_1}(f_1, f_2)$ is 12δ closed to $\angle_{\tilde{y}_1}(y_1, t)$ which is smaller than r since $d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Thus:

$$\Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, t) \geq \Theta_{>(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) - r^2 - r - 12\delta.$$

We conclude again with an application of Proposition 3.19.

□

This Lemma allows us to control the angle $\angle_t(a, y_1)$ of Lemma 5.74.

Lemma 5.75. *Let $r \geq 0$, $y_1, y_2 \in G$ such that $d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$. Let $a \in X_c$ and $t \in X_c$ a projection of a on $[y_1, y_2]_c$, if $\angle_t(a, y_1) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + r$, then:*

$$d_a(y_1, y_2) = 0.$$

Proof. We will prove that if $\angle_t(a, y_1) \geq (2000\delta)^2 + r$, we have:

$$\mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_{y_2}(a).$$

According to Proposition 5.28, we know that:

$$\mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_t(a).$$

Moreover:

$$\angle_t(a, y_2) \geq \angle_t(a, y_1) - \angle_t(y_1, y_2) \geq (2000\delta)^2,$$

then, we new use of Proposition 5.28 gives the fact that:

$$\mu_{y_1}(a) = \mu_t(a),$$

and this implies that $d_a(y_1, y_2) = 0$.

□

We now have almost all the ingredients to prove strong-*B1* for \hat{d} . The following proposition simply shows that we can apply strong *B1* for d_a uniformly on $a \in X_c^\infty$.

Proposition 5.76. *For all $\eta, r > 0$, there exists $R = R(\eta, r) \geq 0$ such that for all $a \in X_c^\infty$, for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d_a(x_1, y_1), d_a(x_1, y_2), d_a(x_2, y_1), d_a(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d_a(x_1, x_2), d_a(y_1, y_2) \leq r$, we have:*

$$|d_a(x_1, y_1) + d_a(x_2, y_2) - d_a(x_1, y_2) - d_a(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

Proof. Recall that the group G is hyperbolic relative to a family of admissible subgroups P_1, \dots, P_n . Therefore for each P_i , for each $C > 0$, $\text{Proba}_C(P_i)$ admits a strongly bolic metric. Thus these metrics must satisfy strong-*B1*. For all $\eta, r > 0$, there exists R_i such that for all $a \in X_c^\infty$ associated with P_i , for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d_a(x_1, y_1), d_a(x_1, y_2), d_a(x_2, y_1), d_a(x_2, y_2) \geq R_i$ and $d_a(x_1, x_2), d_a(x_2, x_1) \leq r$, we have:

$$|d_a(x_1, y_1) + d_a(x_2, y_2) - d_a(x_1, y_2) - d_a(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

Taking R as the maximum of the R_i , for all $a \in X_\infty$, for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in X$, with $d_a(x_1, y_1), d_a(x_1, y_2), d_a(x_2, y_1), d_a(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d_a(x_1, x_2), d_a(x_2, x_1) \leq r$, we have:

$$|d_a(x_1, y_1) + d_a(x_2, y_2) - d_a(x_1, y_2) - d_a(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

□

Here, we will prove the most important result for \hat{d} , namely strong-*B1*. According to Proposition 3.17 the distance formula, there are two cases to consider when the distance $d(x_1, y_1)$ is large: the case where there is a large angle between x_1 and y_1 in the coned-off graph, or the case where the distance between x_1 and y_1 in the coned-off space is large

Theorem 5.77. *The metric space (G, \hat{d}) satisfies strongly-*B1*.*

Proof. Let us recall that for all $x, y \in G$, $d'(x, y) = d_c(x, y) + \Theta'(x, y)$, where $\Theta'(x, y)$ denote the minimal sum of angles at infinite valence vertices on a geodesic between $[x, y]_c$. According to Proposition 5.68 and to Proposition 3.17 the fact that (X, \hat{d}) satisfies strong-*B1* is equivalent to the fact that for all $r > 0$ and $\eta > 0$, there exists $R = R(\eta, r) \geq 0$ such that for all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in G$, with $d'(x_1, y_1), d'(x_1, y_2), d'(x_2, y_1), d'(x_2, y_2) \geq R$ and $d'(x_1, x_2), d'(y_1, y_2) \leq r$, we have:

$$|\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

We will choose $R \in \mathbb{N}$ even and large enough later. Let us assume that:

$$d'(x_1, y_1) \geq R$$

This implies that:

$$d_c(x_1, y_1) + \Theta(x_1, y_1) \geq R.$$

There are two cases to consider.

1. Let us assume in the first one that:

$$d_c(x_1, y_1) \leq \sqrt{R}.$$

Thus, if $R \geq 4$, we get:

$$\sqrt{R} \max_{a \in X_c^\infty} (\angle_a(x_1, y_1)) \geq \Theta(x_1, y_1) \geq \frac{R}{2}.$$

Therefore there exists $a_0 \in X_c^\infty$ such that:

$$\angle_{a_0}(x_1, y_1) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2}.$$

We will show that for R large enough, for all $a \in X_c$, $a \neq a_0$, we have:

$$|\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| = 0.$$

To do so we remark that for all $a \in X_c$, $a \neq a_0$, we have:

$$\angle_{a_0}(x_1, a) + \angle_{a_0}(a, y_1) \geq \angle_{a_0}(x_1, y_1) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2}.$$

Let us assume without loss of generality that:

$$\angle_{a_0}(x_1, a) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{4}.$$

Thus we get:

$$\angle_{a_0}(x_2, a) \geq \angle_{a_0}(x_1, a) - \angle_{a_0}(x_1, x_2) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{4} - r.$$

Therefore, if we take R large enough such that $\frac{\sqrt{R}}{4} - r \geq (2000\delta)^2$, we have:

$$\angle_{a_0}(x_1, a), \angle_{a_0}(x_2, a) \geq (2000\delta)^2.$$

Then according to Proposition 5.28, this implies that:

$$\mu_{x_1}(a) = \mu_{x_2}(a) = \mu_{a_0}(a).$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| \\
&= |\theta(d_b(\mu_{x_1}(a), \mu_{y_1}(a))) + \theta(d_b(\mu_{x_1}(a), \mu_{y_2}(a))) - \theta(d_b(\mu_{x_1}(a), \mu_{y_1}(a))) - \theta(d_a(\mu_{x_1}(a), \mu_{y_1}(a)))| \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| \\
&= |\theta(d_{a_0}(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_{a_0}(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(x_2, y_1))|.
\end{aligned}$$

We have:

- $\alpha_{a_0}(x_1, y_1) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2}$,
- $\alpha_{a_0}(x_2, y_1) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2} - r$,
- $\alpha_{a_0}(x_1, y_2) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2} - r$,
- $\alpha_{a_0}(x_2, y_2) \geq \frac{\sqrt{R}}{2} - 2r$.

Thus, according to Proposition 5.43, if we take R large enough, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| \\
&= |\theta(d_{a_0}(x_1, y_1)) + \theta(d_{a_0}(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_{a_0}(x_2, y_1))| \\
&= t_0^{P-1} |d_{a_0}(x_1, y_1) + d_{a_0}(x_2, y_2) - d_{a_0}(x_1, y_2) - d_{a_0}(x_2, y_1)|.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude with an application of Proposition 5.76, we can find R independent of a_0 such that:

$$|d_{a_0}(x_1, y_1) + d_{a_0}(x_2, y_2) - d_{a_0}(x_1, y_2) - d_{a_0}(x_2, y_1)| \leq \eta.$$

2. Let us assume in the second case that $d_c(x_1, y_1) \geq \sqrt{R}$. Again, we will choose R large enough later.

Let us denote by \mathcal{B} the set of $a \in X_c$ such that:

- $d_a(x_1, y_1) \geq t_0$,
- or $d_a(x_1, y_2) \geq t_0$,
- or $d_a(x_2, y_1) \geq t_0$,
- or $d_a(x_2, y_2) \geq t_0$.

We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\hat{d}(x_1, y_1) + \hat{d}(x_2, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_1, y_2) - \hat{d}(x_2, y_1)| \\
&\leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| \\
&\quad + \sum_{a \in X_c} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P|.
\end{aligned}$$

(a) We will start by showing that for R large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1))| \leq 4\eta.$$

We fix four geodesics $[x_1, y_1]_c, [x_2, y_2]_c, [x_1, y_2]_c, [x_2, y_1]_c$. According to Lemma 5.53, we know that:

$$\mathcal{B} \subset ([x_1, y_1]_c \cup [x_2, y_2]_c \cup [x_1, y_2]_c \cup [x_2, y_1]_c) \cap X_c^\infty.$$

We will show that for R large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))| \leq \eta.$$

This will implies the same result for $\mathcal{B} \cap [x_2, y_1]_c, \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_2]_c, \mathcal{B} \cap [x_2, y_2]_c$ by symmetry of the roles of x_1, y_1, x_2 and y_2 .

We denote by m a vertex in $[x_1, y_1]_c$ such that $d_c(x_1, m) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_c(x_1, y_1) - 1$ and $d_c(m, y_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_c(x_1, y_1) - 1$. We remark the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c, a \in [x_1, m]} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))| \\ & + \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c, a \in [m, y_1]} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))|. \end{aligned}$$

Let us bound from above the first sum, the bound for the second sum will follow by symmetry.

Let $a \in X_c$ such that $a \in [x_1, m]_c$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} d_c(a, [y_1, y_2]_c) & \geq d_c(a, y_1) - r \quad (\text{since } d_c(y_1, y_2) \leq r) \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}d_c(x_1, y_1) - 1 - r \quad (\text{since } a \in [x_1, m]_c). \end{aligned}$$

Thus if R is large enough, we could apply Theorem 5.42 to a and $[y_1, y_2]_c$ and we have:

$$d_a(y_1, y_2) \leq K_1 \kappa^{d_c(a, [y_1, y_2]_c)} \leq K_1 \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}d_c(x_1, y_1) - 1 - r},$$

where K_1 is the constant of Theorem 5.42.

Thereby, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c, a \in [x_1, m]_c} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in \mathcal{B} \cap [x_1, y_1]_c, a \in [x_1, m]} 2P t_0^{P-1} d_a(y_1, y_2) \quad (\text{according to Lemma 5.52}) \\ & \leq 2P t_0^{P-1} d_c(x_1, y_1) \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}d_c(x_1, y_1) - 1 - r} \\ & \leq 2P t_0^{P-1} R \kappa^{\frac{1}{2}R - 1 - r}, \end{aligned}$$

for R large enough.

The last term converges to 0 as R tends to positive infinity, thus for R large enough, it is smaller than η .

To conclude, we proved that:

$$\sum_{a \in \mathcal{B}} |\theta(d_a(x_1, y_1) + \theta(d_a(x_2, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_1, y_2)) - \theta(d_a(x_2, y_1)))| \leq 4\eta.$$

(b) Now, we will prove that for R large enough, we have:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P| \leq 2\eta.$$

We will choose $R \in \mathbb{N}$ even and large enough later. We denote by m a vertex in $[x_1, y_1]_c$ such that $d_c(x_1, m) \geq \frac{R}{2}$ and $d_c(m, y_1) \geq \frac{R}{2}$. For all $a \in X$, $\pi(a)$ denotes the projection of a onto $[x_1, y_1]_c$ that is closest to x_1 . More precisely, this means that $\pi(a) \in [x_1, y_1]_c$, $d_c(a, [x_1, y_1]_c) = d_c(a, \pi(a))$, for all $u \in [x_1, y_1]_c$, such that $d_c(a, [x_1, y_1]_c) = d_c(a, u)$, we have: $d_c(x_1, u) > d_c(x_1, \pi(a))$. The fact that $\pi(a)$ is the projection of a closest to x_1 is used only to define the projection of a in $[x_1, y_1]_c$ without ambiguity.

We have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P| \\ & + \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [m, y_1]_c} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P|. \end{aligned}$$

We will bound from above the first sum, the same proof will apply for the second by symmetry. To do this, we remark that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P| \\ & \leq \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} P \max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) d_a(y_1, y_2) \\ & + \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} P \max(d_a(x_2, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_2, y_2)^{P-1}) d_a(y_1, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Again, we will bound the first sum. For the second sum, the same proof will apply. Let us denote $N := d_c(x_1, m)$. We order $[m, x_1]_c$ in the following sense: $[m, x_1]_c = \{z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N\}$ with $z_0 = m$, $z_N = x_1$ and $d_c(z_i, z_{i+1}) = 1$ for $0 \leq i \leq N-1$.




Figure 26: $\pi(a) = z_i \in [x_1, m]$

If R is large enough, for all $a \in X_c$ with $a \in [m, x_1]_c$, we could apply Theorem 5.42 to a and $[y_1, y_2]_c$, combined with Lemma 5.74 and Lemma 5.75, we get:

$$d_a(y_1, y_2) \leq K_1 \kappa^{\frac{1}{2} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) - \omega_2}, \quad (10)$$

where $\omega_2 := \lambda_2 + (2000\delta)^2 + r$ with λ_2 the constant of Lemma 5.74.

For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $a \in X_c$ such that $\pi(a) = z_i$, we have $d_c(z_i, y_1) \geq i + \frac{R}{2}$, thus:

$$\begin{aligned} d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) &\geq d_c(a, y_1) \\ &\geq d_c(a, z_i) + d_c(z_i, y_1) - 24\delta \text{ (according to Lemma 4.7)} \\ &\geq d_c(a, z_i) + i + \frac{R}{2} - 24\delta \\ &\geq i + \frac{R}{2} - 24\delta. \end{aligned}$$

We have also according to Lemma 5.47 on the geodesic $[x_1, y_1]_c$:

$$d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) \geq \frac{1}{W}(i + \frac{R}{2} + d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)) - W.$$

Moreover, according to Theorem 5.42, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $a \in X_c$ such that $\pi(a) = z_i$ except for a finite number of a , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) \\ &\leq K_1 \max(\kappa^{(P-1)d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)}, \kappa^{(P-1)(\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i) - \omega)}) \text{ (according to Lemmata 5.72 and 5.73)} \\ &\leq K_1 \kappa^{\frac{P-1}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i) - (P-1)\omega_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $\omega_1 := \lambda_1 + (2000\delta)^2 + 12\delta + \max(r, 12\delta)$ with λ_1 the constant of Lemma 5.72.

Thus, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} P \max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) d_a(y_1, y_2) \\ &\leq P \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) = z_i} \max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) d_a(y_1, y_2) \\ &\leq P \sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) = z_i} \max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) K_1 \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, y_1) - \omega_2} \text{ (according to Equation 10)} \\ &\leq P K_1 2 \gamma_G^{C_1} t_0 \kappa^{-\frac{24\delta}{\alpha_2^2} - \omega_2} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha_2^2}} \text{ (bound for the } a \text{ closed to } [x_1, y_1]_c) \\ &\quad + P \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \kappa^{-(P-1)\omega_1 - \omega_2} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha_2^4}} \sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} \kappa^{\frac{P-1}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)} \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)} \text{ (according to Equation 11)} \\ &\leq P K_1 2 \gamma_G^{C_1} t_0 \kappa^{-\frac{24\delta}{\alpha_2^2} - \omega_2} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}}} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \text{ (geometric sum)} \\ &\quad + P \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \kappa^{-(P-1)\omega_1 - \omega_2} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_4}} \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha_2^4}} \sum_{a \in X_c} \kappa^{\frac{P}{\alpha_2^2}d'_{(2000\delta)^2}(a, z_i)} \\ &\leq P K_1 2 \gamma_G^{C_1} t_0 \kappa^{-\frac{24\delta}{\alpha_2^2} - \omega_2} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}}} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \\ &\quad + P \kappa^{-(P-1)\omega_1 - \omega_2} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} \sigma \sum_{i=0}^N \kappa^{\frac{i}{\alpha_2^4}} \text{ (according to Proposition 5.50)} \\ &\leq P K_1 2 \gamma_G^{C_1} t_0 \kappa^{-\frac{24\delta}{\alpha_2^2} - \omega_2} \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^2}}} \kappa^{\frac{R}{2\alpha_2^2}} + P \kappa^{-(P-1)\omega_1 - \omega_2} \sigma \frac{1}{1 - \kappa^{\frac{1}{\alpha_2^4}}} \kappa^{\frac{R}{\alpha_2^4}} \text{ (geometric sum).} \end{aligned}$$

As R goes to infinity the last term goes to zero therefore, for R big enough, we have:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}, \pi(a) \in [x_1, m]_c} P \max(d_a(x_1, y_1)^{P-1}, d_a(x_1, y_2)^{P-1}) d_a(y_1, y_2) \leq \eta.$$

Hence:

$$\sum_{a \in X_c \setminus \mathcal{B}} |d_a(x_1, y_1)^P + d_a(x_2, y_2)^P - d_a(x_1, y_2)^P - d_a(x_2, y_1)^P| \leq 2\eta.$$

This concludes the proof. □

5.11 Conclusion

We give a proof of Theorem 5.19.

Proof. of Theorem 5.19

The function \hat{d} of Definition 5.60 is a metric on G according to Proposition 5.61.

By definition \hat{d} is G -invariant.

According to Proposition 5.68 \hat{d} is quasi-isometric to the word metric, therefore \hat{d} is uniformly locally finite.

The metric space (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic according to Proposition 5.67.

According to Theorem 5.77 \hat{d} satisfies the strong- $B1$ condition and the weak- $B2'$ condition according to Proposition 5.71, therefore \hat{d} is strongly bolic. □

As $CAT(0)$ groups are admissible, we deduce Theorem 5.1. □

Proof. of Theorem 5.1 According to Proposition 5.17 $CAT(0)$ groups are admissible. We apply Theorem 5.19. □

According to Lafforgue's theorem 1.1, we present here our results concerning the Baum-Connes conjecture.

Proof. of Corollary 5.2

Let H be a subgroup of a relatively hyperbolic group G with $CAT(0)$ parabolics with the (RD) property. According to Theorem 5.8, there exists a metric \hat{d} on G such that (G, \hat{d}) is weakly geodesic and strongly bolic. According to Proposition 5.68, \hat{d} is quasi-isometric to the word metric on G therefore it is locally uniformly finite and the action of H on G is proper. Finally, H satisfies the (RD) property according to [CR05a]. According to Theorem 1.1, we deduce that H satisfies the Baum-Connes conjecture. □

In this corollary, we provide families of $CAT(0)$ groups for which the (RD) property is known.

Proof. of Corollary 5.3

According to [UM25, Proposition 8.1], virtually abelian groups are $CAT(0)$, therefore they are admissible according to Proposition 5.17. They satisfy (RD) property according to Jolissaint [Jol90].

Cocompactly cubulated groups are $CAT(0)$ by definition, they satisfy (RD) property according to [CR05b].

Coxeter groups are $CAT(0)$ according to [Dav25], they satisfy (RD) property according to [CR05b]. □

Proof. of Corollary 5.4

According to [BH99, Lemma II.10.27], Fundamental groups of real complete hyperbolic manifold are hyperbolic relatively to virtually abelian subgroups, therefore they satisfy the Baum-Connes conjecture according to Corollary 5.3. \square

References

- [AAS07] James W. Anderson, Javier Aramayona, and Kenneth J. Shackleton. An obstruction to the strong relative hyperbolicity of a group. *J. Group Theory*, 10(6):749–756, 2007.
- [AL17] Aurélien Alvarez and Vincent Lafforgue. Proper affine isometric actions of hyperbolic groups on ℓ^p spaces. *Expo. Math.*, 35(1):103–118, 2017.
- [AL18] Aurélien Alvarez and Vincent Lafforgue. Proper affine isometric actions of hyperbolic groups on quotients of ℓ^p spaces. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 51(6):1389–1398, 2018.
- [BC00] Paul Baum and Alain Connes. Geometric K -theory for Lie groups and foliations. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 46(1-2):3–42, 2000.
- [BCH94] Paul Baum, Alain Connes, and Nigel Higson. Classifying space for proper actions and K -theory of group C^* -algebras. In *C^* -Algebras: 1943-1993. A fifty year celebration. AMS special session commemorating the first fifty years of C^* -algebra theory, January 13-14, 1993, San Antonio, TX, USA*, pages 241–291. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1994.
- [BCV95] M. E. B. Bekka, P.-A. Cherix, and A. Valette. Proper affine isometric actions of amenable groups. In *Novikov conjectures, index theorems and rigidity. Vol. 2. Based on a conference of the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach in September 1993*, pages 1–4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren Math. Wiss.* Berlin: Springer, 1999.
- [BK02] Michelle Bucher and Anders Karlsson. On the definition of Bolic spaces. *Expo. Math.*, 20(3):269–277, 2002.
- [BMV05] Hela Bettaieb, Michel Matthey, and Alain Valette. Unbounded symmetric operators in K -homology and the Baum-Connes conjecture. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 229(1):184–237, 2005.
- [Bow12] B. H. Bowditch. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Int. J. Algebra Comput.*, 22(3):1250016, 66, 2012.
- [CD20] Indira Chatterji and François Dahmani. Proper actions on ℓ^p -spaces for relatively hyperbolic groups. *Annales Henri Lebesgue*, 3:35–66, 2020.
- [CDH10] Indira Chatterji, Cornelia Druțu, and Frédéric Haglund. Kazhdan and Haagerup properties from the median viewpoint. *Adv. Math.*, 225(2):882–921, 2010.
- [CDHL20] Indira Chatterji, François Dahmani, Thomas Haettel, and Jean Lécureux. Tangent bundles of hyperbolic spaces and proper affine actions on ℓ^p spaces, 2020.
- [Cha17] Indira Chatterji. Introduction to the rapid decay property. In *Around Langlands correspondences. International conference, Université Paris Sud, Orsay, France, June 17–20, 2015. Proceedings*, pages 53–72. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2017.
- [CM90] Alain Connes and Henri Moscovici. Cyclic cohomology, the Novikov conjecture and hyperbolic groups. *Topology*, 29(3):345–388, 1990.
- [CR05a] I. Chatterji and K. Ruane. Some geometric groups with rapid decay. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 15(2):311–339, 2005.
- [CR05b] I. Chatterji and K. Ruane. Some geometric groups with rapid decay. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 15(2):311–339, 2005.

[Dav25] Michael W. Davis. *The geometry and topology of Coxeter groups*. Springer Monogr. Math. Cham: Springer, 2nd edition edition, 2025.

[DK18] Cornelia Druțu and Michael Kapovich. *Geometric group theory. With an appendix by Bogdan Nica*, volume 63 of *Colloq. Publ., Am. Math. Soc.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2018.

[dlH88] Pierre de la Harpe. Groupes hyperboliques, algèbres d'opérateurs et un théorème de Jolissaint. (Hyperbolic groups, operator algebras and Jolissaint's theorem). *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I*, 307(14):771–774, 1988.

[DS05] Cornelia Druțu and Mark Sapir. Relatively hyperbolic groups with rapid decay property. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 2005(19):1181–1194, 2005.

[Far98] B. Farb. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(5):810–840, 1998.

[FRR95] Steven C. Ferry, Andrew Ranicki, and Jonathan Rosenberg. A history and survey of the Novikov conjecture. In *Novikov conjectures, index theorems and rigidity. Vol. 1. Based on a conference of the Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach held in September 1993*, pages 7–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[GAJV19] Maria Paula Gomez Aparicio, Pierre Julg, and Alain Valette. The Baum-Connes conjecture: an extended survey. In *Advances in noncommutative geometry. Based on the noncommutative geometry conference, Shanghai, China, March 23 – April 7, 2017. On the occasion of Alain Connes' 70th Birthday*, pages 127–244. Cham: Springer, 2019.

[GdlH90] Etienne Ghys and Pierre de la Harpe, editors. *Sur les groupes hyperboliques d'après Mikhael Gromov. (On the hyperbolic groups à la M. Gromov)*, volume 83 of *Prog. Math.* Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1990.

[Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. *Essays in group theory*, Publ., Math. Sci. Res. Inst. 8, 75–263 (1987)., 1987.

[HHP25] Thomas Haettel, Nima Hoda, and Harry Petyt. ℓ^p metrics on cell complexes. *J. Lond. Math. Soc., II. Ser.*, 111(1):43, 2025. Id/No e70062.

[HK97] Nigel Higson and Gennadi Kasparov. Operator K -theory for groups which act properly and isometrically on Hilbert space. *Electron. Res. Announc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 3(22):131–142, 1997.

[Jol90] Paul Jolissaint. Rapidly decreasing functions in reduced C^* -algebras of groups. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*, 317(1):167–196, 1990.

[KS94] Guennadi Kasparov and Georges Skandalis. “Bolic” groups and Novikov’s conjecture. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. I*, 319(8):815–820, 1994.

[KS03] Gennadi Kasparov and Georges Skandalis. Groups acting properly on “bolic” spaces and the Novikov conjecture. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 158(1):165–206, 2003.

[Laf02] Vincent Lafforgue. Bivariant K -theory for Banach algebras and the Baum-Connes conjecture. *Invent. Math.*, 149(1):1–95, 2002.

[Laf08] Vincent Lafforgue. A reinforcement of property (T). *Duke Math. J.*, 143(3):559–602, 2008.

[Laf10] Vincent Lafforgue. The strengthened property (T) and the Baum-Connes conjecture. In *Quanta of maths. Conference on non commutative geometry in honor of Alain Connes, Paris, France, March 29–April 6, 2007*, pages 323–345. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS); Cambridge, MA: Clay Mathematics Institute, 2010.

[Laf12] Vincent Lafforgue. The Baum-Connes conjecture with coefficients for hyperbolic groups. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 6(1):1–197, 2012.

[Lan15] Markus Land. The analytical assembly map and index theory. *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 9(2):603–619, 2015.

[LD25] Hermès Lajoinie-Dodel. Strong property (T) and relatively hyperbolic groups. *Math. Z.*, 310(2):42, 2025. Id/No 36.

[Mat11] Haïssinsky Matthieu. La conjecture de baum-connes pour les groupes hyperboliques par les marches aléatoires. online available, 2011.

[MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. I: Hyperbolicity. *Invent. Math.*, 138(1):103–149, 1999.

[MY02] Igor Mineyev and Guoliang Yu. The Baum-Connes conjecture for hyperbolic groups. *Invent. Math.*, 149(1):97–122, 2002.

[NP25] Shintaro Nishikawa and Nansen Petrosyan. Dehn fillings, equivariant homology, and the baum-connes conjecture, 2025.

[OO01] Hervé Oyono-Oyono. Baum-Connes conjecture and group actions on trees. *K-Theory*, 24(2):115–134, 2001.

[Osi06] Denis V. Osin. *Relatively hyperbolic groups: intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems.*, volume 843 of *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.* Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2006.

[RS95] Jonathan Rosenberg and Stephan Stolz. A “stable” version of the Gromov-Lawson conjecture. In *The Čech centennial. A conference on homotopy theory dedicated to Eduard Čech on the occasion of his 100th birthday, June 22–26, 1993, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA*, pages 405–418. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1995.

[Sap15] Mark Sapir. The rapid decay property and centroids in groups. *J. Topol. Anal.*, 7(3):513–541, 2015.

[Sis13] Alessandro Sisto. Projections and relative hyperbolicity. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 59(1-2):165–181, 2013.

[Stu03] Karl-Theodor Sturm. Probability measures on metric spaces of nonpositive curvature. In *Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces. Lecture notes from a quarter program on heat kernels, random walks, and analysis on manifolds and graphs, April 16–July 13, 2002, Paris, France*, pages 357–390. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2003.

[UM25] Jon Merladet Urigüen and Ashot Minasyan. Virtual retractions in free constructions, 2025.

[Val02] Alain Valette. *Introduction to the Baum-Connes conjecture. With notes taken by Indira Chatterji. With an appendix by Guido Mislin.* Basel: Birkhäuser, 2002.

[VGG73] A. M. Vershik, I. M. Gel’fand, and M. I. Graev. Representations of the group $\mathrm{SL}(2, R)$, where R is a ring of functions. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 28(5):87–132, 1973.

[VGG74] A. M. Vershik, I. M. Gel’fand, and M. I. Graev. Irreducible representations of the group G^X and cohomologies. *Funct. Anal. Appl.*, 8:151–153, 1974.