HADAMARD SPACES WITH ISOLATED FLATS

G. CHRISTOPHER HRUSKA AND BRUCE KLEINER

Abstract. We explore the geometry of nonpositively curved spaces with isolated flats, and its consequences for groups that act properly discontinuously, cocompactly, and isometrically on such spaces. We prove that the geometric boundary of the space is an invariant of the group up to equivariant homeomorphism. We also prove that any such group is relatively hyperbolic, biautomatic, and satisfies the Tits Alternative. The main step in establishing these results is a characterization of spaces with isolated flats as asymptotically tree-graded with respect to flats in the sense of Druţu–Sapir. Finally we show that a CAT(0) space has isolated flats if and only if its Tits boundary is a disjoint union of isolated points and standard Euclidean spheres.

1. Introduction

In this article, we explore the large scale geometry of CAT(0) spaces with isolated flats and its implications for groups that act geometrically, *i.e.*, properly discontinuously, cocompactly, and isometrically, on such spaces. Spaces with isolated flats have many features in common with Gromov-hyperbolic spaces and can be viewed as the nonhyperbolic CAT(0) spaces that are closest to being hyperbolic.

Throughout this article, a *k–flat* is an isometrically embedded copy of Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^k$ for $k \geq 2$. In particular a geodesic line is not considered to be a flat. Let $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$ denote the space of all flats in X with the topology of Hausdorff convergence on bounded sets (see §2.3 for details). A CAT(0) space with a geometric group action has *isolated flats* if it contains an equivariant collection $\mathcal{F}$ of flats such that $\mathcal{F}$ is closed and isolated in $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$ and each flat $F \subseteq X$ is contained in a uniformly bounded tubular neighborhood of some $F' \in \mathcal{F}$. As with the notion of Gromov-hyperbolicity, the notion of isolated flats can be characterized in many equivalent ways.

1.1. **Examples.** The prototypical example of a CAT(0) space with isolated flats is the truncated hyperbolic space associated to a finite volume cusped hyperbolic manifold M. Such a space is obtained from hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^n$ by removing an equivariant collection of disjoint open horoballs that are the

Date: November 15, 2004.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 20F67; Secondary: 20F69.

Key words and phrases. Isolated flats, asymptotic cone, relative hyperbolicity.

The first author is supported in part by an NSF Postdoctoral Research Fellowship. The second author is supported by NSF grant DMS-0204506.

lifts of the cusps of M and endowing the resulting space with the induced length metric. The truncated space is nonpositively curved,[1] and its only flats are the boundaries of the deleted horoballs. It is easy to see that the truncated space has isolated flats. Furthermore, the fundamental group of M acts cocompactly on the truncated space.

Other examples of groups that act geometrically on CAT(0) spaces with isolated flats include the following:

- Geometrically finite Kleinian groups [Bow93].
- Fundamental groups of compact manifolds obtained by gluing finite volume hyperbolic manifolds along cusps (Heintze, see [Gro81, §3.1]).
- Fundamental groups of compact manifolds obtained by the cusp closing construction of Thurston–Schroeder [Sch89].
- Limit groups (also known as ω–residually free groups), which arise in the study of equations over free groups [AB].

Examples in the 2–dimensional setting include the fundamental group of any compact nonpositively curved 2–complex whose 2–cells are isometric to regular Euclidean hexagons [BB94, Wis96]. Ballmann–Brin showed that such 2–complexes exist in abundance and can be constructed with arbitrary local data [BB94]. For instance, for each simplicial graph L there is a CAT(0) hexagonal 2–complex X such that the link of every vertex in X is isomorphic to the graph L ([Mou88], see also [Hag91] and [Ben94]).

1.2. **Main results.** The following theorem gives several equivalent formulations of the notion of isolated flats. Further equivalent geometric notions are discussed in Theorem 1.2.3 below.

Theorem 1.2.1. *Let X be a* CAT(0) *space and Γ a group acting geometrically on X. The following are equivalent.*

(1) *X has isolated flats.*
(2) *Each component of the Tits boundary $\partial_T X$ is either an isolated point or a standard Euclidean sphere.*
(3) *X is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to a family of flats $\mathcal{F}$ in the sense of Druțu–Sapir.*
(4) *Γ is (strongly) hyperbolic relative to a collection of virtually abelian subgroups of rank at least two.*

Several different nomenclatures exist in the literature for relative hyperbolicity. We use the terminology of Bowditch throughout. The property we call "relative hyperbolicity" is equivalent to Farb's "relative hyperbolicity with Bounded Coset Penetration."

The implications (3) $\iff$ (4) and (3) $\implies$ (1) follow in a straightforward fashion from work of Druțu–Osin–Sapir [DSb]. A large part of this

[1]This fact is a special case of a result stated by Gromov in [Gro81, §2.2]. A proof of Gromov's theorem was provided by Alexander–Berg–Bishop in [ABB93]. For a proof tailored to this special case, see [BH99, II.11.27].

article consists of establishing the remaining implications (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) and (1) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (2).

A result analogous to (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) is established by Kapovich–Leeb in [KL95] using a more restrictive notion of isolated flats, discussed in more detail in the next subsection. This notion, while sufficiently general for their purposes, is tailored to make their proof go smoothly. A major goal of this article is to generalize Kapovich–Leeb's results to a more natural class of spaces. A portion of our proof can be viewed as a streamlined version of Kapovich–Leeb's proof.

Theorem 1.2.1 has the following consequences for groups acting on spaces with isolated flats, using some existing results from the literature.

Theorem 1.2.2. *Let Γ act geometrically on a* CAT(0) *space X with isolated flats. Then X and Γ have the following properties.*

(1) *Quasi-isometries of X map maximal flats to maximal flats.*
(2) *A subgroup $H \leq \Gamma$ is undistorted if and only if it is quasiconvex (with respect to the* CAT(0) *action).*
(3) *The geometric boundary ∂X is a group invariant of Γ.*
(4) *Γ satisfies the Strong Tits Alternative. In other words, every subgroup of Γ either is virtually abelian or contains a free subgroup of rank two.*
(5) *Γ is biautomatic.*

Property (1) is a direct consequence of Theorem 1.2.1 and a result of Druțu–Sapir [DSb]. Properties (2) and (3) are consequences of Theorem 1.2.1 and results proved by Hruska in [Hru]. Property (4) follows from Theorem 1.2.1 together with work of Gromov and Bowditch [Gro87, Bow99]. Property (5) is proved using Theorem 1.2.1 and a result of Rebbechi [Reb01].

In addition, Chatterji–Ruane have used Theorem 1.2.1 to show that a group acting geometrically on a space with isolated flats satisfies the property of Rapid Decay as well as the Baum–Connes conjecture [CR] (*cf.* [DSa]). Groves has also used Theorem 1.2.1 in his proof that toral, torsion free groups acting geometrically on spaces with isolated flats are Hopfian [Gro].

In proving Theorem 1.2.1, we found it useful to clarify the notion of isolated flats by exploring various geometric formulations and proving their equivalence. Indeed, we consider this exploration to be the most novel contribution of this article. Each of these formulations has advantages in certain situations. We explain these various formulations below.

Let X be a CAT(0) space and Γ a group acting geometrically on X. We say that X has (IF1), or *isolated flats in the first sense*, if it satisfies the definition of isolated flats given above. A flat in X is *maximal* if it is not contained in a finite tubular neighborhood of any higher dimensional flat. The space X has *thin parallel sets* if for each geodesic line γ in a maximal flat F the parallel set $\mathbb{P}(\gamma)$ lies in a finite tubular neighborhood of F. The space has *uniformly thin parallel sets* if there is a uniform bound on the thickness of these tubular neighborhoods. The space X has *slim parallel*

sets if for each geodesic γ in a maximal flat F, the Tits boundary of the parallel set $\mathbb{P}(\gamma)$ is equal to the Tits boundary of F.

We say that X has (IF2), or *isolated flats in the second sense*, if there is a Γ–invariant set $\mathcal{F}$ of flats in X such that the following properties hold.

(1) There is a constant $D < \infty$ so that each flat in X lies in a D–tubular neighborhood of some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$.
(2) For each positive $\rho < \infty$ there is a constant $\kappa = \kappa(\rho) < \infty$ so that for any two distinct flats $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ we have

$$\operatorname{diam}\big(\mathcal{N}_\rho(F) \cap \mathcal{N}_\rho(F')\big) < \kappa.$$

Theorem 1.2.3. *Let X be a* CAT(0) *space and Γ a group acting geometrically on X. The following are equivalent.*

(1) *X has* (IF1).
(2) *X has uniformly thin parallel sets.*
(3) *X has thin parallel sets.*
(4) *X has slim parallel sets.*
(5) *X has* (IF2).

Of these formulations, (IF1) seems the most natural and also appears to be the most easily verified in practice. For instance, (IF1) is evidently satisfied for the cusp gluing manifolds of Heintze and the cusp closing manifolds of Thurston–Schroeder. The notion of slim parallel sets plays a crucial role in the proof of (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) from Theorem 1.2.1. The notion of thin parallel sets is important in establishing the equivalence of the remaining formulations. The formulation (IF2), while rather technical in appearance, seems to be the strongest and most widely applicable formulation, giving precise control over the coarse intersections of any pair of maximal flats. This formulation is used throughout this paper and has previously been used in the literature as a definition of isolated flats (see [Hru04, Hru]).

1.3. **Historical background.** Nonpositively curved spaces with isolated flats were first considered by Kapovich–Leeb and Wise, independently. Kapovich–Leeb [KL95] study a class of CAT(0) spaces in which the maximal flats are disjoint and separated by regions of strict negative curvature, *i.e.*, the separating regions are locally CAT(-1). It is clear that such a space satisfies (IF1). As mentioned above, they prove that such a space is asymptotically tree-graded, although they use a different terminology, and they conclude that quasi-isometries of such spaces coarsely preserve the set of all flats. The latter result is a key step in their quasi-isometry classification of nongeometric Haken 3–manifold groups.

The Flat Closing Problem asks the following: If Γ acts geometrically on a CAT(0) space X, is it true that either Γ is word hyperbolic or Γ contains a subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$? If X has isolated flats, an easy geometric argument solves the Flat Closing Problem in the affirmative. Such an argument was discovered by Ballmann–Brin in the context of CAT(0) hexagonal 2–complexes [BB94] and independently by Wise for arbitrary CAT(0)

spaces satisfying the weaker formulation (IF1) of isolated flats [Wis96, Proposition 4.0.4].

The Flat Plane Theorem states that a proper, cocompact CAT(0) space either is δ–hyperbolic or contains a flat plane [Ebe73, Gro87]. In the 2–dimensional setting, Wise proved an analogous Flat Triplane Theorem, which states that a proper, cocompact CAT(0) 2–complex either has isolated flats or contains an isometrically embedded triplane. A *triplane* is the space formed by gluing three Euclidean halfplanes isometrically along their boundary lines. A proof, due to Wise, of the Flat Triplane Theorem first appeared in [Hru04], however the ideas are implicit in Wise's article [Wis], which has been circulated since 1998. Some of the ideas in the proof of Theorem 1.2.3 have combinatorial analogues in the proof of the Flat Triplane Theorem, although the 2–dimensional situation is substantially simpler than the general case.

The question of whether (or when) the geometric boundary depends only on the group Γ was raised in [Gro93, §6.B_4]; in the Gromov hyperbolic case the invariance follows from the stability of quasi-geodesics. Croke–Kleiner [CK00, CK02] found examples which showed that this is not always the case, and then analyzed, for a class of examples including nonpositively curved graph manifolds, exactly what geometric structure determines the geometric boundary up to equivariant homeomorphism. We note that Buyalo, using a different geometric idea, later found examples showing that the equivariant homeomorphism type of the boundary is not a group invariant [Buy98]. At the beginning of Croke–Kleiner's project, Kleiner studied, in unpublished work from 1997, the simpler case of spaces with isolated flats; he proved (a reformulation of) the implications (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2), (3) of Theorem 1.2.1, using the strong hypothesis (IF2), and showed that equivariant quasi-isometries map geodesic segments close to geodesic segments and induce equivariant boundary homeomorphisms.

Hruska studied isolated flats in the 2–dimensional setting in [Hru04]. He showed that in that setting, isolated flats is equivalent to the Relatively Thin Triangle Property, which states that each geodesic triangle is "thin relative to a flat," and also to the Relative Fellow Traveller Property, which states that quasigeodesics with common endpoints track close together "relative to flats." The Relative Fellow Traveller Property generalizes a phenomenon discovered by Epstein in the setting of geometrically finite Kleinian groups [ECH$^+$92, Theorem 11.3.1]. In [Hru] Hruska then established parts (1), (2), and (3) of Theorem 1.2.2 for CAT(0) spaces satisfying both (IF2) and the Relative Fellow Traveller Property.

1.4. **Summary of the sections.** Section 2 contains general facts about the geometry of CAT(0) spaces and asymptotic cones. This section includes background facts from the literature, as well as some basic lemmas that are not specific to the isolated flats setting. In Subsection 2.2, we prove several results about triangles in which one or more vertex angles has a

small angular deficit. In Subsection 2.5, we prove a lemma characterizing periodic flats whose boundary sphere is isolated in the Tits boundary of the CAT(0) space. In Subsection 2.8, we prove a result about ultralimits of triangles in an ultralimit of CAT(0) spaces.

The goal of Section 3 is to prove the equivalence (1) $\iff$ (3) from Theorem 1.2.1. The definition of isolated flats used in this section is the strong formulation (IF2). Subsection 3.1 is a review of basic properties of spaces with isolated flats; in particular, we prove that maximal flats are periodic (this result is due to Ballmann–Brin and Wise, independently). In Subsection 3.2 we prove Proposition 3.2.4, which states that, in the presence of isolated flats, a large nondegenerate triangle with small angular deficit must lie close to a flat (*cf.* Proposition 4.2 of [KL95]). This proposition can be viewed as a generalization of the well-known result that a triangle with zero angle deficit bounds a flat Euclidean region. In Subsection 3.3 we study the geometry of the asymptotic cones of a space with isolated flats. A key result is Proposition 3.3.2, which determines the space of directions at a point in an asymptotic cone. The space of directions consists of a disjoint union of spherical components corresponding to flats and a discrete set of isolated directions. Finally we prove Theorem 3.3.6, which gives (1) $\iff$ (3) from Theorem 1.2.1. As mentioned above, the reverse implication is an easy consequence of work of Druțu–Sapir.

In Section 4, we focus on applications of Theorem 3.3.6. We prove (3) $\iff$ (4) of Theorem 1.2.1 and also Theorem 1.2.2. Most of the results in this section are immediate consequences of Theorem 3.3.6 in conjunction with results from the literature. Consequently, must of this section is expository in nature. The applications are divided into two subsections, the first of which consists of geometric results relating to quasi-isometries and the second of which concerns consequences of relative hyperbolicity.

In Section 5 we study the various equivalent geometric formulations of isolated flats. In particular we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.3. We make use of these formulations in the proof of Theorem 5.2.4, which establishes the last remaining equivalence (1) $\iff$ (2) of Theorem 1.2.1.

2. Background and preliminaries

2.1. CAT(0) **spaces.** This section is a review of basic facts about CAT(0) spaces. We refer the reader to [BH99] and [Bal95] for more details about these facts.

If p and q are points in a geodesic space, we use the notation $[p, q]$ to denote a geodesic segment connecting the points p and q (in general such a segment may not be unique).

Definition 2.1.1 (CAT(0))**.** Given a geodesic triangle Δ in X, a *comparison triangle* for Δ is a triangle in the Euclidean plane with the same edge lengths as Δ. A geodesic space is CAT(0) if distances between points on any geodesic

triangle Δ are less than or equal to the distances between the corresponding points on a comparison triangle for Δ.

Note that in a CAT(0) space, it follows immediately from the definition that every geodesic segment $[p, q]$ is uniquely determined by its endpoints.

Definition 2.1.2 (Comparison angles). Let $\Delta(p, q, r)$ be a geodesic triangle in a CAT(0) space and let $\bar{\Delta}(\bar{p}, \bar{q}, \bar{r})$ be a comparison triangle for Δ. The interior angle of $\bar{\Delta}$ at $\bar{p}$, denoted $\widetilde{\angle}_p(q, r)$, is called the *comparison angle* between q and r at p.

Definition 2.1.3 (Angles). Let X be a CAT(0) space, and let c and c' be geodesics with $x = c(0) = c'(0)$. The quantity $\widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), c'(t')\big)$ is monotonically increasing as a function of both t and t'. The *angle* $\angle_x(c, c')$ between c and c' is defined by the limit

$$\angle_x(c, c') := \lim_{t,t'\to 0} \widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), c'(t')\big).$$

Since geodesic segments in a CAT(0) space are uniquely determined by their endpoints, the angle between nontrivial segments $[x, y]$ and $[x, z]$ will frequently be denoted $\angle_x(y, z)$.

Proposition 2.1.4. *Let X be a* CAT(0) *space. Then*

(1) $\angle_x(y, z) \le \widetilde{\angle}_x(y, z)$.
(2) *For each $x \in X$, the function $\angle_x$ satisfies the triangle inequality.*
(3) (Alexandrov's Lemma) *If $p \in [y, z]$ then*

$$\widetilde{\angle}_x(y, p) + \widetilde{\angle}_x(p, z) \le \widetilde{\angle}_x(y, z).$$

(4) *The quantity $\angle_x(y, z)$ is an upper semicontinuous function of x, y, and z. In other words, if $x_k \to x$, $y_k \to y$, and $z_k \to z$, then*

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k) \le \angle_x(y, z).$$

(5) (First variation) *Let $c\colon [0, a] \to X$ be a geodesic segment with $c(0) = x$ and $c(a) = y$. Then*

$$\angle_x(y, z) = \lim_{t\to 0} \widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), z\big).$$

The following lemma is an easy consequence of the CAT(0) inequality and the Law of Cosines. The proof is left as an exercise for the reader.

Lemma 2.1.5 (Convexity). *Suppose $d(x, y)$ and $d(x, z)$ are at least D and $\angle_x(y, z)$ is at least θ. Then $d(y, z) \ge 2D \sin(\theta/2)$.* □

Let p be any point in a CAT(0) space X. The relation given by $c \sim c'$ if and only if $\angle(c, c') = 0$ is an equivalence relation on the set of all nontrivial geodesics emanating from p. Let $\Sigma_p^* X$ be the set of equivalence classes of this relation. The function $\angle$ defines a metric on $\Sigma_p^* X$. The completion of $\Sigma_p^* X$ with respect to this metric is the *space of directions at p*, denoted $\Sigma_p X$.

Let $\overrightarrow{px}$ be the equivalence class of the geodesic $[p, x]$. We have a *logarithm map*

$$\log_p = \log_{\Sigma_p X} \colon X \setminus \{p\} \to \Sigma_p X$$

which sends each point x to the direction $\overrightarrow{px}$.

Suppose two subsets F_1 and F_2 of a CAT(0) space X are isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then X_1 and X_2 are *parallel* if they have finite Hausdorff distance. Parallelism is an equivalence relation.

Theorem 2.1.6 (Flat Strip). *Let F_1 and F_2 be isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$ for $k \geq 1$. If F_1 and F_2 are parallel and at Hausdorff distance d, then the convex hull of $F_1 \cup F_2$ is isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k \times [0, d]$.*

If F is isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$, the *parallel set* $\mathbb{P}(F)$ of F is the union of all F' parallel to F. The parallel set is closed, convex, and has a canonical isometric splitting $\mathbb{P}(F) \simeq F \times Y$ for some closed, convex set $Y \subset X$.

Theorem 2.1.7 (Bieberbach). *Let H act geometrically on $\mathbb{E}^k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Then H contains a finite index free abelian subgroup A of rank k which acts cocompactly on $\mathbb{E}^k$ by Euclidean translations.*

Theorem 2.1.8 (Flat Torus). *Let Γ act geometrically on a CAT(0) space X. Each free abelian subgroup $A \leq \Gamma$ of rank $k \geq 1$ stabilizes a subspace $F \subset X$ isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$. Furthermore, A acts cocompactly on F by Euclidean translations.*

2.2. **Triangles with small angular deficit.** In this subsection, we consider triangles whose angles are nearly the same as the corresponding comparison angles. We prove Proposition 2.2.1, which states that the family of such triangles is closed under certain elementary subdivisions, and Proposition 2.2.3, which provides a means of constructing numerous such triangles.

Proposition 2.2.1. *Let $\Delta(x, y, z)$ be a geodesic triangle in a CAT(0) space, and choose $p \in [y, z] \setminus \{x, y, z\}$. Suppose each angle of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ is within δ of the corresponding comparison angle. Then each angle of $\Delta(x, y, p)$ and each angle of $\Delta(x, p, z)$ is within 3δ of the corresponding comparison angle.*

Furthermore, if each comparison angle of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ is greater than θ for some $\theta > 0$, then $\angle_p(x, y)$, $\angle_p(x, z)$, and their comparison angles lie in $(\theta, \pi - \theta)$.

In order to prove the proposition, we first establish the following lemma concerning subdivisions of a triangle with one angle close to its comparison angle.

Lemma 2.2.2. *Choose points $x, y, z \in X$ and $p \in [y, z] \setminus \{x, y, z\}$.*

1. *Suppose $\angle_y(x, z)$ is within δ of the corresponding comparison angle. Then the quantities $\angle_y(x, p)$, $\widetilde{\angle}_y(x, p)$, and $\widetilde{\angle}_y(x, z)$ are within δ.*
2. *Suppose $\angle_x(y, z)$ is within δ of the corresponding comparison angle. Then the same is true of both $\angle_x(y, p)$ and $\angle_x(p, z)$. Furthermore, the quantities $\widetilde{\angle}_x(y, z)$ and $\widetilde{\angle}_x(y, p) + \widetilde{\angle}_x(p, z)$ are within δ.*

Proof. The first assertion is immediate, since

$$\angle_y(x,z) = \angle_y(x,p) \le \widetilde{\angle}_y(x,p) \le \widetilde{\angle}_y(x,z) \le \angle_y(x,z) + \delta.$$

For the second assertion, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\angle_x(y,z) &\le \angle_x(y,p) + \angle_x(p,z)\\ &\le \widetilde{\angle}_x(y,p) + \widetilde{\angle}_x(p,z)\\ &\le \widetilde{\angle}_x(y,z)\\ &\le \angle_x(y,z) + \delta.\end{aligned}$$

The assertion now follows from Proposition 2.1.4(1). □

Proof of Proposition 2.2.1. Lemma 2.2.2 shows that each of the angles

$$\angle_y(x,p), \quad \angle_z(x,p), \quad \angle_x(y,p), \quad \text{and} \quad \angle_x(p,z)$$

is within δ of its corresponding comparison angle. But since $p \in [y,z]$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi &\le \angle_p(x,y) + \angle_p(x,z)\\ &\le \widetilde{\angle}_p(x,y) + \widetilde{\angle}_p(x,z)\\ &= \big(\pi - \widetilde{\angle}_y(x,p) - \widetilde{\angle}_x(y,p)\big) + \big(\pi - \widetilde{\angle}_z(x,p) - \widetilde{\angle}_x(z,p)\big)\\ &\le 2\pi + 3\delta - \widetilde{\angle}_y(x,z) - \widetilde{\angle}_x(y,z) - \widetilde{\angle}_z(x,y)\\ &= \pi + 3\delta,\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality on the fourth line is a consequence of Lemma 2.2.2. It now follows easily that each of $\angle_p(x,y)$ and $\angle_p(x,z)$ is within 3δ of its comparison angle.

To establish the last assertion, suppose each comparison angle of $\Delta(x,y,z)$ is greater than θ. Then

$$\angle_p(x,y) \le \widetilde{\angle}_p(x,y) \le \pi - \widetilde{\angle}_y(p,x) < \pi - \theta.$$

Similarly, we see that $\angle_p(x,z) \le \widetilde{\angle}_p(x,z) < \pi - \theta$. But $\angle_p(x,y) + \angle_p(x,z)$ is at least π by the triangle inequality for $\angle_p$. Thus $\angle_p(x,y)$ and $\angle_p(x,z)$ are each greater than θ as desired. □

Proposition 2.2.3. *Let c and c' be geodesics with $c(0) = c'(0) = x$. Then for sufficiently small t and t', each angle of $\Delta\big(x, c(t), c'(t')\big)$ is within δ of the corresponding comparison angle.*

The proof of Proposition 2.2.3 uses the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2.4. *Choose $x, y, z \in X$ and let $c(t)$ be the geodesic $[x,y]$ parametrized so that $c(0) = x$. Then*

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \angle_{c(t)}(x,z) = \lim_{t\to 0} \widetilde{\angle}_{c(t)}(x,z) = \pi - \angle_x(y,z).$$

Proof. Consider the comparison triangle $\bar{\Delta}\big(x, z, c(t)\big)$. By Proposition 2.1.4(5), the comparison angle $\widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), z\big)$ tends to $\angle_x(y, z)$ as $t \to 0$. Since $\widetilde{\angle}_z\big(c(t), x\big)$ clearly tends to zero and the angles of $\bar{\Delta}$ sum to π, we see that

$$\limsup_{t\to 0} \angle_{c(t)}(x, z) \leq \lim_{t\to 0} \widetilde{\angle}_{c(t)}(x, z) = \pi - \angle_x(y, z).$$

But we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{t\to\infty} \angle_{c(t)}(x, z) &\geq \liminf_{t\to 0}\big(\pi - \angle_{c(t)}(y, z)\big)\\ &= \pi - \limsup_{t\to 0} \angle_{c(t)}(y, z)\\ &\geq \pi - \angle_x(y, z),\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality for $\angle_{c(t)}$ and the last uses the upper semicontinuity of $\angle$. □

Proof of Proposition 2.2.3. By the definition of $\angle_x(c, c')$, all points y and z on c and c' sufficiently close to x have the property that $\widetilde{\angle}_x(y, z)$ is within δ of $\angle_x(y, z)$. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.2.4 for each fixed z, sliding y toward x along c, we can guarantee that $\widetilde{\angle}_y(x, z)$ is within δ of $\angle_y(x, z)$.

Thus we may assume that the angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ at x and y are within δ of the corresponding comparison angles. Applying Lemma 2.2.4 again, gives us a point $z' \in [x, z]$ so that the angles of $\Delta(x, y, z')$ at x and z' are within δ of their comparison angles. If we consider the subdivision of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ into subtriangles $\Delta(x, y, z')$ and $\Delta(z', y, z)$ and apply Lemma 2.2.2(2), it is clear that $\angle_y(x, z')$ is within δ of $\widetilde{\angle}_y(x, z')$ as well. □

2.3. **Hausdorff convergence on bounded sets.** Let X be a proper metric space. The set of all closed subspaces of X has a natural topology of *Hausdorff convergence on bounded sets* defined as follows. For each closed set $C_0 \subseteq X$, each $x_0 \in X$, and each positive r and ϵ define $U(C_0, x_0, r, \epsilon)$ to be the set of all closed subspaces $C \subseteq X$ such that the Hausdorff distance between $C \cap B(x_0, r)$ and $C_0 \cap B(x_0, r)$ is less than ϵ. The topology of Hausdorff convergence on bounded sets is the topology generated by the sets $U(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$.

2.4. **The boundary of a** CAT(0) **space.** Let X be a complete CAT(0) space. Two rays in X are *asymptotic* if their Hausdorff distance is finite. The relation of two rays being asymptotic is an equivalence relation on the set of all geodesic rays. The *boundary* ∂X of X is the set of all equivalence classes. For each $\xi \in \partial X$ and each $x \in X$ there is a unique ray $[x, \xi]$ emanating from x which represents ξ. The topology of Hausdorff convergence on bounded sets on the set of rays emanating from x induces a topology on ∂X called the *cone topology*, which does not depend on the choice of basepoint x. The boundary with this topology is called the *visual boundary* or *geometric boundary*. If X is proper then its visual boundary is compact.

Given ξ and $\eta \in \partial X$, and a basepoint $x \in X$, the angle $\angle_x(\xi,\eta)$ is defined to be the angle at x between the rays $[x,\xi]$ and $[x,\eta]$. The *Tits angle* $\angle_T(\xi,\eta)$ between two boundary points ξ and η is defined to be

$$\angle_T(\xi,\eta) := \lim_{t,t'\to\infty} \widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), c'(t)\big),$$

where c and c' are geodesic parametrizations of the rays $[x,\xi]$ and $[x,\eta]$ respectively. The Tits angle does not depend on the choice of $x \in X$.

Proposition 2.4.1. *Let $x \in X$ be any basepoint, and let c be a geodesic ray based at x asymptotic to ξ. Then the quantity $\angle_{c(t)}(\xi,\eta)$ is monotonically increasing as a function of t and satisfies*

$$\angle_T(\xi,\eta) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \angle_{c(t)}(\xi,\eta)).$$

The Tits angle $\angle_T$ defines a metric on ∂X called the *angular metric*. The *Tits metric* d_T on ∂X is the length metric associated to the angular metric. In other words, $d_T(\xi,\eta)$ is the infimum of the angular lengths of rectifiable paths connecting ξ and η. The *Tits boundary* $\partial_T X$ of X is the metric space $(\partial X, d_T)$.

If X contains a k–flat F, then $\partial_T F \subseteq \partial_T X$ is an isometrically embedded standard Euclidean sphere $S = S^{k-1}$. Not every isometrically embedded standard sphere in $\partial_T X$ is the Tits boundary of a flat. However we have the following result, established by Schroeder in the Riemannian case and extended to arbitrary CAT(0) spaces by Leeb [BGS85, Appendix 4.E], [Lee98].

Proposition 2.4.2 (Schroeder, Leeb)**.** *Let X be a proper* CAT(0) *space, and $S = S^{k-1}$ an isometrically embedded standard sphere in $\partial_T X$. Then one of the following holds.*

(1) *There is a k–flat F in X such that $\partial_T F = S$.*
(2) *There is an isometric embedding of a standard hemisphere $H \subset S^k$ in $\partial_T X$ such that the topological boundary of H maps to S.*

2.5. **Periodic Euclidean subspaces and the Tits boundary.** Let Y be a proper CAT(0) space, and $F \subseteq Y$ a subset isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Let $G \subset \mathrm{Isom}(Y)$ be any group of isometries of Y. We say that F is *G–periodic* if $\mathrm{Stab}_G(F) := \{\, g \in G \mid g(F) = F \,\}$ acts cocompactly on F. We say that F is *periodic* if it is $\mathrm{Isom}(Y)$–periodic.

Lemma 2.5.1. *If F is periodic, then either $\partial_T F$ is isolated in $\partial_T Y$, or there is a flat half-plane $H \subset Y$ meeting F orthogonally.*

Proof. Assume $\partial_T F$ is not isolated in $\partial_T Y$, *i.e.*, assume that there are sequences $\xi_k \in \partial_T Y \setminus \partial_T F$, $\eta_k \in \partial_T F$ such that

$$\angle_T(\xi_k,\eta_k) = \angle_T(\xi_k, \partial_T F) \to 0 \tag{2.5.2}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Pick $p \in F$. Let d_F denote the distance function from F. Then by (2.5.2) there exists $c_k \to 0$ such that for all $x \in [p,\xi_k]$ we have $d(x,F) \leq c_k\, d(x,p)$. Since d_F is convex, this also means that when we restrict d_F to the ray $[p,\xi_k]$ we get a function whose left and right derivatives

are $\leq c_k$. Pick $R < \infty$, and let $x_k \in [p, \xi_k]$ be the point on $[p, \xi_k]$ where the distance to F is R. Now let $g_k \in \mathrm{Isom}(Y)$ be a sequence of isometries preserving F such that $g_k(x_k)$ remains in a bounded subset of Y, and pass to a subsequence so that $g_k(x_k)$ converges to some point x_∞ and the rays $g_k\big([p, \xi_k]\big)$ converge to a complete geodesic γ passing through x_∞. The derivative estimate on $d_F\big|_{[p,\xi_k]}$ implies that d_F restricts to the constant function R on γ. By Theorem 2.1.6 we obtain a flat strip of width R meeting F orthogonally. Since this works for any $R < \infty$, we can use the stabilizer of F again to obtain a flat half-plane leaving F orthogonally. □

2.6. **Ultralimits and asymptotic cones.** This section is a review of basic facts about asymptotic cones, which can be found in more detail in [Gro93] and [KL97].

A *nonprincipal ultrafilter* ω is a finitely additive probability measure on the set of all subsets of the natural numbers such that

(1) $\omega(S)$ is either 0 or 1 for each $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.
(2) If $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ is finite, then $\omega(S) = 0$.

Definition 2.6.1 (ultralimits)**.** Let ω be a nonprincipal ultrafilter and (x_k) a sequence of points in a metric space X. A point $x \in X$ is an *ultralimit* of (x_k), denoted $\omega\text{-}\lim x_k = x$, if for each positive ϵ the set $S_\epsilon = \{\, k \mid d(x_k, x) < \epsilon \,\}$ satisfies $\omega(S_\epsilon) = 1$.

Lemma 2.6.2. *Let X be a compact metric space and ω any nonprincipal ultrafilter. For each infinite sequence (x_k) in X there is a unique $x \in X$ so that $\omega\text{-}\lim x_k = x$. In particular, every bounded sequence of real numbers has a unique ultralimit with respect to a fixed nonprincipal ultrafilter.*

Definition 2.6.3. Let $(X_n, d_n, \star_n)$ be a sequence of metric spaces with basepoints $\star_n$. Let X_∞ denote the set of infinite sequences $(x_n) \in \prod_n X_n$ such that the distances $d_n(x_n, \star_n)$ remain bounded as $n \to \infty$. Let X_ω denote the set of equivalence classes of the relation $(x_n) \sim (y_n)$ whenever $\omega\text{-}\lim d_n(x_n, y_n) = 0$. Then X_ω has a natural metric d_ω given by $d_\omega(x, y) = \omega\text{-}\lim d_n(x_n, y_n)$, where x and y are the equivalence classes of the sequences (x_n) and (y_n) respectively. The metric space (X_ω, d_ω) is the *ultralimit* of the sequence $(X_n, d_n, \star_n)$, denoted $\omega\text{-}\lim(X_n, d_n, \star_n)$.

Proposition 2.6.4. *If $(X_n, d_n, \star_n)$ is a sequence of* CAT(0) *spaces, then X_ω is a complete* CAT(0) *space. If points x and y in X_ω are represented by sequences (x_n) and (y_n), then the geodesic segment $[x, y]$ is an ultralimit of the segments $[x_n, y_n]$.*

Definition 2.6.5. Let (X, d) be a metric space with a sequence of basepoints $(\star_n)$, and let (λ_n) be a sequence of numbers called *scaling constants* with $\omega\text{-}\lim \lambda_n = \infty$. The *asymptotic cone* $\mathrm{Cone}_\omega(X, \star_n, \lambda_n)$ of X with respect to $(\star_n)$ and (λ_n) is the ultralimit $\omega\text{-}\lim(X, \lambda_n^{-1} d, \star_n)$.

Remark 2.6.6. Any asymptotic cone of Euclidean space $\mathbb{E}^k$ is isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$. Let X be any CAT(0) space with basepoints $(\star_n)$ and scaling constants (λ_n),

and let (F_n) be a sequence of k-flats in X such that $\omega\text{-}\lim \lambda_n^{-1} d(F_n, \star_n)$ is finite. Then the ultralimit of the sequence of embeddings

$$\big(F_n, \lambda_n^{-1} d_{F_n}, \pi_{F_n}(\star_n)\big) \hookrightarrow (X, \lambda_n^{-1} d, \star_n)$$

is a k-flat in $\mathrm{Cone}_\omega(X, \star_n, \lambda_n)$.

2.7. **Asymptotically tree-graded spaces.** In this section we recall some definitions and facts about tree-graded spaces established by Druțu–Sapir in [DSb].

Definition 2.7.1 (Tree-graded)**.** Let X be a complete geodesic metric space and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a collection of closed geodesic subspaces of X called *pieces*. We say that X is *tree-graded with respect to* $\mathcal{P}$ if the following two properties hold.

(1) Every two distinct pieces have at most one common point.
(2) Every simple geodesic triangle in X (a simple loop composed of three geodesics) lies inside one piece.

Definition 2.7.2 (Asymptotically tree-graded)**.** Let X be a space and $\mathcal{A}$ a collection of subspaces of X. For each asymptotic cone $X_\omega = \mathrm{Cone}_\omega(X, \star_n, \lambda_n)$, let $\mathcal{A}_\omega$ be the collection of all subsets $A \subset X_\omega$ of the form $A = \omega\text{-}\lim A_n$ where $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\omega\text{-}\lim \lambda_n^{-1}\, d(A_n, \star_n) < \infty$. Then X is *asymptotically tree-graded with respect to* $\mathcal{A}$ if, for every nonprincipal ultrafilter ω, each asymptotic cone X_ω is tree-graded with respect to A_ω.

The following theorem shows that being asymptotically tree-graded is a geometric property.

Theorem 2.7.3 ([DSb], Theorem 5.1)**.** *Let X be a geodesic space which is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $\mathcal{A}$. Let $q\colon X \to X'$ be a quasi-isometry. Then X' is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $q(\mathcal{A})$.*

Definition 2.7.4. A family of geodesic metric spaces $\mathcal{B}$ is *uniformly asymptotically without cut-points* if for every sequence (B_n) of elements of $\mathcal{B}$ with basepoints $b_n \in B_n$, every ultrafilter ω, and each sequence of scaling constants (λ_n) with $\omega\text{-}\lim \lambda_n = \infty$, the ultralimit $\omega\text{-}\lim(B_n, \lambda_n^{-1} d_n, b_n)$ is without cut-points.

Proposition 2.7.5 ([DSb], Proposition 5.4)**.** *Let X be asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose the family of spaces $\mathcal{B}$ is uniformly asymptotically without cut-points. For each choice of constants L and C, there is a constant $M = M(L, C)$ such that for each $B \in B$ and each (L, C)–quasi-isometric embedding $q\colon B \to X$ there is an $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that q has image within the M–tubular neighborhood of A.*

Lemma 2.7.6 ([DSb], Lemma 4.7)**.** *Let X be asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $\mathcal{A}$. Then for each positive ρ, there is a constant $\kappa = \kappa(\rho)$ so that if A_1 and A_2 are distinct elements of $\mathcal{A}$, then*

$$\mathrm{diam}\big(\mathcal{N}_\rho(A_1) \cap \mathcal{N}_\rho(A_2)\big) < \kappa.$$

2.8. **Ultralimits of triangles.** This subsection is devoted to the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8.1. *Let $X = \omega\text{-}\lim(X_k, d_k, \star_k)$ be the ultralimit of a sequence of based* CAT(0) *spaces, and let x, y, and z be points of X with $x \neq y$ and $x \neq z$. Let (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) be sequences representing x, y, and z respectively. Then there is a sequence (x'_k) representing x such that $x'_k \in [x_k, y_k]$ and such that, for all sequences (y'_k) and (z'_k) representing y and z, we have*

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x'_k}(y'_k, z'_k) = \angle_x(y, z).$$

Proposition 2.8.1 has the following immediate corollary regarding ultralimits of geodesic triangles.

Corollary 2.8.2. *Let $X = \omega\text{-}\lim(X_k, d_k, \star_k)$ be the ultralimit of a sequence of* CAT(0) *spaces. Let (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) be sequences representing three distinct points x, y, and z in X. Then there are sequences (x'_k), (y'_k), and (z'_k) also representing x, y, and z with the property that x'_k and y'_k lie on the segment $[x_k, y_k]$ and each angle of the triangle $\Delta(x, y, z)$ is equal to the ultralimit of the corresponding angles of $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$.* □

The proof of Proposition 2.8.1 uses the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.8.3. *Let $X = \omega\text{-}\lim(X_k, d_k, \star_k)$ as above, and choose points x, y, and z in X with $x \neq y$ and $x \neq z$. If (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) represent x, y, and z respectively, then the quantity*

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k)$$

depends only on the choice of (x_k) and not on the choice of (y_k) and (z_k).

Proof. Fix a sequence (x_k) representing x, and choose sequences (y_k) and (y'_k) representing y. Observe that, since $x \neq y$ we have

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \frac{d_k(y_k, y'_k)}{d_k(y_k, x_k)} = 0.$$

So the comparison angle $\widetilde{\angle}_{x_k}(y_k, y'_k)$ has ultralimit zero, and therefore so does $\angle_{x_k}(y_k, y'_k)$. The lemma now follows easily from the triangle inequality for $\angle_{x_k}$. □

Lemma 2.8.4. *Suppose $X = \omega\text{-}\lim(X_k, d_k, \star_k)$ as above, and we have (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) representing points x, y, and z in X with $x \neq y$ and $x \neq z$. Then*

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k) \leq \angle_x(y, z).$$

Proof. Let c_k and c'_k be geodesic parametrizations of the segments $[x_k, y_k]$ and $[x_k, z_k]$ such that $c_k(0) = c'_k(0) = x_k$. Taking ultralimits of c_k and c'_k produces geodesic parametrizations c and c' of the segments $[x, y]$ and $[x, z]$.

By Proposition 2.1.4(1), we have

$$\angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k) = \angle_{x_k}\big(c_k(t), c'_k(t)\big) \leq \widetilde{\angle}_{x_k}\big(c_k(t), c'_k(t)\big)$$

for every positive t. Taking ultralimits of both sides of this inequality, we see that

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k) \leq \omega\text{-}\lim \widetilde{\angle}_{x_k}\big(c_k(t), c_k'(t)\big) = \widetilde{\angle}_x\big(c(t), c'(t)\big).$$

Since the previous inequality holds for all $t > 0$, it remains true in the limit as $t \to 0$; *i.e.*,

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x_k}(y_k, z_k) \leq \angle_x(y, z) \qquad \square.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.8.1. Choose sequences (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) representing x, y, and z respectively. The choice of (y_k) and (z_k) is irrelevant by Lemma 2.8.3. Thus by Lemma 2.8.4, it suffices to find another sequence (x_k') representing x such that

$$\omega\text{-}\lim \angle_{x_k'}(y_k, z_k) \geq \angle_x(y, z). \tag{2.8.5}$$

In X, choose a sequence of points w^n on the segment $[x, y]$ with $w^n \to x$. Since $[x, y]$ is the ultralimit of the segments $[x_k, y_k]$ we can choose $w_k^n \in [x_k, y_k]$ so that for each n the sequence (w_k^n) represents w^n.

The triangle inequality for $\angle_{w_k^n}$, together with Lemmas 2.8.4 and 2.2.4 give that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega\text{-}\lim_k \angle_{w_k^n}(y_k, z_k) &\geq \omega\text{-}\lim_k \big(\pi - \angle_{w_k^n}(x_k, z_k)\big)\\ &\geq \pi - \angle_{w^n}(x, z)\\ &= \angle_x(y, z) - \epsilon^{(n)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon^{(n)} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. In other words, there are constants $\epsilon_k^{(n)}$ with $\omega\text{-}\lim_k \epsilon_k^{(n)} = \epsilon^{(n)}$ such that

$$\angle_{w_k^n}(y_k, z_k) \geq \angle_x(y, z) - \epsilon_k^{(n)}.$$

The desired sequence (x_k') is constructed using a diagonal argument as follows. Set $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathbb{N}$ and recursively define sets $\mathcal{S}_n$ with $\omega(\mathcal{S}_n) = 1$ so that $\mathcal{S}_n$ is contained in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ but does not contain the smallest element of $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$, and so that for each $k \in \mathcal{S}_n$ we have $\epsilon_k^{(n)} < 2\epsilon^{(n)}$. Then $(\mathcal{S}_n)$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of sets with empty intersection.

Set $x_k' = w_k^{n(k)}$, where $n(k)$ is the unique natural number such that $k \in \mathcal{S}_{n(k)} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{n(k)+1}$. By construction, $\omega\text{-}\lim_k n(k) = \infty$. Thus (x_k') represents x, and

$$\omega\text{-}\lim_k \epsilon_k^{(n(k))} \leq \omega\text{-}\lim_k 2\epsilon^{(n(k))} = 0,$$

so (x_k') satisfies (2.8.5) as desired. $\square$

3. Isolated flats and tree-graded spaces

The main goal of this section is Theorem 3.3.6, which establishes the equivalence (1) $\iff$ (3) of Theorem 1.2.1.

3.1. **Isolated flats.** Throughout this subsection, let X be a CAT(0) space and Γ be a group acting geometrically on X. For the purposes of this section, the term *isolated flats* refers to the formulation (IF2).

Lemma 3.1.1. *If X has isolated flats with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is locally finite; in other words, only finitely many elements of $\mathcal{F}$ intersect any given compact set.*

Proof. It suffices to show that only finitely many $F \in \mathcal{F}$ intersect each closed metric ball $\overline{B}(x, r)$. Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be the collection of all flats $F \in \mathcal{F}$ intersecting this ball. Choose $\kappa = \kappa(1)$ so that any intersection of 1–neighborhoods of distinct elements of $\mathcal{F}$ has diameter less than κ. Any sequence of distinct elements in $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains a subsequence (F_i) that Hausdorff converges on bounded sets. In particular, whenever i and j are sufficiently large, there are closed discs $D_i \subset F_i$ and $D_j \subset F_j$ of radius κ whose Hausdorff distance is less than 1, contradicting our choice of κ. □

Lemma 3.1.2. *Any locally finite, Γ–invariant collection $\mathcal{F}$ of flats in X has the following properties.*

(1) *The elements of $\mathcal{F}$ lie in only finitely many Γ–orbits, and the stabilizers of the $F \in \mathcal{F}$ lie in only finitely many conjugacy classes.*
(2) *Each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is Γ–periodic.*

In particular, the lemma holds if X has isolated flats with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let K be a compact set whose Γ–translates cover X. (1) follows easily from the fact that only finitely many flats in $\mathcal{F}$ intersect K. Thus we only need to establish (2). For each $F \in \mathcal{F}$, let $\{g_i\}$ be a minimal set of group elements such that the translates $g_i(K)$ cover F. If the flats $g_i^{-1}(F)$ and $g_j^{-1}(F)$ coincide, then $g_j g_i^{-1}$ lies in $H := \mathrm{Stab}_\Gamma(F)$. It follows that the g_i lie in only finitely many right cosets Hg_i. In other words, the sets $g_i(K)$ lie in only finitely many H–orbits. But any two H–orbits $Hg_i(K)$ and $Hg_j(K)$ lie at a finite Hausdorff distance from each other. Thus any $g_i(K)$ can be increased to a larger compact set K' so that the translates of K' under H cover F. So F is Γ–periodic, as desired. □

A flat in X is *maximal* if it is not contained in a finite tubular neighborhood of a higher dimensional flat. It follows easily from (IF2) that every flat in $\mathcal{F}$ is maximal.

Corollary 3.1.3. *The set of stabilizers of flats $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is precisely the set $\mathcal{A}$ of maximal virtually abelian subgroups of Γ with rank at least two.*

Proof. Theorem 2.1.8 (Flat Torus) shows that each subgroup $A \in \mathcal{A}$ stabilizes a flat. Lemma 3.1.2 and Theorem 2.1.7 (Bieberbach) show that the stabilizer of each flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is virtually abelian. The correspondence now follows easily from the maximality of elements of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{A}$. □

3.2. **Approximately Euclidean triangles.** In this subsection we prove that, in a space with isolated flats, a sufficiently large triangle whose vertex angles are approximately equal to the corresponding comparison angles must lie close to a flat.

Lemma 3.2.1. *Let X be any proper, cocompact metric space. For each positive r and ϵ, there is a constant $a = a(r, \epsilon)$ so that for each isometrically embedded 2–dimensional Euclidean disc C in X of radius a, the central subdisc of C of radius r lies in an ϵ–tubular neighborhood of a flat.*

Proof. If not, then there would be constants r, ϵ and a sequence of 2–dimensional Euclidean closed discs C_a for $a = r,\ r+1,\ r+2, \dots,$ such that C_a has radius a and the central subdisc of C_a of radius r does not lie in the ϵ–tubular neighborhood of any flat. Applying elements of the cocompact isometry group and passing to a subsequence, we may arrange that the discs C_a Hausdorff converge on bounded sets to a 2–flat, contradicting our choice of r and ϵ. □

Lemma 3.2.2. *Suppose X has isolated flats. There is a decreasing function $D_1 = D_1(\theta) < \infty$ such that if $S \subset X$ is a flat sector of angle $\theta > 0$, then $S \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta)}(F)$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Pick positive constants θ and r, and set $\epsilon := 1$. Let $a = a(r, \epsilon)$ be the constant given by Lemma 3.2.1, and choose $\rho = \rho(\theta, a)$ so that, for any sector S with angle at least θ, the entire sector S lies inside a ρ–tubular neighborhood of the subsector

$$S' := \{\, s \in S \mid d(s, \partial S) \geq a \,\}.$$

Note that for fixed a, the quantity $\rho(\theta, a)$ is a decreasing function of θ. By Lemma 3.2.1, for each $s \in S'$ the intersection of S with $B(s, r)$ is a flat disc contained in the ϵ–neighborhood of a flat. By (IF2–1), this disc also lies in the $(D + \epsilon)$–neighborhood of a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then (IF2–2) shows that F will be independent of the choice of $s \in S'$ when r is sufficiently large. Setting $D_1(\theta) := D + \epsilon + \rho$ completes the proof. □

Lemma 3.2.3. *Let X have isolated flats. For all $\theta_0 > 0$, $R < \infty$, there exist $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\theta_0, R)$, $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\theta_0, R)$ such that if $p, x, y \in X$ satisfy $d(p, x), d(p, y) > \rho_1$ and*

$$\theta_0 < \angle_p(x, y) \leq \widetilde{\angle}_p(x, y) < \angle_p(x, y) + \delta_1 < \pi - \theta_0,$$

then there is a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\big([p, x] \cup [p, y]\big) \cap B(p, R) \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}(F).$$

Proof. If the lemma were false, we would have $\theta_0 > 0$, $R < \infty$ and sequences $p_k, x_k, y_k \in X$ such that $d(p_k, x_k), d(p_k, y_k) \to \infty$ and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \angle_{p_k}(x_k, y_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \widetilde{\angle}_{p_k}(x_k, y_k) =: \theta \in [\theta_0, \pi - \theta_0]$$

and such that there is no $F \in F$ with

$$\big([p_k, x_k] \cup [p_k, y_k]\big) \cap B(p_k, R) \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}(F).$$

Applying the group Γ and passing to subsequences, we may assume that there exist $p \in X$, $\xi, \eta \in \partial_T X$ such that $[p_k, x_k] \to [p, \xi]$ and $[p_k, y_k] \to [p, \eta]$. By triangle comparison it follows that $\angle_p(\xi, \eta) = \angle_T(\xi, \eta) = \theta$, so $[p, \xi] \cup [p, \eta]$ bounds a flat sector; then Lemma 3.2.2 gives a contradiction. □

Proposition 3.2.4. *For all $\theta_0 > 0$ there are $\delta_2 = \delta_2(\theta_0) > 0$ and $\rho_2 = \rho_2(\theta_0)$ such that if $x, y, z \in X$, all vertex angles and comparison angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ lie in $(\theta_0, \pi - \theta_0)$, each vertex angle is within δ_2 of the corresponding comparison angle, and all distances are greater than ρ_2, then*

$$[x, y] \cup [x, z] \cup [y, z] \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}(F)$$

for some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Fix $\theta_0 > 0$ and let R be sufficiently large that each set of diameter at least $R/2$ lies in the $D_1(\theta)$–tubular neighborhood of at most one flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $\delta_1(\theta_0, R)$ and $\rho_1(\theta_0, R)$ be the constants guaranteed by Lemma 3.2.3, and define

$$\rho_2 := \max\left\{2\rho_1, \frac{\rho_1}{\sin(\theta_0/2)}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_2 := \delta_1/3.$$

Pick any triangle $\Delta(x, y, z)$ such that each vertex angle is within δ_2 of the corresponding comparison angle, all vertex angles and comparison angles lie in $(\theta_0, \pi - \theta_0)$, and all side lengths are greater than ρ_2. Choose an arbitrary point on one of the sides of Δ, say $p \in [y, z]$. Then p divides $[y, z]$ into two segments, one of which, say $[p, y]$, has length greater than $\rho_2/2$.

We now verify that the points p, x, and y satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 3.2.3. First note that $\angle_p(x, y)$ and $\widetilde{\angle}_p(x, y)$ are within $3\delta_2 = \delta_1$ of each other and both lie in $(\theta_0, \pi - \theta_0)$ by Proposition 2.2.1. By hypothesis $d(p, y) > \rho_2/2 \geq \rho_1$. Furthermore, observe that $d(p, y)$ and $d(x, y)$ are both greater than $\rho_1/2\sin(\theta_0/2)$, and that $\angle_p(x, y) \geq \theta_0$. Thus by Lemma 2.1.5, we have $d(p, y) > \rho_1$.

Therefore by Lemma 3.2.3 there is a flat $F_p \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\big([p, x] \cup [p, y]\big) \cap B(p, R) \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}\big(F_p\big).$$

But our choice of R guarantees that F_p is independent of the choice of $p \in [x, y] \cup [x, z] \cup [y, z]$. In other words, there is a single flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$[x, y] \cup [x, z] \cup [y, z] \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}(F),$$

completing the proof. □

3.3. **Asymptotic cones are tree-graded.** Let X_ω be an asymptotic cone $\mathrm{Cone}_\omega(X, \star_n, \lambda_n)$ where X is CAT(0) with isolated flats. We let $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ denote the collection of flats F in X_ω of the form $F = \omega\text{-}\lim F_n$ where $F_n \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\omega\text{-}\lim \lambda_n^{-1}\, d(F_n, \star) < \infty$.

Lemma 3.3.1. *For all $\theta_0 > 0$ there is a $\delta_3 = \delta_3(\theta_0) > 0$ such that if $x, y, z \in X_\omega$ are distinct, all vertex angles and comparison angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ lie in $(\theta_0, \pi - \theta_0)$, and each vertex angle is within δ_3 of the corresponding comparison angle, then there is a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ containing $\{x, y, z\}$. Furthermore, if $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ and $F \cap F'$ contains more than one point, then $F = F'$.*

Proof. Choose θ_0, and let δ_2 and ρ_2 be the constants provided by Proposition 3.2.4. Set $\delta_3 := \delta_2$. To prove the first assertion, choose $x, y, z \in X_\omega$ as above and apply Corollary 2.8.2 to get sequences (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) representing x, y, and z such that each vertex angle of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ is the ultralimit of the corresponding angle of $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$. Then $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 3.2.4 for ω–almost all k. Consequently, x, y, and z lie in a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$.

To prove the second assertion, suppose flats $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ have distinct points x, y in common. Let (F_k) be a sequence in $\mathcal{F}$ with ultralimit F, and choose $z \in F'$ such that the triangle $\Delta(x, y, z)$ in F' is nondegenerate. Let (x_k), (y_k), and (z_k) be sequences in X representing x, y, and z, such that $x_k, y_k \in F_k$. Since $[x_k, y_k]$ is contained in F_k as well, we may assume by Corollary 2.8.2 that the angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ are ultralimits of the corresponding angles of $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$. Since $\Delta(x, y, z)$ is a flat triangle, its vertex angles are equal to their comparison angles. Therefore there exists $\theta_0 > 0$ such that for ω–almost all k the triangle $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$ satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 3.2.4. Hence $\Delta(x_k, y_k, z_k)$ lies $D_1(\theta_0)$–close to a single flat F_k''. As $[x_k, y_k] \subset F_k$, we must have $F_k'' = F_k$ for ω–almost all k by (IF2). Hence $z \in F$. Since a dense subset of F' lies in F, it follows that $F' \subseteq F$. □

Proposition 3.3.2. *If $x \in X_\omega$, then each connected component of $\Sigma_x X_\omega$ is either an isolated point or a sphere of the form $\Sigma_x F$ for some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ passing through x. The map $F \mapsto \Sigma_x F$ gives a one-to-one correspondence between flats of $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ passing through x and spherical components of $\Sigma_x F$. Furthermore, if a direction $\overrightarrow{xy}$ lies in a spherical component $\Sigma_x F$ then an initial segment of $[x, y]$ lies in F.*

Proof. Suppose $y, z \in X_\omega$ and $0 < \angle_x(y, z) < \pi$. Then $\angle_x(y, z) \in (\theta, \pi - \theta)$ for some positive θ. Let $\delta_3 = \delta_3(\theta/8)$ be the constant given by Lemma 3.3.1, and let $\delta := \min\{\delta_3, \theta/4\}$. Sliding y and z toward x along the segments $[x, y]$ and $[x, z]$, we may assume by Proposition 2.2.3 that the angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ are within δ of their respective comparison angles, and also that $d(x, y) = d(x, z)$. Since $\delta \le \theta/4$, the angles of $\Delta(x, y, z)$ at y and z lie in the interval $(\theta/8, \pi/2)$. Lemma 3.3.1 now implies that x, y, and z lie in a

common flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$. Thus the directions $\overrightarrow{xy}$ and $\overrightarrow{xz}$ lie in a sphere of the form $\Sigma_x F$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$, and each has an initial segment that lies in F.

If z' is any other point of X_ω with $0 < \angle_x(y, z') < \pi$, then $[x, y]$ and $[x, z']$ have initial segments in a flat $F' \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$. It follows from Lemma 3.3.1 that $F = F'$. Therefore $\Sigma_x F$ is a component of $\Sigma_x X_\omega$. Furthermore, every nontrivial component of $\Sigma_x X_\omega$ arises in this manner, and $\Sigma_x F = \Sigma_x F'$ implies $F = F'$. □

Corollary 3.3.3. *Let $\pi_F \colon X_\omega \to F$ be the nearest point projection of X_ω onto a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$. Then π_F is locally constant on $X_\omega \setminus F$. In other words, π_F is constant on each component of $X_\omega \setminus F$.*

Proof. Choose $s \in X_\omega \setminus F$ and let $x = \pi_F(s)$. Then $\angle_x(s, F)$ is at least $\pi/2$. So $\log_x(s)$ lies in a different component of $\Sigma_x X_\omega$ from the tangent sphere $\Sigma_x F$ by Proposition 3.3.2. By continuity of $\log_x$, if U is any connected neighborhood of s not containing x, the image $\log_x(U)$ is disjoint from the component $\Sigma_x F$. Thus each point of $\log_x(U)$ is at an angular distance π from $\Sigma_x F$. Hence for each $s' \in U$, we have $\pi_F(s') = x$. □

Lemma 3.3.4. *If p lies on the interior of the segment $[x, y] \subset X_\omega$, then x and y lie in distinct components of $X_\omega \setminus \{p\}$ unless p is contained in an open subarc of $[x, y]$ that lies in a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$.*

Proof. If the segments $[p, x]$ and $[p, y]$ do not have initial segments in a common flat, then the directions $\overrightarrow{px}$ and $\overrightarrow{py}$ lie in distinct components of $\Sigma_p X_\omega$. The result follows immediately from the continuity of $\log_p$. □

Lemma 3.3.5. *Every embedded loop in X_ω lies in some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$.*

Proof. Let γ be an embedded loop containing points $x \neq y$. By Lemma 3.3.4 and the fact that γ has no cut points, it follows that the geodesic $[x, y]$ lies in some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$. Let β be a maximal open subpath of γ in the complement of F. It follows from Corollary 3.3.3 that β projects to a constant under π_F. Hence its endpoints coincide, which is absurd. □

Theorem 3.3.6. *Let X be a* CAT(0) *space admitting a proper, cocompact, isometric action of a group Γ, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a Γ–invariant collection of flats in X. Then X is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $\mathcal{F}$ if and only if X has isolated flats with respect to the family $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. First suppose X has isolated flats with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. Each flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ is a closed convex subspace of X_ω. By Lemma 3.3.1, any two flats $F \neq F' \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$ intersect in at most one point. Furthermore, Lemma 3.3.5 shows that every embedded geodesic triangle in X_ω lies in a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_\omega$.

Now suppose X is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. Since the collection $\mathcal{B} := \{\mathbb{E}^2, \mathbb{E}^3, \mathbb{E}^4, \dots\}$ is uniformly asymptotically without cut-points, it follows from Proposition 2.7.5 that there is a constant M so that every flat in X lies in an M–tubular neighborhood of some element of $\mathcal{F}$.

Furthermore, condition (2) of (IF2) is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.7.6. □

4. Applications

Theorem 3.3.6 has many immediate consequences, which we examine in the present section. In particular, we show the equivalence (3) $\iff$ (4) of Theorem 1.2.1 and prove the various parts of Theorem 1.2.2. These applications are divided into two subsections, the first of which deals with geometric properties of spaces with isolated flats. The second subsection is concerned with relative hyperbolicity and its ramifications.

4.1. Geometric invariants of spaces with isolated flats.

The following theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.3.6 together with Proposition 2.7.5.

Theorem 4.1.1 (Quasiflat). *Let X be a* CAT(0) *space with isolated flats. For each constants L and C, there is a constant $M = M(L, C)$ so that every quasi-isometrically embedded flat in X lies in an M–tubular neighborhood of some flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$.* □

We will now begin to explore the relationship between the geometry of X and the algebra of a group Γ acting geometrically on X.

Proposition 4.1.2. *Suppose Γ acts geometrically on a* CAT(0) *space X. The following are equivalent.*

1. *X is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to a Γ–invariant collection $\mathcal{F}$ of flats.*
2. *Γ is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to the left cosets of a collection $\mathcal{A}$ of virtually abelian subgroups of rank at least two.*

Proof. The action of Γ on X induces a quasi-isometry $\Gamma \to X$. Since being asymptotically tree-graded is a geometric property (Theorem 2.7.3), it suffices to show that this quasi-isometry takes $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ if we assume either (1) or (2).

By Theorem 3.3.6, if X satisfies (1) then X has isolated flats with respect to $\mathcal{F}$. So by Lemma 3.1.2 and Theorem 2.1.7, each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is Γ–periodic with virtually abelian stabilizer. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a collection of representatives of the conjugacy classes of stabilizers of flats $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Then the quasi-isometry $\Gamma \to X$ sends the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ to the left cosets of elements of $\mathcal{A}$.

Conversely, suppose X satisfies (2). Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ be a collection of flats stabilized by the elements of $\mathcal{A}$, as guaranteed by Theorem 2.1.8. Then $\Gamma \to X$ again sends the Γ–translates of elements of $\mathcal{F}_0$ to the left cosets of elements of $\mathcal{A}$. □

Recall that being virtually abelian is a quasi-isometry invariant of finitely generated groups. Therefore, by [DSb, Corollary 5.19], satisfying Property (2) of Proposition 4.1.2 is also a quasi-isometry invariant of finitely generated groups. We therefore have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1.3. *Let X_1 and X_2 be quasi-isometric* CAT(0) *spaces admitting geometric actions by groups Γ_1 and Γ_2 respectively. If X_1 has isolated flats, then X_2 also has isolated flats.* □

Definition 4.1.4 (Fellow travelling relative to flats.)**.** A pair of paths

$$\alpha\colon [0,a] \to X \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha'\colon [0,a'] \to X$$

in a CAT(0) space *L–fellow travel relative to a sequence of flats* $(F_1, \dots, F_n)$ if there are partitions

$$0 = t_0 \le s_0 \le t_1 \le s_1 \le \cdots \le t_n \le s_n = a$$

and

$$0 = t'_0 \le s'_0 \le t'_1 \le s'_1 \le \cdots \le t'_n \le s'_n = a'$$

so that for $0 \le i \le n$ the Hausdorff distance between the sets $\alpha\big([t_i, s_i]\big)$ and $\alpha'\big([t'_i, s'_i]\big)$ is at most L, while for $1 \le i \le n$ the sets $\alpha\big([s_{i-1}, t_i]\big)$ and $\alpha'\big([s'_{i-1}, t'_i]\big)$ lie in an L–neighborhood of the flat F_i.

We will frequently say that paths *L–fellow travel relative to flats* if they L–fellow travel relative to some sequence of flats.

Definition 4.1.5. A CAT(0) space X satisfies the *Relative Fellow Traveller Property* if for each choice of constants λ and ϵ there is a constant $L = L(\lambda, \epsilon, X)$ such that (λ, ϵ)–quasigeodesics in X with common endpoints L–fellow travel relative to flats.

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.3.6 together with the uniform quasiconvexity of saturations proved by Druțu–Sapir in [DSb, Theorem 4.25].

Proposition 4.1.6. *If X has isolated flats, then it also has the Relative Fellow Traveller Property.* □

The Relative Fellow Traveller Property was previously established by Epstein for the truncated hyperbolic space associated to a finite volume cusped hyperbolic manifold [ECH$^+$92, Theorem 11.3.1]. In the context of 2–dimensional CAT(0) spaces, Hruska showed that isolated flats is equivalent to the Relative Fellow Traveller Property and also to the Relatively Thin Triangle Property, which states that each geodesic triangle is thin relative to a flat in a suitable sense [Hru04].

In [Hru], Hruska proved several results about CAT(0) spaces with isolated flats under the additional assumption that the Relative Fellow Traveller Property holds. With Proposition 4.1.6, we can now drop the Relative Fellow Traveller Property as a hypothesis in each of those theorems. In the remainder of this subsection, we list some immediate consequences of Proposition 4.1.6 together with [Hru].

A subspace Y of a geodesic space X is *quasiconvex* if there is a constant κ so that every geodesic in X connecting two points of Y lies in the κ–tubular neighborhood of Y. Let $\rho\colon G \to \mathrm{Isom}(X)$ be a geometric action of a group on a CAT(0) space. A subgroup $H \le \Gamma$ is *quasiconvex with respect to ρ* if any (equivalently "every") H–orbit is a quasiconvex subspace of X.

In the word hyperbolic setting, Short has shown that any finitely generated $H \leq \Gamma$ is quasiconvex if and only if it is *undistorted* in Γ; in other words, the inclusion $H \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ is a quasi-isometric embedding [Sho91]. It is easy to see that this equivalence does not extend to the general CAT(0) setting (see for instance [Hru]). However, in the presence of isolated flats, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1.7. *If ρ is a geometric action of Γ on a* CAT(0) *space X with isolated flats, then a finitely generated subgroup $H \leq \Gamma$ is quasiconvex with respect to ρ if and only if H is undistorted in Γ.* □

We remark that Osin and Druțu–Sapir have examined related phenomena involving undistorted subgroups and relatively quasiconvex subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups in [Osi, §4.2] and [DSb, §8.3]. In general, it is not true that all undistorted subgroups of a relatively hyperbolic group are quasiconvex. One can only conclude that they are "relatively quasiconvex" with respect to the parabolic subgroups. In two slightly different contexts, Osin and Druțu–Sapir study undistorted subgroups that have finite intersections with all parabolic subgroups, essentially proving that such subgroups are quasiconvex in the standard sense and are word hyperbolic.

The main difference between Theorem 4.1.7 and the work of Osin and Druțu–Sapir is that Theorem 4.1.7 applies to undistorted subgroups with arbitrary intersections with the parabolic subgroups. The CAT(0) geometry inside the flats plays a crucial role in proving quasiconvexity in the isolated flats setting in [Hru].

Now suppose Γ acts geometrically on two CAT(0) spaces X_1 and X_2. In the word hyperbolic setting, Gromov observed that the geometric boundary is a group invariant, in the sense that ∂X_1 and ∂X_2 are Γ–equivariantly homeomorphic. More generally, a quasiconvex subgroup of Γ is again word hyperbolic, and its boundary embeds equivariantly into the boundary of Γ [Gro87].

Croke–Kleiner have shown that the homeomorphism type of the geometric boundary is not a group invariant in the general CAT(0) setting [CK00]. In fact Wilson has shown that the Croke–Kleiner construction produces a continuous family of homeomorphic 2–complexes whose universal covers have nonhomeomorphic geometric boundaries [Wil].

In the presence of isolated flats, the situation is quite similar to the hyperbolic setting. However, a subtle complication arises from the fact that it is currently unknown whether a quasiconvex subgroup of a CAT(0) group is itself CAT(0). (A group is CAT(0) if it admits a geometric action on a CAT(0) space.)

Theorem 4.1.8 (Boundary of a quasiconvex subgroup is well-defined)**.** *Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be geometric actions of groups Γ_1 and Γ_2 on* CAT(0) *spaces X_1 and X_2 both with isolated flats. For each i, let $H_i \leq \Gamma_i$ be a subgroup quasiconvex with respect to ρ_i. Then any isomorphism $H_1 \to H_2$ induces an*

equivariant homeomorphism $\Lambda H_1 \to \Lambda H_2$ *between the corresponding limit sets.* □

Setting $H_i := \Gamma_i$ gives the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1.9 (Boundary is well-defined). *If* Γ *acts geometrically on a* CAT(0) *space* X *with isolated flats, then the geometric boundary of* X *is a group invariant of* Γ. □

4.2. **Relative hyperbolicity and its consequences.** The notion of relative hyperbolicity was first proposed by Gromov in [Gro87]. The theory was subsequently worked out in two different (equivalent) formulations by Farb and Bowditch [Far98, Bow99]. For our purposes, the most useful characterization of relative hyperbolicity is given by the following theorem. (The reverse implication is proved by Druțu–Sapir in [DSb]. The forward implication is proved by Osin–Sapir in an appendix to [DSb].)

Theorem 4.2.1 (Druțu–Osin–Sapir). *A finitely generated group* Γ *is relatively hyperbolic with respect to a collection* $\mathcal{A}$ *of finitely generated subgroups if and only if* Γ *is asymptotically tree-graded with respect to the set of left cosets of the subgroups* $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

The subgroups $A \in \mathcal{A}$ are called *peripheral subgroups* of the relatively hyperbolic structure.

The equivalence (3) $\iff$ (4) of Theorem 1.2.1 follows immediately from Theorem 4.2.1 and Proposition 4.1.2.

A group Γ satisfies the Tits Alternative if every subgroup of Γ either is virtually solvable or contains a nonabelian free subgroup. For CAT(0) groups this property is equivalent to the Strong Tits Alternative, which states that every subgroup either is virtually abelian or contains a nonabelian free subgroup. The Strong Tits Alternative was proved for word hyperbolic groups by Gromov [Gro87, 3.1.A], and has also been established for CAT(0) groups acting on certain real analytic 4–manifolds [Xie04] and those acting on cubical complexes (proved for special cases in [BŚ99] and [Xie], and in full generality in [SW]). However, it is still unknown whether the Strong Tits Alternative holds for arbitrary CAT(0) groups.

Theorem 1.2.1, together with work of Gromov and Bowditch, allows us to extend the Strong Tits Alternative to the class of CAT(0) groups acting on spaces with isolated flats. More precisely, Gromov shows in [Gro87, 8.2.F] that any properly discontinuous group of isometries of a proper δ–hyperbolic space either is virtually cyclic, is parabolic (*i.e.*, fixes a unique point at infinity), or contains a nonabelian free subgroup. Bowditch has shown that each relatively hyperbolic group acts properly discontinuously on a proper δ–hyperbolic space such that the maximal parabolic subgroups are exactly the conjugates of the peripheral subgroups [Bow99]. The following result follows immediately.

Theorem 4.2.2 (Gromov–Bowditch). *Let Γ be relatively hyperbolic with respect to a collection of subgroups that each satisfy the [Strong] Tits Alternative. Then Γ also satisfies the [Strong] Tits Alternative.*

In the isolated flats setting, the peripheral subgroups are virtually abelian. We therefore conclude the following.

Theorem 4.2.3 (Isolated flats $\Longrightarrow$ Tits Alternative). *A group Γ that acts geometrically on a* CAT(0) *space with isolated flats satisfies the Strong Tits Alternative. In other words, every subgroup $H \leq \Gamma$ either is virtually abelian or contains a nonabelian free subgroup.* □

All word hyperbolic groups are biautomatic [ECH+92]. As with the Tits Alternative, it is currently unknown whether this result also holds for arbitrary CAT(0) groups. In fact, the only nonhyperbolic spaces where biautomaticity was previously known are complexes built out of very restricted shapes of cells. For instance, Gersten–Short established biautomaticity for CAT(0) groups acting geometrically on 2–dimensional Euclidean buildings, and more generally on CAT(0) 2–complexes of type $\tilde{A}_1 \times \tilde{A}_1$, $\tilde{A}_2$, $\tilde{B}_2$, and $\tilde{G}_2$ in [GS90, GS91]. Niblo–Reeves proved biautomaticity for groups acting geometrically on CAT(0) cube complexes in [NR98].

Rebbechi shows in [Reb01] that a group which is hyperbolic relative to a collection of biautomatic subgroups is itself biautomatic. Since finitely generated, virtually abelian groups are biautomatic, we obtain the following immediate corollary to Theorem 1.2.1.

Theorem 4.2.4 (Isolated flats $\Longrightarrow$ biautomatic). *If Γ acts geometrically on a* CAT(0) *space with isolated flats, then Γ is biautomatic.* □

Many CAT(0) 2–complexes with isolated flats are built out of irregularly shaped cells. Such 2–complexes provide new examples of biautomatic groups. The following is an elementary construction of such a 2–complex.

Example 4.2.5 (Irregularly shaped cells). Let X be a compact hyperbolic surface and γ a geodesic loop in X representing a primitive conjugacy class. Let T be any flat 2–torus containing a simple geodesic loop γ'. Form a 2–complex Y by gluing X and T along the curve $\gamma = \gamma'$. Then the universal cover of Y has isolated flats. Typically $\gamma \subset X$ will intersect itself many times, subdividing X into a large number of irregularly shaped pieces.

5. Equivalent formulations of isolated flats

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2.3, which establishes the equivalence of the various geometric formulations of isolated flats discussed in the introduction. We then use Theorem 1.2.3 to prove the remaining equivalence (1) $\Longleftrightarrow$ (2) of Theorem 1.2.1, which characterizes spaces with isolated flats in terms of their Tits boundaries.

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.3.** The implications (2) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) $\Longrightarrow$ (4) are immediate from the definitions. We prove (1) $\Longrightarrow$ (3) in Proposition 5.1.4.

We then show in Proposition 5.1.5 that (4) implies both (1) and (2). Finally we prove (4) $\Longrightarrow$ (5) and (5) $\Longrightarrow$ (1) in Propositions 5.1.7 and 5.1.8 respectively.

Lemma 5.1.1. *Any closed, isolated Γ–invariant subset $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathrm{Flat}(X)$ is locally finite.*

Proof. If $K \subset X$ is compact, then

$$\{\, F \in \mathcal{F} \mid F \cap \bar{K} \neq \emptyset \,\}$$

is a closed subset of the compact set

$$\{\, F \in \mathrm{Flat}(X) \mid F \cap \bar{K} \neq \emptyset \,\},$$

and is therefore compact; but all its elements are isolated, so it is also finite. Thus $\mathcal{F}$ is a locally finite collection. □

The following is an immediate corollary of Lemma 5.1.1 together with Lemma 3.1.2.

Corollary 5.1.2. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a closed, isolated Γ–invariant subset of* $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$. *Then the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ lie in only finitely many Γ–orbits and each $F \in \mathcal{F}$ is Γ–periodic.* □

Lemma 5.1.3. *Suppose X has* (IF1) *with respect to the family $\mathcal{F}$. We may assume without loss of generality that every element of $\mathcal{F}$ is maximal.*

Proof. By Corollary 5.1.2, we may throw away (finitely many) Γ–orbits of flats from $\mathcal{F}$ until it becomes a minimal Γ–invariant subset satisfying (IF1). But a minimal $\mathcal{F}$ clearly contains only maximal flats. □

Proposition 5.1.4. *If X has* (IF1) *then X has thin parallel sets.*

Proof. It is sufficient to consider parallel sets of geodesics lying in flats $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Let Ξ be the collection of pairs (F, S) where $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $S \subset F$ is isometric to $\mathbb{E}^k$ for some $k \geq 1$, and the parallel set of S is not contained in a finite neighborhood of F. Suppose Ξ is nonempty, and choose an element $(F, S) \in \Xi$ which is "maximal" in the sense that if $(F', S') \in \Xi$ and $\dim F' \geq \dim F$ and $\dim S' \geq \dim S$, then $\dim F' = \dim F$ and $\dim S' = \dim S$.

We have a Euclidean product decomposition $\mathbb{P}(S) = S \times Y$ where $Y \subset X$ is convex. Let $\pi\colon \mathbb{P}(S) \to Y$ be the projection onto the second factor, and define $\bar{F} \subset Y = \pi(F)$. Then we have $F = S \times \bar{F}$. Note that Y is not contained in a finite neighborhood of $\bar{F}$. So by applying the cocompact stabilizer of F and a convergence argument, we may assume without loss of generality that $\partial_T Y \setminus \partial_T \bar{F} \neq \emptyset$.

Step 1. We first show that $S = F$. Assume by way of contradiction that $\dim S < \dim F$, so that $\dim \bar{F} \geq 1$.

First suppose $\partial_T \bar{F}$ is not a component of $\partial_T Y$. Then we may apply Lemma 2.5.1 to see that there is a flat half-plane $H \subset Y$ which meets $\bar{F}$ orthogonally. But then $S' := S \times \partial H \subset F$ is a subflat of F with $\dim S' > \dim S$ and $\mathbb{P}(S') \supset S \times H$ is not contained in a finite neighborhood of F. This

contradicts the choice of the pair (F, S), and so $\partial_T \bar{F}$ must be a component of $\partial_T Y$.

Pick $\xi \in \partial_T Y \setminus \partial_T \bar{F}$. Then there is a geodesic $\gamma \subset Y$ with $\partial_T \gamma = \{\xi, \eta\}$ where $\eta \in \partial_T \bar{F}$. By (IF1) there is a flat $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $S \times \gamma \subset \mathcal{N}_D(F')$; let $\bar{F}'$ be the projection of F' to Y. Let $\alpha \subset \bar{F}$ be a geodesic with $\eta \in \partial_T \alpha$, and pick $x \in F$ such that $\bar{x} := \pi(x) \in \alpha$. By Theorem 2.1.7, the stabilizer of F contains a subgroup A which acts cocompactly by translations on F; therefore we can find an infinite sequence $g_k \in A$ such that $d\big(g_k(\alpha), \alpha\big)$ is uniformly bounded, and $g_k \bar{x}$ converges to $\eta_- \in \partial_\infty X$, where $\partial_T \alpha = \{\eta, \eta_-\}$. All the flats $g_k(F')$ pass through some ball around x, so the collection $\big\{g_k(F')\big\}$ is finite. It follows that for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a translation $g \in A$ which preserves F', and which translates $\bar{F}$ in a direction ϵ–close to η_-; in particular g does not preserve S. If $\tau \subset \bar{F}$ is a geodesic translated by g, then $S' := S \times \tau$ is a Euclidean subset with $\dim S' > \dim S$, and $\mathbb{P}(S') \supset F'$ is not contained in a finite neighborhood of F. This contradicts the choice of (F, S). Therefore we have $S = F$.

Step 2. We now know that $S = F$. So $\mathbb{P}(F) = F \times Y$ where Y is unbounded. Pick $p \in F$, and let $[p, x_k] \subset \mathbb{P}(F)$ be a sequence of segments with with $\angle_p(x_k, F) \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$, where $d(x_k, F) \to \infty$. Let y_k be the midpoint of the segment $[p, x_k]$, and let $F_k \subset \mathbb{P}(F)$ be the flat parallel to F passing through y_k. Applying a sequence $g_k \in \Gamma$ and passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $g_k(F_k)$ converges to a flat F_∞, that $g_k(F_k) \subset F'$ for some $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and all k, and that there is a flat $F'' \in \mathcal{F}$ of dimension $> \dim F$ with $F_\infty \subset \mathcal{N}_D(F'')$. Note that $\dim F' > \dim F$ for otherwise we would have $F' \subset \mathcal{N}_{2D}(F'')$, contradicting Lemma 5.1.3. But then $g_k(F_k) \in \mathcal{F}$ lies in a finite neighborhood of F', which again contradicts Lemma 5.1.3. □

Proposition 5.1.5. *If X has slim parallel sets, then X has uniformly thin parallel sets and satisfies* (IF1).

The proposition is an immediate consequence of the following lemma in the case $n = 2$.

Lemma 5.1.6. *Suppose X has slim parallel sets. Then for each $n \geq 2$ there is a closed, isolated Γ–invariant set $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathrm{Flat}(X)$ and a constant D_n with the following properties.*

1. *Each element of $\mathcal{F}_n$ is a maximal flat of dimension at least n.*
2. *Each k–flat in X with $k \geq n$ is contained in the D_n–tubular neighborhood of some $F \in \mathcal{F}_n$.*
3. *If $\gamma \subseteq F$ is a geodesic contained in a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}_n$ then the parallel set of γ lies in the D_n–neighborhood of F.*

Proof. Since there is a uniform bound on the dimensions of all flats in X, the lemma is satisfied for sufficiently large n by the set $\mathcal{F}_n := \emptyset$. We will prove the lemma by decreasing induction on n, so suppose the lemma is true for $n + 1$.

If F is a maximal n–flat, then its parallel set is of the form $F \times K_F$ for some compact set K_F. Define $\mathcal{F}_n$ to be the union of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ and the set of all n–flats of the form $F \times \{c_F\}$, where F is maximal and c_F is the circumcenter of K_F. Note that $\mathcal{F}_n$ is Γ–invariant.

Step 1. We will first show that the set of all maximal flats of dimension n is closed in $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$. If not, then there is a sequence (F_i) of maximal n–flats converging to a nonmaximal n–flat F, which must lie in a finite tubular neighborhood of a higher dimensional flat $\hat{F} \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$. It follows from (3) that $F \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_{n+1}}(\hat{F})$. Since F is not maximal, it is not parallel to any F_i. So F_i is not contained in any finite tubular neighborhood of $\hat{F}$. Consequently, for any $r > D_{n+1}$, if we set

$$C_i := F_i \cap \mathcal{N}_r(\hat{F}),$$

then C_i is a convex, open, proper subset of F_i whose inscribed radius ρ_i tends to infinity as $i \to \infty$. Let $p_i \in F_i$ be a point on the boundary of C_i that is also on the boundary of an inscribed n–dimensional Euclidean disc in C_i of radius ρ_i. By Corollary 5.1.2, we know that $\hat{F}$ has a cocompact stabilizer. So we may apply elements $g_i \in \mathrm{Stab}(\hat{F})$ and pass to a subsequence so that the $g_i(p_i)$ converge to a point p, the $g_i(F_i)$ converge to a flat $\bar{F}$ containing p, the $g_i(C_i)$ converge to an open halfspace $H \subset \bar{F}$ that lies in the closed r–tubular neighborhood of $\hat{F}$, and each point of the bounding hyperplane ∂H lies at a distance exactly r from $\hat{F}$. Since ∂H lies in the parallel set of a geodesic in $\hat{F}$ and $r > D_{n+1}$, we get a contradiction with the inductive hypothesis applied to $\hat{F}$.

Step 2. Our next goal is to show that a sequence of nonparallel maximal flats cannot converge in $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$. Suppose by way of contradiction that (F_i) converges to a flat F. Then by the previous step, F must be maximal. Fix a positive r, and define C_i and p_i in F_i as in Step 1. As F is n–dimensional, it is not known to be periodic. Nevertheless, we may apply isometries $g_i \in \Gamma$ and pass to a subsequence to arrange that $g_i(p_i)$ converges to a point p, the $g_i(F_i)$ converge to a flat $\bar{F}$, the $g_i(F)$ converge to a flat $\hat{F}$, and the $g_i(\partial C_i)$ converge to an $(n-1)$–dimensional subflat S of $\bar{F}$ every point of which is at a distance exactly r from $\hat{F}$. By Step 1, the limiting flats $\bar{F}$ and $\hat{F}$ are again maximal. But $\bar{F} \cup \hat{F}$ is contained in the parallel set of any geodesic line $\gamma \subset S$. It follows from slim parallel sets that $\partial_T \bar{F} = \partial_T \hat{F}$, and hence that $\bar{F}$ and $\hat{F}$ are parallel and separated by a distance exactly r.

Since r is arbitrary, the preceding paragraph produces for each positive r a pair of parallel maximal n–flats $\bar{F}_r$ and $\hat{F}_r$ at a Hausdorff distance exactly r. The convex hull of $\bar{F}_r \cup \hat{F}_r$ is isometric to a product $\bar{F}_r \times [-r/2, r/2]$. Applying isometries in Γ again, we can arrange that as $r \to \infty$ the maximal flats $\bar{F}_r \times \{0\}$ converge to an n–flat which is not maximal, contradicting Step 1.

Thus $\mathcal{F}_n$ is a closed, isolated, Γ–invariant set in $\mathrm{Flat}(X)$ containing exactly one maximal flat from each parallel class of maximal flats of dimension $\geq n$. By Corollary 5.1.2, the elements of $\mathcal{F}_n$ lie in only finitely many Γ–orbits

and are each Γ–periodic. Another convergence argument using the cocompact stabilizer of each $F \in \mathcal{F}_n$ can now be used to uniformly bound the thickness of the parallel sets $\mathbb{P}(\gamma)$ for each geodesic $\gamma \subset F$. The lemma follows immediately, since each k–flat with $k \geq n$ lies inside one of these parallel sets. □

Proposition 5.1.7. *Let X have slim parallel sets. Then X has* (IF2).

Proof. Consider the set $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_2$ given by Lemma 5.1.6. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is locally finite, consists of only maximal flats, and also has the property that no two flats in $\mathcal{F}$ are parallel. Pick $\rho < \infty$ and a sequence of pairs $F_k \neq F_k'$ in $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\operatorname{diam}\big(\mathcal{N}_\rho(F_k) \cap \mathcal{N}_\rho(F_k')\big) \to \infty$. After passing to subsequences and applying a sequence of isometries, we may assume that $F_k \to F_\infty \in \mathcal{F}$, $F_k' \to F_\infty' \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{N}_\rho(F_\infty) \cap \mathcal{N}_\rho(F_\infty')$ contains a complete geodesic γ. Since $\mathcal{F}$ is locally finite, we in fact have $F_k = F_\infty$, $F_k' = F_\infty'$ for all sufficiently large k.

But $F_\infty \cup F_\infty'$ lies in the parallel set of γ. As in the proof of Lemma 5.1.6, it follows that F_∞ and F_∞' are parallel, contradicting the fact that $F_k \neq F_k'$. □

Proposition 5.1.8. *If X has* (IF2) *with respect to $\mathcal{F}$, then X also has* (IF1) *with respect to $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. The only nontrivial fact to check is that a sequence of distinct flats in $\mathcal{F}$ cannot converge in $\operatorname{Flat}(X)$. But this follows immediately from Lemma 3.1.1. □

5.2. **The structure of the Tits boundary.** In this section we show that X has isolated flats if and only if the components of its Tits boundary are isolated points and standard spheres.

Proposition 5.2.1. *If X has isolated flats, then for each $\theta_0 > 0$ there is a positive constant $\delta_4 = \delta_4(\theta_0)$ such that whenever $p \in X$ and $\xi, \eta \in \partial_T X$ satisfy*

$$\theta_0 \leq \angle_p(\xi,\eta) \leq \angle_T(\xi,\eta) \leq \angle_p(\xi,\eta) + \delta_4 \leq \pi - \theta_0, \tag{5.2.2}$$

then there is a flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$ so that

$$[p,\xi] \cup [p,\eta] \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}\big(F\big).$$

Proof. Choose θ_0 positive, and let R be sufficiently large that any set of diameter at least $R/4$ is contained in the $D_1(\theta_0)$–tubular neighborhood of at most one flat in $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\theta_0, R)$ and $\rho_1 = \rho_1(\theta_0, R)$ be the constants given by Lemma 3.2.3, and set $\delta_4 := \delta_1$. Now suppose $p \in X$ and $\xi, \eta \in \partial_T X$ satisfy

$$\theta_0 \leq \angle_p(\xi,\eta) \leq \angle_T(\xi,\eta) \leq \angle_p(\xi,\eta) + \delta_1 \leq \pi - \theta_0. \tag{5.2.3}$$

Then we have

$$\angle_p(\xi,\eta) \leq \widetilde{\angle}_p\big(c(\rho_1), c'(\rho_1)\big) \leq \angle_T(\xi,\eta),$$

where c and c' are geodesic parametrizations of $[p,\xi]$ and $[p,\eta]$ respectively. So by Lemma 3.2.3 there is a flat $F_p \in \mathcal{F}$ so that

$$B(p,R) \cap \big([p,\xi] \cup [p,\eta]\big) \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}\big(F\big).$$

Notice that Proposition 2.4.1 implies that (5.2.3) remains valid if we replace p with any point $x \in [p,\xi] \cup [p,\eta]$. So we can apply the preceding argument to the rays $[x,\xi]$ and $[x,\eta]$ to produce for each x a flat $F_x \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$B(x,R) \cap \big([x,\xi] \cup [x,\eta]\big) \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}\big(F_x\big).$$

But our choice of R guarantees that all the flats F_x are the same. So $[p,\xi]\cup[p,\eta]$ lies in the $D_1(\theta)$–tubular neighborhood of a single flat $F \in \mathcal{F}$. □

Theorem 5.2.4. *Let X be any* CAT(0) *space admitting a geometric group action. Then X has isolated flats if and only if each connected component of $\partial_T X$ either is an isolated point or is isometric to a standard Euclidean sphere. Furthermore, the spherical components of $\partial_T X$ are precisely the Tits boundaries of the flats $F \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Suppose X has isolated flats. By (IF2), it is clear that if $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ are distinct then $\partial_T F \cap \partial_T F' = \emptyset$. If $\xi, \eta \in \partial_T X$ and $0 < \angle_T(\xi,\eta) < \pi$, then we can find $\theta_0 > 0$ and $p \in X$ such that (5.2.2) holds. Hence $[p,\xi] \cup [p,\eta] \subset \mathcal{N}_{D_1(\theta_0)}(F)$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}$, which means that $\{\xi,\eta\} \subset \partial_T F$. Thus $\partial_T X$ has the desired structure.

Now suppose every component of $\partial_T X$ either is an isolated point or is isometric to a standard Euclidean sphere. We will show that X has slim parallel sets. By Proposition 2.4.2, any spherical component of $\partial_T X$ is the boundary of a maximal flat. It follows that the Tits boundary of any maximal flat F is a component of $\partial_T X$. But for each geodesic $\gamma \subset F$, the Tits boundary of $\mathbb{P}(\gamma)$ is a connected set containing $\partial_T F$. Hence $\partial_T \mathbb{P}(\gamma) = \partial_T F$. □

References

[AB] E. Alibegović and M. Bestvina. Limit groups are CAT(0). Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0410198.

[ABB93] S.B. Alexander, I.D. Berg, and R.L. Bishop. Geometric curvature bounds in Riemannian manifolds with boundary. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 339(2):703–716, 1993.

[Bal95] W. Ballmann. *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature*, volume 25 of *DMV Seminar*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1995. With an appendix by M. Brin.

[BB94] W. Ballmann and M. Brin. Polygonal complexes and combinatorial group theory. *Geom. Dedicata*, 50(2):165–191, 1994.

[Ben94] N. Benakli. Polygonal complexes. I. Combinatorial and geometric properties. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 97(3):247–263, 1994.

[BGS85] W. Ballmann, M. Gromov, and V. Schroeder. *Manifolds of nonpositive curvature*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, Mass., 1985.

[BH99] M.R. Bridson and A. Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[Bow93] B.H. Bowditch. Geometrical finiteness for hyperbolic groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 113(2):245–317, 1993.

[Bow99] B.H. Bowditch. Relatively hyperbolic groups. Preprint, University of Southampton, 1999.

[BŚ99] W. Ballmann and J. Świątkowski. On groups acting on nonpositively curved cubical complexes. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 45(1-2):51–81, 1999.

[Buy98] S.V. Buyalo. Geodesics in Hadamard spaces. *Algebra i Analiz*, 10(2):93–123, 1998. English translation in *St. Petersburg Math. J.* 10(2):293–313, 1999.

[CK00] C.B. Croke and B. Kleiner. Spaces with nonpositive curvature and their ideal boundaries. *Topology*, 39(3):549–556, 2000.

[CK02] C.B. Croke and B. Kleiner. The geodesic flow of a nonpositively curved graph manifold. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 12(3):479–545, 2002.

[CR] I. Chatterji and K. Ruane. Some geometric groups with rapid decay. To appear in *Geom. Funct. Anal.* Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0310356.

[DSa] C. Druţu and M. Sapir. Relatively hyperbolic groups with Rapid Decay property. Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0405500.

[DSb] C. Druţu and M. Sapir. Tree-graded spaces and asymptotic cones of groups. With an appendix by D. Osin and M. Sapir. Preprint available at arXiv:math.GT/0405030.

[Ebe73] P. Eberlein. Geodesic flows on negatively curved manifolds. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 178:57–82, 1973.

[ECH+92] D.B.A. Epstein, J.W. Cannon, D.F. Holt, S.V.F. Levy, M.S. Paterson, and W.P. Thurston. *Word processing in groups*. Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, MA, 1992.

[Far98] B. Farb. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(5):810–840, 1998.

[Gro] D. Groves. Limits of (certain) CAT(0) groups, II: The Hopf property and the shortening argument. Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0408080.

[Gro81] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic manifolds, groups and actions. In I. Kra and B. Maskit, editors, *Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference* (*State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978*), volume 97 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 183–213, Princeton, N.J., 1981. Princeton Univ. Press.

[Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In S.M. Gersten, editor, *Essays in group theory*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.

[Gro93] M. Gromov. Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups. In G.A. Niblo and M.A. Roller, editors, *Geometric group theory, Vol. 2* (*Sussex, 1991*), pages 1–295. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[GS90] S.M. Gersten and H.B. Short. Small cancellation theory and automatic groups. *Invent. Math.*, 102(2):305–334, 1990.

[GS91] S.M. Gersten and H.B. Short. Small cancellation theory and automatic groups. II. *Invent. Math.*, 105(3):641–662, 1991.

[Hag91] F. Haglund. Les polyèdres de Gromov. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 313(9):603–606, 1991.

[Hru] G.C. Hruska. Geometric invariants of spaces with isolated flats. To appear in *Topology*. Preprint available at arXiv:math.MG/0404208.

[Hru04] G.C. Hruska. Nonpositively curved 2–complexes with isolated flats. *Geom. Topol.*, 8:205–275, 2004.

[KL95] M. Kapovich and B. Leeb. On asymptotic cones and quasi-isometry classes of fundamental groups of 3–manifolds. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 5(3):582–603, 1995.

[KL97] B. Kleiner and B. Leeb. Rigidity of quasi-isometries for symmetric spaces and Euclidean buildings. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 86:115–197 (1998), 1997.

[Lee98] B. Leeb. *A characterization of irreducible symmetric spaces and Euclidean buildings of higher rank by their asymptotic geometry.* Habilitation, Univ. Bonn, 1998.

[Mou88] G. Moussong. *Hyperbolic Coxeter groups.* PhD thesis, Ohio State Univ., 1988.

[NR98] G.A. Niblo and L.D. Reeves. The geometry of cube complexes and the complexity of their fundamental groups. *Topology*, 37(3):621–633, 1998.

[Osi] D.V. Osin. Relatively hyperbolic groups: Intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems. To appear in *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0404040.

[Reb01] D.Y. Rebbechi. *Algorithmic properties of relatively hyperbolic groups.* PhD thesis, Rutgers Univ., 2001. Available at arXiv:math.GR/0302245.

[Sch89] V. Schroeder. A cusp closing theorem. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 106(3):797–802, 1989.

[Sho91] H. Short. Quasiconvexity and a theorem of Howson's. In É. Ghys, A. Haefliger, and A. Verjovsky, editors, *Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint* (*Trieste, 1990*), pages 168–176. World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 1991.

[SW] M. Sageev and D.T. Wise. The Tits alternative for CAT(0) cubical complexes. Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0405022.

[Wil] J. Wilson. A CAT(0) group with uncountably many distinct boundaries. Preprint.

[Wis] D.T. Wise. Subgroup separability of the figure 8 knot group. To appear in *Topology*.

[Wis96] D.T. Wise. *Non-positively curved squared complexes, aperiodic tilings, and non-residually finite groups.* PhD thesis, Princeton Univ., 1996.

[Xie] X. Xie. Groups acting on CAT(0) square complexes. Preprint available at arXiv:math.GR/0303120.

[Xie04] X. Xie. Tits alternative for closed real analytic 4–manifolds of nonpositive curvature. *Topology Appl.*, 136(1-3):87–121, 2004.

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, 5734 S. University Ave., Chicago, IL 60637-1514, USA

E-mail address: `chruska@math.uchicago.edu`

Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109, USA

E-mail address: `bkleiner@umich.edu`