

ACYLINDRICITY IN HIGHER RANK

PART I: FUNDAMENTALS

TALIA FERNÓS, SAHANA H BALASUBRAMANYA

ABSTRACT. We present a new notion of non-positively curved groups: the collection of discrete countable groups acting (AU-)acylindrically on finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces with general type factors and associated subdirect products. This work is inspired by the classical theory of S -arithmetic lattices and the flourishing theory of acylindrically hyperbolic groups. In this paper - the first of three - we develop various fundamental results, explore elementary subgroups in higher rank, and exhibit a free vs abelian Tits Alternative. Along the way we give representation-theoretic proofs of various results about acylindricity – some methods are new even in the rank-one setting.

The vastness of this class of groups is exhibited by recognizing that it contains S -arithmetic lattices with rank-one factors, acylindrically hyperbolic groups, colorable HHGs, groups with property (QT), and enjoys robust stability properties.

*In honor of Bhama Srinivasan
and Alex Furman and Denis Osin
on the occasions of their recent multiples of 10^{th} birthdays*




Figure showing the classification of actions on a δ -hyperbolic space
Counter-clockwise from 3 o'clock: lineal, general type, tremble, rift, rotation, quasi-parabolic
Center: parabolic

CONTENTS

Table of Standing Notation	1
1. Introduction	2
2. Main Theorems	4
3. Metric Basics	8
3.1. The Polish Topology on $\text{Isom } Y$	8
3.2. Actions and AU-acylindricity	9
3.3. Hyperbolic Geodesic Metric Spaces	11
3.4. Products	15
4. Isometric Actions in Rank-one	17
4.1. Classification results.	17
4.2. Busemann quasimorphism	19
5. Actions in Higher rank	21
5.1. Obstructions and simplifications to acylindricity in higher rank.	21
5.2. Regular Elements Exist	24
5.3. Some Representation Theory	25
6. A Plethora of Examples	30
6.1. The Iwasawa Decomposition and Godement's Compactness Criterion	31
6.2. Semi-Simple Lattices and Superrigidity	33
6.3. The Special Linear Group of Dimension 2	35
6.4. Genericity for Unipotent-Free	37
6.5. Groups with Property (NL)	38
7. Elementary subgroups and the Tits Alternative	39
7.1. Rank-one	40
7.2. Higher rank	41
References	47

TABLE OF STANDING NOTATION

Γ	discrete countable group
H	arbitrary subgroup
X or X_i	complete separable δ -hyperbolic geodesic metric space
Y, Z	arbitrary metric space
$\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(\cdot), \overline{\mathcal{N}}_\epsilon(\cdot)$	open, closed ϵ -neighborhood
$\text{Set}_\epsilon A$	pointwise ϵ -coarse stabilizer of the set A
$\text{Stab}_\Gamma A$	(setwise) stabilizer of the set A in Γ
$\text{Fix}_\Gamma A$	pointwise fixator of the set A in Γ
$R = R(\epsilon), N = N(\epsilon)$	acylindricity constants, depend on ϵ
$\mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} X_i$	product of δ -hyperbolic spaces
$x \in \mathbb{X}, x = (x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_{\mathfrak{D}})$	notation for coordinate factors
\mathfrak{D}	number of factors in product
$\overline{X} = \partial X \cup X$	the Gromov bordification
$\overline{\mathbb{X}} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \overline{X}_i$	bordification of \mathbb{X}
$\partial \mathbb{X} = \overline{\mathbb{X}} \setminus \mathbb{X}$	boundary of \mathbb{X}
$\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \partial X_i$	regular boundary of \mathbb{X}
$\text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D})$	permutation group of isometric factors
$\text{Aut } \mathbb{X} = \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D}) \ltimes \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$	automorphism group
$\text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$	factor preserving automorphism group
$g \in \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}, g = (g_1, \dots, g_i, \dots, g_{\mathfrak{D}})$	notation for coordinate factors
$\text{Isom}_0 L$	kernel of action on ∂L , L a quasiline
$\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma$	(usually) the subgroup that maps to $\text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$
$\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma(g), \mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(H)$	centralizer, normalizer in Γ , for $g \in \Gamma, H \leq \Gamma$

TABLE 1.

1. INTRODUCTION

Taking inspiration from the work of Sela for groups acting on trees [Sel97], in 2008 Bowditch introduced the study of acylindrical actions on general δ -hyperbolic spaces with an eye towards understanding the action of (surface) mapping class groups on their respective hyperbolic curve complexes [MM99, Bow08].

In 2015, Osin introduced the class of acylindrically hyperbolic groups (i.e. those that admit a general type acylindrical action on a δ -hyperbolic space), and proved that this succinct condition unifies many other classes which had previously been studied [Osi16]. Philosophically, one may view the notion of an acylindrically hyperbolic group as a generalization of a uniform lattice in the isometry group of a locally compact δ -hyperbolic space. Since then, many implications of acylindrical hyperbolicity have been established, guided by this philosophy but requiring new techniques that circumvent the strength of properness and coboundedness conferred by a geometric action (see [Osi18] for a survey). Because the defining condition is so succinct, the class of acylindrically hyperbolic groups is vast and includes the groups classically studied in geometric group theory with hyperbolic-like properties: e.g. (irreducible) right angled Artin groups, $\text{Out}(F_n)$, and many hierarchically hyperbolic groups (The class of hierarchically hyperbolic groups is another example of a class that unifies various others [BHS17]). Noteworthy members of this class are mapping class groups as well as all lattices (uniform or not) in the isometry groups of locally compact hyperbolic spaces, e.g. simple rank-one Lie groups.

In 1979 Harvey asked whether mapping class groups were arithmetic lattices [Har79]. Although this was answered in the negative by Ivanov [Iva88], there are many philosophical parallels between mapping class groups and lattices (e.g. the finiteness of their outer-automorphism groups [Iva84, McC86, Gř10]). Our work here is the consequence of extending nonelliptic-acylindrical actions as a proxy for geometric actions to the higher-rank setting. Specifically, we shall consider finite products of (general type) δ -hyperbolic spaces with the ℓ^2 -product metric as *nonpositively curved spaces* as the playground and groups admitting acylindrical-like actions as the players. With the aim of creating a framework that encompasses acylindrically hyperbolic groups as well as S -arithmetic lattices, uniform or not, we allow for non-uniform acylindricity as well. The two concepts are united under the term of *acylindricity of ambiguous uniformity* (which we refer to as AU-acylindricity, see Definition 3.3). This landscape is large as is witnessed by the fact that it contains the already large class of acylindrically hyperbolic groups, S -arithmetic lattices in semi-simple Lie groups with rank-one factors and enjoys robust stability properties. In this first of three papers, we develop a rigorous framework in which to place this playground and establish necessary fundamental results, such as a Tits Alternative.

In this Part I, we use the existing results of acylindrically hyperbolic groups, i.e. acylindricity in rank-one, to guide our development of the semi-simple theory of AU-acylindricity in higher rank. As Section 2 shows, we indeed extend many of the rank-one results. Consequently, this paper also serves as a starting point for systematically studying (AU-) acylindrical actions on finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces, a study that necessitated revisiting proofs in rank-one, and a natural trifurcation of elliptic actions. Understanding the nature of the elliptic actions will also allow us to “tame” the actions in Part II [BFa].

This will turn out to be a key step in establishing a type of semi-simplicity in our higher rank setting, concretely bridging our two sources of inspiration: acylindrically hyperbolic groups and S -arithmetic lattices in products of rank-one groups.

Part II [BFa] also considers semi-simple-type consequences, such as the existence of a “strongly canonical” product decomposition and its ramification for a recent conjecture of Sela announced during his Aisenstadt Chair Distinguished Lecture Series in June 2023 at the Centre de Recherches Mathématiques in Montreal overlapping with the *Groups Around 3-Manifolds* conference, both of which were part of the Thematic Program in Geometric Group Theory. In Part III, we shall extend results from [AM24] to the higher-rank setting and examine a type of irreducibility witnessed on the level of maximal flats [BFb].

It is worth noting that within the framework of AU-acylindrical actions on hyperbolic spaces, elliptic and parabolic actions are not capable of yielding meaningful information about the acting group. Indeed, given an isometric action of a group Γ on a metric space Y one can create new (δ -hyperbolic) spaces Y_{ell} , and Y_{par} on which Γ acts by isometries. To obtain Y_{ell} , one may add an additional “central” point and attach a length-1 edge from that point to all other points in Y , yielding a space of diameter 2. The corresponding action of Γ has a fixed point and is acylindrical. In the case of Y_{par} , one may perform a horoball construction, as in [GM08] and obtain a level-preserving, i.e. parabolic action of Γ on Y_{par} . Both such constructions yield an AU-acylindrical action on a δ -hyperbolic space. Since this applies to any isometric action, clearly no meaningful information can be gleaned from such a framework. This is one reason why we eventually focus on the “semi-simple” case, i.e. the situation where the factor actions are all of general type, though we do not always restrict the factor actions in this way.

When all factors of \mathbb{X} admit general type actions, one may view it as a non-elementary analogue of a vector space. In this sense, the theory we develop of AU-acylindrical actions on finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces can be seen from a representation-theoretic point of view. In particular, the collection of *all* such actions can provide meaningful information about the group, a truth that goes back to the classical theory of linear representations and is also reflected in the results from [ABO19]. This is in contrast with the trend of considering geometric actions as “best”. However, mapping class groups are both acylindrically hyperbolic and have Property (QT) i.e. act by isometries on a finite product of quasi-trees so that the orbit maps are quasi-isometric embeddings. Therefore they admit a general type acylindrical action on a single hyperbolic space, as well as a proper and hence AU-acylindrical action on a product of quasi-trees. Because each of these actions bring to light different and interesting properties, their relative value is incomparable. We also note that while elliptic actions can not provide meaningful information from the point of view of “nonpositive curvature”, the class of such actions for a group Γ (via the above construction) encompasses the entire universe of its isometric actions, including such important classes as its isometric actions on Hilbert or Banach spaces, in particular the left-regular or quasi-left-regular representations.

A point of interest to the geometric group theorist may be the fact that \mathbb{X} , under mild hypotheses on the factors, has a highly structured quasi-isometry group (e.g. the analogue to our $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ for quasi-isometries; which is virtually the product of the isometry groups of the factors, see Table 1, or Section 3.4) [KL97, EF97, KKL98, Bow16]. While quasi-isometry is the leading type of equivalence within geometric group theory, particularly in the context of hyperbolicity, we remark that there are many interesting and important notions that are not invariant under quasi-isometry, for example the geometric $\text{CAT}(0)$ property or the

rigid Property (T) for groups (see [BdlHV08, Theorem 3.6.5]). Relevant to our work is the fact that cocompact lattices in the same product of ambient groups are necessarily quasi-isometric, independent of whether they are reducible or irreducible. Therefore finitely presented simple lattices in products of trees [BM00, Wis96] are quasi-isometric to reducible cocompact lattices in the same, which are virtually products of free groups. Therefore, while the tension between hyperbolicity and quasi-isometry has been incredibly fruitful, when we enter the world of non-positive curvature in higher-rank, we must allow ourselves to let go of quasi-isometry as the sole focus.

Since we are considering \mathbb{X} with d_2 , the ℓ^2 -product metric as nonpositively curved, one may wonder how far our designated group $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is from the isometry group $\text{Isom}(\mathbb{X}, d_2)$. Under natural hypotheses, these are the same. We prove this using [FL08] in Part II [BFa]. We note that $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes effectively have the same structure [Bre17] (see also [CS11]).

We note that we are not the first to consider variations on acylindricity: there are those studied by Hamenstädt [Ham06], Delzant [Del16], and Genevois [Gen19] (see also [CM19]), effectively in the hyperbolic setting, as well as Sela [Sel23, Sel22] and Wan and Yang [WY25] in higher rank (see also [But19]). One can easily verify that our nonuniform acylindricity implies the version studied by Hamenstädt. The weak acylindricity considered by Delzant is a uniform version of the WWPD property introduced by Bestvina-Bromberg-Fujiwara [BBF15]. Genevois' nonuniform acylindricity and weak acylindricity is respectively our AU-acylindricity and the standard acylindricity condition with $\epsilon = 0$. Delzant's weak acylindricity also inspired the higher rank work of both Sela and Wan-Yang. The latter studies proper actions on products of hyperbolic spaces with factor actions that are weakly acylindrical in the sense of Delzant. Sela's versions of acylindricity concern his recent work on higher rank JSJ decompositions and we will consider these more deeply in Part II [BFa] (see also [BF24, Section 10]).

2. MAIN THEOREMS

As Table 1 summarizes, we will use \mathbb{X} to denote a finite product of \mathfrak{D} -many complete, separable, δ -hyperbolic geodesic spaces (which will often have isometry groups whose actions are of general type). Our target group for representations is $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$, which consists of permutations of isometric factors along with the product of the isometry groups of the factors.

Definition 2.1. Let Γ be a discrete countable group, Y a metric space and $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ an isometric action.

- If $\epsilon > 0$ then the joint ϵ -coarse stabilizer of points $x, y \in Y$ will be denoted by

$$\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\} = \{g \in \Gamma : d(gx, x), d(gy, y) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

- The action is called *AU-acylindrical*, or *acylindrical of ambiguous uniformity* if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $R \geq 0$ such that for any points $x, y \in Y$ with $d(x, y) \geq R$, we have an ambiguous bound on cardinality $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}| < \infty$.
- The action is called *acylindrical* if for every $\epsilon > 0$, $N \geq 0$ such that for any points $x, y \in Y$ with $d(x, y) \geq R$, we have the uniform bound on cardinality $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}| < N$.

- The action is called *nonuniformly acylindrical* if it is AU-acylindrical but not acylindrical.

Groups that admit a non-elliptic acylindrical action in rank-one satisfy a Tits Alternative: they are either virtually \mathbb{Z} or contains a nonabelian free group [Osi16, Theorem 1.1]. Let H be a group. We say a group G is *virtually H* if G contains a finite index subgroup that is isomorphic to H . We contribute to the landscape of Tits Alternatives with:

Theorem A (Tits Alternative). Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ be acylindrical and not elliptic. Either Γ contains a nonabelian free group or Γ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k , where $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$, where \mathfrak{D} is the number of factors of \mathbb{X} .

Closely linked to the proof of Theorem A is the structure of the stabilizers of elements in the regular boundary of \mathbb{X} . In this vein, we prove the following result, which says, roughly speaking, that in an acylindrical action on \mathbb{X} , fixed points on the regular boundary must occur in pairs. Recall that $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \partial X_i$ is the regular boundary.

Theorem B. Suppose that $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$, where $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical. If $\text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi\}$ is infinite then there exists an $\xi' \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ such that $\xi \neq \xi'$ and yet $\text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi\} = \text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi, \xi'\}$. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{D}' = |\{i : \xi_i \neq \xi'_i\}|$ then $\text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi\}$ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k for some $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}' \leq \mathfrak{D}$, where \mathfrak{D} is the number of factors of \mathbb{X} .

To emphasize that acylindricity extends the notion of cocompact lattices, we note that Godement's Compactness Criterion states that S -arithmetic lattices are cocompact if and only if they contain no nontrivial unipotents [BHC62, Beh87] (see Theorem 6.2). Nontrivial unipotent subgroups are precisely those that have a distinct fixed point on the regular boundary in the (irreducible) S -arithmetic case. In particular, any solvable subgroup is virtually diagonalizable, i.e. stabilizes a flat in the corresponding product of symmetric spaces and Bruhat-Tits buildings (which is a CAT(0) space when endowed with the ℓ^2 -product metric). Therefore, such a solvable subgroup acts properly on said flat and is hence \mathbb{Z}^k , where k is bounded by the rank of the CAT(0) space. The classical Tits Alternative [Tit72] states that a linear group either contains a free group or is virtually solvable, and hence we recover a Tits Alternative as above for subgroups of such lattices (see Section 6.1).

We also consider *regular* elements, the higher rank analogue of loxodromic elements, namely those that do not permute the factors and whose projection to each factor is loxodromic (classically a regular element refers to one whose axis is contained in a unique maximal flat). Given $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ regular, the associated *elementary subgroup* is $E_\Gamma(\gamma) := E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+) := \bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}$, where $\gamma^-, \gamma^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ are respectively the repelling and attracting fixed points for γ (see Definition 7.1).

Maher and Tiozzo used random walks to show that loxodromic elements in a general type action can be encountered asymptotically almost surely [MT18]. We use their result to easily conclude that regular elements exist. The structure of the centralizer is a higher-rank analog of [BF02, Proposition 6].

Theorem C (Regular elements). Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ be an action with general type factors. Then there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ that acts as a regular element. Furthermore, if the action is

AU-acylindrical and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is a regular element then the centralizer $\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma(\gamma)$ and the elementary subgroup $E_\Gamma(\gamma)$ are both virtually \mathbb{Z}^k , for the same k such that $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$.

Another well known result in rank-one is that pertaining to the classification of isometries and isometric actions (see Section 4 and Theorem 4.3). In this paper, we observe that the well known classification of isometries and actions in rank-one can be refined: elliptic elements and actions admit a trichotomy, manifesting themselves as *trembles*, *rotations* or *rifts* (see Definition 4.1, and the left-most three images in the figure on the title page). Of note, the trembles shall in a sense take on the role of the center in a semi-simple lattice. This analogy is further extended to a semi-simple dictionary in Part II [BFa], where controlling the trembles with the use of acylindricity will be helpful in dealing with results and proofs pertaining to lattice envelopes.

Osin demonstrated that there is a tension between the acylindricity hypothesis and the possibilities for isometric actions on δ -hyperbolic spaces – only elliptic, lineal or general type actions are compatible (i.e. parabolic and quasiparabolic acylindrical actions do not exist see [Osi16, Theorem 1]). This implies that a group acting acylindrically will not contain elements acting parabolically. We extend this result to the higher rank setting by proving the following, which furthers the analogy with (S -arithmetic) semi-simple cocompact lattices via Godement’s Compactness Criterion (see Theorem 6.2).

Theorem D (Obstructions to acylindricity in higher rank). Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ such that the projections $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ are all either elliptic, parabolic or quasiparabolic (with at least one factor being parabolic or quasiparabolic). Then $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is not acylindrical. In particular, if $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical, then every element of Γ is either an elliptic isometry or contains a loxodromic factor.

As a consequence of this obstruction, we are able to deduce (see Corollary 6.15 and Proposition 6.16) that while groups such as $\text{PSL}_2 \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ act (with general type factors) nonuniformly properly, and hence nonuniformly acylindrically, on the product of δ -hyperbolic spaces, it does not act acylindrically on any \mathbb{X} , unless the action is elliptic. This is in contrast to the rank-one setting. For example, $\text{PSL}_2 \mathbb{Z}[i]$ is a nonuniform lattice in $\text{PSL}_2 \mathbb{C}$ and hence has a general type nonuniformly proper action on the associated symmetric space, which is the (real) hyperbolic 3-space. However, thanks to the existence of a WPD element and the associated construction of Bestvina, Bromberg, and Fujiwara [BBF15, BBFS19], $\text{PSL}_2 \mathbb{Z}[i]$ also admits a general type acylindrical action on some other δ -hyperbolic space (which is necessarily not locally compact).

Using the superrigidity for actions on hyperbolic spaces established by Bader, Caprace, Furman, and Sisto [BCFS25] (see Theorem 6.6), and representation theoretic tools we prove the following theorem. The reduction in the statement means passing to the essential cores of the factors of \mathbb{X} , as in Proposition 6.8, and the equivalence for actions introduced in [BCFS25, Definition 4.2].

Theorem E. Fix integers $\mathbf{D} \geq 0$ and $F \geq 0$. Consider an irreducible lattice $\Gamma \leq G$ where $G = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{D}} H_i \times \prod_{j=1}^F G_j$ is a product of centerless simple Lie groups, $H_1, \dots, H_{\mathbf{D}}$ have real rank one, and G_1, \dots, G_F have real rank strictly larger than one. Let $S_1, \dots, S_{\mathbf{D}}$ be the hyperbolic symmetric spaces for $H_1, \dots, H_{\mathbf{D}}$. There exists an AU-acylindrical action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ with general type factors if and only if $F = 0$, and up to a natural reduction, $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}_{\text{dup}}$,

where $\mathbb{S} = \prod_{i=1}^D S_i$ and \mathbb{S}_{dup} is the (possibly empty) product of duplicate copies of factors of \mathbb{S} . Furthermore, the action is acylindrical if and only if $\Gamma \leq G$ is cocompact.

Earlier, we highlighted that nonuniform lattices in the isometry groups of locally compact hyperbolic spaces are acylindrically hyperbolic. A more general fact is true: in rank-one a nonuniformly acylindrical general type action can be used to find an acylindrical general type action (via [BBFS19]). Theorem E, as well as the examples in Section 6.3 show that this is no longer the case in higher rank. Namely, these irreducible nonuniform lattices *do not* admit acylindrical actions on any product of δ -hyperbolic spaces.

Question. *Which groups admit a nonuniformly acylindrical action on a finite product of δ -hyperbolic spaces but do not admit a nonelliptic acylindrical action on any such finite product?*

A note on [BF24]: Much of the work presented here is available on the arXiv [BF24], where we claimed without proof that the class of groups admitting an AU-acylindrical action on a product of hyperbolic spaces was closed under direct products. In fact, this is not true and only holds when the actions are proper. Similarly, Petyt and Spriano claimed without proof in [PS23, Remark 4.9] that the action of an HHG on the product of its eyries (i.e. the product of the maximally unbounded domains) is acylindrical which is not true for the same reasons. In a different direction, Bader, Caprace, Furman, and Sisto retracted a claim concerning rigidity for actions of S -arithmetic lattices on hyperbolic spaces, and must rather assume the ambient group is Lie [BCFS25] (see Theorem 6.6 for a precise statement).

However, we are thankful for how these events unfolded as it led us to explore the existence of a strongly canonical product decomposition (see [BF24, Theorem A]) which in turn allowed us to address the recent conjecture of Sela mentioned above (see [BF24, Section 10]). We perhaps may not have explored these directions had we remembered that the class is not closed under products, or potentially believed that S -arithmetic lattices were somehow exceptional (see Section 6.3 for the case of $\text{SL}_2\mathfrak{A}$).

We note that despite the above issues, the results proven in [BF24] are true. In fact, the lack of closure under direct products strengthens the canonical product decomposition. We also note that Sela's Conjecture concerns colorable HHG's. According to [HP22, Theorem 3.1], these act properly and therefore AU-acylindrically on a finite product of δ -hyperbolic spaces and so do admit a strongly canonical product decomposition. These claims will be shown in the forthcoming Part II [BFa], where we also strengthen our treatment of the conjecture.

We are also thankful for the timing of Sela's Conjecture. Our first attempt at addressing it led us to consider subdirect products more carefully. The framework of subdirect products was then a solution we had on-hand to address the lack of closure discussed above. In Part II, we establish the stability of our results for (subdirect) products.

Addressing the above issues required several additional pages of writing which led to the splitting of the work from [BF24] into the present Part I and the forthcoming Part II [BFa] for the convenience of the reader. ■

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank Uri Bader, Jennifer Beck, Yves Benoist, Corey Bregman, Nic Brody, Montserrat Casals-Ruiz, Indira Chatterji, Rémi Coulon,




FIGURE 1. From discrete to Polish

Tullia Dymarz, David Fisher, Alex Furman, Daniel Groves, Thomas Haettel, Jingyin Huang, Michael Hull, Kasia Jankiewicz, François Labourie, Marco Linton, Robbie Lyman, Joseph Maher, Jason Manning, Dan Margalit, Mahan Mj, Shahar Mozes, Denis Osin, Harry Petyt, Jacob Russell, Michah Sageev, Zlil Sela, Alessandro Sisto, Davide Spriano, Henry Wilton, Daniel Woodhouse, and Abdul Zalloum for useful conversations.

The first named author would like to thank Lafayette College for its generous start-up grant. The second named author would like to thank the American Institute of Mathematics, the Fields Institute, the Institut Henri Poincaré, The University of North Carolina, Greensboro, and the National Science Foundation for the support through NSF grants DMS 1802448 and 2005640.

Commutative diagrams were (eventually) made with the use of quivr by varkor, which can currently be found at ([q.uiver.app/](https://github.com/varkor/quiver)) with public github repository [varkor/quiver](https://github.com/varkor/quiver) (<https://github.com/varkor/quiver>).

Structure of the paper: Section 3 deals with some basic notation, definitions and results that will be used in this paper and subsequent ones. These are divided into 3 subsections, on products, hyperbolicity, and the bordification of a hyperbolic space. Sections 4 and 5 address the classification of actions and isometries in rank-one and higher rank respectively; the first part of Theorem C is proved as Proposition 5.8, and the second part is proved in Corollary 7.10. Examples and non-examples are discussed in detail in Section 6, where Theorem E is proved as Theorem 6.9. Section 7 establishes the structure of elementary subgroups and the Tits Alternative Theorem A. Theorem B is also proved therein as Propositions 7.2 and 7.3.

3. METRIC BASICS

We begin with notions that do not require any special properties about the metric space, before progressing to complete separable δ -hyperbolic geodesic spaces and their finite products. We collect some definitions and facts that we will need in this section. Since there are no geometric requirements on these results we state them for general metric spaces.

3.1. The Polish Topology on $\text{Isom } Y$. Recall that a group is said to be *Polish* if it is separable and admits a complete metric with respect to which the group operations are continuous maps. Polish groups fit in a hierarchy as in Figure 1.

If Y is a complete separable metric space then $\text{Isom } Y$ is a Polish group with respect to the topology of pointwise convergence. More specifically, if $\{x_n\} \subset Y$ is a countable

dense set and $g, h \in \text{Isom } Y$ then the following metric is a complete metric on $\text{Isom } Y$ that generates the topology of pointwise convergence [Kec95, Example 9.B(9)]:

$$(1) \quad d(g, h) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \left(\frac{d(g(x_k), h(x_k))}{1 + d(g(x_k), h(x_k))} + \frac{d(g^{-1}(x_k), h^{-1}(x_k))}{1 + d(g^{-1}(x_k), h^{-1}(x_k))} \right).$$

If Y is locally compact, separable, connected (which is the case when Y is geodesic), and complete then by [MS03] we have that $\text{Isom } Y$ is locally compact with respect to the above metric and acts properly on Y . If, in addition, Y is geodesic then every closed metric ball is compact by the Hopf-Rinow Theorem [BH99, Proposition I.3.7]. It is for these reasons that we will have the standing assumption that our metric spaces are separable and complete.

Definition 3.1. Y is said to be uniformly locally compact if for every $\rho, \tau > 0$ there is a $C(\rho, \tau) > 0$ such that for every $x \in Y$ and every open cover of the closed ball $\overline{N}_\rho(x)$ by open τ balls, there is a subcover of cardinality at most $C(\rho, \tau)$.

We note that if a metric space has cocompact isometry group then it is uniformly locally compact.

3.2. Actions and AU-acylindricity. Let S be a set on which the group Γ acts, and let $A \subset S$. We shall denote the stabilizer of A by $\text{Stab}A$ which is the set of $g \in \Gamma$ such that $gA = A$, and the fixator $\text{Fix}A = \bigcap_{a \in A} \text{Stab}\{a\}$. Note that for a single element $\text{Fix}\{a\} = \text{Stab}\{a\}$, while more generally $\text{Fix}A \leq \text{Stab}A$. This last subgroup inclusion is of finite index when A is finite.

Definition 3.2. For an action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$, $x \in Y$, and $\epsilon > 0$, the ϵ -coarse stabilizer of x is $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\} := \{g \in \Gamma : d(gx, x) \leq \epsilon\}$. If $S \subset Y$ then we denote by $\text{Set}_\epsilon S = \bigcap_{x \in S} \text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\}$. The notation $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(x)$ denotes the ϵ -neighborhood of x in Y (with respect to the metric on Y).

Definition 3.3. An action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is said to be

- (1) *cobounded* if for all $x \in Y$ there is an $R > 0$ such that $\Gamma \cdot \mathcal{N}_R(x) = Y$;
- (2) *cocompact* if there exists $C \subset Y$ compact such that $\Gamma \cdot C = Y$;
- (3) *proper* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and every $x \in Y$ we have $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\}| < \infty$;
- (4) *uniformly proper* if for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is an $N > 0$ so that for every $x \in Y$ we have $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\}| \leq N$;
- (5) *acylindrical*, if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exist nonnegative constants $R = R(\epsilon)$ and $N = N(\epsilon)$ such that for every $x, y \in X$ with $d(x, y) \geq R$, we have

$$|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}| \leq N;$$

- (6) *AU-acylindrical*, or *acylindrical of ambiguous uniformity* if for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $R \geq 0$ such that for every $x, y \in Y$ with $d(x, y) \geq R$, we have $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}| < \infty$;
- (7) *nonuniformly acylindrical*, if it is AU-acylindrical but not acylindrical.

The reader may think of AU-acylindricity as a type of properness for the associated action on $Y \times Y$, where ϵ -properness is only guaranteed on the complement of a “thick diagonal”, i.e. outside of the set of pairs that are at distance at most R in Y .

We also note that the type of action a lattice enjoys on its ambient space is always proper, and that proper actions are always AU-acylindrical. Acylindricity generalizes uniformly proper actions, in particular those of cocompact lattices. Tautologically, nonuniform acylindricity generalizes those that are not uniform, in particular the action of a nonuniform lattice on its ambient space. This is summarized in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. From lattices to AU-acylindrical actions

We now state some elementary lemmas that will be used in future sections.

Lemma 3.4. *If an action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is proper and cobounded then it is acylindrical.*

Since elements in the kernel of an action must fix all points in the space, we immediately have the following:

Lemma 3.5. *If $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is AU-acylindrical and Y is unbounded then the kernel $\ker(\rho) = \{g \in \Gamma : \rho(g) = \text{id}_Y\}$ is finite.*

We now prove that the notion of AU-acylindricity coincides with the notion of properness for actions on locally compact spaces that are “sufficiently continuously geodesic” (though AU-acylindricity and properness differ in general for non-locally compact spaces). (See Figure 2.)

Lemma 3.6. *Let Y be an unbounded locally compact metric space.*

- (1) *If $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is AU-acylindrical, then it is proper.*
- (2) *If $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is uniformly proper, then it is acylindrical.*
- (3) *Assume Y is uniformly locally compact and that there is some $T > 0$ so that for every $x \in Y$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an $y \in Y$ with $d(x, y) \in [nT, (n+1)T]$. If $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is acylindrical then it is uniformly proper.*

Proof. The proof of the second statement follows directly from the definitions. The proof of first statement is similar to that of the third, which we prove below. Since properness implies AU-acylindricity by definition, this establishes that AU-acylindricity and properness coincide for Y .

To prove the third statement, let $\epsilon > 0$ and let $N(2\epsilon), R(2\epsilon)$ be the associated acylindricity constants for 2ϵ . Fix $x \in Y$. Let $n_{R(2\epsilon)} = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : nT \geq R(2\epsilon)\}$. By the given condition, there is a $y \in Y$ with $(n_{R(2\epsilon)} + 1)T \geq d(x, y) \geq n_{R(2\epsilon)}T \geq R$.

Set $\rho = \epsilon + (n_{R(2\epsilon)} + 1)T$. Since Y is uniformly locally compact, there exist $C(\rho, \epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \overline{\mathcal{N}}_\rho(x)$ with $m \leq C(\rho, \epsilon)$, forming a finite open cover $\bigcup_{i=1}^m \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(z_i) \supset \overline{\mathcal{N}}_\rho(x)$.

Let $g, h \in \text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\}$ we note that $g \in h \cdot \text{Set}_{2\epsilon}\{x\}$ i.e. $d(h^{-1}gx, x) \leq 2\epsilon$. Furthermore, $gy \in \bar{N}_\rho(x)$ since

$$d(x, gy) \leq d(x, gx) + d(gx, gy) \leq \epsilon + d(x, y) \leq \rho.$$

This means that $gy \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(z_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. If also $hy \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(z_i)$ for the same i , then $d(h^{-1}gy, y) \leq 2\epsilon$ or equivalently $g \in h \cdot \text{Set}_{2\epsilon}\{y\}$.

Let $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$ be the set of indices defined by: $j \in I$ if and only if $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon(z_j) \cap (\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\} \cdot y) \neq \emptyset$. We have established that $I \neq \emptyset$ since the index $i \in I$. For each $j \in I$ fix g_j with $g_j y \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon(z_j)$. Then by the above, we have that $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x\} \subset \bigcup_{j \in I} g_j \cdot \text{Set}_{2\epsilon}\{x, y\}$ and

therefore has cardinality at most $C(\rho, \epsilon) \cdot N(2\epsilon)$. \square

We shall use the following to deduce the Tits Alternative in later sections.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $1 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \Gamma \rightarrow A \rightarrow 1$ be a short exact sequence with K finite and A contains an isomorphic copy of \mathbb{Z}^k as a finite index subgroup, for some $k \geq 1$. Then there is a subgroup of finite index $\Gamma' \leq \Gamma$ so that Γ' is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^k .*

Proof. Consider the action of Γ by conjugation on K . This gives a homomorphism $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } K$, the latter is a finite group, and therefore the kernel is of finite index in Γ . Furthermore, since A contains a finite index subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^k , up to passing to a finite index subgroup of Γ , we may assume that the action of Γ on K by conjugation is trivial, and that A is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^k . (We note that this reduction also amounts to passing to the center of K , which is characteristic and finite index in K .)

Let A have free generators $\{g_1, \dots, g_k\}$. Choose a lift $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$ of g_i for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Note that if $k = 1$ then g_1 has infinite order and hence the sequence is split.

Let p be the cardinality of K . Then $h^p = 1$ for every $h \in K$. Fix $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. Then there exists an $h \in K$ such that $\gamma_i \gamma_j \gamma_i^{-1} = \gamma_j h$. Since γ_j commutes with h we have that

$$\gamma_i \gamma_j^p \gamma_i^{-1} = \gamma_j^p h^p = \gamma_j^p.$$

Therefore, $[\gamma_i, \gamma_j^p] = 1$.

Applying the above argument for all pairs, we obtain that $\{\gamma_1^p, \dots, \gamma_k^p\}$ are commuting infinite order elements. Their projection to A is a finite index subgroup and hence they generate a finite index subgroup Γ' in Γ . \square

Lemma 3.8. *Consider the action of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ on itself by left-translation. If $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ is AU-acylindrical then it is uniformly proper and Γ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k , for $0 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$.*

Proof. First, since the action is AU-acylindrical, the kernel is finite by Lemma 3.5. By Lemma 3.6 the action is proper and hence the orbits are discrete. By [BS66, Lemma 4, p102] Γ mod the kernel of the action is \mathbb{Z}^k , where $0 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$. By Lemma 3.7, Γ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k . \square

3.3. Hyperbolic Geodesic Metric Spaces. The Gromov product of $x, y \in Y$ with respect to the base-point $o \in Y$ is defined as

$$\langle x, y \rangle_o = \frac{1}{2}(d(x, o) + d(o, y) - d(x, y)) \geq 0.$$




FIGURE 3. Gromov Product with Comparison Tripod for general triangle

It is a measure of how far the triple is from achieving the triangle equality.

Assume Y is geodesic and consider $a, b, c \in Y$ with choice of geodesics, as in Figure 3. The points s and t are marked on the geodesic $[c, a]$ so that $d(c, b) = d(c, t)$ and $d(a, b) = d(a, s)$. The point m is the midpoint between s and t . The points m' and m'' are then the corresponding points on the geodesics $[a, b]$ and $[b, c]$ respectively so that

$$\begin{aligned} d(a, m) &= d(a, m') \\ d(b, m') &= d(b, m'') \\ d(c, m'') &= d(c, m) \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $d(s, m) = d(m, t) = \langle c, a \rangle_b$ and with the previous observations, we see that

$$d(b, m') = d(b, m'') = \langle c, a \rangle_b.$$

Combining these, we obtain the comparison tripod on the right in Figure 3, which is uniquely determined by $d(A, M) = d(a, m)$, $d(B, M) = d(b, m')$ and $d(C, M) = d(c, m)$. We note that this yields a natural projection

$$\pi : [a, b] \cup [b, c] \cup [c, a] \rightarrow [A, B] \cup [B, C] \cup [C, A]$$

Definition 3.9. A geodesic metric space X is said to be δ -hyperbolic if for every $a, b, c \in X$ with comparison tripod as above, the diameter of preimages of a point under π is uniformly bounded by δ .

Remark 3.10. For a geodesic triangle as in Figure 1, we shall refer to its *center* as the triple $\{m, m', m''\} = \pi^{-1}\{M\}$. We note that if X is δ -hyperbolic then the center of any geodesic triangle has diameter no larger than δ . There are other (equivalent) formulations of δ -hyperbolicity – such as the so-called “slim-triangles” condition due to Rips – additional details can be found in [BH99, Chapter III.H].

Corollary 3.11. Let X be a δ -hyperbolic geodesic metric space. Fix $a, b, c \in X$ and $[a, c]$ a geodesic between a and c . If $p \in [a, c]$ is a point closest to b then $\langle a, c \rangle_b \leq d(p, b) \leq \langle a, c \rangle_b + \delta$.

Definition 3.12. Let $C \geq 1$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. A map $\varphi : Y \rightarrow Z$ between metric spaces is a (C, λ) quasi-isometric embedding if it is coarsely bi-Lipschitz i.e. for all $y, y' \in Y$ we have

$$\frac{1}{C}d(y, y') - \lambda \leq d(\varphi(y), \varphi(y')) \leq Cd(y, y') + \lambda.$$

If in addition, φ is *coarsely surjective*, i.e. for every $z \in Z$ there is a $x \in Y$ such that $d(\varphi(x), z) \leq \lambda$ we say φ is a quasi-isometry. If $Y = \mathbb{Z}$ then the image of φ is called a *quasigeodesic*.

Hyperbolicity is a quasi-isometry invariant [BH99, Theorem III.H.1.9].

3.3.1. Gromov Bordification. Let X be a δ -hyperbolic geodesic metric space. A sequence $x(n) \in X$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is said to be a Gromov sequence if $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \langle x(n), x(m) \rangle_o = \infty$. Recall that if $a(n, m) \in \mathbb{R}$ is a double indexed sequence then $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} a(n, m) = \infty$ if for every $L > 0$ there is an $N > 0$ so that if $n, m \geq N$ then $a(n, m) \geq L$. Two Gromov sequences $x(n), y(n), n \in \mathbb{N}$ are said to be equivalent if $\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \langle x(n), y(m) \rangle_o = \infty$.

The Gromov boundary as a set is the collection of equivalence classes of Gromov sequences converging to infinity and is denoted ∂X . If $\xi, \eta \in \partial X$ then we may extend the Gromov product by taking the following infimum ranging over equivalence class representatives:

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_o = \inf \left(\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \langle x(n), y(m) \rangle_o \right).$$

We topologize ∂X by saying that two classes are topologically “nearby” if they have “large” Gromov product, or equivalently the corresponding quasigeodesic rays fellow travel for a “long” time.

Since these conditions are independent of the choice of the base point $o \in X$ there is a natural map [VÖ5, Theorem 5.3] (see also [Ham17])

$$\text{Isom } X \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(\partial X), f \mapsto \partial f.$$

Remark 3.13. Benakli and Kapovich sketch an argument that for every $x \in X$ and $\xi \in \partial X$, there is a $(1, 10\delta)$ quasigeodesic ray from x to ξ . They also state that this can be used to prove that a pair of distinct boundary points can be connected by a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic [BK02, Remark 2.16]. This sketch can be more rigorously seen by results from Väisälä’s work [VÖ5] as follows: By Remark 6.4, a (μ, h) -road can be made into a $(1, \mu)$ -quasigeodesic ray. By Theorem 6.7, for every $h > 0$ there exists a $(4\delta + 2h, h)$ -road connecting x and ξ . Hence there exists a $(1, 5\delta)$ quasigeodesic ray connecting x and ξ . Similarly, by Lemma 6.13, given distinct $\xi, \eta \in \partial X$, for every $h > 0$ there exists a $(12\delta + 10h, h)$ -biroad and so ξ and η can be connected by a $(1, 13\delta)$ quasigeodesic. The work of Bonk and Schramm can also be employed here with less precision to the constants [BS00, Proposition 5.2]. The fact that the multiplicative constant here is trivial is indispensable for our results and therefore most will be phrased for $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics. We note that there is a small discrepancy in that those sources use \mathbb{R} to define quasigeodesics whereas we use \mathbb{Z} . This means that technically, the additive constants above should be corrected with a $+1$, where appropriate. For ease of notation, we shall ignore this discrepancy as well as the precision guaranteed by Väisälä: we will utilize $(1, 10\delta)$ quasigeodesic rays and $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesics.

We shall denote by $\overline{X} = X \cup \partial X$ the Gromov bordification of X and note that it may not be compact, and ∂X not closed, though they are both metrizable [VÖ5, Section 5]. It is for this reason that we use the term bordification.

3.3.2. The Morse Property. An important property of hyperbolic metric spaces is the Morse property for stability of quasigeodesics.

Proposition 3.14 (Finite Morse Property). [VÖ5, Theorem 3.7][BH99, Theorem III.H.1.7] *Let X be a δ -hyperbolic space, and $C \geq 1, \lambda \geq 0$ be two constants. Then there is a constant $M = M(\delta, C, \lambda)$ such that if q is a (C, λ) -quasigeodesic in X and $[x, y]$ is a geodesic segment between the end points of q , then the Hausdorff distance between q and $[x, y]$ is at most M .*

Theorem 3.15 (Infinite Morse Property). [VÖ5, Theorem 6.32] *Let X be δ -hyperbolic, $C \geq 0$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. There exists $M = M(\delta, C, \lambda)$ so that if c, q are either two (C, λ) quasigeodesic rays starting from the same point, and converging to the same point in ∂X or are two bi-infinite (C, λ) quasigeodesics with the same endpoints on ∂X , then $d_{\text{Haus}}(\text{im}(c), \text{im}(q)) \leq M$.*

Remark 3.16 (The Morse Constant). In Väisälä's work, the constant $M(\delta, C, \lambda)$ from Proposition 3.14 is used to prove Theorem 3.15 and are therefore the same. We shall exclusively be using $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics and later want to refer to “the” Morse constant. So, to be precise we set M_λ to be δ plus the infimum of the $M(\delta, 1, \lambda)$ from Proposition 3.14.

A consequence of the Morse Property is that the “slim-triangles” formulation of hyperbolicity may be extended to quasigeodesic triangles as well; see [BH99, Corollary III.H.1.8] for instance.

The following lemma establishes a fellow-traveling property for $(1, \lambda)$ quasi-geodesics. We note that the lemma is not true for (C, λ) quasigeodesics if $C \neq 1$. For example, consider the quasigeodesics $c, q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $c(n) = n$ and $q(n) = Cn$. Then $d(c(n), q(n)) = |(C - 1)n|$ which is unbounded if $C \neq 1$.

Lemma 3.17. *Let $c, q : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ be $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesic rays with $c(0) = q(0)$ and $c(n), q(n) \rightarrow \xi \in \partial X$. Let M_λ be as in Remark 3.16. Then $d(c(n), q(n)) \leq 2M_\lambda + 3\lambda$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 3.15 there is an $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $d(c(n), q(m_n)) \leq M_\lambda$. Since c and q are quasigeodesics with the same base point, using the reverse triangle inequality we have that

$$|n - m_n| - 2\lambda \leq |d(c(n), c(0)) - d(q(m_n), q(0))| \leq d(c(n), q(m_n)) \leq M_\lambda.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} d(c(n), q(n)) &\leq d(c(n), q(m_n)) + d(q(m_n), q(n)) \\ &\leq M_\lambda + |m_n - n| + \lambda \\ &\leq 2M_\lambda + 3\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.18. *Let $c, q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X$ be $(1, \lambda)$ oriented quasigeodesics converging to the same points in ∂X , in the same direction. Let M_λ be the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesic rays and M'_λ be the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda + 2M_\lambda)$ quasigeodesics. Then for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that*

$$d(c(n), q(n)) \leq 2M'_\lambda + 8M_\lambda + 5\lambda + d(c(0), q(0)).$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.15, there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $d(c(0), q(m_0)) \leq M_\lambda$. Let $q' : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X$ be given by $q'(n) = q(n + m_0)$, which is still a $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesic. Furthermore, define $c'(n) = c(n)$ if $n \neq 0$ and $c'(0) = q'(0)$. Then the quasigeodesics $c'|_{[0, \infty)}$ and $q'|_{[0, \infty)}$

(respectively $c'|_{(-\infty, 0]}$ and $q'|_{(-\infty, 0]}$) are $(1, \lambda + M_\lambda)$ quasigeodesic rays starting from the same point and converging to the same end point in ∂X . By Lemma 3.17 for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that

$$d(c'(n), q'(n)) \leq 2M'_\lambda + 3(\lambda + 2M_\lambda)$$

and

$$d(c'(-n), q'(-n)) \leq 2M'_\lambda + 3(\lambda + 2M_\lambda).$$

Now, let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(c(n), q(n)) &\leq d(c(n), c'(n)) + d(c'(n), q'(n)) + d(q'(n), q(n)) \\ &\leq M_\lambda + 2M'_\lambda + 3(\lambda + 2M_\lambda) + |m_0| + \lambda \\ &\leq 2M'_\lambda + 7M_\lambda + 4\lambda + d(q(m_0), q(0)) + \lambda \\ &\leq 2M'_\lambda + 7M_\lambda + 5\lambda + d(q(m_0), c(0)) + d(c(0), q(0)) \\ &\leq 2M'_\lambda + 8M_\lambda + 5\lambda + d(c(0), q(0)) \end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that the proofs of Lemma 3.17 and Corollary 3.18 also hold for $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesic segments by applying the finite version of the Morse Property Proposition 3.14. Furthermore, if we know the quasigeodesics in question are at bounded Hausdorff distance, then hyperbolicity condition on X is unnecessary.

3.4. Products. We begin by recalling the universal property for products and some consequences and then dive in to the context of this work: finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces.

The universal property for direct products is important as it encapsulates that a variety of objects associated to a product (e.g. a point in the product, or maps *to* a product) are determined by its projections to the factors.

3.4.1. The universal property. Recall that if A_1, A_2, B are sets, and $p_i : A_1 \times A_2 \rightarrow A_i$, is the natural projection defined by, $p_i(a_1, a_2) := a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ then for any set-maps $f_1 : B \rightarrow A_1$ and $f_2 : B \rightarrow A_2$ there exists a unique set-map $f : B \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2$ such that $p_1 \circ f = f_1$ and $p_2 \circ f = f_2$. This fits into the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_2 & \xleftarrow{p_2} & A_1 \times A_2 \\ f_2 \uparrow & \searrow \exists! f & \downarrow p_1 \\ B & \xrightarrow{f_1} & A_1 \end{array}$$

Notation: Given a map $f : B \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2$, we shall denote the factors as f_1 , and f_2 , respectively. Similarly, given $f_i : B \rightarrow A_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, we may assemble this into $f : B \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2$ in a unique fashion. However, if we wish to emphasize this assembly, we may write $\Delta(f_1, f_2) : B \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2$, where the symbol Δ represents the word “diagonal”.

Note that if $B = B_1 \times B_2$ is itself a product, there is no reason that f_1 must factor through (one or both of) the natural projections $p'_i : B_1 \times B_2 \rightarrow B_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. For

example, consider a rotation $r : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, given by $r_1(x_1, x_2) = x_1 \cos \theta - x_2 \sin \theta$, and $r_2(x_1, x_2) = x_1 \sin \theta + x_2 \cos \theta$. The universal property states that $r(x_1, x_2)$ is uniquely determined by r_1 and r_2 . Note that both maps r_1 and r_2 depend on both variables. *Such a map does not preserve the factors.*

However, given set-maps $f_i : B_i \rightarrow A_i$, for $i = 1, 2$ we do have a unique set map $f_1 \times f_2 : B_1 \times B_2 \rightarrow A_1 \times A_2$ given by $(f_1 \times f_2)(b_1, b_2) = (f_1(b_1), f_2(b_2))$, which *does preserve the factors*. The properties of $f_1 \times f_2$ are captured by the following commutative diagram. Note the absence of maps $B_1 \rightarrow A_2$ and $B_2 \rightarrow A_1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A_2 & \xleftarrow{p_2} & & A_1 \times A_2 & \\
 f_2 \uparrow & & & \nearrow \exists! f_1 \times f_2 & \\
 B_2 & \xleftarrow{p'_2} & B_1 \times B_2 & & \downarrow p_1 \\
 & & \downarrow p'_1 & & \downarrow p_1 \\
 & & B_1 & \xrightarrow{f_1} & A_1
 \end{array}$$

Furthermore, the above commutative diagrams can be completed uniquely in a variety of categories, yielding unique homomorphisms for groups, continuous maps for topological spaces (with the product topology), and isometries (with respect to, for example, ℓ^p -product metrics). For clarity, we note that in the image above,

$$f_1 \times f_2 = \Delta(f_1 \circ p'_1, f_2 \circ p'_2).$$

Notation: When considering multiple factors, for example $\mathfrak{D} > 1$, and $f_i : B_i \rightarrow A_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, we shall denote the above factor preserving product map as

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} f_i : \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} B_i \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i$$

3.4.2. Products of δ -hyperbolic spaces and their isometry groups. Finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces of course play a leading role in our work. We shall consistently use the notation that $\mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} X_i$, where X_i are separable complete geodesic δ -hyperbolic spaces. Separability and completeness will ensure that their isometry groups are Polish (see Section 3.1). In [BFa], these conditions will give us additional control of the spaces, allowing us to build an “essential core” (see Proposition 6.8).

We denote by $\text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D})$ the collection of possible permutations of indices according to whether the corresponding spaces are isometric and fix such an isomorphism. This allows us to consider the corresponding automorphism group $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X} := \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D}) \ltimes \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$ and

we will denote by $\text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$, which is the maximal subgroup which preserves the factors.

Notation: Let $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{X}$, we shall denote the i^{th} coordinate of x as $x_i \in X_i$. For $g \in \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$, we shall denote the isometry that g acts by on X_i by $g_i \in \text{Isom } X_i$. This does mean that we shall occasionally have to use notation such as x^n or $x(n)$ to denote finite or infinite sequences of elements.

There are of course different metrics that one could consider on \mathbb{X} , the class of ℓ^p -product metrics being an important family of equivalent ones. The availability of the ℓ^2 -product metric allows us to place \mathbb{X} in the category of non-positively curved spaces. However, we will most often use the ℓ^∞ metric, and while we distinguish these in the following definition, we shall use d for the ℓ^∞ metric, as it will be the one most utilized. We shall more generally, use d to denote most metrics, unless confusion may arise.

Definition 3.19 (The ℓ^p -product metric on \mathbb{X}). If $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ and $p \in [1, \infty)$ then $d_p(x, y) := \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} [d_i(x_i, y_i)]^p}$ and if $p = \infty$ then $d_\infty(x, y) := \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}} d_i(x_i, y_i)$.

We note that if the factors are geodesic then \mathbb{X} is also geodesic with respect to the ℓ^p -product metric (e.g. consider the product of geodesics in each factor and choose an ℓ^p -geodesic in the resulting \mathfrak{D} -dimensional interval). This is true in particular for $p = 2$, allowing us to think of these spaces as being “nonpositively curved”. In Part II [BFa], we shall prove that under natural hypotheses, the ℓ^2 -isometry group of \mathbb{X} is $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$.

Using the Roller compactification and boundary of a $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complex as inspiration, we shall consider $\overline{\mathbb{X}} := \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \overline{X}_i$ and $\partial \mathbb{X} := \overline{\mathbb{X}} \setminus \mathbb{X}$, which is only a bordification in general. (Recall that $\overline{X} = X \cup \partial X$ represents the Gromov bordification of the hyperbolic space X .) Note that if $\mathfrak{D} = 2$ then $\partial \mathbb{X} = (X_1 \times \partial X_2) \cup (\partial X_1 \times \partial X_2) \cup (\partial X_1 \times X_2)$. We define the *regular boundary* as the subset $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \partial X_i$. As is the case for the Roller compactification of a $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complex (e.g. [NS13, CF16, KS16, Fer18, FLM18, FLM24], also [Lin10]) the regular boundary carries the important dynamical information. We note that usually the regular boundary is referred to as the set of “regular points”. However, as none of these boundaries confer a compactification of \mathbb{X} in general, we believe the use of the word “boundary” here is acceptable.

Consider the projection $p : \text{Aut } \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D})$. Then $\ker(p) = \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$ is a finite index subgroup. We then have that if $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is a homomorphism then $\Gamma_0 = \rho^{-1}(\ker(p))$ is of finite index in Γ .

As a product, $\text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ comes equipped with natural projections $\pi_i : \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$. As was discussed in Section 3.4.1, $\rho|_{\Gamma_0}$ is uniquely determined by the factor actions $\rho_i = \pi_i \circ \rho : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, and conversely, given a homomorphism $\rho_i : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$ there exists a unique homomorphism $\rho : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ such that $\rho_i = \pi_i \circ \rho$, namely $\Delta(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}})$. The related question of inducing representations from a finite index subgroup will be considered in Section 5.3.

4. ISOMETRIC ACTIONS IN RANK-ONE

In order to classify the isometries in higher rank in the next section, we first discuss isometries and actions in rank-one here.

4.1. Classification results. We recall some standard terminology used in relation to actions on hyperbolic spaces and introduce some new terminology along the way. Note that the


following classification extends that obtained by Gromov in the case when the boundary is “visible by geodesics”, which includes the locally compact case [Gro87, Corollary 8.1.B] and by Hamann in the general case [Ham17, Theorem 2.3, Proposition 4.4]. Recall that given a hyperbolic space X , we denote by ∂X its Gromov boundary.

Definition 4.1. Let X be a (unbounded) δ -hyperbolic space, and $\gamma \in \text{Isom } X$. For $\epsilon \geq 0$, define $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\gamma) = \{x \in X : d(\gamma^n x, x) \leq \epsilon \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. We shall say that γ is

- (1) *elliptic* if all orbits are bounded. More precisely, an elliptic isometry is
 - (a) a *tremble* if there is an $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that the set $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\gamma) = X$;
 - (b) a *rotation* if $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\gamma)$ is bounded for every $\epsilon \geq 0$;
 - (c) a *rift* if it is neither a tremble nor a rotation.
- (2) *parabolic* if $\langle \gamma \rangle$ has a unique fixed point in ∂X and has unbounded orbits.
- (3) *loxodromic* if γ is not elliptic and has exactly two fixed points on $\gamma^-, \gamma^+ \in \partial X$, in which case $\lim_{n \rightarrow \pm\infty} \gamma^n \cdot x = \gamma^\pm$, for all $x \in \overline{X} \setminus \{\gamma^-, \gamma^+\}$.

Remark 4.2. For γ loxodromic, the fixed point corresponding to γ^- and γ^+ will be called the *repelling* and *attracting* fixed points of γ . Hamann guarantees the convergence for $x \in X$ in Theorem 2.3, and the extension to the boundary is Property (C1) [Ham17]. Furthermore, loxodromic elements are characterized by having positive *stable translation length*, i.e. $\inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{d(\gamma^n x, x)}{n} > 0$ for all $x \in X$ and quasi-isometrically embedded orbits.

Example: To distinguish between the three types of elliptic elements, consider the standard embedding of the 4-valent tree T in \mathbb{R}^2 , as depicted in the adjacent figure. A rotation by $\pi/2$ would be a rotation on the tree, and a flip along a horizontal axis would be a rift. On the other hand, trees without leaves have no non-trivial trembles.



To create a non-trivial tremble, we may take the product of T with a bounded graph. Then any nontrivial isometry of the bounded graph will induce a non-trivial tremble of the δ -hyperbolic space $T \times C$. ■

Given an action $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$, we denote by $\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))$ the set of limit points of $\rho(\Gamma)$ in ∂X . That is,

$$\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma)) = \partial X \cap \overline{\rho(\Gamma) \cdot x},$$

where $\overline{\rho(\Gamma) \cdot x}$ denotes the closure of the $\rho(\Gamma)$ -orbit of $x \in X$ in \overline{X} ; the limit set is independent of the choice of basepoint x . The ρ -action of Γ on X naturally extends to a continuous action of Γ on ∂X by postcomposing ρ with $\partial : \text{Isom } X \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(\partial X)$. We also note that as ∂X is not closed in general, neither is $\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))$. Moreover, we will often drop the name of the homomorphism ρ and simply denote the set by $\Lambda(\Gamma)$, if no confusion can arise.

The following theorem summarizes the standard classification of groups acting on hyperbolic spaces. Since the image of a homomorphism is a subgroup, we may also view this as a classification of subgroups of $\text{Isom } X$.

Theorem 4.3. Let X be a hyperbolic space and $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ a homomorphism. For $\epsilon \geq 0$ we define $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma)) = \{x \in X : d(\rho(g)x, x) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } g \in \Gamma\}$. One of the following is true:

- (1) $|\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))| = 0$ and the action is elliptic, i.e. $X = \bigcup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma))$. If in addition
- there exists $\epsilon \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma)) = X$ then we say the action is a tremble;
 - for every $\epsilon \geq 0$ we have that $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma))$ is bounded then we say the action is a rotation;
 - for all $\epsilon \geq 0$ sufficiently large we have that $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma)) \neq X$ and unbounded, then we say the action is a rift.
- (2) $|\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))| = 1$ and the action is parabolic. In this case, $\rho(\Gamma)$ has a unique fixed point in ∂X , unbounded orbits, and no loxodromic elements;
- (3) $|\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))| = 2$ and the action is lineal. In this case, a loxodromic exists in $\rho(\Gamma)$. If further, $\rho(\Gamma)$ fixes each limit point, the action is called oriented lineal.
- (4) $|\Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))| = \infty$ and the action is one of the following:
- (a) quasiparabolic if in addition $\rho(\Gamma)$ fixes a unique point in ∂X . In this case $\rho(\Gamma)$ contains two loxodromic with distinct attracting fixed points and that generate a free semigroup;
 - (b) general type if there exists two loxodromics in $\rho(\Gamma)$ with disjoint fixed point sets in ∂X that freely generate a free subgroup of Γ acting by loxodromic elements.

Remark 4.4. This theorem was proved by Gromov in the locally compact case, or when the boundary is accessible by geodesics, where it is argued that any δ -hyperbolic space can be ultra-completed in an Isom X -equivariant fashion, i.e. completed so that it is geodesic and has a boundary that is accessible by geodesics [Gro87, Section 8.2]. Bonk and Schramm proved that a hyperbolic space can be completed through the use of transfinite induction [BS00, Theorem 4.1], a procedure unlikely to be compatible with the isometry group. The general case for a geodesic δ -hyperbolic space (not necessarily separable) follows from a combination of [Ham17, Theorem 2.8, Theorem 4.4] and [DSU17, Proposition 7.3.1, Proposition 10.5.4]. We contribute to the classification through the observation that elliptic actions in general naturally have the above trifurcation.

The reader may have noted the figure on the title page, which has a representation for each of the types of actions in the following theorem. This schematic should be read as one would read figures in the disk model of the hyperbolic plane. We hope that, beyond its aesthetic appeal, it is also instructive (see [CDHH⁺24] “On the importance of illustration for mathematical research”).

4.2. Busemann quasimorphism. A function $b: \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a *quasimorphism* if there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that

$$|b(gh) - b(g) - b(h)| \leq C$$

for all $g, h \in \Gamma$. We say that b has *defect at most C* . If, in addition, the restriction of b to every cyclic subgroup of G is a homomorphism, then b is called a homogeneous quasimorphism. Every quasimorphism b gives rise to a homogeneous quasimorphism β defined as follows:

$$\beta(g) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b(g^n)}{n} \quad \forall g \in \Gamma.$$

We note that since $b(g^n)$ is uniformly close to a subadditive sequence this limit exists by Fekete’s Lemma. The function β is called the *homogenization of b* . It is straightforward to check that

$$|\beta(g) - b(g)| \leq C$$

for all $g \in \Gamma$ where C is the defect of b as above.

Given any action of a group on a hyperbolic space fixing a point ξ on the boundary, one can associate the *Busemann quasimorphism*. We briefly recall the construction and necessary properties here, and refer the reader to [Gro87, Sec. 7.5.D] and [Man08, Sec. 4.1] for further details.

Definition 4.5. Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ be an action that fixes a point $\xi \in \partial X$. Let $s = \{x(n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence of points of X converging to ξ . Then the function $b_s : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$b_s(g) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d(gx(0), x(n)) - d(x(0), x(n)))$$

is a quasimorphism. Its homogenization β_s is called the *Busemann quasimorphism*. It is known that this definition is independent of the choice of s (see [Man08, Lemma 4.6]), and thus we can drop the subscript and just write β .

Roughly speaking, the Busemann quasimorphism measures the translation of group elements towards or away from ξ , ignoring horocyclic translation. In particular $\beta(g) \neq 0$ if and only if g is loxodromic. Therefore, $\beta \neq 0$ if the action is oriented lineal or quasiparabolic. Note that, in general, β need not be a homomorphism, but it is when the group is amenable or if X is proper (see [CCMT15, Corollary 3.9]).

We will use the following results concerning the Busemann quasimorphism, which appear in [ABR23, Section 3] in a slightly different setting. We include the setup, notation and statements here – these will be reused later, particularly in Section 7. We omit some of the proofs as they follow directly from the proofs in [ABR23].

Local Notation: Let us establish the notation that will be used through until the end of the proof of Lemma 4.8, and where these results are invoked. Let X be δ -hyperbolic, $\xi \in \partial X$, $q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X$ be a quasigeodesic converging to ξ in the positive direction, and $M = M_{20\delta}$ be the Morse constant as in Remark 3.16. If $g \in \text{Fix}\{\xi\}$ then the ray $q|_{[0, \infty)}$ and its translate $gq|_{[0, \infty)}$ are both $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic rays that share the endpoint ξ and thus are eventually M -Hausdorff close by [Vö5, 6.9.Closeness Lemma], and synchronously fellow travel forever after (see Lemma 7.4). Specifically, there are numbers $t_0 = t_0(g)$ and $s_0 = s_0(g) \geq 0$ depending on g and $q(0)$ so that $q|_{[t_0, \infty)}$ and $gq|_{[s_0, \infty)}$ are M -Hausdorff close and $d(q(t_0), gq(s_0)) \leq M$. In other words s_0 is a bound for how long we must wait for the ray $gq|_{[0, \infty)}$ to become close to the ray $q|_{[0, \infty)}$. This depends only on $d(q(0), gq(0))$, and $s_0(g)$ may be chosen smaller than a (linear) function of $d(q(0), gq(0))$. We consider the difference $l = t_0 - s_0$ as the amount that g “shifts” the quasigeodesic q , which may be positive or negative. In the case when the space X is a quasi-line, we may take $s_0 = 0$ since q, gq share both end points on ∂X and are thus always Hausdorff-close.

Lemma 4.6. [ABR23, Corollary 3.15] *Under the setup described above, there is a constant $E > 0$ so that for any $g \in \Gamma$, if $s \geq s_0(g)$ then*

$$d(q(s - \beta(g)), gq(s)) \leq E.$$

In particular, when X is a quasi-line, then $d(q(-\beta(g)), gq(0)) \leq E$ and it follows that $d(q(0), gq(0)) \leq |\beta(g)| + E + 20\delta$.

Proposition 4.7. [ABR23, Proposition 3.12] *Let X be a quasi-line, $\xi \in \partial X$ and $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Fix}\{\xi\}$ be an action so that the associated Busemann quasimorphism $\beta : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a homomorphism.*

Define the function $A: [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$A(r) = \sup\{|\beta(g)| : g \in \Gamma \text{ s.t. } d(q(0), gq(0)) \leq r\}.$$

Then there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that for any $g, h \in \Gamma$ with $d(q(0), gq(0)) \leq r$ and $\beta(h) \leq A(r)$, we have $d(ghq(0), hq(0)) \leq |\beta(g)| + B$.

We will also need the following lemma pertaining to the behavior of quasigeodesics in parabolic actions. If the action is parabolic, then Γ is infinite, and we may fix a strictly increasing sequence $\{1\} \subsetneq S_1 \subsetneq S_2 \subsetneq \dots$ of finite symmetric subsets of Γ .

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Fix}\{\xi\}$ is parabolic and $q : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic ray converging to ξ . Let E be the constant from Lemma 4.6. Define*

$$M(t) = \max\{m \mid d(gq(t), q(t)) \leq E \ \forall g \in S_m\}.$$

Then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a t_n such that $M(t) \geq n$ for all $t \geq t_n$. In particular, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} M(t) = \infty$.

Proof. Since the action is parabolic, there are no loxodromic elements and hence the Busemann quasimorphism $\beta \equiv 0$ on Γ (and is hence a homomorphism).

Since the action is by isometries fixing ξ , if $q : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X$ is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic converging to ξ , then so is gq for every $g \in \Gamma$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $g_1, g_2 \in S_n$. Then there exists a $t_0 = t_0(g_1, g_2)$ such that $d(g_1q(t), g_2q(t)) \leq E$ for all $t \geq t_0$; this follows from Lemma 4.6. Set $t_n = \max\{t_0(g_1, g_2) \mid g_1, g_2 \in S_n\}$. It follows that if $t \geq t_n$ then S_n satisfies the definition of $M(t)$ and therefore $M(t) \geq n$. \square

5. ACTIONS IN HIGHER RANK

We now turn our attention to classifying isometries in higher rank. Note that some of these have been considered in the work of Button [But25, Section 4].

Definition 5.1. An element $g = (g_1, \dots, g_{\mathfrak{D}}) \in \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is said to be

- (1) *elliptic* if all components g_i are elliptic;
- (2) *parabolic* if all components g_i are parabolic;
- (3) *pseudo-parabolic* if all components g_i are either elliptic or parabolic, with at least one of each type;
- (4) *regular loxodromic* if all components g_i are loxodromic;
- (5) *weakly-loxodromic* if at least one component g_i is loxodromic, but g is not regular.

5.1. Obstructions and simplifications to acylindricity in higher rank. Our first goal is to show that factors where the action is elliptic or parabolic do not “contribute” to acylindricity, and can thus be omitted from \mathbb{X} without losing the acylindricity of the action (see Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3). For the case of AU-acylindricity, we note that Lemma 5.2 shows that elliptic factors can still be omitted, but the remaining results require the stronger acylindricity assumption.

Since the notion of an elliptic action is well defined for any metric space, we prove the following lemma in a more general setting.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y \times \text{Isom } Z$ is (AU-)acylindrical, where Y, Z are metric spaces. If the projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is elliptic then the projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Z$ is (AU-)acylindrical.*

Proof. We shall just prove the case of an acylindrical action since the case of nonuniformly acylindrical actions is analogous. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Fix $y \in Y$. Then there is a constant $B > 0$ such that $\text{diam}(\Gamma y) \leq B$. Let R, N be the acylindricity constants for $\epsilon' = \epsilon + B$ for the action on $Y \times Z$. Let $a, b \in Z$ be any points such that $d(a, b) > R$. Consider the set

$$S = \{g \in \Gamma \mid d(a, ga) \leq \epsilon \text{ and } d(b, gb) \leq \epsilon\}.$$

We claim that $|S| \leq N$, which will prove acylindricity.

Firstly, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} d((y, a), (y, b)) &= d(y, y) + d(a, b) \\ &= d(a, b) \\ &\geq R \end{aligned}$$

Further, if $g \in S$, then

$$\begin{aligned} d((y, a), g(y, a)) &= d(y, gy) + d(a, ga) \\ &\leq B + \epsilon \\ &= \epsilon' \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $d((y, b), g(y, b)) \leq \epsilon'$. By acylindricity of the action on $Y \times Z$, we have that $|S| \leq N$. \square

Similar to the previous result, the next lemma allows us to remove parabolic factors from an acylindrical action on a product. Again, we prove the result in a more general setting, as it might be helpful for future explorations.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Z \times \text{Isom } X$ be acylindrical, where Z is a metric space and X is hyperbolic. If the projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ is parabolic, then the projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Z$ is acylindrical.*

Proof. Since the action of Γ on X is parabolic, Γ has a unique fixed point ξ in ∂X , and hence the associated Busemann quasimorphism $\beta : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is identically 0. Let E be the constant from Lemma 4.6 and q a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic converging to ξ .

We proceed by contrapositive. Assume, that the action on Z is not acylindrical. Then, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $R, N > 0$, there exist points $z, w \in Z$ with $d(z, w) \geq R$ and

$$|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{z, w\}| = |\{g \in \Gamma \mid d(z, gz) \leq \epsilon \text{ and } d(w, gw) \leq \epsilon\}| \geq N.$$

Set $\epsilon' = \epsilon + E$. We will complete the proof by showing that the action of Γ on $Z \times Y$ is not acylindrical for this $\epsilon' > 0$. Let $\Gamma = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} S_n$ be a nested sequence of finite symmetric sets

exhausting Γ (the group is infinite as the orbit is unbounded). Choose m large enough so that $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{z, w\} \cap S_m| \geq N$. By Lemma 4.8, there is a $t_m > 0$ such that $M(t) \geq m$ for all $t \geq t_m$. It follows from the proof of Lemma 4.8, that $y = q(t_m) \in X$ is a point such that

$$d(gy, y) \leq E$$

for all $g \in S_m \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{z, w\}$. Then $(z, y), (w, y) \in Z \times X$ and $d((z, y), (w, y)) \geq R$. Consider $g \in S_m \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{z, w\}$. Then for $u \in \{z, w\}$, we have that

$$d((u, y), g(u, y)) = \max\{d(u, gu), d(y, gy)\} \leq \epsilon + E \leq \epsilon'.$$

As a consequence $|\text{Set}_{\epsilon'}\{(z, y), (w, y)\}| \geq N$. This shows that any choice of R, N fail to satisfy the acylindricity condition for ϵ' on $Z \times X$, as claimed. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ such that each factor is parabolic. Then the action of Γ on \mathbb{X} is not acylindrical.*

Proof. Assume, by contradiction, that the action on \mathbb{X} is acylindrical. Repeatedly applying Proposition 5.3 to the factors of \mathbb{X} ultimately leaves one factor with a parabolic, acylindrical action, which is impossible by [Osi16, Theorem 1.1]. \square

We now eliminate the possibility of quasiparabolic actions on all factors in the case of acylindrical actions in higher rank.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ be acylindrical and not elliptic. Let $I \subset \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ be the subset of indices such that the factor action $\rho_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ is neither elliptic, nor parabolic. Then $I \neq \emptyset$ and $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in I) : \Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is acylindrical.*

Proof. Let $I_{\text{ell}}, I_{\text{par}} \subset \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ be the indices for which $\rho_i(\Gamma)$ is elliptic, respectively parabolic. Since $\rho(\Gamma)$ is not elliptic, we have that $J := \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\} \setminus I_{\text{ell}}$ is not empty. By Lemma 5.2, the action $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in J) : \Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i \in J} X_i$ is acylindrical.

By Corollary 5.4, we have that $I = J \setminus I_{\text{par}}$ is not empty. And by Proposition 5.3, we have that $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in I) : \Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is acylindrical. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical and fixes some $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$. Then every finitely generated subsemigroup of Γ has polynomial growth and no factor is quasiparabolic.*

Proof. Since acylindricity of the action passes to subgroups, without loss of generality, up to passing to a finite index subgroup, we may assume that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$. The components of ξ are $\xi_i \in \partial X_i$ $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ and are Γ -fixed. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$, let $q_i : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow X_i$ be a $(1, 10\delta)$ quasigeodesic ray converging to ξ_i , and let $\beta_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Busemann quasimorphism associated to the action in each factor and of defect at most $B \geq 0$. Set $\beta : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ and $q : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ to be the associated diagonal maps. i.e. $\beta(g) = \Delta(\beta_1(g), \dots, \beta_{\mathfrak{D}}(g))$ and $q(n) = \Delta(q_1(n), \dots, q_{\mathfrak{D}}(n))$. Since we are using the ℓ^∞ -product metric on \mathbb{X} and $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$, q is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic in \mathbb{X} .

Define $F_n = \{g \in \Gamma : \|\beta(g)\|_\infty \leq n\} \subset \Gamma$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The reader may think of these as Følner sets and we will show they have polynomial growth.

Claim 1: For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|F_n| \leq N$, where N is the smallest constant from the definition of acylindricity associated to $\epsilon_n = n + 20\delta + E$, where E is the constant from Lemma 4.6.

Suppose by contradiction, that there exists a k_0 such that $|F_{k_0}| > N$, for the N associated to ϵ_{k_0} . Let $Q \subset F_{k_0}$ be of cardinality $N + 1$. Recall our notation that we have $h \mapsto (h_1, \dots, h_{\mathfrak{D}})$. For each $h \in Q$, it follows from Lemma 4.6, that if $t \geq t_0(h_i)$, then

$$d(q_i(t - \beta_i(h)), h_i q_i(t)) \leq E.$$

Using the triangle inequality and that q_i is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d(q_i(t), h_i q_i(t)) &\leq d(q_i(t), q_i(t - \beta_i(h))) + d(q_i(t - \beta_i(h)), h_i q_i(t)) \\ &\leq |\beta_i(h)| + 20\delta + E \\ &\leq k_0 + 20\delta + E = \epsilon_{k_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $T = \max\{t_0(h_i) \mid h \in Q, 1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{D}\}$. Then for all $t \geq T$, it follows that

$$d(q(t), h.q(t)) \leq \epsilon_{k_0}$$

Choose $a, b \geq T$ such that $d(q(a), q(b)) \geq R(\epsilon)$, where R is the constant from the definition of acylindricity for ϵ_{k_0} . Such a, b exists as $q(t)$ is an infinite quasigeodesic. Then it follows that for all $h \in Q$, $d(q(a), h.q(a)) \leq \epsilon_{k_0}$ and $d(q(b), h.q(b)) \leq \epsilon_{k_0}$. This contradicts the acylindricity of the action as since $|Q| = N + 1 > N$. Thus Claim 1 holds.

It is easy to verify that $\bigcup_n F_n = \Gamma$. Since we use subscripts to denote the factors of \mathbb{X} , we will use superscripts to enumerate elements in the following step – these should not be confused for powers. Let $s^1, \dots, s^k \in \Gamma$ and let $S = \langle s^1, \dots, s^k \rangle^+$ be the semigroup generated by them. We now show that S has polynomial growth. Fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ to be the smallest index such that $s^1, \dots, s^k \in F_m$.

Claim 2: For any l , the product $a^1 \cdots a^l \in F_{l(m+B)}$ where each $a^i \in \{s^1, \dots, s^k\}$ is a generator of S .

Since $a^1, \dots, a^l \in F_k$ and β_i is a quasimorphism, it is easy to check that for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$,

$$|\beta_i(a^1 \cdots a^l)| \leq lB + |\beta_i(a^1)| + \dots + |\beta_i(a^l)| \leq lB + lm,$$

which proves the claim.

By Theorem 4.3, no factor can be quasiparabolic as this would yield a finitely generated subsemigroup of Γ with exponential growth. \square

We now have all the tools to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.7. *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ such that the projections $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ are all either elliptic, parabolic or quasiparabolic (with at least one factor being parabolic or quasiparabolic). Then $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is not acylindrical.*

In particular, if $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical, then every element of Γ is either an elliptic, weakly loxodromic, or regular loxodromic isometry.

Proof. The theorem follows by combining Lemmas 5.2 and 5.6 and Proposition 5.3. If $\Gamma \leq \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical, then so is every subgroup, in particular $\langle g \rangle$ for each $g \in \Gamma$. The result now follows since it must be the case that g is either elliptic in each factor or has at least one loxodromic factor. \square

5.2. Regular Elements Exist. We now turn our attention to regular elements i.e those that preserve factors and act as a loxodromic in each factor. Regular elements will be consider more in Section 7. Our goal for this subsection is to prove the following proposition. (See also [CS11, CZ13, FLM18].)

Proposition 5.8. *If $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ has general type factors then Γ contains regular elements.*

The proof of Proposition 5.8 relies on the following results of Maher and Tiozzo and properties of probability measures, which will allow us to find regular elements in actions with general type factors with asymptotically high probability.

Theorem 5.9. [MT18, Theorem 1.4] *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ be a general type action, and μ be a generating symmetric probability measure on Γ . Then the translation-length $\tau(w_n)$ of the n^{th} -step of the μ -random walk grows at least linearly, i.e. there exists $T > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(w \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} : \tau(w_n) \leq Tn) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Lemma 5.10. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, and \mathbb{P} be a probability measure on Ω . Assume $A_1, \dots, A_{\mathfrak{D}} \subset \Omega$ are measurable sets such that $\mathbb{P}(A_i) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\mathfrak{D}}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$. Then $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i\right) > 1 - \epsilon$.*

Proof. We shall use $A^c := \Omega \setminus A$ to denote set compliments. For $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$ our assumption is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}(A_i^c) < \frac{\epsilon}{\mathfrak{D}}$ which means that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i^c\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \mathbb{P}(A_i^c) < \epsilon$$

Therefore, by De-Morgan's Law, $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i\right) > 1 - \epsilon$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.8. As before, up to passing to a finite index subgroup, without loss of generality we assume that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$. Fix a generating probability measure μ on Γ , and $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Since each projection is of general type, we may apply Theorem 5.9 to each action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$, where $\tau_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the stable translation length of elements acting on X_i . This gives real numbers $T_i > 0$, so that for any n sufficiently large we have the following measurable sets:

- (1) $A_i = \{w \in \Gamma^{\mathbb{N}} : \tau_i(w) > T_i n\}$
- (2) $\mathbb{P}(A_i) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{\mathfrak{D}}$

It then follows from Lemma 5.10 that $\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i\right) > 1 - \epsilon$. In particular, the set $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} A_i$ is non-empty and consists of regular elements. □

5.3. Some Representation Theory. Recall that an action by a group Γ on a set S corresponds to a homomorphism from Γ to the group of permutations of S . If the action preserves additional structure, then the image of said homomorphism will belong to the subgroup of the permutation group that preserves that structure. Therefore, when considering actions, representation theoretic tools are indispensable. In this section, we explore the interactions between (AU-)acylindricity in the higher rank setting with some representation theoretic tools. Again, we use the ℓ^∞ -product metric on the product spaces. This means that if the distance in the product is large then some factor must be large. Similarly, if the distance in the product is small then all factors are small.

We begin with diagonal actions. Recall from the universal property for products, given homomorphisms $\rho_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, there is a unique diagonal homomorphism $\rho = \Delta(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } Y_i$ determined by the property that post-composition with

the natural projection $\pi_j : \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } Y_i \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y_j$ yields the equality $\pi_j \circ \rho = \rho_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$.

Lemma 5.11. *Let $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathbb{N}$, Γ be a group, Y_i be metric spaces. Suppose that $\rho_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y_i$ is an (AU-)acylindrical action for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$. Then, the diagonal action $\rho = \Delta(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } Y_i$ is (AU-)acylindrical.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{Y} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} Y_i$, and let us use the ℓ^∞ -product metric. Consider an element $g \in \Gamma$ and points $x, y \in \mathbb{Y}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. Since $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y_i$ is acylindrical for all i , choose R, N to be the maximum of the associated acylindricity constants for ϵ from each factor Y_i . We will show that R, N satisfy acylindricity requirements for the diagonal action of Γ on \mathbb{Y} .

Let $d(x, y) = \max_{i=1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}} d(x_i, y_i) \geq R$. Then $d(x_j, y_j) \geq R$ for some $1 \leq j \leq \mathfrak{D}$. Let $g \in \text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}$. Since $d(x, \rho(g)x)$, respectively $d(y, \rho(g)y)$ is the maximum of the coordinate distances, the inequality holds in the j^{th} coordinate, i.e. $d(x_j, \rho_j(g)x_j) \leq \epsilon$ and similarly, $d(y_j, \rho_j(g)y_j) \leq \epsilon$. This shows that $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\} \subset \text{Set}_\epsilon\{x_j, y_j\}$, and hence

$$|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x, y\}| \leq |\text{Set}_\epsilon\{x_j, y_j\}| \leq N.$$

□

Lemma 5.12. *Let Y and Z be metric spaces. Consider homomorphisms $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$, $\sigma : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Z$. For an element $\alpha \in \text{Isom } Y$, let $\rho_\alpha(g) = \alpha\rho(g)\alpha^{-1}$. The associated diagonal action $\Delta(\rho, \sigma) : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y \times \text{Isom } Z$ is (AU-)acylindrical if and only if the diagonal action $\Delta(\rho, \rho_\alpha, \sigma) : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y \times \text{Isom } Y \times \text{Isom } Z$ is (AU-)acylindrical.*

This lemma shows that duplicating a representation neither helps nor hinders (AU-)acylindricity, even up to postcomposition with an inner-automorphism of $\text{Isom } Y$.

Proof. We shall prove the case of acylindricity since the case of ambiguous uniformity is similar. For clarity we write down the actions of Γ on $Y \times Z$ and $Y \times Y \times Z$, without the use of the cumbersome notation $\Delta(\rho, \sigma)$ and $\Delta(\rho, \rho_\alpha, \sigma)$: If $g \in \Gamma$, $(y, z) \in Y \times Z$, $(y, y', z) \in Y \times Y \times Z$ then

$$g.(y, z) = (\rho(g)y, \sigma(g)z) \quad \text{and} \quad g.(y, y', z) = (\rho(g)y, (\alpha\rho(g)\alpha^{-1})y, \sigma(g)z).$$

We will need the following calculation. We utilize a blackboard comma in various places in hopes of aiding readability:

$$\begin{aligned} (2) \quad d\left(g.(y, y', z), (b, b', c)\right) &= d\left(\left(\rho(g)y, (\alpha\rho(g)\alpha^{-1})y, \sigma(g)z\right), (b, b', c)\right) \\ &= \max\left\{d\left(\rho(g)y, b\right), d\left((\alpha\rho(g)\alpha^{-1})y, b'\right), d\left(\sigma(g)z, c\right)\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{d\left(\rho(g)y, b\right), d\left(\rho(g)(\alpha^{-1}.y'), \alpha^{-1}.b'\right), d\left(\sigma(g)(z), c\right)\right\} \\ &= d\left(\left(\rho(g)y, \rho(g)(\alpha^{-1}.y'), \sigma(g)(z)\right), (b, \alpha^{-1}.b', c)\right). \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation for $d(g.(y, z), (b, c))$ shows that

$$(3) \quad d(g.(y, \alpha.y, z), (b, \alpha.b, c)) = d(g.(y, z), (b, c)).$$

It follows that

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, y', z)\} &= \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(\alpha.y', z)\} \\ &= \{g \in \Gamma : d(\rho(g)y, y), d(\rho(g)\alpha.y', \alpha.y'), d(\sigma(g)z, z) \leq \epsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

These in turn allow us to calculate that

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, y', z), (b, b', c)\} &= \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, y', z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(b, b', c)\} \\ &= \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(\alpha.y', z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(b, c)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(\alpha.b', c)\} \\ &= \left(\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\}\right) \cap \left(\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(\alpha.y', z), (\alpha.b', c)\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that the action of Γ on $Y \times Y \times Z$ is acylindrical. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $R, N \geq 0$ be the associated constants. We claim that these constants work for the action of Γ on $Y \times Z$ as well.

Let $(y, z), (b, c) \in Y \times Z$ be such that $d((y, z), (b, c)) \geq R$. By equation (3) (for $g = 1$) we have that $d((y, \alpha.y, z), (b, \alpha.b, c)) \geq R$. Furthermore, we claim that $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\} = \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, \alpha.y, z), (b, \alpha.b, c)\}$. By definition, $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\} = \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(b, c)\}$. By equation (3), the latter is equal to $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, \alpha.y, z)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(b, \alpha.b, c)\}$, which by definition is $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, \alpha.y, z), (b, \alpha.b, c)\}$.

Therefore, since $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\} = \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, \alpha.y, z), (b, \alpha.b, c)\}$ we deduce that

$$|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\}| \leq N.$$

Conversely, suppose that the action of Γ on $Y \times Z$ is acylindrical. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and let $R, N \geq 0$ be the associated constants. We claim that these constants work for the action of Γ on $Y \times Y \times Z$ as well.

Let $(y, y', z), (b, b', c) \in Y \times Y \times Z$ be such that $d((y, y', z), (b, b', c)) \geq R$. By calculation (5) above, we have that

$$\text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, y', z), (b, b', c)\} = \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(y, z), (b, c)\} \cap \text{Set}_\epsilon\{(\alpha.y', z), (\alpha.b', c)\}.$$

Furthermore, if $d((y, y', z), (b, b', c)) > R$ then one of the factors must be large, i.e. $d(y, b) \geq R$, $d(y', b') \geq R$ or $d(z, c) \geq R$. Either way, by acylindricity of the action of Γ on $Y \times Z$, the coarse stabilizer has cardinality at most N . \square

In what follows, the homomorphism ρ' is the induced representation from Γ to Γ' and often denoted by $\text{ind}_{\Gamma}^{\Gamma'} \rho$. This somewhat cumbersome notation is sometimes useful, but it will not be for our purposes (see for example [BdlHV08, Appendix E].) Breaking with our previous convention of how elements in a product are written, given a finite set F , we identify $\mathbb{X}^{|F|}$ with the set of sequences indexed by elements in F and values in \mathbb{X} , i.e. for each $\chi \in F$ and choice of $\mathbf{x}_\chi \in \mathbb{X}$, the corresponding element in $\prod_{\chi \in F} \mathbb{X}$ will be denoted by $(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}$. The formulation below comes from [Zim84, Example 4.2.12] and is also used in [Fer06, page 1793]. We note that the induction can be performed generally from any action of Γ . We will need the following lemma, which is straightforward to check.

Lemma 5.13. *Let Γ be a group, $\alpha \in \text{Aut } \Gamma$ an automorphism, Y a metric space and $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$. The action $\rho(\Gamma)$ is (AU-)acylindrical if and only if the action $\rho \circ \alpha : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } Y$ is (AU-)acylindrical.*

Proposition 5.14 (Induced representation). *Let $\Gamma \leq \Gamma'$ be of finite index and let $F = \Gamma'/\Gamma$ be the set of cosets, where $\chi_0 \in F$ is the identity coset. If $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is a homomorphism then there exists $\rho' : \Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\prod_{\chi \in F} \mathbb{X}) = \text{Sym}(F) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ such that*

- (1) *the permutations in $\text{Sym}(F)$ associated to $\rho'(\Gamma)$ fix the identity coset $\chi_0 \in F$ and the associated projection coincides with ρ , i.e. $\pi_{\chi_0} \circ \rho' = \rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$;*
- (2) *if $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma$ is the kernel of the permutation representation $\Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Sym}(F)$ then for each $\kappa \in F$ there exists an inner automorphism $\alpha_\kappa \in \text{Inn}(\Gamma')$ such that $\rho'|_{\Gamma_0} = \Delta(\rho|_{\Gamma_0} \circ \alpha_\chi)_{\chi \in F}$;*
- (3) *$\rho(\Gamma)$ has general type factors if and only if $\rho'(\Gamma')$ has general type factors;*
- (4) *if the action of $\rho(\Gamma)$ on \mathbb{X} is (AU-)acylindrical then the action of $\rho'(\Gamma')$ on $\prod_{\chi \in F} \mathbb{X}$ is (AU-)acylindrical.*

The maps are summarized in the following commutative diagrams, where the multiple arrows on the right represent the various maps according to $\kappa \in F$ (see Section 3.4.1):

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \Gamma' & \xrightarrow{\rho'} & \text{Sym}(F) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X} \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 & & \text{Sym}(F \setminus \{\chi_0\}) \ltimes (\prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}) \\
 \uparrow & \nearrow \rho'|_{\Gamma} & \downarrow \pi_{\chi_0} \\
 \Gamma & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \Gamma' & \xrightarrow{\rho'} & \text{Sym}(F) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X} \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\rho'|_{\Gamma_0}} & \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X} \\
 \uparrow \alpha_{\kappa, \kappa \in F} & \nearrow \Delta(\rho|_{\Gamma_0} \circ \alpha_\chi)_{\chi \in F} & \downarrow \pi_{\kappa, \kappa \in F} \\
 \Gamma_0 & \xrightarrow{\rho|_{\Gamma_0} \circ \alpha_{\kappa, \kappa \in F}} & \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}
 \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{X}' = \prod_{\chi \in F} \mathbb{X} = \{(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} : \mathbf{x}_\chi \in \mathbb{X}\}$. We begin by defining the homomorphism $\rho' : \Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}' = \text{Sym}(F) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$. Recall that since $F = \Gamma'/\Gamma$ is the set of left cosets, left multiplication in Γ' yields a natural permutation representation $\Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Sym}(F)$. Let $p : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma'/\Gamma$, given by $p(g) = g\Gamma = g\chi_0$ be the natural projection. Choose a section $s : F \rightarrow \Gamma'$ taking the identity coset to the identity of Γ' , i.e. $p(s(\chi)) = \chi$ and $s(\chi_0) = 1$. Consider the map $c : \Gamma' \times F \rightarrow \Gamma$ given by

$$c(g, \chi) = [s(g\chi)]^{-1}gs(\chi).$$

The fact that c is well defined follows from the fact that $p(gs(\chi)) = p(s(g\chi))$. Further, it is easy to verify that the map c is a cocycle, meaning that it satisfies the relation:

$$c(g_1g_2, \chi) = c(g_1, g_2\chi) \cdot c(g_2, \chi).$$

We are now ready to define the induced homomorphism $\rho' : \Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}'$. For $g \in \Gamma'$ define

$$\rho'(g)\left((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}\right) := \left(\rho(c(g, \chi))(\mathbf{x}_\chi)\right)_{g\chi \in F}$$

This definition has a permutation of the cosets according to $g : \chi \mapsto g\chi$ (witnessed in the index) and in each factor we have $\rho(c(g, \chi)) \in \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$. Therefore, $\rho'(g) \in \text{Sym}(F) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ as promised and the cocycle relation ensures this is indeed a homomorphism.

Item (1): Observe that if $g \in \Gamma$ then $g\Gamma = \Gamma$. Since $\Gamma = \chi_0$, this means that $g\chi_0 = \chi_0$. Also, we have chosen $s(\chi_0) = 1$, and so $c(g, \chi_0) = s(g\chi_0)^{-1}gs(\chi_0) = g$, i.e. $c(\cdot, \chi_0)|_\Gamma : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ is the identity map. This means that $\rho'(\Gamma)$ preserves the χ_0 -coordinate. We may therefore postcompose with the associated projection $\pi_{\chi_0} : \text{Sym}(F \setminus \{\chi_0\}) \ltimes \prod_{\chi \in F} \text{Aut } \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ and

the above calculation shows that indeed $\pi_{\chi_0} \circ \rho'|_\Gamma = \rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$. This completes the proof of the first claim in the statement.

Item (2): Let $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma$ denote the finite index kernel of the permutation action $\Gamma' \rightarrow \text{Sym}(F)$. (Note that, in case Γ was normal to begin with, we would have that $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma$.) If $g \in \Gamma_0$ then $g\chi = \chi$ for each $\chi \in F$, meaning that

$$c(g, \chi) = s(g\chi)^{-1}gs(\chi) = s(\chi)^{-1}gs(\chi).$$

In other words, $c(\cdot, \chi)|_{\Gamma_0} : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \Gamma_0$ is the inner automorphism $\alpha_\chi : g \mapsto s(\chi)^{-1}gs(\chi)$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho'(g)((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) &= (\rho(c(g, \chi))(\mathbf{x}_\chi))_{g\chi \in F} \\ &= (\rho \circ \alpha_\chi(g)(\mathbf{x}_\chi))_{\chi \in F}, \end{aligned}$$

meaning that $\rho'|_{\Gamma_0} = \Delta(\rho \circ \alpha_\chi)_{\chi \in F}$.

Item (3): The factor actions of $\rho'(\Gamma')$ are the factor actions of $\rho(\Gamma)$ together with their precompositions with α_χ , for $\chi \in F$, which preserves the action being general type.

Item (4): We shall prove the claim for acylindricity; as before the nonuniform case follows analogously. Furthermore, since acylindricity is inherited by subgroups, it is sufficient to prove that if $\rho(\Gamma_0)$ is acylindrical then $\rho'(\Gamma')$ is acylindrical. As established in (2), $\rho'_{\Gamma_0} = \Delta(\rho \circ \alpha_\chi)_{\chi \in F}$, which is acylindrical by Lemma 5.13.

Let $C \subset \Gamma'$ be a set of coset representatives for $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma'$. Then $\Gamma' = \bigcup_{h \in C} h\Gamma_0$. We claim that

$$\text{Set}_\epsilon^{\Gamma'} \{(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, (\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}\} \subset \bigcup_{h \in C} \left[\left(\text{Set}_\epsilon^{\Gamma_0} \{ \rho'(h)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(h)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} \} \right) \cdot h \right].$$

Indeed, if $g \in \text{Set}_\epsilon^{\Gamma'} \{(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, (\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}\} \subset \Gamma'$ then there exists $h \in C$ such that $g = hg_0$ for some $g_0 \in \Gamma_0$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} d(\rho'(g)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(g)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) &= d(\rho'(hg_0)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(hg_0)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) \\ &= d\left(\rho'(hg_0h^{-1})\rho'(h)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(hg_0h^{-1})\rho'(h)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since Γ_0 is normal, we have that $hg_0h^{-1} \in \text{Set}_\epsilon^{\Gamma_0} \{ \rho'(h)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(h)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} \}$, and so

$$hg_0 \in \left(\text{Set}_\epsilon^{\Gamma_0} \{ \rho'(h)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(h)(\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} \} \right) \cdot h$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ and $R, N_0 \geq 0$ be the acylindricity constants for $\rho'(\Gamma_0)$. The above calculations show that R and $N = |F| \cdot N_0$ are acylindricity constants for $\rho'(\Gamma')$. \square

6. A PLETHORA OF EXAMPLES

Let G_1, \dots, G_F be locally compact second countable groups. A subgroup $\Gamma \leq \prod_{i=1}^F G_i$ is said to be a *lattice* if it is discrete and has finite covolume (with respect to the Haar measure on the product). Moreover, it is said to be an *irreducible lattice* if the natural projection of Γ to $\prod_{j \in J} G_j$ is dense (or dense in a finite index subgroup) for all $J \subsetneq \{1, \dots, F\}$. In both

the reducible or irreducible case, discreteness ensures that Γ acts properly on $G = \prod_{i=1}^F G_i$. Moreover, if the factors of G have a nice model geometry then Γ acts properly on the associated product as well. For example, if Γ is (S) -arithmetic semi-simple and $K_i \leq G_i$ is maximal compact then $\prod_{i=1}^F G_i/K_i$ is a product of symmetric spaces (and Bruhat-Tits buildings when $S \neq \emptyset$), each of which is CAT(0). Taking the ℓ^2 -product metric yields a CAT(0) space on which Γ acts properly and hence AU-acylindrically.

In the same way that δ -hyperbolic spaces “coarsify” the notion of negative curvature, we consider finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces with the ℓ^2 -product metric as a coarse version of nonpositive curvature (though admittedly we almost exclusively work with the Lipschitz equivalent ℓ^∞ -product metric). Similarly one can view groups acting AU-acylindrically on said products as a coarsening of a lattice in nonpositive curvature, or a “generalized lattice”. We will further this analogy in [BFa]: if all factor actions are of general type, then the generalized lattice enjoys a type of semi-simple behavior.

In this section we will discuss the class of groups which we can consider to be generalized lattices within the setting of finite products of δ -hyperbolic spaces. It is straightforward to verify that the class of groups that admit such an AU-acylindrical (but not proper) action is not closed under direct products. Nevertheless, we prove in [BFa] that the consequences we deduce of said class remain true for groups that can be represented as a subdirect product in a product of groups within the class.

Additionally, we also prove in [BFa] that our class of groups is closed under passing to “general type” subgroups and virtual isomorphism. Interestingly, to date there are two notable related questions that remain open. Namely whether the class of CAT(0) groups (respectively acylindrically hyperbolic groups) is invariant under virtual isomorphism, in particular finite index extension. The key issue here is that the standard approach of inducing a representation from a finite index subgroup (see Proposition 5.14) does not produce a space sufficiently small to retain a cocompact action (respectively retain hyperbolicity). The class under consideration here however, is not mired by these obstacles, thanks to the intertwining of the (AU-)acylindricity property and the higher-rank structure.

We compile a list of examples, beginning with those that can be found in the existing literature.

- (1) Acylindrically hyperbolic groups (see also [Osi16, Theorem 1.2]), with $\mathfrak{D} = 1$. This is, in itself, an extensive class of groups, including, for example:
 - Most (non-finite) mapping class groups [Bow08, MM99].
 - Non-cyclic Hyperbolic groups
 - Relatively hyperbolic groups (see e.g. [DGO16])
 - Nonamenable amalgamated products (see [MO15] and [DGO16, Theorem 2.25])
 - Many small cancellation groups [GS18]
 - Groups acting properly on proper CAT(0) spaces with rank-one elements [Sis18]. In particular, this includes irreducible RAAGs. (See also [CM19, Gen19].)
 - Many Artin groups [Hae22, MP22, Vas22, HMS24]
- (2) Since our class is closed under passing to general type subgroups that act properly, we also obtain groups with exotic finiteness properties such as the kernels of Bieri-Stallings and Bestvina-Brady, see [Bie76, Sta63], [BB97] and other subdirect products such as those in [BHMS09, Bri23, BM09] (See also [NP23]).
- (3) Infinite groups with property (QT) admit an action on a finite product of quasitrees whose orbit maps yield a quasi-isometric embedding, which are in particular proper [BBF21]. In this case, due to properness, the action is AU-acylindrical.
- (4) The class of colorable Hierarchically Hyperbolic Groups (abbreviated as HHGs), or more generally any finitely generated group that admits an action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ for which the orbit maps are quasi-isometric embeddings [HP22]. Again, due to properness, the action is AU-acylindrical.
- (5) Groups acting properly on products of trees, such as Coxeter groups and RAAGs [Jan02, Hos11, But19], or finitely generated subgroups of $\text{PGL}_2 K$, where K is a global field of positive characteristic [FLSS18].
- (6) Finitely generated infinite groups that are quasi-isometric to a finite product of proper cocompact non-elementary δ -hyperbolic spaces in fact act geometrically, and hence acylindrically on a (possibly different) finite product of rank-one symmetric spaces and locally finite δ -hyperbolic graphs [Mar22, Theorem K].
- (7) Finitely generated subgroups $\Gamma < \text{SL}_2 \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, where $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the algebraic closure of \mathbb{Q} . See Section 6.3 for more details.
- (8) Limit groups (in the sense of Sela) or fully residually free (in the sense of Kharlamovich and Miasnikov) are relatively hyperbolic with respect to their higher-rank maximal abelian subgroups [Ali05, Dah03]. Subdirect products of such have been studied [BHMS09], [KLdGZ24]. (See also [BR84].)

Remark 6.1. Mapping class groups importantly appear in both (1) and (4) (with $D > 1$), each of which confers different information and are therefore both of interest. We take the opportunity to highlight the importance of taking a “representation theoretic” point of view, namely to value all such actions.

6.1. The Iwasawa Decomposition and Godement’s Compactness Criterion. As has been discussed above, AU-acylindricity generalizes the notion of a proper action, which in turn generalizes the type of action a lattice enjoys on its ambient group. In the context of linear groups, unipotent elements play an important role, as the reader will see throughout the rest of this section.

If G is a semisimple Lie group (over a local field) then it admits an *Iwasawa decomposition* $G = KAN$, where $K \leq G$ is a maximal compact subgroup, $AN \leq G$ is a maximal solvable subgroup, $N \leq AN$ its maximal unipotent subgroup, and A the maximal diagonalizable

subgroup [Bum04, Theorem 29.3], [AB08, Proposition 11.100]. (Having fixed a linear representation, a unipotent subgroup is such that all eigenvalues are equal to 1, and diagonalizable means that the representation can be conjugated in an algebraically closed field so as to make the subgroup diagonal.) The symmetric space or Bruhat-Tits building associated to G is $Z = G/K$ is a CAT(0) space (with the ℓ^2 -product metric if G is not strongly irreducible) and has Furstenberg boundary G/\mathcal{AN} .

If G is a simple Lie group over \mathbb{R} of rank-one then Z is one of the algebraic hyperbolic spaces [DSU17] and the visual boundary of Z as a CAT(0) space can be naturally identified with the Furstenberg boundary, i.e. $\partial Z \cong H/\mathcal{N}$ [GJT93, IV.4.50.Lemma], [BGS85, Appendix 5.6].

Moreover, the Iwasawa decomposition yields the following connections between algebra and geometry:

- an element $\gamma \in G$, respectively a subgroup H is elliptic if and only if it can be conjugated into K ;
- an element $\gamma \in G$, respectively a subgroup H is parabolic if and only if it can be conjugated into \mathcal{N} [BGS85, Appendix 5.4];
- an element $\gamma \in G$ is loxodromic, respectively a subgroup H is lineal if and only if it can be conjugated into A ;
- a subgroup H is quasi-parabolic if and only if it can be conjugated into \mathcal{AN} and is not lineal or parabolic;
- a subgroup H is general type (with full limit set) if and only if it is Zariski-dense.

Unipotent elements also play a starring role in Godement Compactness criterion. This conjecture was proved for standard lattices (i.e. $G(\mathbb{Z}) \leq G(\mathbb{R})$) by Borel and Harish-Chandra [BHC62, Theorem 3] and later generalized by Behr to the S -arithmetic case [Beh87, Theorem C] (see also [Ben09, Theorem 5.8]).

Theorem 6.2 (Godement Compactness criterion). *Let $G(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \mathrm{SL}_n \mathbb{Q}$ be an algebraic group defined over \mathbb{Q} , and $S \subset \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set of primes. The lattice $G(\mathbb{Z}[S^{-1}]) \leq G(\mathbb{R}) \times \prod_{p \in S} G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is cocompact if and only if $G(\mathbb{Z}) \leq G(\mathbb{R})$ is cocompact if and only if $G(\mathbb{Z})$ has no nontrivial unipotent elements.*

Therefore, combining these results with Theorem 5.7 we obtain:

Corollary 6.3. *Let $G(\mathbb{Q}) \leq \mathrm{SL}_n \mathbb{Q}$ be an algebraic group defined over \mathbb{Q} , and $S \subset \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set of primes such that the irreducible factors of $G(\mathbb{R}) \times \prod_{p \in S} G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ have rank one.*

The lattice $G(\mathbb{Z}[S^{-1}]) \leq G(\mathbb{R}) \times \prod_{p \in S} G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ acts acylindrically on \mathbb{X} the product of algebraic hyperbolic spaces and Bruhat-Tits trees if and only if $G(\mathbb{Z}) \leq G(\mathbb{R})$ is cocompact if and only if $G(\mathbb{Z})$ has no nontrivial unipotent elements.

Indeed, a unipotent element in $G(\mathbb{Z})$ will project to a unipotent element in each irreducible factor of $G(\mathbb{R})$. Since these factors are assumed to be rank-one, such an element from $G(\mathbb{Z})$ is either the identity if $G(\mathbb{Z})$ is cocompact (and hence the action is acylindrical) or not the identity (and hence the action is nonuniformly acylindrical).

Remark 6.4. This allows us to contextualize the obstructions found in Section 5.1. As we saw above, if $G(\mathbb{R})$ has rank-one factors, then unipotent elements in $G(\mathbb{Z})$ will correspond to elements that act as parabolic isometries in each factor associated to $G(\mathbb{R})$.

The reader will see that unipotent elements continue to reappear below. We also point the reader to [LMR00, 2.4.Proposition] which states that distortion characterizes unipotent elements.

6.2. Semi-Simple Lattices and Superrigidity. In what follows, an action of Γ on a hyperbolic space X is called *coarsely minimal* if X is unbounded, the limit set of Γ in ∂X is not a single point, and every quasi-convex Γ -invariant subset of X is coarsely dense. Given a metric space X and $C \geq 0$, denote by $Bdd_C(X)$ the set of all closed subsets of diameter at most C , endowed with the Hausdorff metric. Notice that $Bdd_C(X)$ is quasi-isometric to X . Moreover, two actions of a group Γ on metric spaces X_1, X_2 are said to be *equivalent* if there exists a Γ -equivariant quasi-isometry $X_1 \rightarrow Bdd_C(X_2)$ for some $C \geq 0$.

Remark 6.5. Let $X_1, \dots, X_{\mathfrak{D}}, X'_1, \dots, X'_{\mathfrak{D}}$ be δ -hyperbolic spaces, and set $\mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} X_i$, and $\mathbb{X}' = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} X'_i$. It is straightforward to check that if Γ acting on X_i is equivalent to Γ acting on X'_i for all $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{D}$, then the action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is (AU-)acylindrical if and only if the action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}'$ is (AU-)acylindrical.

We note that, the following theorem applies to reducible lattices as well, provided that the hypotheses are met for the corresponding factors, which is how it is originally stated in [BCFS25]. We also note that if $\mathfrak{D} = 0$ then no coarsely minimal actions exist, which was first proved by Haettel [Hae20] (see Theorem 6.19 below).

Theorem 6.6. [BCFS25, Theorem 1.1] *Fix integers $\mathbf{D} \geq 0$ and $F \geq 0$. Consider an irreducible lattice $\Gamma \leq G$ where $G = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{D}} H_i \times \prod_{j=1}^F G_j$ is a product of centerless simple Lie groups. Assume further that $H_1, \dots, H_{\mathbf{D}}$ have real rank one, and G_1, \dots, G_F have real rank strictly larger than one. If $\mathbf{D} \geq 2$ or $F > 0$ then any coarsely minimal isometric action of Γ on a geodesic hyperbolic space is equivalent to one of the actions*

$$\Gamma \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{pr_i} H_i \xrightarrow{\rho_i} \text{Isom } S_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq \mathbf{D})$$

where S_i is the hyperbolic symmetric space of the factor H_i , $i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{D}$.

Remark 6.7. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{D}\}$ and set $H = H_i$, $S = S_i$, $\rho = \rho_i$. Theorem 6.6 does not address the quality of the homomorphism $\rho : H \rightarrow \text{Isom } S$. The proof relies on coarse equivalence, which in general does not produce a measurable map. (Note that measurable homomorphisms between Lie groups are continuous [Kle89] and hence smooth [Hal15, Corollary 3.50]). We shall argue that ρ can be taken to be rational automorphism of H , achievable by conjugation in $\text{Isom } S$. First, the coarse minimality condition ensures that the image is not trivial. Since Γ is a higher-rank irreducible lattice, we may apply Margulis Superrigidity [Mar91] to deduce that $\rho|_{\Gamma}$ extends to a rational map $\rho' : H \rightarrow \text{Isom } S$, and so we may replace ρ with ρ' if necessary. (Note that there are uncountably many nonmeasurable homomorphisms $SL_2\mathbb{R} \rightarrow SL_2\mathbb{R}$ that restrict to the identity on $SL_2\mathbb{Z}$.)

Since H is connected and S is its symmetric space, we have that H is the connected component of the identity and has finite index in $\text{Isom } S$. Let $\text{Aut}^\infty H$ denote the group of smooth automorphisms of H . Since H is rank one, we have that $\text{Inn } H \leq \text{Aut}^\infty H$ is of index at most 2, precisely corresponding to the index $H \leq \text{Isom } S$ (see [Gİ0, Corollary 2.15], also [CZ17]). Therefore, any smooth map $H \rightarrow \text{Isom } S$ is in the same $\text{Isom } S$ -conjugacy class of the identity embedding $H \hookrightarrow \text{Isom } S$. We shall call the corresponding action of $\alpha : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } S$ the *standard action of Γ on S* . This is touched on in [BCFS25, Example 1.4]. \blacksquare

In Part II [BFa] (see also [BF24, Lemma 4.26]) we prove the following result. (This is alluded to in [BCFS25, Remark 4.3]; a similar idea is also considered in [BFFG25, Lemma 2.21].) The term “essential” is inspired by a similar construction in [CS11]. We shall use it to prove the results that follow.

Proposition 6.8 (The Essential Core). *Let $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ be of general type. There exists a $\rho(\Gamma)$ -invariant quasiconvex δ' -hyperbolic subspace $\mathcal{E}_\rho(X) \subset X$ on which the restricted action $\rho(\Gamma)|_{\mathcal{E}_\rho(X)}$ is coarsely minimal. In particular, any $\rho(\Gamma)|_{\mathcal{E}_\rho(X)}$ -invariant quasiconvex subset of $\mathcal{E}_\rho(X)$ is coarsely dense in $\mathcal{E}_\rho(X)$ and $\partial\mathcal{E}_\rho(X) = \Lambda(\rho(\Gamma))$ is infinite.*

Theorem 6.9. *Let $\Gamma \leq G$ be an irreducible lattice as in Theorem 6.6 and S_i the hyperbolic symmetric space for the factors H_i , $i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{D}$. There exists an AU-acylindrical action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ with general type factors if and only if $F = 0$, and up to passing to the essential cores and equivalence of the factors of \mathbb{X} , $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}_{\text{dup}}$, where $\mathbb{S} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{D}} S_i$ and \mathbb{S}_{dup} is the (possibly empty) product of duplicate copies of factors of \mathbb{S} . Furthermore, the action is acylindrical if and only if $\Gamma \leq G$ is cocompact.*

Proof. Suppose $F = 0$. Then $G = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{D}} H_i$ is a product of centerless simple Lie groups of real rank one and Γ acts properly (and with finite covolume) on \mathbb{S} the corresponding product of hyperbolic symmetric spaces. Hence, the standard action $\Delta(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mathbf{D}}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{S}$ is AU-acylindrical. Furthermore, by the Tits Alternative for linear groups, the factor actions either have a finite orbit on the boundary or are of general type. Since the projection of $\Gamma \rightarrow H_i$ is Zariski-dense, the action is of general type for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{D}$. Furthermore, if Γ is cocompact, then the action is uniformly proper and hence acylindrical.

Conversely, suppose that $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is AU-acylindrical with general type factors, where $\mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{D}} X_i$. Since a finite index subgroup of Γ is still an irreducible lattice in G and AU-acylindricity with general type factors is inherited by finite index subgroups, without loss of generality, we assume that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$.

Since the factors are of general type, by Proposition 6.8 they each have Γ -invariant subspaces on which the action is coarsely minimal. Since the subspaces are invariant, the action on the product of the subspaces is still an AU-acylindrical action on a finite product of hyperbolic spaces with general type factors. So without loss of generality, we may assume that the factor actions are in fact coarsely minimal.

By Theorem 6.6 and Remark 6.7, up to equivalence, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{D}\}$ there is a $j(i) \in \{1, \dots, \mathbf{D}\}$ such that the factor action $\rho_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ is equivalent to the standard

action $\alpha_{j(i)} : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } S_{j(i)}$. Combining these factors, we get an equivalence between the action $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ and the diagonal of these standard actions $\Delta(\alpha_{j(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{j(\mathfrak{D})}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} S_{j(i)}\right)$. As discussed in Remark 6.5, that action on $\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} S_{j(i)}$ is AU-acylindrical.

By Lemma 5.12, any duplicate factors in $\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} S_{j(i)}$ can be removed. Therefore, we may assume that $\mathfrak{D} \leq \mathbf{D}$ and up to relabeling, $S_{j(i)} = S_i$. Since $\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} S_i$ is locally compact, AU-acylindricity is equivalent to properness of the action. However, since Γ is irreducible, if $F > 0$ or $I \subsetneq \{1, \dots, \mathbf{D}\}$ the projection of Γ to $\prod_{i \in I} H_i$ is dense and therefore, the corresponding action $\Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Isom } S_i$ is not proper. This proves that $F = 0$ and $\mathfrak{D} = \mathbf{D}$.

Finally, if the action is acylindrical then Γ is in fact cocompact. Indeed, by the Godement Compactness Criterion (Theorem 6.2) Γ is cocompact if and only if it has no non-trivial unipotents. Unipotents are precisely those elements that will act parabolically in each factor (see Section 6.1). Therefore, by Theorem 5.7, no such elements in Γ can exist, i.e. Γ has no nontrivial unipotents. \square

6.3. The Special Linear Group of Dimension 2. Recall that if $\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a ring then $SL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is the set of matrices with determinant 1 with entries from \mathfrak{R} .

We now consider a class of groups that is not addressed in Theorem 6.6 (nor in Theorem 6.19 below) – $SL_2 \mathfrak{R}$, where $\mathfrak{R} = \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ is the ring of S -integers in K a finite extension of \mathbb{Q} . This class (and its subgroups) was mentioned in Example (7) above.

Definition 6.10. Let \mathfrak{R} be a ring. The group $EL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is the group generated by *elementary* matrices, i.e. 2×2 matrices g such that there exists $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ for which

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ r & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 6.11. Let U_1, U_2 be the upper and lower unipotent subgroups of $EL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ respectively. The group $EL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is *elementary boundedly generated* if there exists $n_0 > 0$ so that for every $g \in EL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ there exists $g_1, \dots, g_{n_0} \in U_1 \cup U_2$ such that $g = g_1 \cdots g_{n_0}$.

We will need the following result about finitely generated rings of algebraic numbers, their group of units, and the relationship to bounded generation and acylindrical hyperbolicity. The first item follows immediately by observing that the lower (respectively upper) triangular group in $SL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{R}^\times \ltimes \mathfrak{R}$, where the action $\mathfrak{R}^\times \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathfrak{R}$ is given by multiplication by the square of an element (respectively the square of its inverse).

Theorem 6.12. *Let $\mathfrak{R} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a finitely generated ring of algebraic numbers.*

- (1) *The group of units \mathfrak{R}^\times is finite if and only if the upper triangular group in $SL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is virtually abelian if and only if the lower triangular group in $SL_2 \mathfrak{R}$ is virtually abelian.*
- (2) [Vas72] *If $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ has infinitely many units then $SL_2 \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] = EL_2 \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$*

- (3) [MRS18] *The ring $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ has infinitely many units if and only if the group $\mathrm{SL}_2\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ is elementary boundedly generated, and in this case every element can be expressed as a product of at most 9 elementary matrices.*
- (4) *There exists a finite field extension K of \mathbb{Q} , and a finite set of valuations S such that $\mathfrak{R} \leq \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ are finite index inclusions. Furthermore, \mathfrak{R} has infinitely many units if and only if $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ has infinitely many units if and only if $S \neq \emptyset$ or $K \not\subset \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-a})$, where $a \in \mathbb{N}$.*

The last unjustified item is currently folklore, but its proof will appear in a forthcoming update of [OO25]. We can now prove the following result about $\mathrm{SL}_2\mathfrak{R}$; the proof follows the strategy developed in [Sha99]. Recall that actions on bounded metric spaces are always acylindrical.

Proposition 6.13. *For each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, let X_i be unbounded locally compact δ -hyperbolic spaces such that if $\xi \in \overline{X}_i$ then $\mathrm{Fix}\{\xi\} \leq \mathrm{Isom} X_i$ is amenable. Let Γ be nonamenable and $\rho_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Isom} X_i$ have amenable kernel such that $\Delta(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$ is proper. If $I \subset \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ is the subset of indices for which $\rho_i(\Gamma)$ is general type, then $I \neq \emptyset$ and $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in I) : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_0 \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is proper.*

Proof. Since Γ is nonamenable and the kernels of $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}}$ are amenable, the images $\rho_i(\Gamma)$ must be nonamenable. Furthermore, the hypotheses on amenability of boundary point stabilizers and the classification of actions Theorem 4.3 eliminates all possibilities except elliptic and general type.

By Lemma 3.5 the kernel $\Delta(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\mathfrak{D}})$ is finite and since Γ is nonamenable, it is infinite. Therefore, not all factor actions are elliptic, in particular, the set of indices I for which $\rho_i(\Gamma)$ is general type is not empty. By Lemma 5.2 we have that $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in I) : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_0 \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ is proper. \square

Remark 6.14. Let X be one of the standard algebraic hyperbolic spaces or an infinite locally finite tree. As discussed in Section 6.1, or proved in [PV91, Section 4], $\mathrm{Fix}\{\xi\}$ is amenable for every $\xi \in \partial X$, and therefore, these spaces satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 6.13.

Corollary 6.15. *If $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{SL}_2 \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be finitely generated and nonamenable then there exists a proper action with general type factors $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$, where \mathbb{X} is a product of finitely many copies of the hyperbolic plane, hyperbolic 3-space and Bruhat-Tits trees.*

Proof. Since Γ is finitely generated, there exists a finite field extension $\mathbb{Q} \subset K$, and S a finite set of valuations on \mathbb{Q} such that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$. The latter is a lattice in $\prod_{i=1}^r \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathbb{R} \times \prod_{j=1}^c \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathbb{C} \times \prod_{s \in S} \mathrm{SL}_2 K_s$ which acts properly (and with finite covolume) on the associated product of rank-one symmetric spaces and Bruhat-Tits trees, and hence the action of Γ is proper as well. Furthermore, the factor actions are injective and hence have trivial kernel. By Remark 6.14, these factors have amenable boundary-point stabilizers and the result follows from Proposition 6.13. \square

Proposition 6.16. *Let $\mathfrak{R} \subset \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be a finitely generated infinite ring of algebraic numbers and let $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathfrak{R}$. Then there exists a nonelliptic acylindrical action $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut} \mathbb{X}$ if and only if \mathfrak{R}^\times is finite, in which case Γ is acylindrically hyperbolic.*

Proof. Assume that \mathfrak{R}^\times is infinite and $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut} \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical. We will deduce that the action is elliptic. By Theorem 6.12.4, there exists a finite field extension $K \supset \mathbb{Q}$ and a finite set of non-archimedean valuations S on K such that $\mathfrak{R} \leq \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$. Therefore, $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathfrak{R} \leq \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ are finite index inclusions of groups. Moreover, since \mathfrak{R} has infinitely many units, so does $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$. Let $\Gamma' := \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ and F denote the set of cosets Γ'/Γ .

By Proposition 5.14, setting $\mathbb{X}' = \prod_{\chi \in F} \mathbb{X}$ there exists $\rho' : \Gamma' \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut} \mathbb{X}' = \mathrm{Sym}(F) \ltimes \mathrm{Aut} \mathbb{X}'$ that is acylindrical and such that $\rho'(\Gamma)$ does not permute the factor corresponding to χ_0 , the identity coset in F . Since projections are 1-Lipschitz, in particular, if $(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, (\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} \in \mathbb{X}'$ then

$$d(\mathbf{x}_{\chi_0}, \mathbf{y}_{\chi_0}) \leq d((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, (\mathbf{y}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}).$$

Therefore, to deduce that the action of $\rho(\Gamma)$ on \mathbb{X} is elliptic, it is sufficient to deduce that the $\rho'(\Gamma)$ action on \mathbb{X}' is elliptic. To this end, let $U', L' \leq \Gamma'$ be the upper and lower triangular groups. Since the group of units in \mathfrak{R} is infinite, so is that in $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ and hence U' and L' are not virtually abelian. By the Tits Alternative Theorem A, it follows that the action of $\rho'(U')$ and $\rho'(L')$ on \mathbb{X}' must be elliptic.

We now deduce that the action $\rho'(\Gamma')$ is also elliptic. Fix $(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F} \in \mathbb{X}'$ and $R > 0$ such that $d((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(g)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) \leq R$ for all $g \in U' \cup L'$. By Theorem 6.12.3 Γ' is boundedly generated by U' and L' , i.e. for every $g' \in \Gamma'$ there exists $g_1, \dots, g_9 \in U' \cup L'$ such that $g' = g_1 \cdots g_9$. We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} d((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(g)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) &= d((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(g_1 \cdots g_9)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^9 d((\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}, \rho'(g_i)(\mathbf{x}_\chi)_{\chi \in F}) \leq 9R. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\rho'(\Gamma')$ and hence the subgroup $\rho'(\Gamma)$ are acting elliptically.

Conversely, let \mathfrak{R}^\times be finite. Then $\mathfrak{R} \leq \mathcal{O}_K$ is a finite index inclusion of abelian groups, where \mathcal{O}_K is the ring of integers in $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-a})$, for some $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathfrak{R} \leq \mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K$ is also finite index. In this case, $\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K$ is a nonuniform lattice in $\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathbb{R}$ (respectively $\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathbb{C}$), according to whether $a = 0$ (respectively $a > 0$). In either case, the standard action on the associated hyperbolic space is general type and proper. Furthermore, any matrix whose trace has absolute value larger than 2 is a WPD element. Therefore, $\mathrm{SL}_2 \mathcal{O}_K$ is acylindrically hyperbolic and so is Γ . \square

6.4. Genericity for Unipotent-Free. In this section, we deduce that admitting an AU-acylindrical action on a $\mathrm{CAT}(0)$ space is generic among the finitely generated subgroups of SU_n . The key to this is the following result by Douba.

Theorem 6.17. [Dou25, Theorem 1.1.i] *Let $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{SL}_n \mathbb{C}$ be finitely generated such that no non-trivial element of Γ is unipotent. Then Γ acts properly on a $\mathrm{CAT}(0)$ space.*

If $n = 2$ then the associated $\text{CAT}(0)$ space will be the ℓ^2 -product of copies of $\mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{H}^3$ and (not necessarily locally finite) Bruhat-Tits trees, as above.

The reader may wonder how to find examples of such groups that are free of non-trivial unipotents: Consider the special unitary group $\text{SU}_n \leq \text{SL}_n \mathbb{C}$, which is the group of matrices whose inverse is given by the transpose-complex conjugate, i.e. $AA^* = I$. By way of this equation, we see that all eigen-values of a unitary matrix must belong to the unit circle in \mathbb{C} , and in particular, the only unipotent element (i.e. the only element to have sole eigen value 1) in SU_n is the identity. Moreover, if $n > 1$ then SU_n is not virtually solvable, and so by the Tits Alternative, it contains nonamenable groups. Using Lemma 3.6, we obtain the following corollary. Note that SU_n can also be replaced with any group within its isogeny class; isogenies are algebraic isomorphisms up to finite kernel.

Corollary 6.18. *Let $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Gamma \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \text{SU}_{n_i}$ be finitely generated. Then Γ acts properly (and hence AU -acylindrically) on a $\text{CAT}(0)$ space. If in fact Γ can be conjugated in to $\text{SU}_{n_i} \cap \text{SL}_{n_i}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ then the $\text{CAT}(0)$ space is uniformly locally compact and hence the Γ action is acylindrical. If $\{n_1, \dots, n_k\} = \{2\}$, then the $\text{CAT}(0)$ space is a finite product of copies of $\mathbb{H}^2, \mathbb{H}^3$, and locally finite trees.*

6.5. Groups with Property (NL). In [BFFG25], the authors systemize the study of groups that do not admit *any* actions on hyperbolic spaces with a loxodromic element – such groups are said to have Property (NL). In other words, the only actions such a group can admit on a hyperbolic space are elliptic or parabolic. If every finite index subgroup also has Property (NL), the group is said to be *hereditary* (NL).

A primary example of a group with this property comes from higher-rank lattices. Note that if $F = 1$ in the following statement, the irreducibility condition should be ignored. We also note that the lattices in the below theorem do act properly on the associated product of model geometries.

Theorem 6.19. [Hae20, Theorem A] *Let $F \geq 1$ and $\Gamma \leq G$ be an irreducible lattice in $G = \prod_{i=1}^F G_i$, where G_i is a higher rank, almost simple connected, algebraic group with finite center over a local field, for $i = 1, \dots, F$. Then any action of Γ by isometries on a δ -hyperbolic space is either elliptic or parabolic.*

Further examples of groups with Property (NL), besides the obvious finite groups and the higher-rank lattices considered above, include Burnside groups, Tarskii monster groups, Grigorchuk groups, Thompsons groups T, V and many “Thompson-like” groups (see [BFFG25, Theorem 1.6] for a more extensive list). It is worth noting however that Thompson’s group V and similar-type diagram groups act properly on infinite-dimensional $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes [Far05]. Furthermore, while finitely generated torsion groups do not act on 2-dimensional $\text{CAT}(0)$ complexes [NOP22], free Burnside groups do act non-trivially on infinite dimensional $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes [Osa18]. Finitely generated bounded-torsion groups are conjectured not to admit fixed-point free actions on locally compact $\text{CAT}(0)$ spaces. In a personal communication, Coulon and Guirardel have told us of some upcoming work: there is a finitely generated infinite amenable (unbounded) torsion group G which admits a proper action on an infinite dimensional $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complex.

Returning to our context, it follows from [BFFG25, Corollary 6.5], that groups with the hereditary (NL) property also do not admit interesting actions on products of hyperbolic graphs. In particular, it follows from the proof of [BFFG25, Proposition 6.4] and Theorem 5.7, that if Γ is a hereditary (NL) group, and \mathbb{X} is a product of hyperbolic spaces, then $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical only if the action is elliptic in each factor.

7. ELEMENTARY SUBGROUPS AND THE TITS ALTERNATIVE

In this section, we explore the structure of the stabilizer of a pair of points in the regular boundary $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \partial X_i$. If the points have distinct factors and the action is AU-acylindrical, we will prove that the stabilizer is virtually free abelian of rank no larger than \mathfrak{D} . This is an analog of the result in rank-one [BF02, Proposition 6], [Osi16, Theorem 1.1], and for HHGs [DHS17, Theorem 9.15], although our proof uses new techniques. We also consider the stabilizer of a single point in the regular boundary in a group acting acylindrically and obtain the same result, which is as expected according to our philosophy (see Section 6.1).

Definition 7.1. Given $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ and $\xi^-, \xi^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ with distinct factors, i.e. $\xi_i^- \neq \xi_i^+$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, the subgroup $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Fix}_{\Gamma} \{\xi_i^-, \xi_i^+\}$ is the associated *elementary subgroup*, denoted by $E_{\Gamma}(\xi^-, \xi^+)$. Recall that $\text{Fix}_{\Gamma} \{\xi_i^-, \xi_i^+\}$ is the set of elements that fix the set $\{\xi_i^-, \xi_i^+\}$ pointwise. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is a regular element, then the associated *elementary subgroup* is $E_{\Gamma}(\gamma) := E_{\Gamma}(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)$, where $\gamma^-, \gamma^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ are respectively the repelling and attracting fixed points for γ .

Our main goal is to prove the following results.

Proposition 7.2. *If $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is AU-acylindrical and not elliptic, and $\xi^-, \xi^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ with distinct factors then $E_{\Gamma}(\xi^-, \xi^+)$ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k where $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$.*

Proposition 7.3. *Assume $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical and not elliptic. If $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ then either $\text{Stab}\{\xi\}$ is finite or there exists an $\xi' \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ such that $\xi \neq \xi'$ and $\text{Fix}_{\Gamma}\{\xi\} = \text{Fix}_{\Gamma}\{\xi, \xi'\}$. Furthermore, if all factor actions are neither elliptic nor parabolic, then $\xi'_i \neq \xi_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$.*

Our strategy to prove the above propositions is as follows:

- (1) We first prove, under the hypotheses of Proposition 7.2 that $E_{\Gamma}(\xi^-, \xi^+)$ is amenable by showing that all finitely generated subgroups have polynomial growth (of degree at most \mathfrak{D}).
- (2) Using amenability, the Busemann quasimorphisms are now homomorphisms and the associated product of these allows the action to descend to $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$. We prove that the AU-acylindricity of the action also descends. An application of Lemma 3.8 then proves Proposition 7.2.
- (3) Without loss of generality, up to passing to a finite index subgroup that preserves the conditions, we may assume that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X}$. We then deduce Proposition 7.3 by utilizing the uniformity of acylindricity to exclude the possibility of a quasi-parabolic factor and hence find another point in $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ which is also fixed. We then conclude

by applying Proposition 7.2 and noting that the structure of $\text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi\}$ (whether finite or infinite) lifts back to $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$.

Assuming the above results hold, we can immediately prove our version of the Tits Alternative as stated in Theorem A.

Proof of Theorem A. Without loss of generality, we may first pass to a finite index subgroup if necessary and assume that Γ is factor-preserving, i.e. assume $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{X} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom } X_i$. Indeed, the finite index subgroup must also act non-elliptically and the acylindricity is naturally inherited. Since the action is not elliptic, by Corollary 5.5, we may assume that all factors are neither elliptic nor parabolic.

If any projection $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X_i$ is general type then Γ contains a free group by the classification of actions Theorem 4.3. Therefore, we may assume that no factor is of general type.

We are then in the situation that each factor is lineal or quasi-parabolic. Up to passing to a finite index subgroup once more, we may assume that each factor is either oriented lineal or quasi-parabolic. This means the action is not elliptic and fixes some point $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$. By applying Proposition 7.3 first and then applying Proposition 7.2, the result follows. \square

We now establish some preliminary results that we will need to prove the propositions listed above. We start with an examination of actions on quaselines in rank-one and products of such in higher rank in the next two subsections.

7.1. Rank-one. Fix distinct boundary points $\xi^-, \xi^+ \in \partial X$. Let L be the union of all $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-geodesics that limit to ξ^- and ξ^+ , which is nonempty by Remark 3.13. By the Morse Property (Theorem 3.15), L is a quasiline, i.e. there exists a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-isometry $q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L$ that is $M_{20\delta}$ coarsely surjective. Furthermore, L is invariant under the subgroup of $\text{Isom } X$ which stabilizes the set $\{\xi^-, \xi^+\}$. Therefore, to understand elementary subgroups it is key to understand actions on quaselines. In the spirit of the above, we shall consider quaselines L that admit a $(1, \lambda)$ quasi-isometry $q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L$ that is M_λ -coarsely onto. In Remark 3.16, we fixed M_λ the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics in a δ -hyperbolic space.

Recall that $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics between the same end-points synchronously fellow travel by Corollary 3.18, this is the key reason we consider such quasigeodesics. The following lemma generalizes this to the group setting and implies that a group acting elliptically on a quasi-line and fixing the Gromov boundary pointwise has uniformly bounded orbits and is hence a tremble (see Theorem 4.3).

Note that if L is a quasiline then $\text{Isom } L$ has a subgroup of index at most two that fixes the boundary pointwise. We shall denote this subgroup by $\text{Isom}_0 L$.

Lemma 7.4. *Fix $\delta, \lambda \geq 0$. Let L be a δ -hyperbolic quasiline and $q : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L$ a $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesic. Then q is M -coarsely surjective, where $M = M_\lambda$. Let $M' = M_{\lambda+2M_\lambda}$ be the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda + 2M_\lambda)$ quasigeodesics. Fix $g \in \text{Isom}_0 L$. Setting $C_0(g) = 2M' + 8M + 5\lambda + d(gq(0), q(0))$ and $C(g) = 2M + C_0(g)$, we get that*

- (1) *If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then $d(gq(n), q(n)) \leq C_0(g)$.*
- (2) *If $x \in L$ then $d(gx, x) \leq C(g)$.*

In particular if $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom}_0 L$ is elliptic then $d(gx, x) \leq C_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma)$ for every $g \in \Gamma$ and $x \in L$, where $C_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma) = 2M' + 10M + 5\lambda + B_0$ and $B_0 := \sup_{g \in \Gamma} d(gq(0), q(0)) < \infty$.

Proof. (1) Observe that for $g \in \text{Isom}_0 L$ we can directly apply Corollary 3.18 with $c = gq$ and hence we set $C_0(g) = 2M' + 8M + 5\lambda + d(gq(0), q(0)) \geq 0$ so that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$d(g \cdot q(n), q(n)) \leq C_0(g).$$

(2) Let $x \in L$. There is an n such that $d(x, q(n)) \leq M$ and since g is an isometry, $d(gx, gq(n)) \leq M$. We deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} d(gx, x) &\leq d(x, q(n)) + d(q(n), gq(n)) + d(gq(n), gx) \\ &\leq 2M + C_0(g) = C(g). \end{aligned}$$

Now consider the case when $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom}_0 L$ elliptic. Then the constant B_0 defined in the statement is finite. Applying part (1) uniformly to q and all gq , $g \in \Gamma$ we can set $C'_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma) = 2M' + 8M + 5\lambda + B_0$ so that $d(gq(n), q(n)) \leq C'_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma)$.

Let $x \in X$. Then, $d(x, q(n)) \leq M$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Letting $g \in \Gamma$ and using the triangle inequality as above, we get

$$d(gx, x) \leq 2M + C'_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma) = C_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma).$$

□

Remark 7.5. We note that the above proof also shows that if $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } X$ is elliptic and also fixes a point $\xi \in \partial X$, then there is an $\epsilon > 0$ so that the set $\mathcal{O}^\epsilon(\rho(\Gamma))$ is unbounded. Indeed, take a $(1, 10\delta)$ quasi-ray q converging to ξ . Since Γ fixes ξ , the Hausdorff distance between q and gq for any $g \in \Gamma$ is uniformly bounded. The arguments from the lemma can then be adapted to the quasi-ray q to get the desired conclusion.

7.2. Higher rank. Similar to the rank-one case, given distinct boundary points $\xi_i^-, \xi_i^+ \in \partial X_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, we may consider L_i to be the union of all $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-geodesics that limit to ξ_i^- and ξ_i^+ . Set $\xi^- = (\xi_1^-, \dots, \xi_{\mathfrak{D}}^-)$, and $\xi^+ = (\xi_1^+, \dots, \xi_{\mathfrak{D}}^+)$ and form the product $\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i \subset \mathbb{X}$, which is invariant under the subgroup of $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ that stabilizes the set $\{\xi^-, \xi^+\}$. We can therefore take the product of these to form a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-isometry $q = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} q_i : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$ that is $M_{20\delta}$ coarsely surjective. Recall we are using the ℓ^∞ -product metric. Furthermore, $\prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$ is invariant under the subgroup of $\text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ that stabilizes $\{\xi^-, \xi^+\}$ as well as the finite index subgroup which fixes the factors $\{\xi_i^-, \xi_i^+\}$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$.

The following is immediate from Lemma 7.4 applied to the factors. It implies that an elliptic action on a product of quasilines preserving factors and fixing the boundary pointwise has uniformly bounded orbits and is hence a tremble.

Corollary 7.6. Fix $\delta, \lambda \geq 0$. Let $L_1, \dots, L_{\mathfrak{D}}$ be δ -hyperbolic quasilines. Let $q = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} q_i : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$ be the product of $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics. Then q is a $(1, \lambda)$ quasi-isometry that is

M -coarsely surjective, where $M = M_\lambda$ is the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda)$ quasigeodesics. Let $M' = M_{\lambda+2M}$ be the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda + 2M)$ quasigeodesics. Fix $g \in \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom}_0 L_i$. Setting $C_0(g) := 2M' + 8M + 5\lambda + d(gq(0), q(0))$ and $C(g) := 2M + C_0(g)$, we have that

- (1) If $a \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ then $d(gq(a), q(a)) \leq C_0(g)$.
- (2) If $x \in \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$ then $d(gx, x) \leq C(g)$.

In particular, if $\Gamma \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Isom}_0 L_i$ is elliptic, then $d(gx, x) \leq C_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma)$ for every $g \in \Gamma$ and $x \in \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$, where $C_{\text{ell}}(\Gamma) = 2M' + 10M + 5\lambda + B_0$, and $B_0 := \sup_{g \in \Gamma} d(gq(0), q(0)) < \infty$.

We are now ready to prove the first step towards the amenability of $E_\Gamma(\xi^-, \xi^+)$ when Γ is acting AU-acylindrically on \mathbb{X} . We note that to keep with our convention that subscripts denote components in products, we will use superscripts for sequences as we have done in previous sections. We hope that the reader will not confuse these for powers, as the only powers we take are inverses, specifically g_a^{-1} .

Theorem 7.7. *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ be AU-acylindrical. If $\xi^-, \xi^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ have distinct factors then $E_\Gamma(\xi^-, \xi^+)$ is amenable.*

Proof. Recall that we are using the ℓ^∞ -product metric, and that $\text{Set}_\epsilon\{\cdot\}$ denotes the coarse pointwise stabilizer. Since the action of Γ is AU-acylindrical on \mathbb{X} , so is the action of the subgroup $E_\Gamma(\xi^-, \xi^+)$. To conserve notation, without loss of generality, we may assume $\Gamma = E_\Gamma(\xi^-, \xi^+)$. Further, let $M = M_{20\delta}$ be the associated Morse constant from the Morse Property (See Theorem 3.15), and let $\lambda = \max\{20\delta, M\}$.

By Remark 3.13 for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ there exists a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasigeodesic $q_i : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X_i$ with end points ξ_i^- and ξ_i^+ . Let L_i be the union of all such quasigeodesics. We have that L_i is a quasiline and q_i is M coarsely surjective. Let $\mathbb{F} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i \subset \mathbb{X}$ be the corresponding product.

Then $q = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} q_i : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-isometry that is M coarsely surjective. Note that Γ preserves \mathbb{F} . Let $M' = M_{\lambda+2M}$ is the Morse constant for $(1, \lambda + 2M)$ quasigeodesics.

We claim that $\text{Set}_{2\lambda}\{q(0)\} \subset \text{Set}_{2M'+8M+7\lambda}\{q(0), q(a)\}$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$. Indeed, if $g \in \text{Set}_{2\lambda}\{q(0)\}$ then $d(gq(0), q(0)) \leq 2\lambda$. So, by Corollary 7.6 (1), if $a \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ then $d(gq(a), q(a)) \leq C_0(g) \leq 2M' + 8M + 7\lambda$.

Now, since the action of Γ on \mathbb{X} is AU-acylindrical and \mathbb{F} is Γ invariant, it follows that the restricted action of Γ to \mathbb{F} is also AU-acylindrical. We now use this assumption: Let $\epsilon = 2M' + 8M + 7\lambda$. By AU-acylindricity, there exists an $R = R(\epsilon) > 0$ so that for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ if $d(q(0), q(z)) > R$ then the cardinality $|\text{Set}_\epsilon\{q(0), q(z)\}| < \infty$. Since \mathbb{F} is unbounded, there exists a $z \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ such that $d(q(0), q(z)) > R$, which we now fix. Let $N_\epsilon = N_\epsilon(q(0), q(z)) = |\text{Set}_\epsilon\{q(0), q(z)\}| < \infty$ and note that by the previous paragraph applied to our choice of z , it follows that

$$|\{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(0)) \leq 2\lambda\}| \leq N_\epsilon < \infty.$$

Let $F_n = \bigcup_{a \in [-n, n]^{\mathfrak{D}}} \{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(a)) \leq \lambda\}$. Since $\lambda \geq M$ and q is M -coarsely surjective, it follows that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} F_n = \Gamma$. To give an upper bound on the cardinality $|F_n|$ observe that for each $a \in [-n, n]^{\mathfrak{D}}$ either $\{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(a)) \leq \lambda\} = \emptyset$ or there is a $g_a \in \{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(a)) \leq \lambda\}$. If there is such a g_a , then for any $h \in \{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(a)) \leq \lambda\}$, we get that

$$d(g_a^{-1} \cdot h \cdot q(0), q(0)) \leq d(g_a^{-1} \cdot h \cdot q(0), g_a^{-1} q(a)) + d(g_a^{-1} \cdot q(a), q(0)) \leq 2\lambda.$$

Therefore, $|g_a^{-1} \cdot \{g \in \Gamma : d(gq(0), q(a)) \leq \lambda\}| \leq N_\epsilon$ and we have shown by isometry of the action that

$$|F_n| \leq N_\epsilon \cdot (2n + 1)^{\mathfrak{D}}.$$

Note that the finite constant N_ϵ above is independent of n . Since amenable groups are closed under taking unions, we now prove that every finitely generated subgroup of Γ has polynomial growth of degree bounded by \mathfrak{D} and is hence amenable. To this end, let $S \subset \Gamma$ be a finite set and consider the associated finitely generated subgroup H . Then there is a $k^0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $S \subset F_{k^0}$, i.e. if $s^1, s^2 \in S$ then there are $a^1, a^2 \in [-k^0, k^0]^{\mathfrak{D}}$ so that $d(s^i q(0), q(a^i)) \leq \lambda$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Let $C_0(s)$ are the constants provided by Corollary 7.6. Since the action is by isometries, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} d(s^1 s^2 \cdot q(0), q(a^1 + a^2)) &\leq d(s^1 s^2 \cdot q(0), s^1 \cdot q(a^2)) + d(s^1 \cdot q(a^2), s^1 \cdot q(a^1 + a^2)) \\ &\quad + d(s^1 \cdot q(a^1 + a^2), q(a^1 + a^2)) \\ &\leq \lambda + \|a^1\|_\infty + \lambda + \max_{s \in S} d(s \cdot q(a^1 + a^2), q(a^1 + a^2)) \\ &\leq 2\lambda + k^0 + \max_{s \in S} C_0(s). \end{aligned}$$

Now by the coarse surjectivity, there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ such that $d(s^1 s^2 \cdot q(0), q(b)) \leq \lambda$. The following calculation shows that $s^1 s^2 \in F_{4\lambda + 3k^0 + \max_{s \in S} C_0(s)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|b\|_\infty &= \|a^1 + a^2 + b - a^1 - a^2\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|a^1 + a^2 - b\|_\infty + \|a^1 + a^2\|_\infty \\ &\leq d(q(a^1 + a^2), q(b)) + \lambda + 2k^0 \\ &\leq d(q(a^1 + a^2), s^1 s^2 \cdot q(0)) + d(s^1 s^2 \cdot q(0), q(b)) + \lambda + 2k^0 \\ &\leq 4\lambda + 3k^0 + \max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \end{aligned}$$

Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We claim that if $s^1, \dots, s^n \in S$ then $s^1 s^2 \dots s^n \in F_{(3n-2)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s)}$, which we shall prove by induction on n . Obviously, we have established above that this holds for $n = 2$ (and holds for $n = 1$ as well). Assume we have proven the claim for $s^1 s^2 \dots s^n$, i.e. there exists $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ such that

$$d(s^1 s^2 \dots s^n q(0), q(b)) \leq \lambda$$

and $\|b\|_\infty \leq (3n-2)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_s$.

Let $s^{n+1} \in S$ and consider $s^1 s^2 \dots s^n s^{n+1}.q(0)$. Choose b as above and $w \in \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ such that

$$d(s^1 s^2 \dots s^n s^{n+1}.q(0), q(w)) \leq \lambda.$$

Then similar to the computation above, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_\infty &= \|w + b - b\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|w - b\|_\infty + \|b\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|w - b\|_\infty + (3n-2)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &\leq d(q(w), q(b)) + \lambda + (3n-2)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &= d(q(w), q(b)) + (3n-1)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &\leq d(q(w), s^1 \dots s^n s^{n+1}.q(0)) + d(s^1 \dots s^n s^{n+1}.q(0), s^1 s^2 \dots s^n.q(0)) \\ &\quad + d(s^1 s^2 \dots s^n.q(0), q(b)) + (3n-1)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &\leq \lambda + d(s^{n+1}.q(0), q(0)) + \lambda + (3n-1)\lambda + 3k^0 + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &\leq (3n+1)\lambda + 3k^0 + d(s_{n+1}.q(0), q(0)) + (n-1)\max_{s \in S} C_0(s) \\ &\leq (3n+1)\lambda + 3k^0 + n \max_{s \in S} C_0(s). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction argument, and gives us the linear relation that the set of words from S of length bounded by n is a subset of $F_{n(\lambda + \max_{s \in S} C_0(s)) + \lambda'}$. Therefore, H has polynomial growth and is hence amenable. Finally Γ is the union of its finitely generated subgroups, all of which have polynomial growth of exponent \mathfrak{D} , and hence Γ is also amenable. \square

Note: For the remainder of this subsection, suppose that Γ is an amenable group with an action $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{F}$, where $\mathbb{F} = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} L_i$. Up to replacing Γ with a subgroup of index at most $2^{\mathfrak{D}}$, we may assume that Γ acts trivially on $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{F}$. Fix $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{F}$. We then obtain $\beta_i : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Busemann homomorphism associated to $\xi_i \in \partial L_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$ and hence $\beta := \Delta(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\mathfrak{D}}) : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$. This yields an action by translations $g(r) = r + \beta(g)$, for $g \in \Gamma$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$. In coordinates we have

$$g.(r_1, \dots, r_{\mathfrak{D}}) = (r_1 + \beta_1(g), \dots, r_{\mathfrak{D}} + \beta_{\mathfrak{D}}(g)).$$

We will show that AU-acylindricity of the original action on \mathbb{F} descends to AU-acylindricity for this action by translations $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$.

Proposition 7.8. *Let Γ be amenable and $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{F}$ be an AU-acylindrical action with trivial action on $\partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{F}$. Then the action by translation on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ defined above is also AU-acylindrical.*

Proof. Fix $q_i : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow L_i$ a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-isometry for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$. Then $q = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} : \mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is a $(1, 20\delta)$ quasi-isometry as well. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $x = q(0)$ be a base point in \mathbb{F} . Since

Γ preserves the factors, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$ we may project $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Isom } L_i$ and apply Proposition 4.7 and Lemma 4.6, yielding the functions A_i and associated constants B_i, E_i . Let $B = \max_i B_i$ and $E = \max_i E_i$ (with respect to the base point $x_i = q_i(0)$).

Let R be the AU-acylindricity constant associated to the action of $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_0 \mathbb{F}$ for $\epsilon' = \epsilon + 20\delta + B + E$. We claim that AU-acylindricity holds for ϵ for the action on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ by taking $R_\epsilon = 2\epsilon$.

Indeed, let $r, s \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ at distance greater than 2ϵ . Consider $g \in \Gamma$ such that

$$d(r, gr) \leq \epsilon \text{ and } d(s, gs) \leq \epsilon.$$

Since Γ is acting by translation, the above inequalities imply that $|\beta_i(g_i)| \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}\}$. Applying Lemma 4.6 to each factor, it follows that in \mathbb{F} ,

$$d(x, gx) \leq \epsilon + E + 20\delta.$$

Fix an element $h \in \Gamma$ such that $d(hx, x) \geq R$. Such an element must exist as the orbit of Γ on \mathbb{F} is unbounded. There are two possibilities to consider in each factor L_i . If $\beta_i(h_i) \leq A_i(\epsilon + 20\delta + E_i)$, then it follows from Proposition 4.7 that

$$d(h_i x_i, g_i h_i x_i) \leq |\beta_i(g_i)| + B_i \leq \epsilon + B_i.$$

If not, then $\beta_i(h_i) \leq A_i(n)$ for a sufficiently large $n \geq \epsilon + 20\delta + E_i$. However, then $d(x_i, g_i x_i) \leq \epsilon + 20\delta + E_i \leq n$, and Proposition 4.7 still implies $d(h_i x, g_i h_i x) \leq |\beta_i(g_i)| + B_i \leq \epsilon + B_i$.

Thus we have

$$d(x, gx) \leq \epsilon + 20\delta + E \leq \epsilon'$$

and

$$d(ghx, hx) \leq \epsilon + B \leq \epsilon'.$$

Since the action is AU-acylindrical, the element g has at most finitely many choices (which is a uniform $N' = N(\epsilon')$ in the acylindrical case) and thus we are done. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.2. By Theorem 7.7, we know that $E_\Gamma(\xi^-, \xi^+)$ is amenable. By Proposition 7.8, we see that the action via the Busemann quasimorphisms descends to an AU-acylindrical action on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{D}}$ by translations. The result now follows by Lemma 3.8. \square

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 7.3. Thinking of acylindricity as being a generalization of a cocompact lattice, this result is in line with saying that there are no unipotents in a cocompact lattice.

Proof of Proposition 7.3. We recall our hypotheses: $\rho : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is acylindrical and not elliptic and $\xi \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$. Without loss of generality, we may first pass to a finite index subgroup if necessary and assume that Γ is factor-preserving. For ease of notation, let $H = \text{Stab}_\Gamma\{\xi\}$.

Case 1: For each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, the action $\rho_i(H)$ is either elliptic or parabolic.

As acylindricity passes to subgroups, by Theorem 5.7, at least one factor is elliptic. By Proposition 5.3, if J is the set of indices for which $\rho_i(H)$ is elliptic, then $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in J) : H \rightarrow \prod_{i \in J} \text{Isom } X_i$ is acylindrical. By Remark 7.5 and the acylindricity applied to a half-ray tending to each $\xi_i \in \partial X_i$ proves that H is finite.

Case 2: For each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$, the action $\rho_i(H)$ is neither elliptic nor parabolic.

Lemma 5.6 rules out the possibility that some factor action is quasiparabolic. Therefore, by Theorem 4.3 for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$ the action of $\rho_i(H)$ on X_i is oriented lineal so $\rho_i(H)$ fixes exactly two points in ∂X_i . Let ξ'_i be the other fixed point.

Let $\xi' = (\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_\mathfrak{D}) \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$. It follows that ξ and ξ' have distinct factors and $H = \text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi, \xi'\}$. Moreover, since acylindricity passes to subgroups, the action $\rho(H)$ on \mathbb{X} is acylindrical and not elliptic. By Corollary 7.2, H is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k where $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$.

Case 3: The set of indices I for which $\rho_i(H)$ is neither elliptic nor parabolic is not empty.

By Corollary 5.5, the action $\Delta(\rho_i : i \in I) : H \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \text{Isom } X_i$ is acylindrical. By Case 2, for each $i \in I$ there exists $\xi'_i \in \partial X_i \setminus \{\xi_i\}$ that is fixed by $\rho_i(H)$. Finally, for $i \notin I$, let $\xi'_i = \xi_i$. Observing that $|I| \leq \mathfrak{D}$ and setting $\xi' = (\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_\mathfrak{D})$ completes the proof as $H = \text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\xi, \xi'\}$ in this case as well.

Lastly, the furthermore part of the statement of the proposition follows directly from the details of Case 2 above. \square

Corollary 7.9. *Suppose that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ is AU-acylindrical with all factors lineal. Then Γ is virtually \mathbb{Z}^k for $0 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{D}$.*

Proof. Up to passing to a finite index subgroup, we may assume that $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\bar{0}} \mathbb{X}$ with all factors admitting oriented lineal factors. Then result now follows from the fact that each lineal factor has exactly two distinct limit points on ∂X_i that are fixed by the whole group and applying Proposition 7.2. \square

The following is the second part of Theorem C. Let $g \in \Gamma$ and $H \leq \Gamma$. We shall denote the centralizer of g in Γ by $\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma(g)$ and the normalizer of H in Γ by $\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(H)$.

Corollary 7.10. *Let $\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Aut } \mathbb{X}$ be AU-acylindrical, and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ a regular element. Let $\gamma^-, \gamma^+ \in \partial_{\text{reg}} \mathbb{X}$ be the repelling, respectively attracting fixed points of γ with coordinates $\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+ \in \partial X_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$. Then the following are finite index inclusions*

$$\mathfrak{C}_\Gamma(\gamma) \leq E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+) \leq \mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)) \leq \text{Sym}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathfrak{D}) \ltimes \bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Stab}_\Gamma\{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}.$$

Remark 7.11. Let $\gamma, g \in \text{Isom } X$. If γ is loxodromic then it is straightforward to verify that $g\gamma g^{-1}$ is also loxodromic with repelling fixed point $g.\gamma^-$ and attracting fixed point $g.\gamma^+$.

Proof. Recall that $E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Fix}_\Gamma\{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}$. As any subgroup normalizes itself, the second inclusion $E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+) \leq \mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+))$ is immediate.

Without loss of generality, assume that Γ is factor-preserving, as this amounts to passing to a subgroup of index at most $\mathfrak{D}!$. Let us prove that $\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)) \leq \bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Stab}_\Gamma\{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}$ and so by the orbit stabilizer theorem the index of the second inclusion is at most $2^\mathfrak{D}$.

Let $g \in \mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+))$ and note that $g\gamma g^{-1} \in E_\Gamma(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)$, meaning that $g_i \gamma_i g_i^{-1}$ fixes γ_i^- and γ_i^+ . By Remark 7.11, $g_i \gamma_i g_i^{-1}$ is a loxodromic with repelling and attracting fixed

points $g \cdot \gamma_i^-$ and $g \cdot \gamma_i^+$, respectively, and therefore, $\{g_i \cdot \gamma_i^-, g_i \cdot \gamma_i^+\} = \{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}$, for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathfrak{D}$ i.e. $g \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Stab}_{\Gamma}\{\gamma_i^-, \gamma_i^+\}$.

The above argument also shows that if $g \in \mathfrak{C}_{\Gamma}(\gamma)$ then $g \in E_{\Gamma}(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)$, as in this case $g\gamma g^{-1} = \gamma$ and therefore, only the question of finite index remains. By Proposition 7.2, $E_{\Gamma}(\gamma^-, \gamma^+)$ is virtually free abelian. This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB08] Peter Abramenko and Kenneth S. Brown. *Buildings*, volume 248 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2008. Theory and applications.
- [ABO19] Carolyn R. Abbott, Sahana Balasubramanya, and Denis Osin. Hyperbolic structures on groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 19(4):1747–1835, 2019.
- [ABR23] C. R. Abbott, S. Balasubramanya, and A. J. Rasmussen. Higher rank confining subsets and hyperbolic actions of solvable groups. *Advances in Math.*, 424:109–145, 2023.
- [Ali05] Emina Alibegović. A combination theorem for relatively hyperbolic groups. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 37(3):459–466, 2005.
- [AM24] Carolyn R. Abbott and Jason F. Manning. Acylindrically hyperbolic groups and their quasi-isometrically embedded subgroups. *Michigan Math. J.*, 74(2):357–402, 2024.
- [BB97] Mladen Bestvina and Noel Brady. Morse theory and finiteness properties of groups. *Invent. Math.*, 129(3):445–470, 1997.
- [BBF15] Mladen Bestvina, Ken Bromberg, and Koji Fujiwara. Constructing group actions on quasi-trees and applications to mapping class groups. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, 122:1–64, 2015.
- [BBF21] Mladen Bestvina, Ken Bromberg, and Koji Fujiwara. Proper actions on finite products of quasi-trees. *Ann. H. Lebesgue*, 4:685–709, 2021.
- [BBFS19] Mladen Bestvina, Ken Bromberg, Koji Fujiwara, and Alessandro Sisto. Acylindrical actions on projection complexes. *Enseign. Math.*, 65(1-2):1–32, 2019.
- [BCFS25] Uri Bader, Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace, Alex Furman, and Alessandro Sisto. Hyperbolic actions of higher rank lattices come from rank-one factors. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 45(4):961–988, 2025.
- [BdlHV08] Bachir Bekka, Pierre de la Harpe, and Alain Valette. *Kazhdan’s property (T)*, volume 11 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [Beh87] Helmut Behr. Finite presentability of arithmetic groups over global function fields. volume 30, pages 23–39. 1987. Groups—St. Andrews 1985.
- [Ben09] Yves Benoist. Five lectures on lattices in semisimple Lie groups. In *Géométries à courbure négative ou nulle, groupes discrets et rigidités*, volume 18 of *Sémin. Congr.*, pages 117–176. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2009.
- [BFa] Sahana Balasubramanya and Talia Fernós. Acylindricity in higher rank, part ii: Semi-simplicity.
- [BFb] Sahana Balasubramanya and Talia Fernós. Acylindricity in higher rank, part iii: Irreducibility.
- [BF02] Mladen Bestvina and Koji Fujiwara. Bounded cohomology of subgroups of mapping class groups. *Geometry & Topology*, 6(1):69–89, march 2002.
- [BF24] Sahana Balasubramanya and Talia Fernós. The semi-simple theory of higher rank acylindricity, 2024.
- [BFFG25] Sahana H. Balasubramanya, Francesco Fournier-Facio, and Anthony Genevois. Property (nl) for group actions on hyperbolic spaces (with an appendix by Alessandro Sisto). *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 19(4):1319–1371, 2025.
- [BGS85] Werner Ballmann, Mikhael Gromov, and Viktor Schroeder. *Manifolds of nonpositive curvature*, volume 61 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985.
- [BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [BHC62] Armand Borel and Harish-Chandra. Arithmetic subgroups of algebraic groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 75:485–535, 1962.

- [BHMS09] Martin R. Bridson, James Howie, Charles F. Miller, III, and Hamish Short. Subgroups of direct products of limit groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 170(3):1447–1467, 2009.
- [BHS17] Jason Behrstock, Mark F. Hagen, and Alessandro Sisto. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces, I: Curve complexes for cubical groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(3):1731–1804, 2017.
- [Bie76] Robert Bieri. Normal subgroups in duality groups and in groups of cohomological dimension 2. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 7(1):35–51, 1976.
- [BK02] Nadia Benakli and Ilya Kapovich. Boundaries of hyperbolic groups. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001)*, volume 296 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 39–93. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [BM00] Marc Burger and Shahar Mozes. Lattices in product of trees. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (92):151–194, 2000.
- [BM09] Martin R. Bridson and Charles F. Miller, III. Structure and finiteness properties of subdirect products of groups. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 98(3):631–651, 2009.
- [Bow08] Brian H. Bowditch. Tight geodesics in the curve complex. *Invent. Math.*, 171(2):281–300, 2008.
- [Bow16] Brian H. Bowditch. Quasi-isometric maps between direct products of hyperbolic spaces. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 26(4):619–633, 2016.
- [BR84] Gilbert Baumslag and James E. Roseblade. Subgroups of direct products of free groups. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 30(1):44–52, 1984.
- [Bre17] Corey Bregman. Isometry groups of $\text{cat}(0)$ cube complexes, 2017.
- [Bri23] Martin R. Bridson. Binary subgroups of direct products. *Enseign. Math.*, 69(3-4):399–416, 2023.
- [BS66] A. I. Borevich and I. R. Shafarevich. *Number theory*, volume Vol. 20 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1966. Translated from the Russian by Newcomb Greenleaf.
- [BS00] M. Bonk and O. Schramm. Embeddings of Gromov hyperbolic spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(2):266–306, 2000.
- [Bum04] Daniel Bump. *Lie groups*, volume 225 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [But19] J. Button. Groups acting faithfully on trees and properly on products of trees, 2019.
- [But25] J. O. Button. Generalised baumslag-solitar groups and hierarchically hyperbolic groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 25(4):2253–2279, 2025.
- [CCMT15] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace, Yves Cornuier, Nicolas Monod, and Romain Tessera. Amenable hyperbolic groups. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 17(11):2903–2947, 2015.
- [CDHH⁺24] Rémi Coulon, Gabriel Dorfsman-Hopkins, Edmund Harriss, Martin Skrodzki, Katherine E. Stange, and Glen Whitney. On the importance of illustration for mathematical research. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 71(1):105–115, 2024.
- [CFI16] Indira Chatterji, Talia Fernós, and Alessandra Iozzi. The median class and superrigidity of actions on $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes. *J. Topol.*, 9(2):349–400, 2016. With an appendix by Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace.
- [CM19] Indira Chatterji and Alexandre Martin. A note on the acylindrical hyperbolicity of groups acting on $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes. In *Beyond hyperbolicity*, volume 454 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 160–178. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2019.
- [CS11] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace and Michah Sageev. Rank rigidity for $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 21(4):851–891, 2011.
- [CZ13] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace and Gašper Zadnik. Regular elements in $\text{CAT}(0)$ groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 7(3):535–541, 2013.
- [CZ17] Meng-Kiat Chuah and Mingjing Zhang. Outer automorphism groups of simple Lie algebras and symmetries of painted diagrams. *Forum Math.*, 29(3):555–562, 2017.
- [Dah03] François Dahmani. *Les groupes relativement hyperboliques et leurs bords*, volume 2003/13 of *Prépublication de l’Institut de Recherche Mathématique Avancée [Prepublication of the Institute of Advanced Mathematical Research]*. Université Louis Pasteur, Département de Mathématique, Institut de Recherche Mathématique Avancée, Strasbourg, 2003. Thèse, l’Université Louis Pasteur (Strasbourg I), Strasbourg, 2003.
- [Del16] Thomas Delzant. Kähler groups, \mathbb{R} -trees, and holomorphic families of Riemann surfaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 26(1):160–187, 2016.

- [DGO16] François Dahmani, Vincent Guirardel, and Denis Osin. Hyperbolically embedded subgroups and rotating families in groups acting on hyperbolic spaces. *Amer. Math. Soc.*, 245(1156), 2016.
- [DHS17] Matthew Gentry Durham, Mark F. Hagen, and Alessandro Sisto. Boundaries and automorphisms of hierarchically hyperbolic spaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(6):3659–3758, 2017.
- [Dou25] Sami Douba. Proper $\text{cat}(0)$ actions of unipotent-free linear groups. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 24(2):587–601, 2025.
- [DSU17] Tushar Das, David Simmons, and Mariusz Urbański. *Geometry and dynamics in Gromov hyperbolic metric spaces*, volume 218 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. With an emphasis on non-proper settings.
- [EF97] Alex Eskin and Benson Farb. Quasi-flats and rigidity in higher rank symmetric spaces. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 10(3):653–692, 1997.
- [Far05] Daniel S. Farley. Actions of picture groups on $\text{CAT}(0)$ cubical complexes. *Geom. Dedicata*, 110:221–242, 2005.
- [Fer06] Talia Fernós. Relative property (T) and linear groups. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 56(6):1767–1804, 2006.
- [Fer18] Talia Fernós. The Furstenberg-Poisson boundary and $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(6):2180–2223, 2018.
- [FL08] Thomas Foertsch and Alexander Lytchak. The de Rham decomposition theorem for metric spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 18(1):120–143, 2008.
- [FLM18] Talia Fernós, Jean Lécureux, and Frédéric Mathéus. Random walks and boundaries of $\text{CAT}(0)$ cubical complexes. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 93(2):291–333, 2018.
- [FLM24] Talia Fernós, Jean Lécureux, and Frédéric Mathéus. Contact graphs, boundaries, and a central limit theorem for $\text{CAT}(0)$ cubical complexes. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 18(2):677–704, 2024.
- [FLSS18] David Fisher, Michael Larsen, Ralf Spatzier, and Matthew Stover. Character varieties and actions on products of trees. *Israel J. Math.*, 225(2):889–907, 2018.
- [Gİ0] Hasan Gündoğan. The component group of the automorphism group of a simple Lie algebra and the splitting of the corresponding short exact sequence. *J. Lie Theory*, 20(4):709–737, 2010.
- [Gen19] Anthony Genevois. Hyperbolicities in $\text{CAT}(0)$ cube complexes. *Enseign. Math.*, 65(1-2):33–100, 2019.
- [GJT93] Yves Guivarc’h, Lizhen Ji, and John Taylor. Compactifications of symmetric spaces. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 317(12):1103–1108, 1993.
- [GM08] D. Groves and J. F. Manning. Dehn filling in relatively hyperbolic groups. *Israel J. Math.*, 168:317–429, 2008.
- [Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.
- [GS18] Dominik Gruber and Alessandro Sisto. Infinitely presented graphical small cancellation groups are acylindrically hyperbolic. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 68(6):2501–2552, 2018.
- [Hae20] Thomas Haettel. Hyperbolic rigidity of higher rank lattices. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 53(2):439–468, 2020. With an appendix by Vincent Guirardel and Camille Horbez.
- [Hae22] Thomas Haettel. XXL type Artin groups are $\text{CAT}(0)$ and acylindrically hyperbolic. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 72(6):2541–2555, 2022.
- [Hal15] Brian Hall. *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations*, volume 222 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, second edition, 2015. An elementary introduction.
- [Ham06] Ursula Hamenstaedt. Bounded cohomology and isometry groups of hyperbolic spaces, 2006.
- [Ham17] Matthias Hamann. Group actions on metric spaces: fixed points and free subgroups. *Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hambg.*, 87(2):245–263, 2017.
- [Har79] W. J. Harvey. Geometric structure of surface mapping class groups. In *Homological group theory (Proc. Sympos., Durham, 1977)*, volume 36 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 255–269. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge-New York, 1979.
- [HMS24] Mark Hagen, Alexandre Martin, and Alessandro Sisto. Extra-large type Artin groups are hierarchically hyperbolic. *Math. Ann.*, 388(1):867–938, 2024.
- [Hos11] Tetsuya Hosaka. On boundaries of Coxeter groups and topological fractal structures. *Tsukuba J. Math.*, 35(2):153–160, 2011.
- [HP22] Mark F. Hagen and Harry Petyt. Projection complexes and quasimedians maps. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 22(7):3277–3304, 2022.

- [Iva84] N. V. Ivanov. Algebraic properties of the Teichmüller modular group. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 275(4):786–789, 1984.
- [Iva88] N. V. Ivanov. Teichmüller modular groups and arithmetic groups. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 167:95–110, 190–191, 1988.
- [Jan02] Tadeusz Januszkiewicz. For Coxeter groups $z^{|g|}$ is a coefficient of a uniformly bounded representation. *Fund. Math.*, 174(1):79–86, 2002.
- [Kec95] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [KKL98] Michael Kapovich, Bruce Kleiner, and Bernhard Leeb. Quasi-isometries and the de Rham decomposition. *Topology*, 37(6):1193–1211, 1998.
- [KL97] Bruce Kleiner and Bernhard Leeb. Rigidity of quasi-isometries for symmetric spaces and Euclidean buildings. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (86):115–197, 1997.
- [KLdGZ24] Dessislava H. Kochloukova and Jone Lopez de Gamiz Zearra. On subdirect products of type FP_n of limit groups over Droms RAAGs. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 176(2):417–440, 2024.
- [Kle89] Adam Kleppner. Measurable homomorphisms of locally compact groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 106(2):391–395, 1989.
- [KS16] Aditi Kar and Michah Sageev. Ping pong on $CAT(0)$ cube complexes. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 91(3):543–561, 2016.
- [Lin10] Gabriele Link. Asymptotic geometry in products of Hadamard spaces with rank one isometries. *Geom. Topol.*, 14(2):1063–1094, 2010.
- [LMR00] Alexander Lubotzky, Shahar Mozes, and M. S. Raghunathan. The word and Riemannian metrics on lattices of semisimple groups. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (91):5–53, 2000.
- [Man08] Jason Fox Manning. Actions of certain arithmetic groups on Gromov hyperbolic spaces. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 8(3):1371–1402, 2008.
- [Mar91] G. A. Margulis. *Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups*, volume 17 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [Mar22] Alex Margolis. Discretisable quasi-actions i: Topological completions and hyperbolicity, 2022.
- [McC86] John D. McCarthy. Automorphisms of surface mapping class groups. A recent theorem of N. Ivanov. *Invent. Math.*, 84(1):49–71, 1986.
- [MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity. *Invent. Math.*, 138(1):103–149, 1999.
- [MO15] Ashot Minasyan and Denis Osin. Acylindrical hyperbolicity of groups acting on trees. *Math. Ann.*, 362(3-4):1055–1105, 2015.
- [MP22] Alexandre Martin and Piotr Przytycki. Acylindrical actions for two-dimensional Artin groups of hyperbolic type. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (17):13099–13127, 2022.
- [MRS18] Aleksander V. Morgan, Andrei S. Rapinchuk, and Balasubramanian Sury. Bounded generation of SL_2 over rings of S -integers with infinitely many units. *Algebra Number Theory*, 12(8):1949–1974, 2018.
- [MS03] Antonios Manoussos and Polychronis Strantzalos. On the group of isometries on a locally compact metric space. *J. Lie Theory*, 13(1):7–12, 2003.
- [MT18] Joseph Maher and Giulio Tiozzo. Random walks on weakly hyperbolic groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 742:187–239, 2018.
- [NOP22] Sergey Norin, Damian Osajda, and Piotr Przytycki. Torsion groups do not act on 2-dimensional $CAT(0)$ complexes. *Duke Math. J.*, 171(6):1379–1415, 2022.
- [NP23] Francisco Nicolás and Pierre Py. Irrational pencils and Betti numbers. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 32(1):55–67, 2023.
- [NS13] Amos Nevo and Michah Sageev. The Poisson boundary of $CAT(0)$ cube complex groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 7(3):653–695, 2013.
- [OO25] D. Osin and K. Oyakawa. Classifying group actions on hyperbolic spaces, 2025.
- [Osa18] Damian Osajda. Group cubization. *Duke Math. J.*, 167(6):1049–1055, 2018. With an appendix by Mikael Pichot.
- [Osi16] D. Osin. Acylindrically hyperbolic groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(2):851–888, 2016.

- [Osi18] Denis V. Osin. Groups acting acylindrically on hyperbolic spaces. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. II. Invited lectures*, pages 919–939. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018.
- [PS23] Harry Petyt and Davide Spriano. Unbounded domains in hierarchically hyperbolic groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 17(2):479–500, 2023.
- [PV91] Isabelle Pays and Alain Valette. Sous-groupes libres dans les groupes d’automorphismes d’arbres. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 37(1-2):151–174, 1991.
- [Sel97] Z. Sela. Acylindrical accessibility for groups. *Invent. Math.*, 129(3):527–565, 1997.
- [Sel22] Z. Sela. Automorphisms of groups and a higher rank jsj decomposition ii: The single ended case, 2022.
- [Sel23] Z. Sela. Automorphisms of groups and a higher rank JSJ decomposition I: RAAGs and a higher rank Makanin-Razborov diagram. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 33(3):824–874, 2023.
- [Sha99] Yehuda Shalom. Bounded generation and Kazhdan’s property (T). *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (90):145–168, 1999.
- [Sis18] Alessandro Sisto. Contracting elements and random walks. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 742:79–114, 2018.
- [Sta63] John Stallings. A finitely presented group whose 3-dimensional integral homology is not finitely generated. *Amer. J. Math.*, 85:541–543, 1963.
- [Tit72] J. Tits. Free subgroups in linear groups. *J. Algebra*, 20:250–270, 1972.
- [V05] Jussi Väisälä. Gromov hyperbolic spaces. *Expo. Math.*, 23(3):187–231, 2005.
- [Vas72] L. N. Vaseršteĭn. The group SL_2 over Dedekind rings of arithmetic type. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 89(131):313–322, 351, 1972.
- [Vas22] Nicolas Vaskou. Acylindrical hyperbolicity for Artin groups of dimension 2. *Geom. Dedicata*, 216(1):Paper No. 7, 28, 2022.
- [Wis96] Daniel T. Wise. *Non-positively curved squared complexes: Aperiodic tilings and non-residually finite groups*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1996. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Princeton University.
- [WY25] Renxing Wan and Wenyuan Yang. Uniform exponential growth for groups with proper product actions on hyperbolic spaces. *J. Algebra*, 676:189–235, 2025.
- [Zim84] Robert J. Zimmer. *Ergodic theory and semisimple groups*, volume 81 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, PARDEE HALL, USA

Email address: hassanba@lafayette.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, 1326 STEVENSON CENTER, NASHVILLE, TN, USA

Email address: Talia.Fernos@Vanderbilt.edu