

# GEOMETRY OF EXTENSIONS OF FREE GROUPS VIA AUTOMORPHISMS WITH FIXED POINTS ON THE COMPLEX OF FREE FACTORS

PRITAM GHOSH AND FUNDA GÜLTEPE

**ABSTRACT.** We give conditions of an extension of a free group to be hyperbolic and relatively hyperbolic using the dynamics of the action of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  on the complex of free factors combined with the weak attraction theory. We work with subgroups of exponentially growing outer automorphisms and instead of using a standard pingpong argument with loxodromics, we allow fixed points for the action and investigate the geometry of the extension group when the fixed points of the automorphisms on the complex of free factors are sufficiently far apart.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a free group of finite rank  $\geq 3$ . Similar to that of mapping classes for a surface, there is a dichotomy for elements of the group of outer automorphisms  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  of the free group  $\mathbb{F}$ , in terms of their *growth*. An element  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is called *exponentially growing* if for some conjugacy class  $[w]$  of an element  $w \in \mathbb{F}$ , the word length of  $\phi^i([w])$  grows exponentially with  $i$  for any fixed generating set of  $\mathbb{F}$ . We will call a subgroup of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  exponentially growing if all of its elements are. For an exponentially growing subgroup  $\mathcal{Q} < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ , we are interested in understanding the geometry of the extension  $E_{\mathcal{Q}}$  given by the short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow E_{\mathcal{Q}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow 1$$

that is induced from the sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \text{Out}(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow 1.$$

The extension group  $E_{\mathcal{Q}}$  is the pullback of  $\mathcal{Q}$  to  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F})$ , hence a subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F})$ .

When  $\mathcal{Q}$  is free group of rank  $\geq 2$ , which is our main focus for this paper, we say that  $E_{\mathcal{Q}}$  is a free-by-free group and it is known that  $E_{\mathcal{Q}} \cong \mathbb{F} \rtimes \hat{\mathcal{Q}}$ , where  $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}$  is some (any) lift of  $\mathcal{Q}$  to  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{F})$ . In this paper we give necessary and sufficient conditions for  $E_{\mathcal{Q}}$  to be hyperbolic using the dynamical information of the generators of  $\mathcal{Q} < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  obtained from train track maps of free group automorphisms, as well as via their actions on the complex of free factors  $\mathcal{FF}$ .

---

The first author was supported by the Ashoka University faculty research grant.

The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2137611.

An outer automorphism  $\phi$  is *atoroidal* (or hyperbolic) if no power of  $\phi$  fixes a conjugacy class in  $\mathbb{F}$ . Atoroidal automorphisms are a special class of exponentially growing elements of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ . Using train-track theory, Bestvina-Feighn-Handel [BFH00] developed dynamical invariants for exponentially growing outer automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}$ , called *attracting and repelling laminations*. Namely, associated to each exponentially growing outer automorphism  $\phi$  (respectively  $\phi^{-1}$ ), we have finitely many invariant sets of biinfinite *lines* in the (compactified Cayley graph of) the Gromov hyperbolic space  $\mathbb{F} \cup \partial\mathbb{F}$  called *attracting laminations* (respectively *repelling laminations*), denoted by  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  (respectively  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$ ). Atoroidal outer automorphisms are characterised by the property that for every conjugacy class  $[w]$ , the sequence  $\phi^i([w])$  converges to some element of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$  (Lemma 3.1, [Gho20]). The first author showed that these sets were central to describing the Cannon-Thurston laminations for the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \langle \phi \rangle$  (Lemma 4.4, [Gho20]). We use  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi)$  to denote the union of the two lamination sets  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$ .

We show that  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi)$  is instrumental in characterising hyperbolicity of the extension group  $E_Q$ , when  $Q$  is a free group of rank  $\geq 2$ . Our theorem shows that in this case the extension group is hyperbolic, provided we enforce the condition that the attracting and repelling laminations associated to the generators of  $Q$  to be pairwise disjoint.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing outer automorphisms such that no pair of automorphisms have a common power. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) *Each  $\phi_i$  is a hyperbolic (atoroidal) outer automorphism and  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ .*
- (2) *There exists  $M > 0$  such that for all  $m_i \geq M$ ,  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group and the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic (where  $\widehat{Q}$  is any lift of  $Q$ ).*

Theorem 1.1 is comparable to Theorem 1.3 of Farb and Mosher ([FM02]) and the main Theorem of [Ham05] where hyperbolicity of the extension group  $E_Q = \pi_1(S) \rtimes Q$  is characterized by the *convex cocompactness* of a free subgroup  $Q$  of the mapping class group  $MCG(S)$  of a surface  $S$ . We discuss a new possible definition of convex cocompactness for  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  in section 6.2.

We say that  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$  are *independent* if generic leaves of elements of  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j)$  are not asymptotic to each other. Hence, Theorem 1.1 can be written as;

*Theorem.* Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing outer automorphisms such that no pair of automorphisms have a common power. Then,  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  is a purely atoroidal (all infinite order elements are atoroidal), pairwise independent collection if and only if the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic for a free group  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  generated by high enough  $m_i$ 's.

The interest in the geometry of extensions of groups started with Thurston ([Thu]) where the  $\pi_1(S)$ -extension of a cyclic group is hyperbolic if and only if the cyclic group is generated by a pseudo-Anosov element of the mapping class group. Bestvina-Feighn [BF92] and Brinkmann [Bri00] have shown that when  $Q$  is an infinite cyclic group,  $E_Q$  is hyperbolic if and only if  $\phi$  is atoroidal.

We remark that we do not need  $Q$  to be free to prove that the collection is independent and purely atoroidal.

**1.1. Fixed points on  $\mathcal{FF}$  and hyperbolicity of the extension.** Free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$  of the free group  $\mathbb{F}$  is a simplicial complex whose vertices are conjugacy classes of non-trivial free factors of  $\mathbb{F}$ . Two vertices corresponding to free factors are connected by an edge if one includes the other as subgroup, up to conjugation.  $\mathcal{FF}$  is Gromov-hyperbolic ([HV98, BF14a]) and in many other ways shows resemblance to the curve complex. Hence the action of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  on  $\mathcal{FF}$  is reminiscent of the action of the mapping class group on the curve complex.

An element of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is *fully irreducible* if and only if it has no periodic orbits on  $\mathcal{FF}$ . It is well known that fully irreducible elements of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  act loxodromically on  $\mathcal{FF}$  ([BF14a]) and this was exploited by Dowdall-Taylor [DT18] to produce hyperbolic extensions of free groups. Their theorem can be compared to those of Kent–Leininger ([KL08]), and Hamenstädt ([Ham05]) characterizing convex cocompactness, hence the hyperbolicity of the extension, with quasi isometric embedding of the group in the curve complex. As such the automorphisms of [DT18] are fully irreducible.

We take a different approach in this paper and produce hyperbolic extensions of groups whose elements are not necessarily fully irreducible, hence we allow automorphisms to have fixed points on  $\mathcal{FF}$ . The following result shows that the only condition one needs for hyperbolicity is that they do not have a common fixed point on  $\mathcal{FF}$ .

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of hyperbolic (atoroidal) elements which do not have a common power. If no pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$  fixes a common vertex in the free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$ , then*

- (1) *There exists  $M > 0$  such that for all  $m_i \geq M$ ,  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group,*
- (2) *Extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is a hyperbolic group (where  $\widehat{Q}$  is any lift of  $Q$ ).*

Our Theorem 1.2 hence responds to the question of what happens when a pair  $\phi, \psi$  in a collection of automorphisms do have common fixed points for their action on  $\mathcal{FF}$ .

**1.2. Sufficiently different automorphisms, non-attracting sink and the geometry of the extension group.** One of the key motivation for this work was to establish a connection between the dynamics of the action of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  on the free factor complex and the dynamical data that we have from the train-track theory. We believe that this is a theme that has barely been explored and a lot can be learned if we are able exploit this connection.

We call a collection of automorphisms *sufficiently different* if no pair of automorphisms have a common power and for each pair of outer automorphisms in the collection, the distance between the fixed vertices in  $\mathcal{FF}$  is at least 2 (if such vertices exist) (see section 3.1). Lemma 3.1 gives a simple criterion for constructing free subgroups of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  using sufficiently different elements. We then address the question of when can such free subgroups of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  yield relatively hyperbolic extensions with a cusp-preserving structure.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing, sufficiently different outer automorphisms. If all the nonattracting sinks are nonempty, then exactly one of following are true:*

- (1)  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  is a collection of fully irreducible geometric outer automorphisms induced by some pseudo-Anosov homomorphisms of the same compact surface with one boundary component. Moreover, all sufficiently high powers of  $\phi_i$ 's generate a free group  $Q$  such that  $E_Q$  has a cusp-preserving relatively hyperbolic structure.
- (2) Extension  $E_Q$  of a free group  $Q$ , which is generated by sufficiently high powers of  $\phi_i$ 's, cannot have a cusp preserving relatively hyperbolic structure.

Thus we conclude that being sufficiently different is an obstruction to cusp-preserving relative hyperbolicity of the extension group, except in one particular case. Equivalently, it is an obstruction to having an *admissible subgroup system* ([GG23], Section 2.8) for the collection of  $\phi_i$ 's. This is a malnormal collection of subgroups with some special properties, and the *nonattracting sink*  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  of an automorphism  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ , which is developed in [GG23] as an example of an admissible subgroup system, carries all conjugacy classes which do not grow exponentially under iteration by  $\phi$  (see Lemma 3.5). Nonattracting sink can be computed explicitly using relative train-track maps.

For a collection  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  of pairwise sufficiently different and rotationless exponentially growing outer automorphisms, let  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  be the nonattracting sink of  $\phi_i$ . We have the following theorem characterizing the hyperbolicity of  $E_Q$  using sinks:

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing and sufficiently different outer automorphisms. Let  $Q$  be a free group generated by sufficiently high powers of  $\phi_i$ 's. Then,  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \hat{Q}$  is a hyperbolic group if and only if  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \emptyset$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .*

We remark that in this theorem  $Q$  is not necessarily *convex cocompact* subgroup of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  in the sense of [HH18, DKT16] and [DT17], since our groups do not quasi isometrically embed in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . Hence our theorem cannot be obtained via their work. In fact, as far as our knowledge goes, this theorem cannot be obtained by studying the action of  $Q$  on any known hyperbolic simplicial complex on with a nice  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  action.

In a similar vein, we obtain the following necessary and sufficient condition in terms of nonattracting sinks, regarding cusp-preserving relative hyperbolicity of the extension group when  $Q$  is generated by sufficiently different collection of outer automorphisms.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k\}$  be a collection of rotationless, pairwise sufficiently different and exponentially growing outer automorphisms. Let  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  be the nonattracting sink of  $\phi_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and assume that  $\mathcal{K}_j^* \neq \emptyset$  for some fixed  $j$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \hat{Q}$  has a cusp preserving relatively hyperbolic structure where  $Q$  is a free group generated by sufficiently large exponents of  $\phi_i$ 's.
- (2)  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \mathcal{K}_j^*$  for all  $i$ .

To summarize, given a pair of sufficiently different, exponentially growing elements of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ : All sinks empty gives hyperbolic extensions (Theorem 1.3). No sink empty gives relatively hyperbolic extensions with cusp-preserving structure only for geometric fully-irreducibles (Proposition 3.9). Some sink nonempty gives relatively hyperbolic extensions with cusp-preserving structure only if all sinks are nonempty and are equal (Theorem 5.1).

**1.3. Plan of the paper:** Section 2 collects all the definitions and the tools we use.

In Section 3 we investigate obstructions to (relative) hyperbolicity using the dynamics of sufficiently different automorphisms on  $\mathcal{FF}$ . In this section we also discuss the notion of a sink and include proof of Proposition 3.9.

In Section 4 we continue working with a specific type of exponentially growing automorphism; a reducible automorphism that is fully irreducible on a free factor (a *partial* fully irreducible). We investigate the conditions on the small displacement sets on  $\mathcal{FF}$  of partial fully irreducible automorphisms that determine the geometry of the extension groups they generate.

Section 5 includes proofs of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 5.1. In this section we discuss further the notion of sink and how the sinks of automorphisms determine the geometry of an extension group generated by those automorphisms and prove Theorem 1.3. We work with partial and relative fully irreducibles directly to determine examples of relatively hyperbolic free group extensions.

Section 6 discusses further problems such as characterization of non relative hyperbolicity; in this section we give an example which could help characterize non relative hyperbolicity of a free group extension. At the end of this section, we discuss convex cocompactness in  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ .

**1.4. Acknowledgements.** We thank Spencer Dowdall, Chris Leininger, Lee Mosher, Pranab Sardar, and Sam Taylor for their remarks and comments on the earlier version of the paper.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Marked graphs, circuits and path:** A *marked graph* is a graph  $G$  which is a core graph (a graph with no valence 1 vertices) that is equipped with a homotopy equivalence to the rose  $m : G \rightarrow R_n$  (where  $n = \text{rank}(\mathbb{F})$ ). Thus the fundamental group of  $G$  can be identified with  $\mathbb{F}$  (up to inner automorphisms). A *circuit* in a marked graph is a locally injective and continuous map of  $S^1$  into  $G$ . The set of circuits in  $G$  can be identified with the set of conjugacy classes in  $\mathbb{F}$ .

A *path* is an immersion of the interval  $[0, 1]$  into  $G$  with endpoints at vertices of  $G$ . Every path can be written as a finite concatenation of edges of  $G$ , so that there is no backtracking.

A *line*  $\ell$  is a bi-infinite concatenation  $\ell = \dots E_{i-1}E_iE_{i+1}\dots$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  of edges of  $G$  without backtracking *i.e.* so that  $E_{j-1}^{-1} \neq E_j \neq E_{j+1}^{-1}$  (where  $E_s^{-1}$  is  $E_s$  traveled in opposite direction). A *ray*  $\gamma$  is “one-sided” infinite concatenation of edges  $\gamma = E_iE_{i+1}\dots$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  in  $G$  without backtracking. Two lines are said to be asymptotic if they have a common sub-ray. Any continuous map  $f$  from  $S^1$  or  $[0, 1]$  to  $G$  can be *tightened* to a circuit or path,

in other words is freely homotopic to a locally injective and continuous map. Tightened image of a path  $\alpha$  under  $f$  will be denoted by  $f_{\#}(\alpha)$  and we will not distinguish between circuits or paths that differ by a homeomorphism of their respective domains.

**2.2. Topological representative, EG strata, NEG strata:** A *filtration* of a marked graph  $G$  is a strictly increasing sequence  $G_0 \subset G_1 \subset \cdots \subset G_k = G$  of subgraphs  $G_r$  with no isolated vertices. The filtration is *f-invariant* if  $f(G_r) \subset G_r$  for all  $r$ .

The *stratum of height  $r$*  is a subgraph  $H_r = G_r \setminus G_{r-1}$  together with the endpoints of edges. The minimum  $r$  such that a subset of  $G$  is contained in  $G_r$  is called the *height* the subset.

For an  $f$ -invariant filtration, the square matrix  $M_r$  whose  $j^{\text{th}}$  column records the number of times the image of an edge  $e_j$  under  $f$  intersects the other edges is called the *transition matrix* of the stratum  $H_r$ .  $M_r$  is said to be irreducible if for each  $i, j$ , the  $i, j$ -th entry of some power of  $M_r$  is nonzero. In this case we say that the associated stratum  $H_r$  is also *irreducible*. When  $H_r$  is irreducible Perron-Frobenius theorem states that the matrix  $M_r$  has unique eigenvalue  $\lambda \geq 1$ , called the *Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue*, for which some associated eigenvector has positive entries. if  $\lambda = 1$  then  $H_r$  is a *nonexponentially growing (NEG) stratum* whereas if  $\lambda > 1$  then we say that  $H_r$  is an *exponentially growing (EG) stratum*.

An automorphism  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  can be represented by a homotopy equivalence  $f : G \rightarrow G$  that takes vertices to vertices and edges to edge-paths of a marked graph  $G$  with marking  $\rho : R_n \rightarrow G$ , called a *topological representative*. Topological representative  $f$  preserves the marking of  $G$ , in other words  $\bar{\rho} \circ f \circ \rho : R_n \rightarrow R_n$  represents  $R_n$ . A nontrivial path  $\alpha$  in  $G$  is a *periodic Nielsen path* if  $f_{\#}^k(\alpha) = \alpha$  for some  $k$ , where  $k$  is called the *period*.  $\alpha$  is a Nielsen path if  $k = 1$ . A periodic Nielsen path is *indivisible* (iNP) if it cannot be written as a concatenation of nontrivial periodic Nielsen paths.

Given a topological representative  $f : G \rightarrow G$  let  $Tf$  be the map such that  $Tf(E)$  is the first edge in the edge path associated to  $f(E)$ . A *turn* is a concatenation  $\{E_i, E_j\}$  of edges and we let  $Tf(E_i, E_j) = (Tf(E_i), Tf(E_j))$  making  $Tf$  a map that takes turns to turns. We say that a non-degenerate (i.e,  $i \neq j$ ) turn is *illegal* if for some iterate of  $Tf$  the turn becomes degenerate; otherwise the turn is legal. A path is said to be *legal path* if it contains only legal turns and it is *r-legal* if it is of height  $r$  and all its illegal turns are in  $G_{r-1}$ .

**Relative train track map.** Given  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  and a topological representative  $f : G \rightarrow G$  with a filtration  $G_0 \subset G_1 \subset \cdots \subset G_k$  which is preserved by  $f$ , we say that  $f$  is a relative train track map if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $f$  maps  $r$ -legal paths to  $r$ -legal paths.
- (2) If  $\gamma$  is a path in  $G_{r-1}$  with endpoints in  $G_{r-1} \cap H_r$  then  $f_{\#}(\gamma)$  is non-trivial.
- (3) If  $E$  is an edge in  $H_r$  then  $Tf(E)$  is an edge in  $H_r$ . In particular, every turn consisting of a direction of height  $r$  and one of height  $< r$  is legal.

By [BFH00, Theorem 5.1.5] every  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  has a relative train-track map representative which satisfies some useful conditions in addition to the ones we listed above.



**2.3. Weak topology.** Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(G)$  denote the compact space of equivalence classes of circuits and finite paths, rays and lines in a graph  $G$ , whose endpoints (if any) are vertices of  $G$ . For each finite path  $\gamma$  in  $G$ , we denote by  $\widehat{N}(G, \gamma)$  the set of all paths and circuits in  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(G)$  which have  $\gamma$  as its subpath. The collection of all such sets gives a basis for a topology on  $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(G)$  called *weak topology*. Let  $\mathcal{B}(G) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{B}}(G)$  be the compact subspace of all lines in  $G$  with the induced topology.

Two distinct points in  $\partial\mathbb{F}$  determine a *line*, up to reversing the direction. Let  $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{\partial\mathbb{F} \times \partial\mathbb{F} - \Delta\}/(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  be the set of pairs of boundary points of  $\mathbb{F}$  where  $\Delta$  is the diagonal and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  acts by interchanging factors. We can give the weak topology to  $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ , induced by the Cantor topology on  $\partial\mathbb{F}$ .

$\mathbb{F}$  acts on  $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$  and the quotient space  $\mathcal{B} = \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}/\mathbb{F}$  is compact but non-Hausdorff as such the topology is called *weak*. The quotient topology is also called the *weak topology*. For any marked graph  $G$ , there is a natural identification  $\mathcal{B} \approx \mathcal{B}(G)$ .

We call the elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  *lines* as well. A lift of a line  $\gamma \in \mathcal{B}$  is an element  $\widetilde{\gamma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$  that projects to  $\gamma$  under the quotient map and the two elements of  $\widetilde{\gamma}$  are called its endpoints.

A line (or a path)  $\gamma$  is said to be *weakly attracted* to a line (path)  $\beta$  under the action of  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ , if for some  $k$   $\phi^k(\gamma)$  converges to  $\beta$  in the weak topology, in other words, if any given finite subpath of  $\beta$  is contained in  $\phi^k(\gamma)$  for some  $k$ . Similarly if we have a homotopy equivalence  $f : G \rightarrow G$ , a line(path)  $\gamma$  is said to be *weakly attracted* to a line(path)  $\beta$  under the action of  $f_{\#}$  if  $f_{\#}^k(\gamma)$  weakly converges to  $\beta$ . the *accumulation set* of  $\gamma$  is the set of lines  $l \in \mathcal{B}(G)$  that are elements of the weak closure of a ray  $\gamma$  in  $G$ . This is the set of lines  $l$  such that every finite subpath of  $l$  occurs infinitely many times as a subpath  $\gamma$ . Similarly, the weak accumulation set of some point  $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{F}$  is the set of lines in the weak closure of any of the asymptotic rays in its equivalence class.

**2.4. Free factor systems and malnormal subgroup systems.** A finite collection of conjugacy classes  $\mathcal{K} = \{[K_1], [K_2], \dots, [K_s]\}$  of nontrivial, finite rank subgroups  $K_s < \mathbb{F}$  is called a *subgroup system*. A subgroup system is called *malnormal* if whenever  $K_s^x \cap K_t$  is nontrivial then  $s = t$  and  $x \in K_s$ , for any  $[K_s], [K_t] \in \mathcal{K}$ . Given two malnormal subgroup systems  $\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{K}'$  we define a partial ordering  $\sqsubset$  on the set of subgroup systems by  $\mathcal{K} \sqsubset \mathcal{K}'$  if for each conjugacy class of subgroup  $[K] \in \mathcal{K}$  there exists some conjugacy class of subgroup  $[K'] \in \mathcal{K}'$  such that  $K < K'$ .

Given a finite collection  $\{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_s\}$  of subgroups of  $\mathbb{F}$ , we say that this collection determines a *free factorization* of  $\mathbb{F}$  if  $\mathbb{F} = K_1 * K_2 * \dots * K_s$ . A *free factor system*  $\mathcal{F} := \{[F_1], [F_2], \dots, [F_p]\}$  of  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite collection of conjugacy classes of subgroups such that there is a free factorization of  $\mathbb{F}$  of the form  $\mathbb{F} = F_1 * F_2 * \dots * F_p * B$ , where  $B$  is some (possibly trivial) finite rank subgroup of  $\mathbb{F}$ . Every free factor system is a malnormal subgroup system.

A malnormal subgroup system  $\mathcal{K}$  *carries* a conjugacy class  $[c] \in \mathbb{F}$  if there exists some  $[K] \in \mathcal{K}$  such that  $c \in K$ . We say that  $\mathcal{K}$  carries a line  $\gamma$  if one of the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1)  $\gamma$  is the weak limit of a sequence of conjugacy classes carried by  $\mathcal{K}$ .

(2) There exists some  $[K] \in \mathcal{K}$  and a lift  $\tilde{\gamma}$  of  $\gamma$  so that the endpoints of  $\tilde{\gamma}$  are in  $\partial K$ .

For any marked graph  $G$  and any subgraph  $H \subset G$ , the fundamental groups of the noncontractible components of  $H$  form a free factor system, denoted by  $[\pi_1(H)]$ . Every free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  can be realized as  $[\pi_1(H)]$  for some nontrivial core subgraph  $H$  of some marked graph  $G$ . An equivalent way of saying that a line or circuit  $\gamma$  is carried by  $\mathcal{F}$  is that for any marked graph  $G$  and a subgraph  $H \subset G$  with  $[\pi_1(H)] = \mathcal{F}$ , the realization of  $\gamma$  in  $G$  is contained in  $H$ .

We have the following fact:

**Lemma 2.1.** [HM20, Fact 1.8] *Given a subgroup system  $\mathcal{K}$  the set of lines/circuits carried by  $\mathcal{K}$  is a closed set in the weak topology.*

As a consequence, given a malnormal subgroup system  $\mathcal{K}$  and a sequence of lines / circuits  $\{\gamma_n\}$ , if  $\mathcal{K}$  carries every weak limit of every subsequence of  $\{\gamma_n\}$ , then  $\gamma_n$  is carried by  $\mathcal{K}$  for all sufficiently large  $n$  ([HM20, Lemma 1.11]).

Given two free factor systems, an extension of the notion of “intersection” of subgroups, extended to free factor systems is called “meet” of free factors:

**Lemma 2.2** ([BFH00], Section 2.6). *Every collection  $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}$  of free factor systems has a well-defined meet  $\wedge\{\mathcal{F}_i\}$ , which is the unique maximal free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{F} \sqsubset \mathcal{F}_i$  for all  $i$ . Moreover, for any free factor  $F < \mathbb{F}$  we have  $[F] \in \wedge\{\mathcal{F}_i\}$  if and only if there exists an indexed collection of subgroups  $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$  such that  $[A_i] \in \mathcal{F}_i$  for each  $i$  and  $F = \bigcap_{i \in I} A_i$ .*

The free factor support  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(B)$  of a set of lines  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined as the meet of all free factor systems that carries  $B$  ([BFH00]). If  $B$  is a single line then  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(B)$  is single free factor. We say that a set of lines  $B$  is *filling* if  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(B) = [\mathbb{F}]$ .

**2.5. Attracting laminations and nonattracting subgroup systems:** For any marked graph  $G$ , there is a natural identification  $\mathcal{B} \approx \mathcal{B}(G)$  which induces a bijection between the closed subsets of  $\mathcal{B}(G)$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ . A *lamination*  $\Lambda$ , is a closed subset of any of these two sets. Given a lamination  $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{B}$  we look at the corresponding lamination in  $\mathcal{B}(G)$  as the realization of  $\Lambda$  in  $G$ . An element  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  is called a *leaf* of the lamination.

A lamination  $\Lambda$  is called an *attracting lamination* for  $\phi$  if it is the weak closure of a line  $\ell$  (called the *generic leaf* of  $\Lambda$ ) satisfying:

- $\ell$  is bi-recurrent leaf of  $\Lambda$ : every finite subpath of  $\ell$  occurs infinitely many times as subpath in both directions.
- There is a neighborhood  $V^+$  such that every line in  $V^+$  is weakly attracted to  $\ell$  in the weak topology.  $V^+$  is called an *attracting neighborhood* of  $\ell$ . (see [BFH00, Definition 3.1.1])
- no lift  $\tilde{\ell} \in \mathcal{B}$  of  $\ell$  is the axis of a generator of a rank 1 free factor of  $\mathbb{F}$ .

Attracting neighborhoods of  $\Lambda$  are defined by choosing sufficiently long segments of generic leaves of  $\Lambda$ . Note that if  $V^+$  is an attracting neighborhood, then  $\phi(V^+) \subset V^+$ .

Associated to each  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is a finite set  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  of laminations, called the set of *attracting laminations* of  $\phi$  ([BFH00]). Similarly we define the set of attracting laminations (or the set of *repelling laminations*)  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$  of  $\phi^{-1}$  (or of  $\phi$ ). Both  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  and  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$  are



$\phi$ -invariant ([BFH00, Lemma 3.1.13, Lemma 3.1.6]). Given a relative train-track map  $f : G \rightarrow G$  representing  $\phi$ , then there is a bijection between the set  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  and the set of exponentially growing strata in  $G$  which is determined by the height of a generic leaf of  $\Lambda^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  ([BFH00, Section 3]).

Free factor support of an element  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  or  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$  is the smallest free factor system that carries each leaf of  $\Lambda$ , denoted  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda)$  ([BFH00, Section 3.2]). Free factor support of  $\Lambda^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  is equal to free factor support of a generic leaf of  $\Lambda^+$  ([BFH00, Corollary 2.6.5, Corollary 3.1.11]). If  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  then  $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda_1) = \mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda_2)$  ([HM20, Fact 1.14]).

An element of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  is dual to an element of  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$  if these two elements have the same free factor support. This imposes a bijection between these two sets [BFH00, Lemma 3.2.4].

A line/circuit  $\gamma$  is said to be *weakly attracted* to  $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  if  $\gamma$  is weakly attracted to some (hence every) generic leaf of  $\Lambda$  under action of  $\phi$ . No leaf of any element of  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$  is ever attracted to any leaf of any element of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$ . No Nielsen path is weakly attracted to either an element of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  or an element of  $\mathcal{L}^-(\phi)$ .

An attracting lamination  $\Lambda^+$  and a repelling lamination  $\Lambda^-$  of  $\phi$  cannot have leaves which are asymptotic, for otherwise it would violate the fact that no leaf of  $\Lambda^-$  is weakly attracted to  $\Lambda^+$ . This allows us to choose sufficiently long subpaths of generic leaves of  $\Lambda^+, \Lambda^-$  and construct attracting and repelling neighborhoods  $V^+, V^-$  so that  $V^+ \cap V^- = \emptyset$ .

An element of  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  is said to be *topmost* if there does not exist any  $\Lambda_j \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  such that  $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_j$ .

Elements of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  can be divided into two distinct classes. If there exists a finite,  $\phi$ -invariant collection of distinct, nontrivial conjugacy classes  $\mathcal{C} = \{[c_1], [c_2], \dots, [c_s]\}$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda^+)$ , then  $\Lambda^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  is said to be *geometric* ([HM20, Definition 2.19]). It is said to be *nongeometric* otherwise.

The *nonattracting subgroup system* of an attracting lamination was first introduced by Bestvina-Feighn-Handel in [BFH00] and later explored in great details by Handel-Mosher in [HM20, Part III, pp-192-202]. Nonattracting subgroup system records the information about the lines and circuits which are not attracted to the lamination. We will list some of the properties which are central to our proofs.

**Lemma 2.3.** ([HM20]- Lemma 1.5, 1.6) *Let  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  and  $\Lambda^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi)$  be an attracting lamination such that  $\phi(\Lambda^+) = \Lambda^+$ . Then there exists a subgroup system  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$  such that:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$  is a malnormal subgroup system and the set of lines carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$  is closed in the weak topology.
- (2) A conjugacy class  $[c]$  is not attracted to  $\Lambda^+$  if and only if it is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$ .
- (3) If each conjugacy class of a finite rank subgroup  $B < \mathbb{F}$  is not weakly attracted to  $\Lambda_\phi^+$ , then there exists some  $A < \mathbb{F}$  such that  $B < A$  and  $[A] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_\phi^+)$ .
- (4) If  $\Lambda^-$  and  $\Lambda^+$  are dual to each other, we have  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+) = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^-)$ .
- (5)  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$  is a free factor system if and only if  $\Lambda^+$  is not geometric.

- (6) If  $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a sequence of lines such that every weak limit of every subsequence of  $\{\gamma_n\}$  is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$  then for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\{\gamma_n\}$  is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+)$ .

A pseudo-Anosov on a surface with non empty boundary induces a fully irreducible automorphism called *geometric* fully irreducible. Geometricity was relativized by Bestvina-Feighn Handel [BFH00] by extending it to so that it is a property of an EG stratum of a relative train track map. The definition of geometricity is expressed in terms of the existence of what we call a “geometric model” which in some sense associates a notion of geometricity (a geometric object given by a surface and an attached graph) to each stratum. (See [HM20] for details of constructions of geometric models.)

When  $\Lambda^+$  is geometric, the geometric model gives us the structure of the nonattracting subgroup system ([HM20, Definition 2.1, Lemma 2.5]). In particular, there is a unique closed indivisible Nielsen path  $\rho_r$  of height  $r$ . ([HM20, Fact 1.42])

The facts listed in ([HM20, Definition 2.1, Lemma 2.5]) show that when  $\Lambda^+$  is geometric,  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda^+) = \mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle c \rangle]\}$ , where  $[c]$  is the conjugacy class determined by  $\rho_r$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  is some free-factor system such that  $[\pi_1 G_{r-1}] \subset \mathcal{F}$ .

## 2.6. Completely split improved relative train track (CT) maps and rotationless outer automorphisms.

A *splitting* of a line, path or a circuit  $\alpha$  is a concatenation  $\dots \alpha_0 \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k \dots$  of subpaths of  $\alpha$  in  $G$  such that for all  $i \geq 1$ ,  $f_{\#}^i(\alpha) = \dots f_{\#}^i(\alpha_0) f_{\#}^i(\alpha_1) \dots f_{\#}^i(\alpha_k) \dots$  whenever  $f : G \rightarrow G$  is a relative train track map. The subpath  $\alpha_i$ ’s in a splitting are called *terms* or *components* of the splitting of  $\alpha$ . The notation  $\alpha \cdot \beta$  will denote a splitting and  $\alpha\beta$  will denote a concatenation of nontrivial paths  $\alpha, \beta$ .

A splitting  $\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_k$  of a non trivial path or circuit  $\alpha$  is a *complete splitting* if each component  $\alpha_i$  is either a single edge in an irreducible stratum, an indivisible Nielsen path, an exceptional path (see [FH11, Definition 4.1]) or a *taken* connecting path in a zero stratum (see [FH11, Definition 4.4]). A complete splitting of a finite path or a circuit in  $G$  is thus a very special kind of splitting which gives us excellent control when iterated under  $f_{\#}$ .

*Completely split improved relative train track (CT) maps* are topological representatives with particularly nice properties. In particular, for each edge  $E$  in each irreducible stratum, the path  $f_{\#}(E)$  is completely split. Moreover, for each taken connecting path  $\alpha$  in each zero stratum, the path  $f_{\#}(\alpha)$  is completely split. CT maps are guaranteed to exist for *rotationless* (see Definition 3.13 [FH11]) outer automorphisms, as has been shown in the following Theorem 4.28 from [FH11].

**Lemma 2.4.** *For each rotationless  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  and each increasing sequence  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\phi$ -invariant free factor systems, there exists a CT map  $f : G \rightarrow G$  that is a topological representative for  $\phi$  and  $f$  realizes  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

Feign-Handel [FH11] showed that there exists some  $k > 0$  such that, given any  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ ,  $\phi^k$  is rotationless. So given any outer automorphism  $\phi$ , some finite power of  $\phi$  has a completely split improved relative train track representative. In the body of our work,

we will use CT's defined in the work of Feighn-Handel in [FH11]. In particular, we will use the properties given in [HM20, Definition 1.29].

**2.7. Critical Constant.** Let  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  be rotationless, exponentially growing and  $f: G \rightarrow G$  be a CT map representing  $\phi$ . Below we will adapt a *bounded cancellation* notion coming from Bestvina-Feign-Handel's bounded cancellation lemma for train-track representatives of automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}$  ([BFH97]); which is inspired by Cooper's same named lemma ([Coo87]). To summarize, if we have a path in  $G$  which has some  $r$ -legal "central" subsegment of length greater than the critical constant given below, then this segment is protected by the bounded cancellation lemma and the length of this segment grows exponentially under iteration.

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $H_r$  be an exponentially growing stratum with associated Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue  $\lambda_r$  and let  $BCC(f)$  denote the bounded cancellation constant for  $f$ . Then, the number

$$\frac{2BCC(f)}{\lambda_r - 1}$$

is called the *critical constant* for  $H_r$ .

It is easy to see that for every number  $C > 0$  that exceeds the critical constant, there is some  $1 \geq \mu > 0$  such that if  $\alpha\beta\gamma$  is a concatenation of  $r$ -legal paths where  $\beta$  is some  $r$ -legal segment of length  $\geq C$ , then the  $r$ -legal leaf segment of  $f_{\#}^k(\alpha\beta\gamma)$  corresponding to  $\beta$  has length at least  $\mu\lambda^k|\beta|_{H_r}$  (see [BFH97, pp 219]). Here  $|\beta|_{H_r}$  is the length of an edge-path  $\beta \subset G$  is the number of the edges of  $\beta$  that remain only in  $H_r$ .

For the rest of this paper, let  $C$  be a number larger than the maximum of all critical constants corresponding to EG strata of  $G$ .

**2.8. Admissible subgroup systems and relative hyperbolicity.** Given a group  $G$  and a collection  $\{K_\alpha\}$  of subgroups  $K_\alpha < G$ , we obtain the *coned-off Cayley graph of  $G$*  or the *electrocuted  $G$*  relative to the collection  $\{K_\alpha\}$  by assigning a vertex  $v_\alpha$  for each  $K_\alpha$  on the Cayley graph of  $G$  such that each point of  $K_\alpha$  is joined to (or coned-off at)  $v_\alpha$  by an edge of length  $1/2$ . The resulting metric space is denoted by  $(\widehat{G}, |\cdot|_{el})$ .

A group  $G$  is said to be (weakly) relatively hyperbolic relative to the collection of subgroups  $\{K_\alpha\}$  if  $\widehat{G}$  is a  $\delta$ -hyperbolic metric space.  $G$  is said to be strongly hyperbolic relative to the collection  $\{K_\alpha\}$  if the coned-off space  $\widehat{G}$  is weakly hyperbolic relative to  $\{K_\alpha\}$  and it satisfies a certain *bounded coset penetration* property (see [Far98]). In this paper, when we say "relative hyperbolicity" we always mean "strong relative hyperbolicity".

Given  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ , let  $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p\}$  be a subgroup system and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^+(\phi)$  (respectively,  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^-(\phi)$ ) denote the collection of attracting (respectively, repelling) laminations of  $\phi$  whose generic leaves are not carried by  $\mathcal{K}$ . Assume,

- (1)  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^+(\phi), \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^-(\phi)$  are both nonempty,
- (2)  $\mathcal{K}$  is a malnormal subgroup system,
- (3)  $\phi(K_s) = K_s$  for each  $s \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ ,

- (4) Let  $V^+$  denote the union of attracting neighborhoods of elements of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^+(\phi)$  defined by generic leaf segments of length  $\geq 2C$ . Define  $V^-$  similarly for  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^-(\phi)$ . By increasing  $C$  if necessary,

$$V^+ \cap V^- = \emptyset$$

- (5) Every conjugacy class which is not carried by  $\mathcal{K}$  is weakly attracted to some element of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^+(\phi)$ .

We will call the subgroups system satisfying the properties above an *admissible subgroup system* for  $\phi$  (where  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is rotationless and exponentially growing). If we are given some finitely generated group  $Q = \langle \phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_k \rangle$  we say that  $\mathcal{K}$  is an *admissible subgroup system* for  $Q$  if  $\mathcal{K}$  is an admissible subgroup system for each  $\phi_i$ . We will simply write “admissible subgroup system” when the context is clear.

In our previous work, we proved,

**Theorem 2.6.** [GG23] *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of exponentially growing, rotationless outer automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  do not have a common power whenever  $i \neq j$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a subgroup system  $\mathcal{K} = \{[K_1], \dots, [K_p]\}$  which is admissible for each  $\phi_i$  and for which  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{\pm}(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^{\pm}(\phi_j) = \emptyset$  whenever  $i \neq j$ .*
- (2) *For every free group  $Q$  generated by sufficiently high powers of  $\phi_i$ ’s,  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic relative to a collection  $\{K_s \rtimes \widehat{Q}_s\}_{s=1}^p$  where  $\widehat{Q}_s$  is a lift of  $Q$  that fixes  $K_s$ .*

### 3. DETECTING OBSTRUCTIONS TO (RELATIVE) HYPERBOLICITY ON THE COMPLEX OF FREE FACTORS

**Why high powers?:** Throughout this paper we have worked with a subgroup  $Q$  which becomes a free group after taking high powers of outer automorphisms, which satisfy certain conditions. We wish to clarify the reasons for resorting to high powers. Firstly, there does not exist a good (for our purposes) hyperbolic metric space where hyperbolic outer automorphisms act loxodromically. The second necessity comes from a technicality, which we describe via the following example:

Let  $\phi$  be the outer automorphism class of the automorphism corresponding to  $\Phi: a \mapsto ad, b \mapsto a, c \mapsto b, d \mapsto c$  and let  $\psi$  be the outer automorphism class of the automorphism corresponding to  $\Psi: a \mapsto ac, b \mapsto a, c \mapsto b, d \mapsto db$ . Thus  $\phi, \psi$  are both atoroidal outer automorphisms and they have disjoint laminations since by design the free factor support of the attracting lamination of  $\psi$  is  $[\langle a, b, c \rangle]$  whereas  $\phi$  is fully irreducible, hence the associated lamination fills. These automorphisms are sufficiently different and have empty sinks.

If one looks at the extension group  $E_Q$  associated to the group  $Q = \langle \phi, \psi \rangle$ , then it is easily checked that the group has multiple copies of  $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $E_Q$  cannot be hyperbolic. Now consider  $H = \langle \Phi^{-1}\Psi, b, c \rangle$ . If  $E_Q$  were relatively hyperbolic, then  $H$  would be conjugate to some peripheral subgroup in this relatively hyperbolic structure. But a simple computation shows that  $\langle a, b, c, d \rangle < H$ , hence  $E_Q$  cannot be relatively hyperbolic either.

However, as we shall see later that if the group  $Q$ , whose generators are sufficiently different with empty corresponding sinks is generated instead by *sufficiently high powers* of  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  then its extension  $E_Q$  is hyperbolic –which is something one expects. This example highlights a tractable but key issue due to which we need to pass to high powers throughout this paper.

**3.1. Sufficiently different outer automorphisms and their dynamics on  $\mathcal{FF}$ .** In this section we will let our exponentially growing automorphisms to have fixed points, but require those fixed points to be sufficiently apart from each other in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . We begin our analysis on  $\mathcal{FF}$  and combine dynamics of automorphisms on  $\mathcal{FF}$  with the dynamics on the set of laminations via weak attraction theory.

A collection of outer automorphisms will be called *sufficiently different* if no pair of the automorphisms have a common power (hence not generating a virtually cyclic, in other words elementary subgroup of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ ) and if fixed vertices (if any) of these outer automorphisms on  $\mathcal{FF}$  are distance at least 2 from each other in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . Given that  $\mathcal{FF}$  has infinite diameter, it is natural to expect that two randomly chosen exponentially growing outer automorphisms will be sufficiently different. Hence, we study their dynamics in relation to one another.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless and exponentially growing outer automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}$  that are sufficiently different. Then,*

- (1) *No generic leaf of any attracting or repelling lamination of a  $\phi_i$  is carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of any attracting or repelling lamination of  $\phi_j$ , for  $i \neq j$ .*
- (2) *There exists some  $M$  such that whenever  $m_i \geq M$ , for all  $i$ ,  $\langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group.*

*Proof.* If no  $\phi_i$  fixes any vertex in the free factor complex, then they are all fully irreducible and the attracting and repelling laminations associated to them fill  $\mathbb{F}$ . The result then follows from an induction argument applied to [BFH97, Proposition 3.7].

Suppose that some  $\phi_i$  fixes some vertex in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . Let  $\Gamma_j^+$  be an attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ ,  $j \neq i$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Gamma_j^+)$  fills then we are done as in this case no generic leaf of  $\Gamma_j^+$  can be carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of any attracting or repelling lamination of  $\phi_i$ . Suppose then that  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Gamma_j^+)$  is proper and  $\Gamma_j^+$  is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^+)$  for some attracting lamination  $\Gamma_i^+$  of  $\phi_i$ . This would imply that  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Gamma_j^+)$  is carried by a free factor component  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^+)$ . This violates the distance requirement of being sufficiently different. So the result follows.

To prove (2), we claim that there exists an attracting (resp. repelling) lamination  $\Gamma_i^+$  (resp.  $\Gamma_i^-$ ) of  $\phi_i$  and an attracting (resp. repelling) lamination  $\Gamma_j^+$  (resp.  $\Gamma_j^-$ ) of  $\phi_j$  such that no generic leaf of  $\Gamma_i^+$  or  $\Gamma_i^-$  is asymptotic to any generic leaf of  $\Gamma_j^+$  or  $\Gamma_j^-$ . Assuming the claim to be true we are done by Corollary 2.17 [HM20] and applying induction to [BFH00, Lemma 3.4.2] (Detecting  $\mathbb{F}_2$  via laminations).

To prove the claim, suppose first that there exists some attracting lamination  $\Lambda$  of  $\phi_i$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda)$  is proper. If some generic leaf of  $\Lambda$  is asymptotic to some generic leaf of an attracting or repelling lamination of  $\phi_j$  then birecurrence of generic leaves implies that both ends of a leaf would have the same height, and as a result these lines would have the same free factor support. Hence,  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda)$  will be invariant under both  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$ , thus violating the distance requirement in  $\mathcal{FF}$  between their fixed vertices. So the claim is proved in the case of existence of any attracting or repelling lamination for either  $\phi_i$  or  $\phi_j$  with a proper free factor support. Suppose then neither  $\phi_i$  nor  $\phi_j$  have an attracting lamination with a proper free factor support. This implies that there exist unique attracting laminations  $\Gamma_i^+, \Gamma_j^+$  for  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  respectively that fill  $\mathbb{F}$ . The filling condition implies that  $\Gamma_i^+, \Gamma_j^+$  are necessarily topmost. If  $\Gamma_i^+, \Gamma_j^+$  have asymptotic generic leaves, say  $\ell_i, \ell_j$  respectively then  $\ell_i$  cannot be carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of  $\Gamma_j^+$ . Also, asymptoticity will imply that  $\ell_i$  cannot be weakly attracted to  $\Gamma_j^-$ . Hence by the weak attraction theorem ([BFH00, Theorem 6.0.1])  $\ell_i$  must be a generic leaf of  $\Gamma_j^+$ . But by being a generic leaf, closure of  $\ell_i$  is all of  $\Gamma_j^+$  (and it is also all of  $\Gamma_i^+$  by the nature of  $\ell_i$ ). Hence  $\Gamma_i^+ = \Gamma_j^+$ . As a result, in this case the following proposition completes the proof of our claim by giving us a contradiction with the hypothesis that no pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  have common power.  $\square$

Following is a technical result which identifies dynamical conditions for detecting when a subgroup of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is virtually cyclic.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless and exponentially growing automorphisms of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  for which following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1) *No pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  with  $i \neq j$  have a common invariant free factor.*
- (2) *There exists a common attracting lamination  $\Gamma^+$  such that  $\Gamma^+$  fills.*

*Then  $\phi_i$  are all fully irreducibles with common powers.*

*Proof.* We will prove the theorem for  $k = 2$  to avoid extra notation as the general case is the same. Consider the group  $\mathcal{H} = \langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ . Then  $\mathcal{H} < \text{Stab}(\Gamma^+)$ . If either  $\phi_1$  or  $\phi_2$  is fully irreducible, then  $\text{Stab}(\Gamma^+)$  is virtually cyclic by [BFH97, Theorem 2.14]. So  $\mathcal{H}$  must be virtually cyclic and hence  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are both fully irreducible and must have common powers.

Suppose then that both  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are reducible. Then the group  $\mathcal{H}$  is fully irreducible, since  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  do not have any common invariant free factor. By applying [HM20, Theorem C' page 2] with  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ , we see that there exists a fully irreducible  $\xi \in \mathcal{H} < \text{Stab}(\Gamma^+)$ . Let  $\Lambda_\xi^+, \Lambda_\xi^-$  be the unique attracting and repelling laminations of  $\xi$  and  $\ell^+$  be a generic leaf of  $\Lambda_\xi^+$ . Then  $\Lambda_\xi^+$  and  $\Lambda_\xi^-$  both fill  $\mathbb{F}$ . If  $\Gamma^+ = \Lambda_\xi^+$  or  $\Lambda_\xi^-$ , then we are reduced to the earlier case. So suppose  $\Gamma^+$  is distinct from  $\Lambda_\xi^+$  and  $\Lambda_\xi^-$ . Choose a train-track map  $f : G \rightarrow G$  for  $\xi$ . Let  $V_\xi^+$  be some attracting neighborhood of  $\Lambda_\xi^+$ , which is described by some sufficiently long generic leaf segment of  $\ell^+$ . Similarly choose a repelling neighborhood  $V_\xi^-$ . Now, by our assumption, if  $\gamma^+$  is a generic leaf of  $\Gamma^+$ , then  $\gamma^+$  fills, and it is not a generic leaf of  $\Lambda_\xi^-$ . Then by the weak attraction theorem Corollary 2.17 [HM20] together with [HM20,



Theorem G], there exists some  $k > 0$  such that  $f_{\#}^k(\gamma^+) \in V_{\xi}^+$ . Since  $\xi \in \text{Stab}(\Gamma^+)$  and  $f_{\#}^k(\gamma^+)$  is always birecurrent,  $f_{\#}^k(\gamma^+) \in \Gamma^+$  is a birecurrent leaf. Hence we conclude that some birecurrent leaf of  $\Gamma^+$  contains the subpath of  $\ell^+$  which described  $V_{\xi}^+$ . As  $\gamma^+$  was chosen to be generic leaf, we have  $\overline{\gamma^+} = \Gamma^+$ . Hence the chosen subpath of  $\ell^+$  is also a subpath of  $\gamma^+$ . Since this subpath was chosen arbitrarily, we deduce that  $\ell^+$  is in the closure of generic leaves of  $\Gamma^+$ , implying that  $\Lambda_{\xi}^+ \subset \Gamma^+$ .

Now consider the dual lamination  $\Gamma^-$  of  $\Gamma^+$ . Since  $\ell^+$  is a filling line, by the weak attraction theorem of [BFH00, Theorem 6.0.1] either  $\ell^+$  is weakly attracted to  $\Gamma^-$  or  $\ell^+$  is a generic leaf of  $\Gamma^+$ . Since being weakly attracted to a lamination is an open condition and every subpath of  $\ell^+$  is a subpath of some generic leaf of  $\Gamma^+$ , the first option is not possible. Hence  $\ell^+$  must be a generic leaf of  $\Gamma^+$ , implying that  $\Gamma^+ = \Lambda_{\xi}^+$ , which is a contradiction to our assumption that they are distinct. Therefore  $\Gamma^+ = \Lambda_{\xi}^+$  or  $\Gamma^+ = \Lambda_{\xi}^-$  and we are done by the first case.  $\square$

*Remark 3.3.* When  $\Lambda_1^{\pm}$  and  $\Lambda_2^{\pm}$  are both geometric and  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 3.1, it may seem that no additional restriction is placed on the conjugacy class representing the unique indivisible Nielsen path associated to the laminations. However, we shall see in Lemma 3.8 that the hypothesis that the fixed vertex sets of  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are of distance at least 2 in  $\mathcal{FF}$  puts some very strong restrictions on them.

**3.2. Cusp preserving relative hyperbolicity.** Given an exact sequence  $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow E_Q \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 1$ , with  $E_Q$  hyperbolic relative to a collection  $H_i$  of subgroups, we shall say that  $E_Q$  is hyperbolic relative to  $H_i$  *so that cusps are preserved*, if whenever  $H_i \cap \mathbb{F} \neq \{id\}$ , the action of  $E_Q$  on  $H_i \cap \mathbb{F}$  preserves the conjugacy class of  $H_i \cap \mathbb{F}$ .

Recall that an outer automorphism  $\phi$  is said to be *polynomially growing* if for each automorphism  $\Phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{F})$  representing  $\phi$  and each  $c \in \mathbb{F}$  the cyclically reduced word length of  $\phi^i(c)$  is bounded above by a polynomial of  $i$ . The *nonattracting sink*  $\mathcal{K}_{\phi}^*$  of  $\phi$  is a  $\phi$ -invariant malnormal subgroup system which carries all conjugacy classes which are either fixed or grow polynomially under iteration by  $\phi$ . Thus, by construction, the nonattracting sink is designed to trap obstructions to hyperbolicity properties of the extension groups.

A subgroup  $Q < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is called *upper polynomially growing (UPG)* if each  $\phi \in Q$  is polynomially growing and  $Q$  has unipotent image in  $GL_n(\mathbb{Z})$ . If  $Q < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is UPG we will call every  $\phi \in Q$  also UPG.

Recall that if  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  are attracting laminations for  $\phi$  with nonattracting subgroup systems  $\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{K}_2$  respectively, then we define  $\mathcal{K}_1 \bigwedge \mathcal{K}_2$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}_1 \bigwedge \mathcal{K}_2 = \{[A \cap B^w] : [A] \in \mathcal{K}_1, [B] \in \mathcal{K}_2, w \in \mathbb{F}, A \cap B^w \neq \{id\}\}$$

where  $B^w$  denotes the group  $w^{-1}Bw$ , with  $w \in \mathbb{F}$ .

**Definition 3.4.** (Sink of an automorphism)[GG23, Section 4.3] Given any exponentially growing outer automorphism  $\phi$  of  $\mathbb{F}$ , consider the full list of attracting laminations  $\{\Lambda_q\}_{q=1}^r$

and let

$$\mathcal{K}_\phi^* = \mathcal{K}_1 \bigwedge \mathcal{K}_2 \bigwedge \dots \bigwedge \mathcal{K}_r, \text{ where } \mathcal{K}_q = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_q) \text{ for } q = 1, \dots, r.$$

If  $\phi$  is not exponentially growing define  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^* = \{[\mathbb{F}]\}$ . We shall call  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  the *nonattracting sink* of  $\phi$ . We have,

**Lemma 3.5.** *Given an exponentially growing, rotationless  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  and its nonattracting sink  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$ , we have*

- (1) *The nonattracting sink of  $\phi$  is an admissible subgroup system for  $\phi$ .*
- (2) *A conjugacy class is carried by  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  if and only if it is not weakly attracted to any attracting lamination of  $\phi$ .*
- (3) *A conjugacy class is carried by  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  if and only if it is either fixed by  $\phi$  or grows polynomially under iteration by  $\phi$ .*
- (4)  *$\mathcal{K}_\phi^* = \mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle a_1 \rangle], \dots, [\langle a_p \rangle]]\}$ , for some free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$  where  $[a_i]$  is fixed by  $\phi$ .*
- (5) *If  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  has only infinite cyclic components, then no conjugacy class has nontrivial polynomial growth under iteration by  $\phi$ .*

*Proof.* (1) and (2) follows from [GG23, Corollary 4.13]. (3) follows from the fact that any conjugacy class grows exponentially under iteration by  $\phi$  if and only if it is weakly attracted to some attracting lamination of  $\phi$  under iteration.

(4) follows from the proof of part (1) of [GG23, Proposition 4.2].

To prove (5) note that if  $[w]$  is a conjugacy class that grows polynomially under iteration by  $\phi$ , then  $[w]$  must be carried by  $\mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^* = \mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle a_1 \rangle], \dots, [\langle a_p \rangle]]\}$ , for some free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $a_i \in \mathbb{F}$ . This implies that there must be a free factor component  $[F^1]$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  such that restriction of  $\phi$  to  $F^1$  is UPG with nonzero growth and hence rank of  $F^1$  must be  $\geq 2$ . This proves that if  $\mathcal{K}_\phi^*$  has only infinite cyclic components, then no conjugacy class can have polynomial growth.  $\square$

We now proceed with the following proposition which identifies a sufficient condition for a collection of outer automorphisms to not have a common admissible subgroup system.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing automorphisms so that no pair of elements have a common power. Let  $Q$  be any free group generated by some powers of  $\phi_i$ 's. Let  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  be the nonattracting sink of  $\phi_i$  and assume that the following conditions hold:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .
- (2) *If  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  is not carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^+)$  for any attracting lamination  $\Gamma_j^+$  of  $\phi_j$  for some  $j \neq i$ .*

*Then we have the following:*

- (a) *There is no admissible subgroup system for  $Q$ .*
- (b) *The extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is not hyperbolic relative to any collection of subgroups so that the cusps are preserved.*

*Proof.* Suppose that (1) and (2) hold. Without loss of generality assume that  $\mathcal{K}_1^* \neq \emptyset$ . Condition (2) implies that  $\mathcal{K}_1^*$  cannot be carried by any admissible subgroup system for  $\phi_j$ , for some  $j \neq 1$ . If  $\mathcal{K}$  were an admissible subgroup system for  $Q$ , then every conjugacy class not carried by  $\mathcal{K}$  would get weakly attracted to some element of  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{K}}^+(\phi_s)$  (hence would grow exponentially under iteration by  $\phi_s$ ), for each  $1 \leq s \leq k$ . Hence conclusion (a) holds.

Now suppose that  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic relative to some collection of peripheral subgroups. Let  $[g]$  be carried by  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$ . Then  $[g]$  is not weakly attracted to any attracting lamination of  $\phi_i$  and hence by definition either  $[g]$  is fixed by  $\phi_i$  or  $|\phi_i^n([g])|$  grows polynomially. So  $g$  must be conjugate to some element in a peripheral subgroup. As a consequence, the peripheral subgroup system in Theorem 2.6 is nonempty. Moreover, whenever  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  preserves cusps, the same theorem ensures the existence of an admissible subgroup system, contradicting conclusion (a) above. This completes proof of (b).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing and sufficiently different outer automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}$ . Then if some  $\phi_i$  fixes the conjugacy class of some rank 1 free factor  $[\langle g \rangle]$ , then  $[g]$  can not be carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of any attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ , for any  $j \neq i$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\phi_i$  fixes the conjugacy class of a rank 1 free factor  $[\langle g \rangle]$ . Let  $\Gamma_j^+$  be any attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ . If  $[g]$  is carried by  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^+)$ , then either  $[B] = [\langle g \rangle]$  or  $[B]$  is a free factor of rank  $\geq 2$ . Both of these conclusions violate that the distance between fixed vertices of  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$  is  $\geq 2$  in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In Proposition 3.6 we identified sufficient conditions for a collection of exponentially growing outer automorphisms to not have a common admissible subgroup system. In the following lemma, we have a hypothesis which negates that sufficient condition and examine the impact of our hypothesis on the nonattracting sinks for a collection of sufficiently different outer automorphisms. As it turns out, the nonattracting sinks in such cases will have a very rigid structure.

For an automorphism  $\phi$ , closed Nielsen paths are circuits which are in bijective correspondence with conjugacy classes which are fixed by  $\phi$ . There are three primary cases in our analysis where Nielsen paths appear. First one (and the most important for us) as an indivisible Nielsen path associated to a geometric EG strata. The second one is from the “twistor” in Dehn twist parts. The third case is when there is an isolated invariant rank 1 free factor, not covered by the previous two cases. All Nielsen paths are carried by the nonattracting sink. In case of absence of a free factor component in the nonattracting sink, which is essentially what the hypothesis of Lemma 3.8 ensures, the second and third cases of Nielsen paths are ruled out.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of sufficiently different rotationless, exponentially growing outer automorphisms of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  be the nonattracting sink of  $\phi_i$  for each  $i$  and suppose that the following condition holds:*

- (1) *If  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$  then for each  $j \neq i$ , there exists an attracting lamination  $\Gamma_j^+$  of  $\phi_j$  such that  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^+)$ .*

Then the following are true :

- a) If  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  has only infinite cyclic components.
- b) For each  $i$  with  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$ , we have  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \{[\langle g_{i_1} \rangle], [\langle g_{i_2} \rangle], \dots, [\langle g_{i_p} \rangle]\}$ , where each  $[g_{i_k}], k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  is the conjugacy class corresponding to the unique closed indivisible Nielsen path associated with some geometric lamination of  $\phi_i$ .
- c) No  $[g_{i_k}] \in \mathcal{K}_i^*$  can be carried by a free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^+)$ , when  $j \neq i$ .

*Proof.* By corollary 3.7, if  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\phi_i$  cannot fix a rank 1 free factor because of our hypothesis. Moreover,  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  does not have any free factor components due to our sufficiently different condition and our hypothesis (1). Nonattracting sink have the structure  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle a_1 \rangle], \dots, [\langle a_s \rangle]\}$  by Lemma 3.5. Since there are no free factor components in  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$ , we must have  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ . This proves (a).

To prove (b), we fix  $i$  and let  $[g_k] \in \mathcal{K}_i^*$ . We first note that  $g_k$  cannot be a power of any  $w \in \mathbb{F}$ , otherwise malnormality of  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  will be violated. Let  $f : G \rightarrow G$  be a CT map for  $\phi_i$  and  $H_r$  be any irreducible strata in  $G$ . Then by Lemma 3.5, since there are no linear edges,  $H_r$  is either exponentially growing or it is a superlinear NEG edge or a fixed (NEG) edge which is not a loop. In the case when  $H_r$  is a superlinear NEG edge  $E$ , we have  $f_\#(E) = E \cdot u$ , where  $u$  must be exponentially growing under iterates of  $f_\#$ . Thus if  $\sigma_k$  is the circuit in  $G$  representing  $[g_k]$  and has height  $r$ , then  $\sigma_k$  is a closed Nielsen path of height  $r$  which is not a power of some indivisible Nielsen path. Moreover,  $H_r$  is either a fixed (NEG) strata or an EG strata due to [HM20, Fact 1.43, page 47]. We claim that  $\sigma_k$  must be a closed *indivisible* Nielsen path. Suppose our claim is false and the Nielsen path is not indivisible. In this case by [HM20, Fact 1.39] there is a complete splitting  $\sigma_k = \dots \alpha \cdot \beta \cdot \gamma \dots$  of  $\sigma_k$  where each term of this complete splitting is either a fixed edge or an indivisible Nielsen path. Suppose  $\beta$  is an indivisible Nielsen path of maximum height, say  $s$ , in this complete splitting. Then  $H_s$  cannot be NEG, for otherwise by [HM20, item (8) of Definition 1.29] we would have a linear edge, which has been ruled out. If  $H_s$  is EG, then at least one of the endpoints of  $\beta$  (possibly both) is not in  $G_{s-1}$  by [HM20, Fact 1.42]. If the initial endpoint of  $\beta$  is not in  $G_{s-1}$ , then it forces  $\alpha$  to be an indivisible Nielsen path of height  $s$  (since no EG strata can have a fixed edge), contradicting the uniqueness of EG–Nielsen paths (see [FH11, Corollary 4.19]). Similar outcome occurs if the terminal endpoint of  $\beta$  is not in  $G_{s-1}$ . Therefore  $H_s$  cannot be EG. So no term in complete splitting of  $\sigma_k$  can be an indivisible Nielsen path. Hence we are left with the possibility that  $\sigma_k$  is an embedded circle obtained by concatenation of fixed edges (which are themselves not loops).

Suppose that  $\sigma_k$  is a Nielsen path obtained as a concatenation of fixed edges and  $E_p, E_q$  are two consecutive edges in the complete splitting of  $\sigma_k$ , of height  $p, q$  respectively. Since no rank 1 free factor is fixed by  $\phi_i$ ;  $E_p, E_q$  cannot be loops. Using [HM20, Definition 1.29, item (5)] we see that both endpoints of  $E_p$  (respectively  $E_q$ ) are in  $G_{p-1}$  (respectively  $G_{q-1}$ ). Having at least one common endpoint implies that  $p = q$  and  $E_p = E_q$ , giving us a contradiction. Therefore our claim that  $\sigma_k$  is a closed indivisible Nielsen path holds and as seen in the proof, if  $\sigma_k$  has height  $r$ , then  $H_r$  must be a geometric EG strata and  $\sigma_k$  is the unique indivisible Nielsen path of height  $r$ . This completes proof of (b).

If the free factor support of  $[g_k] \in \mathcal{K}_i^*$  is not proper, it cannot be carried by a free factor component of the nonattracting subgroup system of any attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ , for  $j \neq i$ . If  $[g_k]$  has a proper free factor support and  $[g_k]$  is carried by some free factor component  $[B]$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^+)$ , then  $[B]$  must carry the free factor support of  $[g_k]$ , which is invariant under  $\phi_i$  (see [HM20, item (3) of Lemma 2.5]). This violates the sufficiently different hypothesis. This completes proof of (c).  $\square$

Having identified the structure of the nonattracting sink for a sufficiently different collection of exponentially growing outer automorphisms, we proceed to answering the question about when we can expect extension groups to have a cusp-preserving relative hyperbolic structure. The answer breaks down into three cases. The first case that we deal with is the following proposition, when all the nonattracting sinks are nonempty. The remaining two cases when either all nonattracting are empty (Theorem 1.3) or the mixed case with some being empty (Theorem 5.1) are dealt with later.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of pairwise sufficiently different rotationless and exponentially growing outer automorphisms. If all the nonattracting sinks are nonempty, then exactly one of following conditions are true:*

- (1)  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  is a collection of fully irreducible geometric outer automorphisms, all of which are induced by some pseudo-Anosov homeomorphisms of the same compact surface with one boundary component.
- (2) Some pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$  does not have a common admissible subgroup system.

*Proof.* When (1) holds, the work of Bowditch [Bow07] and Mj-Reeves [MR08] for mapping classes of once punctured surfaces shows that sufficiently high powers of  $\phi_i$ 's generate a free group  $Q$  of rank  $k$  and the corresponding extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \hat{Q}$  is hyperbolic relative to the collection  $\{\langle \sigma \rangle \oplus \langle \phi_i \rangle\}$ , where  $\sigma$  is the conjugacy class corresponding to the boundary of the surface. This gives us a cusp-preserving relatively hyperbolic structure and an admissible subgroup system  $\{[\langle \sigma \rangle]\}$  for  $Q$ , implying that (2) fails.

Suppose that (1) is false. We argue by contradiction to show that (2) must be true. Without loss of generality, let  $\mathcal{K} = \{[K_1], \dots, [K_p]\}$  be a common admissible subgroup system for  $\phi_1, \phi_2$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}$  is a common admissible subgroup system, by Lemma 3.6, for each  $j \neq i$  the nonattracting sink  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  must be carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of some attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ . Hence  $\phi_i$ ,  $i = \{1, 2\}$  satisfy the conditions of Lemma 3.8. By this lemma,  $\mathcal{K}_1^* = \{[\langle g_1 \rangle], [\langle g_2 \rangle], \dots, [\langle g_p \rangle]\}$ , where each  $[g_i]$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$  is the conjugacy class corresponding to the unique closed indivisible Nielsen path associated with some geometric lamination of  $\phi_1$ .

Since  $[\langle g_1 \rangle] \in \mathcal{K}_1^*$  is carried by the nonattracting subgroup system of some element, say  $\Gamma_2$ , of  $\mathcal{L}^+(\phi_2)$ , using part (c) of Lemma 3.8 we know that no free factor component of such a nonattracting subgroup system can carry  $[g_1]$ . Since the nonattracting subgroup system of  $\Gamma_2^+$  has the structure  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle c \rangle]\}$ , for some free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{F}$  (see Lemma 2.3 and the preceding paragraph), the only available option therefore is that  $\Gamma_2^+$  is a geometric lamination and the unique indivisible Nielsen path associated to  $\Gamma_2^+$  is also

represented by  $[g_1]$ . But this would imply that  $\mathcal{K}_1^* = \{[\langle g_1 \rangle]\}$  and  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  both fix the free factor support of  $[\langle g_1 \rangle] (= [\langle c \rangle])$ .

If free factor support of  $[g_1]$  is proper, we violate the sufficiently different hypothesis. If free factor support of  $[g_1]$  is not proper, then the laminations  $\Gamma_1^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi_1), \Gamma_2^+ \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi_2)$  associated with  $[g_1]$  both fill. Hence  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}([g_1]) = \mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_1^+) = \mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_2^+) = \{\mathbb{F}\}$ . Using the geometric model of Handel and Mosher (Lemma 2.5, Proposition 2.15-item (4), Proposition 2.18 -item (5)) in [HM20, Part 1, Chapter 2] with  $[\partial_0 \mathcal{S}] = [g_1]$  we conclude that  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are both geometric fully irreducible automorphisms, which are induced by pseudo-Anosov homeomorphism of the same compact surface  $\mathcal{S}$  with one boundary component. Since  $\mathcal{K}$  is a common admissible subgroup system for every distinct pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ , our argument shows that all of the  $\phi_i$ 's are fully irreducible geometric outer automorphisms, induced by pseudo-Anosov homeomorphisms of the same surface with one boundary component; a contradiction. This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. SMALL DISPLACEMENT SETS, WEAK ATTRACTION THEORY AND FURTHER OBSTRUCTIONS TO (RELATIVE) HYPERBOLICITY

To further our analysis and suggested by the previous section, we will consider a *small displacement sets* in  $\mathcal{FF}$  for exponentially growing outer automorphisms. We will then investigate interactions between attracting/repelling laminations, their corresponding non-attracting subgroup systems and the small displacements sets.

##### 4.1. Small displacement sets of partial fully irreducibles.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $F$  be some free-factor of  $\mathbb{F}$  which is invariant under  $\psi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ . If the restriction of  $\psi$  to  $F$  is fully irreducible element of  $\text{Out}(F)$ , then we say that  $\psi$  is partial fully irreducible with respect to  $F$ .

Consider the isometric the action of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  on the free factor complex,  $\mathcal{FF}$ . For an automorphism  $\phi$  and constant  $C > 0$ , we define the *small displacement set* of  $\langle \phi \rangle$  on  $\mathcal{FF}$  to be,

$$\mathcal{S}_C = \{x \in \mathcal{FF} : \exists k \neq 0 \text{ such that } d(x, \phi^k(x)) \leq C\}$$

Below we will prove that a small displacement set of a partial fully irreducible outer automorphism has a diameter bounded from above. For that we will need a few definitions regarding  $\mathcal{FF}$ .

Given the free group  $\mathbb{F}$  on  $n$  letters, the associated *outer space* of the marked metric graphs which are homotopy equivalent to  $\mathbb{F}$  is introduced by Culler and Vogtmann in [CV86] as an analog of Teichmüller space. We will denote by  $CV$  the *projectivized* outer space, in which the graphs will all have total volume 1. A marked metric graph is an equivalence class of pair of a metric graph  $\Gamma$  and a marking, which is a homotopy equivalence with a rose. Outer space might be thought as an analogue to Teichmüller space for the mapping class group. For the details we refer the reader to [CV86] and [Vog02].

We will use the coarse projection  $\pi : CV \rightarrow FF$  defined as follows. For each proper subgraph  $\Gamma_0$  of a marked graph  $G$  that contains a circle, its image in  $\mathcal{FF}$  is the conjugacy



class of the smallest free factor containing  $\Gamma_0$ . Now by [BF14a], for two such proper subgraphs  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(\pi(\Gamma_1), \pi(\Gamma_2)) \leq 4$  (Lemma 3.1, [BF14a]). Then for  $G \in CV$  we define,

$$\pi(G) := \{\pi(\Gamma) \mid \Gamma \text{ is a proper, connected, noncontractible subgraph of } G\}$$

We will call the induced map  $CV \rightarrow \mathcal{FF}$  also  $\pi$  which is clearly a *coarse* projection in that the diameter of each  $\pi(G)$  is bounded by 4.

For a point  $G \in CV$  and  $A < \mathbb{F}$  we consider the core graph  $A|G$  corresponding to the conjugacy class of  $A$ . We will denote the projection of this core subgraph to  $\mathcal{FF}(A)$  by  $\pi_A(G)$ .

In other words,  $\pi_A(G) = \pi(A|G)$  where  $\pi : CV \rightarrow \mathcal{FF}$  is the coarse Lipschitz map that takes a graph to the collection of all the proper subgraphs it contains. The image of this projection is of diameter at most 4, by Bestvina-Feighn ([BF14a]). The pulled back metric via the immersion  $p : A|G \rightarrow G$  gives that  $A|G \in CV(A)$ , the outer space of  $A$ .

Let  $A$  and  $B$  be conjugacy classes of two free factors. Assume that  $A$  and  $B$  are not disjoint, in other words they are not free factors of a common free splitting of  $\mathbb{F}$  and one of them is not included in the other. In this case  $A$  and  $B$  said to *overlap*. For two overlapping conjugacy classes of free factors, we have the following definition.

**Definition 4.2.** ([BF14b, Tay14, Tay15]) Let  $A, B$  be two overlapping free factors with rank of  $A$  at least 2. Then the *subfactor projection*  $\pi_A(B)$  of  $B$  to  $A$  is defined to be,

$$\bigcup \{\pi_A(G) : G \in CV \text{ and } B|G \subset G\}$$

where  $B|G \subset G$  will mean embedding of the core graph  $B|G$  in  $G$ .

In other words, given any tree  $T$  with a vertex stabilizer  $B$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  action,  $A$  fixes a tree  $T^A$ . If  $T^A$  is not degenerate, which is guaranteed by overlapping condition, the induced action of  $A$  on  $T^A$  gives a set of vertex stabilizers; by the Bass–Serre theory.  $\pi_A(B)$  is defined to be this set of vertex stabilizers.

**Remark:** Any two rank 1 free factors of  $\mathbb{F}$  are either disjoint or equal. There is no possibility of overlap. Hence the definition of subfactor projections uses rank  $\geq 2$ .

**Lemma 4.3** (Bounded Geodesic Image Theorem [Tay14], [BF14b]). *For free group of rank  $n \geq 3$  there is a number  $M_0 \geq 0$  such that if  $A$  is a free factor and  $\gamma$  is a geodesic in  $\mathcal{FF}$  such that every vertex of  $\gamma$  meets  $A$ . Then*

$$\text{diam } \{\pi_A(\gamma)\} \leq M_0$$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\phi$  be partially fully irreducible automorphism with respect to a free factor  $F^1$  with minimum translation length  $\lambda$  on  $F^1$ . Then, whenever  $\lambda \geq M_0$  and for every  $C > 0$ , there exists a sufficiently large constant  $D = D(C, \lambda)$  such that the diameter of the small displacement set*

$$\mathcal{S}_{\phi, C} = \{x \in \mathcal{FF} : \exists k \neq 0 \text{ such that } d_{\mathcal{FF}}(x, \phi^k(x)) \leq C\}$$

*corresponding to  $\langle \phi \rangle$  is bounded above by  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in S_C$ . Then, by definition of this set, for some  $k > 0$  we have  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(x, \phi^k(x)) \leq C$ . Let also  $G \in CV$  such that  $\pi(G) = x$ . Now, let  $\{G_t\}$  be a folding path in  $CV$  between  $G$  and  $\phi^k(G)$ . The projection path  $\pi(\{G_t\})$  in  $\mathcal{FF}$  is an unparametrized quasi geodesic between  $x$  and  $\phi^k(x)$  and it is Hausdorff close to a geodesic ([BF14a]).

Now, since  $F^1$  is of rank at least 2, the subfactor projection to the free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}(F^1)$  is coarsely defined. Moreover, by the hypothesis (or for a suitable power  $> k$  of  $\phi$ ),  $d_{F^1}(\tilde{x}, \phi|_{F^1}^k(\tilde{x})) > M_0$  where  $\tilde{x}$  is the subfactor projection of  $x$  to  $F^1$  and  $M_0$  is the constant from the Lemma 4.3. By Lemma 4.3 again, there is a vertex  $F^2$  along  $\pi(\{G_t\})$  which does not project to  $\mathcal{FF}(F^1)$ . By [Tay14] this means that either  $F^1$  and  $F^2$  are disjoint or one is included in the other as subgroups. Hence we have  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(F^1, F^2) \leq 4$ .

Use triangle inequality to deduce that  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(x, F^1) \leq 4 + C + C_1$  where  $C_1$  is the Hausdorff distance between  $\pi(\{G_t\})$  and the geodesic between  $x$  and  $\phi^k(x)$ . Hence we have,  $D = 2(4 + C + C_1)$ .  $\square$

Following proposition captures the impact of the separation of small displacement sets of automorphisms  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$  on the weak attraction property of their corresponding lamination sets. We continue using the same notations we set up at the beginning of this subsection (see the paragraph before Proposition 5.3).

Thus, let  $S_\phi$  denote the small displacement set of  $\langle \phi \rangle$  in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . We define the distance between the small displacement sets of  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$  in  $\mathcal{FF}$  to be,

$$d_{\mathcal{FF}}(S_{\phi_i}, S_{\phi_j}) := \min\{d_{\mathcal{FF}}([A], [B]) : A \in S_{\phi_i}, B \in S_{\phi_j}\}$$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\phi_i$  be rotationless and partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F^i$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Assume  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(S_{\phi_i}, S_{\phi_j}) \geq 5$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Then:*

- (1) *There exists some  $M$  such that whenever  $m_i \geq M$ , for all  $i$ ,  $\langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group.*
- (2) *For  $i \neq j$ ,  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$  do not have any common invariant free factors.*
- (3) *For all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , let  $\Gamma_i^+$  be any attracting lamination of  $\phi_i$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  be nontrivial. For a pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , let  $\{[A_k^i]\}_{k=1}^p = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  and  $\{[B_s^j]\}_{s=1}^q = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$ . Then,  $\{[A_k^i \cap B_s^j]\}_{k,s}$  is a malnormal subgroup system.*
- (4) *No generic leaf of any attracting or repelling lamination of a  $\phi_i$  is carried by a nonattracting subgroup system for any dual lamination pair of  $\phi_j$ , for  $j \neq i$ .*
- (5) *If  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  is a nontrivial free factor component, then there exists  $j \neq i$  and a conjugacy class carried by  $[B]$  which is weakly attracted to  $\Lambda_j^+$  under the action of  $\phi_j$ .*
- (6) *Given any attracting lamination  $\Gamma_i^+$  of  $\phi_i$  and some nontrivial free factor component  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$ , with  $j \neq i$ , there exists some conjugacy class  $[g]$  carried by  $[B]$  such that  $[g]$  is weakly attracted to  $\Gamma_i^+$  under the action of  $\phi_i$ .*

- (7) Given any attracting lamination  $\Gamma_i^+$  of  $\phi_i$ , if the corresponding nonattracting subgroup system  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  contains a rank 1 free factor component  $[\langle g \rangle]$ , then  $[g]$  is weakly attracted to every attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ , for all  $j \neq i$ .

*Proof.* (1) is straightforward using Corollary 3.1.

Any invariant free factor of  $\phi_i$  is contained in the respective small displacement set. When the respective small displacement sets are disjoint, the distance between any invariant free factor of  $\phi_i$  and any invariant free factor of  $\phi_j$  is greater than 0. Hence we cannot have a common invariant free factor. This proves (2).

Every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  is a vertex in the small displacement set of  $\phi_i$ . When the small displacement sets are of distance at least 5, every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_i^\pm)$  of rank  $\geq 2$  meets every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$  of rank  $\geq 2$ . Malnormality of the collection of subgroups  $\{[A_k^i \cap B_s^j]\}_{k,s}$  follows directly from the malnormality of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ , for all  $i$ . This proves (3).

Let  $\Gamma_j^+$  be any attracting lamination for  $\phi_j$  with nontrivial nonattracting subgroup system  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$ . By definition every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$  is invariant under  $\phi_j$ . Hence every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$  is an element of the small displacement set of  $\phi_j$ . Let  $\ell$  be a generic leaf of some attracting lamination  $\Gamma_i^+$ ,  $i \neq j$  and let  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Gamma_j^\pm)$  be some free factor component of rank  $\geq 2$ . Assume  $\ell$  is carried by  $[B]$ . Then  $\Gamma_i^+$  is carried by  $[B]$  which implies that  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+) < [B]$ , since  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+)$  is the smallest free factor system that contains  $\Gamma_i^+$ . But  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+)$  is invariant under  $\phi_i$  and hence  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+) \in \mathcal{S}_{\phi_i}$  which violates  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(\mathcal{S}_{\phi_i}, \mathcal{S}_{\phi_j}) \geq 5$  when  $i \neq j$ . This completes the proof of (4).

Let  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  with  $i \neq j$  be fixed. If every conjugacy class carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  is also carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$ , by the minimality of the nonattracting subgroup system (see Proposition 1.4 - pp 198, Lemma 3.1 - pp 104 of [HM20]), each component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  is carried by some component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ . If  $[B]$  is a nontrivial free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  such that every conjugacy class carried by  $[B]$  is also carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ , then distance between the corresponding small displacement sets is  $\leq 1$ , violating our hypothesis. Therefore, for every nontrivial free factor component  $[B] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$ , there exists a conjugacy class carried by  $[B]$  but not carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ . This concludes proof of (5).

Proof of (6) is similar to proof of (5).

If  $[\langle g \rangle] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  is conjugacy class of some rank 1 free factor, then part (6) implies that  $[g]$  is weakly attracted to every attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$  under the action of  $\phi_j$ . This completes proof of (7).  $\square$

Following corollary produces examples similar to Example 6.2 when the small displacement sets are sufficiently separated.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\phi_i$  be rotationless and partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F^i$  and assume  $d_{\mathcal{FF}}(\mathcal{S}_{\phi_i}, \mathcal{S}_{\phi_j}) \geq 2$  for all  $j \neq i$ . Suppose that some  $\phi_i$  fixes a rank 1 free factor*

$[g]$ . Then  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is not hyperbolic relative to any collection of subgroups so that cusps are preserved.

*Proof.* We note that  $[g]$  is carried by  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$ . Corollary 3.7 tells us that  $[g]$  is weakly attracted to every attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$ ,  $j \neq i$ . Proposition 3.6 now completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5. GEOMETRY OF FREE BY FREE EXTENSIONS

**5.1. Hyperbolicity of the extension from atoroidal automorphisms.** Now we are ready to characterize hyperbolicity of the extension group when automorphisms are atoroidal (hyperbolic).

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing outer automorphisms such that no pair of automorphisms have a common power. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) Each  $\phi_i$  is atoroidal (hyperbolic) outer automorphism and  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq j$ .
- (2) There exists  $M > 0$  such that for all  $m_i \geq M$ ,  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group and the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic (where  $\widehat{Q}$  is any lift of  $Q$ ).

*Proof.* We prove the result for  $k = 2$  for the sake of simplicity of the notation. General case is an exact replica of the argument.

(1) $\implies$ (2) : Since  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are both hyperbolic, by [Gho20, Lemma 3.1] every conjugacy class grows exponentially under iteration by both of them. So  $\mathcal{K}_1^* = \mathcal{K}_2^* = \emptyset$ . We will use Theorem 2.6 for  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_1^* = \mathcal{K}_2^* = \emptyset$  (there is no restriction on  $\mathcal{K}$  being nonempty in that theorem). To this end, all that remains is to show that the set of laminations are pairwise disjoint. Let  $f : G \rightarrow G$  be a CT-map representing  $\phi_1$ . If a generic leaf  $\ell_1 \in \Lambda_1^+ \in \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_1)$  has a common end with a generic leaf  $\ell_2 \in \Lambda_2^+ \in \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_2)$ , then birecurrence implies that both ends of  $\ell_i$  have height  $s$ , where  $H_s$  is the exponentially growing strata corresponding to  $\Lambda_1^+$  and  $\ell_1, \ell_2 \subset G_s$ . Since  $\ell_2$  is asymptotic to  $\ell_1$  and being weakly attracted to the dual lamination  $\Lambda_1^-$  is an open condition,  $\ell_2$  cannot be weakly attracted to  $\Lambda_1^-$  under iteration by  $\phi_1^{-1}$ . Using [BFH00, Proposition 6.0.8], we get that  $\ell_2$  is a generic leaf of  $\Lambda_1^+$ . Hence  $\Lambda_1^+ = \overline{\ell}_2 = \Lambda_2^+$ , violating our hypothesis. Hence (2) follows from Theorem 2.6 as  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic relative to empty sets by this theorem.

(2) $\implies$ (1) : Hyperbolicity of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  implies that the Cannon-Thurston map for the inclusion  $\iota : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  exists. Since  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  do not have a common power,  $\phi_1^\infty, \phi_2^\infty$  represent two distinct points in the boundary of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  corresponding the forward end of the axis generated by the elements  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  respectively. Using [Mit97, Proposition 5.1], we see that the ending lamination sets of corresponding to  $\phi_1^\infty$  and  $\phi_2^\infty$  must be disjoint. Since [Gho20, Theorem 3.1, Lemma 4.4] guarantees that generic leaves of all attracting laminations for  $\phi_i$  is contained in the ending lamination set corresponding to  $\phi_i^\infty$  and we know that the ending lamination set corresponding to any boundary point is a closed set, we get

that  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  have no common attracting lamination. Similar arguments, while working with pairs of distinct boundary points  $\{\phi_1^\infty, \phi_2^{-\infty}\}, \{\phi_1^{-\infty}, \phi_2^\infty\}, \{\phi_1^{-\infty}, \phi_2^\infty\}$ , gives us  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_1) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_2) = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

A simple application of Theorem 2.6 given below demonstrates a very easy way to construct free-by-free hyperbolic groups. Note that we neither need the automorphisms to be fully irreducible, nor do we need quasi-isometrically embedded orbits for the quotient group for the hypothesis. We point out to the reader that the converse to the corollary is obviously false.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of atoroidal (equivalently, hyperbolic) elements which do not have a common power. If no pair  $\phi_i, \phi_j$ ,  $i \neq j$  fixes a common vertex in the free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$ , then

- (1) There exists  $M > 0$  such that for all  $m_i \geq M$ , the group  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group,
- (2) the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is a hyperbolic group (where  $\widehat{Q}$  is any lift of  $Q$ ).

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda^+ \in \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j)$  be an attracting lamination for some  $i, \neq j$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda)$  is proper, then  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  both fix the vertex corresponding to  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Lambda)$ , giving us a contradiction. If  $\Lambda$  fills  $\mathbb{F}$ , then Proposition 3.2 gives us a contradiction. Hence  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j) = \emptyset$  and the conclusions follow from Theorem 1.1.  $\square$

**5.2. Hyperbolicity and relative hyperbolicity from sufficiently different automorphisms.** In this section we will focus more on the action on  $\mathcal{FF}$  of our outer automorphisms; fixing some free factors.

**Theorem 1.3.** Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of rotationless, exponentially growing and sufficiently different outer automorphisms. Let  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  be a free group for sufficiently large  $m_i$ .

Then,  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes Q$  is a hyperbolic group if and only if  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \emptyset$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \emptyset$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . If none of the  $\phi_i$  fixes a vertex in  $\mathcal{FF}$ , then they are all fully irreducibles which do not have a common power, and we are done by [BFH97, Theorem 5.2]. Suppose some  $\phi_i$  fixes a vertex in  $\mathcal{FF}$  and  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \emptyset$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . To apply Theorem 1.1 it is enough to show that  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_i) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi_j) = \emptyset$  for all  $j \neq i$ .

Since  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  is trivial every conjugacy class in  $\mathbb{F}$  is weakly attracted to some attracting lamination of  $\phi_i$ . Hence  $\phi_i$  is hyperbolic (atoroidal) outer automorphism for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

**Case 1:** Let  $\Gamma_i^+$  be an attracting lamination of  $\phi_i$  such that  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+)$  is a proper free factor. Let  $j \neq i$ . If  $\phi_j$  is fully irreducible, then  $\Gamma_i^+$  cannot be an attracting or repelling lamination of  $\phi_j$  since  $\phi_j$  has unique attracting and repelling laminations which fill. If  $\phi_j$  is reducible, then  $\Gamma_i^+$  cannot be an attracting or repelling lamination of  $\phi_j$  for otherwise  $\mathcal{F}_{supp}(\Gamma_i^+)$  would be a common invariant free factor and this contradicts the fact that any vertex fixed by  $\phi_i$  is distance at least 2 from any vertex fixed by  $\phi_j$ .

**Case 2:** Suppose that  $\Gamma_i^+$  fills. Pick some  $j \neq i$ . Then  $\Gamma_i^+$  is not an attracting lamination of  $\phi_j$  for otherwise hypotheses of Proposition 3.2 are satisfied, which contradicts with the

fact that  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  do not have a common power. Same contradiction occurs if  $\Gamma_i^+$  is a repelling lamination of  $\phi_j$  by replacing  $\phi_j$  with  $\phi_j^{-1}$  in Proposition 3.2. Therefore  $\phi_i$  and  $\phi_j$  do not have any common attracting or repelling laminations. Now apply Theorem 1.1 to get hyperbolicity of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$ .

The converse part easily follows from the observation that hyperbolicity of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  implies  $\phi_i, \phi_j$  are both hyperbolic outer automorphisms for all  $i \neq j, i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and using [Gho20, Lemma 3.1]. □

The following theorem gives a necessary and sufficient condition for  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  to have a cusp preserving relative hyperbolic structure when  $Q$  is generated by a collection of sufficiently different outer automorphisms. One should read the following result as a relative hyperbolic analogue of Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $\{\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k\}$  be a collection of rotationless, pairwise sufficiently different and exponentially growing outer automorphisms. Let  $\mathcal{K}_i^*$  be the nonattracting sink of  $\phi_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and assume that  $\mathcal{K}_j^* \neq \emptyset$  for some fixed  $j$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  has a cusp preserving relatively hyperbolic structure where  $Q$  is a free group generated by sufficiently large exponents of  $\phi_i$ 's.
- (2)  $\mathcal{K}_i^* = \mathcal{K}_j^*$  for all  $i$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 3.1 ensures high enough  $m_i$ 's so that  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group. If (2) holds, then (1) immediately follows from Theorem 2.6.

Suppose next that for a free group  $Q$  generated by sufficiently large exponents of  $\phi_i$ 's,  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  has a relatively hyperbolic structure where cusps are preserved. By Proposition 3.6  $\mathcal{K}_j^*$  must be carried by nonattracting subgroup system of some  $\Lambda_i \in \mathcal{L}^+(\phi_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $i \neq j$ . Conclusion (a) of Lemma 3.8 tells us that  $\mathcal{K}_j^*$  does not contain any free factor component. Applying Lemma 3.8 item (b), we deduce that  $\mathcal{K}_j^* = \{[\langle c_1 \rangle], [\langle c_2 \rangle], \dots, [\langle c_p \rangle]]\}$ . Moreover, by conclusion (c) of the same lemma, the conjugacy class of any  $c_\ell$ ,  $1 \leq \ell \leq p$  cannot be carried by a free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i)$ . Hence conjugacy class of each  $c_\ell$  must be fixed by  $\phi_i$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . By Theorem 2.6, we know that an admissible subgroup system for  $Q$  exists because we have a relatively hyperbolic structure that preserves cusps. Proposition 3.9 leads to the conclusion that each  $\phi_i$  is fully irreducible, geometric and all  $\phi_i$  induced by a pseudo-Anosov homomorphism on the same compact surface with one boundary component. Hence  $\mathcal{K}_j^* = \mathcal{K}_i^*$  for all  $i$ . This completes the proof. □

**5.3. Relatively hyperbolic extensions using partially fully irreducibles.** In this section we will give examples of relatively hyperbolic extensions using specific types of exponentially growing outer automorphisms. Our first example is for an exponentially growing outer automorphism which is *partially* fully irreducible.



Let  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_k$  be a collection of partially fully irreducibles, each with respect to a free factor  $F^i$  with  $[F^i] \neq [F^j]$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . We denote the corresponding dual attracting and repelling lamination pair of each  $\phi_i$  by  $\Lambda_i^+$  and  $\Lambda_i^-$ . By partial fully irreducibility we have  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Lambda_i^\pm) = [F^i]$ . We use these conventions below.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $\phi_i$  be rotationless and partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F^i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Then  $\Lambda_i^\pm$  and  $\Lambda_j^\pm$  have asymptotic leaves if and only if  $[F^i] = [F^j]$ .*

*Proof.* Since the restriction of  $\phi_i$  to  $[F^i]$  is fully irreducible, every leaf of  $\Lambda_i^+$  and of  $\Lambda_i^-$  is generic. If  $\ell_i \in \Lambda_i^+$  and  $\ell_j \in \Lambda_j^+$  have a common end, birecurrence of generic leaves implies that  $\ell_i$  is carried by  $[F^j] = \mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Lambda_j^+)$ . But since  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\Lambda_i^+) = \mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\ell_i) = [F^i]$ , we must have  $[F^i] = [F^j]$ . Converse direction is obvious.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\phi_i$  be rotationless and partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F^i$ , where  $[F^i] \neq [F^j]$  whenever  $i \neq j$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Then,*

- (1) *For all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $[F^i]$  and free factor components of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  are close in the free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$ .*
- (2) *For  $i \neq j$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  carries a leaf of  $\Lambda_j^+$  if and only if  $[F^j]$  is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ . Equivalently,  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  carries a leaf of  $\Lambda_j^+$  if and only if  $[F^j]$  is distance  $\leq 1$  from some free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ .*
- (3) *If  $[F^i]$  is at distance at least 2 from every free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$ , then any generic leaf of  $\Lambda_i^+$  is weakly attracted to  $\Lambda_j^+$  under the action of  $\phi_i$  ( $\phi_i^{-1}$ ), for all  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $i \neq j$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $i$ . To prove (1), we show that any representative of  $[F^i]$  and any representative of any free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  intersect at identity only. If they are not, there is some nontrivial conjugacy class  $[g]$  of  $F^i$  which is carried also by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ . Since  $\phi_i$  restricted to  $F^i$  is fully-irreducible, this implies that  $\Lambda_i^+$  must be geometric and  $[g]$  must be a representative of the unique closed indivisible Nielsen path corresponding to  $\Lambda_i^+$ . But this implies that  $[g]$  cannot be a free factor of  $\mathbb{F}$  and hence cannot be carried by any free factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$ . The contradiction proves our claim.

Since the restriction of each  $\phi_i$  to  $F^i$  is fully irreducible, every leaf of  $\Lambda_i^+$  is generic and hence not a circuit. If  $\ell \in \Lambda_i^+$  is any leaf which is carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$ ,  $i \neq j$ , malnormality of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  implies that there must be some free factor conjugacy class  $[H] \in \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  which carries  $\Lambda_i^+$  (since the set of lines carried by  $[H]$  is closed and  $\bar{\ell} = \Lambda_i^+$ ). By definition of free factor support we then get  $F^i \leq H$  up to conjugation, which is equivalent to saying that the distance between  $[F^i]$  and  $[H]$  in the free factor complex of  $\mathbb{F}$  is  $\leq 1$ . The converse follows directly from definitions.

The proof of (3) is exactly the same as the proof of [Gho23, Lemma 5.2] (the cited proof does not anywhere use the atoroidal / hyperbolicity assumptions on the automorphisms) or one can see [HM20, Remark 2.8, page 208].  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\psi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F$ . Then there exists a  $\psi$ -invariant, malnormal subgroup system  $\mathcal{K} = \{[K_1], \dots, [K_p]\}$  such that the extension*

group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \langle \psi \rangle$  is strongly hyperbolic relative to the collection of subgroups  $\{K_s \rtimes_{\Psi_s} \mathbb{Z}\}_{s=1}^p$ , where  $\Psi_s$  is a chosen lift of  $\phi$  such that  $\Psi_s(K_s) = K_s$ .

*Proof.* If  $\psi$  is partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F$ , then restriction of  $\psi$  to  $F$  is fully irreducible and hence there exists an attracting lamination  $\Lambda^+$  supported by  $[F]$ .

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be the nonattracting subgroup system associated to  $\Lambda^+$ . Now apply main result of [Gho23] with  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $\psi$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $\phi_i$  be rotationless and partially fully irreducible with respect to  $F^i$ , and  $[F^i] \neq [F^j]$ ,  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Suppose that  $[F^i]$  is distance  $\geq 2$  from every free-factor component of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$  and  $i \neq j$ ; if such free factor components exist. Then there exists  $M > 0$  such that for every  $m_i \geq M$ ,  $Q = \langle \phi_1^{m_1}, \dots, \phi_k^{m_k} \rangle$  is a free group of rank  $k$ .*

*Moreover, if  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_2^\pm) = \dots = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_k^\pm)$ , then for any lift  $\widehat{Q}$  of  $Q$ ,  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is relatively hyperbolic group.*

*Proof.* Lemma 5.2 tells us that  $\Lambda_i^\pm$  and  $\Lambda_j^\pm$  do not have any asymptotic leaves. This implies that we can choose long generic-leaf segments of  $\Lambda_i^+$  and  $\Lambda_i^-$  and construct attracting and repelling neighbourhoods  $V_i^+$  and  $V_i^-$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, k$  so that  $V_i^+, V_i^-, V_j^+, V_j^-$  are pairwise disjoint for  $i \neq j$ .

Since generic leaves of  $\Lambda_i^+$  are not carried by  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_j^\pm)$  for  $i \neq j$ , by Proposition 5.3 generic leaves of  $\Lambda_i^+$  are weakly attracted to  $\Lambda_j^+$  (resp. to  $\Lambda_j^-$ ) under the action of  $\phi_j$  (resp. of  $\phi_j^{-1}$ ).

The conclusion about  $Q$  being free group now follows directly using [BFH00, Lemma 3.4.2, page 551]. For the relative hyperbolicity of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$ , let  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm)$  and apply of Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

Note that the above theorem still remains true if we relax the requirement of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_2^\pm) = \dots = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_k^\pm)$  and replace it by the requirement of  $Q$  having an admissible subgroup system.

**5.4. Relatively hyperbolic extensions using relative fully irreducibles.** Given a collection of free factors  $F^1, F^2, \dots, F^p$  of  $\mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathbb{F} = F^1 * F^2 * \dots * F^p * B$  with  $B$  possibly trivial, we say that the collection forms a *free factor system*, written as  $\mathcal{F} := \{[F^1], [F^2], \dots, [F^p]\}$  and we say that a conjugacy class  $[c]$  of a word  $c \in \mathbb{F}$  is carried by  $\mathcal{F}$  if there exists some  $1 \leq s \leq p$  and a representative  $H^s$  of  $F^s$  such that  $c \in H^s$ .

**Definition 5.6.** We say that an automorphism  $\phi \in \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is *fully irreducible relative to* a free factor system  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\phi$ -invariant and there is no proper  $\phi$ -invariant free factor system  $\mathcal{F}'$  such that  $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}'$ .

Relative fully irreducibles were developed by Handel and Mosher ([HM20]) to find a better analog of Ivanov's theorem on subgroups of mapping class groups of a surface so that the analogous theorem for subgroups of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  works “inductively” on free factors that are fixed and that the behavior of the automorphism in between free factors is better

understood. Below we will describe how subgroups made of relative fully irreducibles give us easy ways to construct relatively hyperbolic extensions, under some mild restrictions on the generators.

Let  $\mathcal{F} \sqsubset \mathcal{F}'$  be free factor systems, where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a proper free factor system. If there exists a marked graph  $G$  and realizations  $H \subset H' \subset G$  of these free factor systems such that  $H' \setminus H$  is a single edge, then  $\mathcal{F}'$  is said to be an one-edge extension of  $\mathcal{F}$ . If no such realization exist, then  $\mathcal{F}'$  is said to be a *multi-edge extension* of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

We record the following lemma which follows from various nontrivial results in [HM20] and use the conclusion as our working definition of relative fully irreducible outer automorphism.

**Lemma 5.7.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{F} \sqsubset \{[\mathbb{F}]\}$  is a multi-edge extension invariant under  $\phi$  and every component of  $\mathcal{F}$  is  $\phi$ -invariant. If  $\phi$  is fully irreducible rel  $\mathcal{F}$  then there exists  $\phi$ -invariant dual lamination pair  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm$  such that the following hold:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{supp}}(\mathcal{F}, \Lambda^\pm) = [\mathbb{F}]$ .
- (2) If  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm$  is nongeometric then  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_\phi^\pm) = \mathcal{F}$ .
- (3) If  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm$  is geometric then there exists a root free  $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_\phi^\pm) = \mathcal{F} \cup \{[\langle \sigma \rangle]\}$ .

Conversely, if there exists a  $\phi$ -invariant dual lamination pair such that if (1) and (2) hold or if (1) and (3) hold then  $\phi$  is fully irreducible rel  $\mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f : G \rightarrow G$  be an improved relative train track map representing  $\phi$  and  $G_{r-1}$  be the filtration element realizing  $\mathcal{F}$ . Apply [HM20, Proposition 2.2] to get all the conclusions for some iterate  $\phi^k$  of  $\phi$ .

We claim that  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm$  obtained by applying [HM20, Proposition 2.2] must be  $\phi$ -invariant. Otherwise, by the definition of being fully irreducible relative to  $\mathcal{F}$   $\phi(\Lambda_\phi^+)$  will be an attracting lamination which is properly contained in  $G_{r-1}$  and hence is carried by  $\mathcal{F}$  which in turn is carried by the nonattracting subgroup system for  $\Lambda_\phi^+$ . This is a contradiction, hence  $\Lambda_\phi^+$  is  $\phi$ -invariant. Similar arguments work for  $\Lambda_\phi^-$ .

The converse part follows from the case analysis in the proof of [HM20, Theorem I, pages 18-19].  $\square$

**Theorem 5.8.** *Let  $\phi, \psi$  be fully-irreducible relative to multi-edge extension  $\mathcal{F}$ , with corresponding invariant lamination pairs  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm, \Lambda_\psi^\pm$  (as in the equivalence condition 5.7). If no leaf of  $\Lambda_\phi^+ \cup \Lambda_\phi^-$  is asymptotic to any leaf of  $\Lambda_\psi^+ \cup \Lambda_\psi^-$ , then there exists an integer  $M \geq 1$  such that*

- (1)  $Q = \langle \phi^m, \psi^n \rangle$  is free group of rank 2 for all  $m, n \geq M$ .
- (2) If  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm, \Lambda_\psi^\pm$  are both nongeometric then the extension group  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is hyperbolic relative to the finite collection of subgroups  $\{F_s \rtimes \widehat{Q}_s\}_{s=1}^p$ , where  $\widehat{Q}_s$  is a lift that preserves  $F_s$ .
- (3) If both  $\Lambda_\phi^\pm$  and  $\Lambda_\psi^\pm$  are geometric laminations which come from the same surface, both fixing the conjugacy class  $[\sigma]$  representing the surface boundary, then  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  is

hyperbolic relative to the finite collection of subgroups  $\{\langle \sigma \rangle \rtimes \widehat{Q}_\sigma\} \cup \{F_s \rtimes \widehat{Q}_s\}_{s=1}^p$ , where  $\widehat{Q}_s$  is a lift that preserves  $F_s$  and  $\widehat{Q}_\sigma$  is a lift that fixes  $\sigma$ .

*Proof.* To prove (1) we apply Theorem 2.6 with  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F}$  and to prove (2) we apply Theorem 2.6 with  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{F} \cup [\langle \sigma \rangle]$ . □

As a corollary of the theorem for  $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$ , we recover the case for surface group with punctures, which was proved in [MR08, Theorem 4.9].

## 6. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

**6.1. Non-relative hyperbolicity.** From the results we have so far we gather a necessary condition of non-relative hyperbolicity as follows:

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  be NRH for every free group  $Q$  which generated by nonzero powers of  $\phi_i$ 's which are sufficiently different. Then, there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{K}_i^* \neq \mathcal{K}_j^*$  for some  $j \neq i$ .*

A sufficient condition for NRH remains to be unknown. However, we investigate the following example.

**Example 6.2.** Let  $\mathbb{F} = \langle a, b, c, d, e \rangle$ ,  $F^1 = \langle a, b, c \rangle$ ,  $F^2 = \langle a, b, c, d \rangle$ . Define  $\phi_1$  as the outer automorphism class of the map  $\Phi_1: a \mapsto ac, b \mapsto a, c \mapsto b, d \mapsto dc, e \mapsto ec$  and  $\phi_2$  to be the outer automorphism class of the map  $\Phi_2: a \mapsto ad, b \mapsto a, c \mapsto b, d \mapsto c, e \mapsto e$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm) = \emptyset$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_2^\pm) = \{[\langle e \rangle]\}$ . In any relatively hyperbolic structure, the subgroup  $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \cong \langle e, \Phi_2 \rangle$  must be contained in some peripheral subgroup. A simple computation shows that  $\mathbb{F} \leq \langle \Phi_1^{-1} \Phi_2, b, c \rangle$  and hence the extension group  $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow E \rightarrow \langle \phi_1, \phi_2 \rangle \rightarrow 1$  is not relatively hyperbolic (NRH as in [BDM09]).

The hypothesis for freeness in the above theorem is easily checked, and so there exists  $M$  such that for every  $m, n \geq M$ , the group  $Q = \langle \phi_1^m, \phi_2^n \rangle$  is a free group of rank 2. Once we raise the automorphisms to sufficiently high powers, the abnormality with peripheral subgroups goes away. We ask the question: is  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$  hyperbolic relative to  $\langle e, \Phi_2 \rangle$  when  $Q$  is generated by high enough powers of  $\phi_1, \phi_2$ ?

*Remark 6.3.* Note that  $[F^i]$  is a fixed vertex for the action of  $\phi_i$  on the free-factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . Also the free-factors in the set  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  are fixed vertices for the same action. If we translate the hypothesis of Theorem 5.5 in the framework of the free factor complex  $\mathcal{FF}$  of  $\mathbb{F}$ , then what we require is that (a)  $[F^1]$  and  $[F^2]$  are distinct points in  $\mathcal{FF}$  (b)  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm) = \mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_2^\pm)$ . Using Proposition 5.3, the second hypothesis in turn implies that  $[F^1]$  and the free-factor components of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_2^\pm)$  are close in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . Similarly free-factor components of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_1^\pm)$  and  $[F^2]$  are also close in  $\mathcal{FF}$ . By partial fully irreducibility  $[F^i]$  and free-factor components of  $\mathcal{A}_{na}(\Lambda_i^\pm)$  are also close. Therefore the entire setup of Theorem 5.5 is in a small (bounded) region of  $\mathcal{FF}$ . The obvious question that comes to mind is: if we assume that  $[F^1]$  and  $[F^2]$  are far apart in Theorem 5.5 can we still expect relative hyperbolicity of  $\mathbb{F} \rtimes \widehat{Q}$ ?

**6.2. Convex cocompactness in  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ .** As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, and the fact that the previous definition of convex cocompactness of [HH18] does not cover our hyperbolic extensions (due to the fact that our subgroup does not quasi isometrically embeds into  $\mathcal{FF}$ ), we propose the following definition of convex cocompactness for subgroups of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ :

**Definition 6.4.** A subgroup  $Q < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  is said to be *convex cocompact* if, up to a finite index,  $Q$  is a purely atoroidal, word-hyperbolic group and  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\xi) = \emptyset$  for all  $\xi, \phi \in Q$  which do not have a common power.

Here *purely atoroidal* will mean that all of the elements of  $Q$  are atoroidal (i.e, hyperbolic). We observe that given any short exact sequence of finitely generated groups

$$1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow E \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 1$$

hyperbolicity of  $E$  implies that  $Q$  is convex cocompact.

**Corollary 6.5.** *Let  $Q < \text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$  be finitely generated. If the extension group in  $1 \rightarrow \mathbb{F} \rightarrow E_Q \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 1$  is a Gromov-hyperbolic group, then  $Q$  is a convex cocompact subgroup of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $E_Q$  is Gromov-hyperbolic, so must be  $Q$  ([MS12, Proposition 5.5, Proposition 5.8]). We may pass to a finite index subgroup of  $Q$  and assume without loss that  $Q$  is torsion-free by [HM20, Theorem B]. Since  $E_Q$  is hyperbolic group, it does not contain any  $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$  subgroup. Hence no element of  $Q$  can have a periodic conjugacy class, implying that  $Q$  is purely atoroidal. Finally if  $\phi, \xi \in Q$ , then using the same argument that we used to prove (2) $\implies$ (1) in Theorem 1.1, it follows that  $\mathcal{L}^\pm(\phi) \cap \mathcal{L}^\pm(\xi) = \emptyset$ . Thus  $Q$  is convex cocompact.  $\square$

Theorem 1.1 shows that the converse is also true when  $Q$  is a free group generated by sufficiently large powers of independent atoroidal outer automorphisms. It remains an open question to characterize convex cocompactness of  $Q$  when it is not necessarily a free group. This is a situation very similar to the mapping class groups case. We refer the reader to [DT18] for a possible partial answer to this open question, under some strong additional assumptions.

## REFERENCES

- [BDM09] Jason Behrstock, Cornelia Druţu, and Lee Mosher. Thick metric spaces, relative hyperbolicity, and quasi-isometric rigidity. *Math. Ann.*, 344(3):543–595, 2009.
- [BF92] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn. A combination theorem for negatively curved groups. *J. Differential Geom.*, 35(1):85–101, 1992.
- [BF14a] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. Hyperbolicity of the complex of free factors. *Adv. Math.*, 256:104–155, 2014.
- [BF14b] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. Subfactor projections. *J. Topol.*, 7(3):771–804, 2014.
- [BFH97] M. Bestvina, M. Feighn, and M. Handel. Laminations, trees, and irreducible automorphisms of free groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(2):215–244, 1997.
- [BFH00] Mladen Bestvina, Mark Feighn, and Michael Handel. The Tits alternative for  $\text{Out}(F_n)$ . I. Dynamics of exponentially-growing automorphisms. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 151(2):517–623, 2000.

- [Bow07] Brian H. Bowditch. The Cannon-Thurston map for punctured-surface groups. *Math. Z.*, 255(1):35–76, 2007.
- [Bri00] P. Brinkmann. Hyperbolic automorphisms of free groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(5):1071–1089, 2000.
- [Coo87] Daryl Cooper. Automorphisms of free groups have finitely generated fixed point sets. *J. Algebra*, 111(2):453–456, 1987.
- [CV86] Marc Culler and Karen Vogtmann. Moduli of graphs and automorphisms of free groups. *Invent. Math.*, 84(1):91–119, 1986.
- [DKT16] Spencer Dowdall, Ilya Kapovich, and Samuel J. Taylor. Cannon-Thurston maps for hyperbolic free group extensions. *Israel J. Math.*, 216(2):753–797, 2016.
- [DT17] Spencer Dowdall and Samuel J. Taylor. The co-surface graph and the geometry of hyperbolic free group extensions. *J. Topol.*, 10(2):447–482, 2017.
- [DT18] Spencer Dowdall and Samuel J. Taylor. Hyperbolic extensions of free groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 22(1):517–570, 2018.
- [Far98] B. Farb. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(5):810–840, 1998.
- [FH11] Mark Feighn and Michael Handel. The recognition theorem for  $\text{Out}(F_n)$ . *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 5(1):39–106, 2011.
- [FM02] Benson Farb and Lee Mosher. Convex cocompact subgroups of mapping class groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 6:91–152, 2002.
- [GG23] Pritam Ghosh and Funda Gültepe. Relative hyperbolicity of free extensions of free groups. arXiv:2307.09674 [math.GR], 2023.
- [Gho20] Pritam Ghosh. Limits of conjugacy classes under iterates of hyperbolic elements of  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F})$ . *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 14(1):177–211, 2020.
- [Gho23] Pritam Ghosh. Relative hyperbolicity of free-by-cyclic extensions. *Compos. Math.*, 159(1):153–183, 2023.
- [Ham05] Ursula Hamenstädt. Word hyperbolic extensions of surface groups. arXiv:math/0505244 [math.GT], 2005.
- [HH18] Ursula Hamenstädt and Sebastian Hensel. Stability in outer space. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 12(1):359–398, 2018.
- [HM20] Michael Handel and Lee Mosher. Subgroup decomposition in  $\text{Out}(F_n)$ . *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 264(1280):vii+276, 2020.
- [HV98] Allen Hatcher and Karen Vogtmann. The complex of free factors of a free group. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 49(196):459–468, 1998.
- [KL08] Autumn Kent and Christopher J. Leininger. Shadows of mapping class groups: capturing convex cocompactness. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 18(4):1270–1325, 2008.
- [Mit97] M. Mitra. Ending laminations for hyperbolic group extensions. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(2):379–402, 1997.
- [MR08] Mahan Mj and Lawrence Reeves. A combination theorem for strong relative hyperbolicity. *Geom. Topol.*, 12(3):1777–1798, 2008.
- [MS12] Mahan Mj and Pranab Sardar. A combination theorem for metric bundles. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(6):1636–1707, 2012.
- [Tay14] Samuel J. Taylor. A note on subfactor projections. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 14(2):805–821, 2014.
- [Tay15] Samuel J. Taylor. Right-angled Artin groups and  $\text{Out}(\mathbb{F}_n)$  I. Quasi-isometric embeddings. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 9(1):275–316, 2015.
- [Thu] William P. Thurston. Hyperbolic Structures on 3-manifolds, II: Surface groups and 3-manifolds which fiber over the circle. Preprint, arXiv:math/9801045.
- [Vog02] Karen Vogtmann. Automorphisms of free groups and outer space. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Geometric and Combinatorial Group Theory, Part I (Haifa, 2000)*, volume 94, pages 1–31, 2002.



DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ASHOKA UNIVERSITY, HARYANA 131029, INDIA,  
*Email address:* `pritam.ghosh@ashoka.edu.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO, TOLEDO, OHIO  
*Email address:* `funda.gultepe@utoledo.edu`  
*URL:* `http://www.math.utoledo.edu/~gultepe/`