

**THE LAMPLIGHTER GROUPS AND THOMPSON'S GROUP F
HAVE INFINITE WEAK-COP NUMBER.**

ANDERS CORNECT AND EDUARDO MARTÍNEZ-PEDROZA

ABSTRACT. The weak-cop number of a graph, introduced by Lee et al (2023), is a quasi-isometric invariant of graphs and hence of finitely generated groups via their Cayley graphs. While for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ there exist graphs with weak-cop number m , it is an open question whether there exists finitely generated groups whose weak-cop number is different than 1 and ∞ . We prove that wreath products of nontrivial groups by infinite groups have infinite weak-cop number. We also prove that Thompson's group F has infinite weak-cop number. The results are proved by defining two new pursuit and evasion games and proving the existence of strategies for the evader. In the case of Thompson's group F , we also present an alternative and simpler argument based on an algebraic property

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
Organization	4
Acknowledgements	4
2. Preliminaries	4
2.1. Graph theory language	4
2.2. Definition of the weak-cop number	5
3. The weak-cop number of wreath products	5
3.1. The Lamplighter game	5
3.2. General winning strategy for the Lamplighter	9
3.3. The wreath product of graphs	11
3.4. Relation Between Lamplighter and Weak-cops and Robbers	12
3.5. Weak-cop number of wreath-products of groups	14
4. The tree Builder game and Thompson's group F	15
4.1. Preliminary Definitions	15
4.2. Playing the Tree Builder Game	20
4.3. Turns and Player Movement	20
4.4. Win Conditions	23
4.5. A Winning Strategy for the Builder	23
4.6. Thompson's Group F and its Weak Cop Number	25
4.7. Alternative Argument for $wCop(F) = \infty$	26
References	27

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been recent interest on quasi-isometric invariants of graphs defined via combinatorial games, and their connections to geometric group theory, see for example [ABK20, ABGK23, Leh19, LMPRQ23, MPPa23].

The Cops and Robber game was introduced independently in the late 1970's and early 1980's by different researchers; among these were the works of Quilliot [Qui78] and Nowakowski and Winkler [NW83]. This is a perfect information two player game on an undirected graph, where one player controls a set of cops and the other one controls a single robber. On the graph each cop and the robber choose a vertex to occupy, with the cops choosing first. The game then alternates between cops and the robber moving along adjacent vertices, with the cops moving first. The cops win if, after a finite number of rounds, a cop occupies the same vertex as the robber; the robber wins if he can avoid capture indefinitely. The cop number of a graph is the minimum number of cops necessary to always capture a robber.

Lee et al. [LMPRQ23] introduced a variation of the cops and robber game which we call *Weak-Cops and Robbers*. This is a two-player game where one of the players controls a finite set of cops, while the other controls a single robber. The objective of the cops is to protect arbitrarily large finite subgraphs of the underlying graph, subject to some parameters. These parameters are chosen by the players. First, the cops player chooses the number of cops, as well as the cops' speed and reach. The robber player, knowing this information, chooses his speed and challenges the cops to protect a large ball in the graph; the cops choose their initial positions, and then the robber choose his initial position. After these choices have been made, the game starts and the cops and robber move in alternating turns, up to a distance determined by their respective speeds. The cops win the game if at some stage the robber is captured (the robber is within reach of a cop) or from some turn on, they keep the robber outside the ball. See Section 2 for a precise definition.

The *weak-cop number* of a connected graph Γ , denoted $\text{wCop}(\Gamma)$, is the minimum number of cops required for the cop player to always have a winning strategy in the Weak-Cops and Robbers game on Γ . If no such finite number exists, then we say that $\text{wCop}(\Gamma) = \infty$. Lee et al. showed that for every $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, there exists a graph with weak-cop number m .

The notion of weak-cop number yields an invariant of finitely generated groups, via playing the game on Cayley Graphs with respect to finite generating sets. This is due to a result in [LMPRQ23, Corollary G] which states that any two Cayley graphs with respect to finite generating sets of a group have the same weak-cop number.

Definition 1.1 (Weak-cop number of a group). Let G be a finitely generated group. The weak-cop number $\text{wCop}(G)$ is defined as the weak-cop number of any Cayley graph of G with respect to a finite generating set.

In [LMPRQ23], it is proved that for finitely generated groups, free groups have weak-cop number 1, non-cyclic free abelian groups have infinite weak cop number, and one-ended non-amenable groups have infinite weak-cop number. They raised the following question.

Question 1.2 ([LMPRQ23, Question K]). Does there exist a finitely generated group G with $1 < \text{wCop}(G) < \infty$?

In this article, we compute the weak-cop number for some finitely generated groups known for their exotic geometries. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *The restricted wreath product $G \wr H$ of finitely generated groups has infinite weak-cop number if G is non-trivial and H is infinite.*

The theorem is proved by defining a new game called *Lamplighter*. Briefly, this is a perfect information game with at least $P \geq 2$ players on a single underlying object called a *streetmap*, essentially a Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(H)$ where the vertices represent lamps that can take on a variety of states given by $\text{Cay}(G)$. One player, the *lamplighter*, moves along a copy of the graph $\text{Cay}(H)$ restricted to a chosen finite subgraph called the *area of play*, changing the states of lamps. The other $P - 1$ players, the *copiers*, move along their own copies of $\text{Cay}(H)$, working together in an attempt for one of them to approximate the lamplighter's pattern of lamps. The lamplighters and the group of copiers move alternately, changing the state of some of the lamps close to their current position. The copiers win the game if eventually one of them can approximate the lamplighter's pattern of lamps. Under the assumptions, we show that the lamplighter has a winning strategy for any number of copiers. We then prove that this implies that $\text{Cay}(G \wr H)$ has infinite weak-cop number. This new game can be regarded as a variation of the weak-cops and robbers where the robber player imposes on himself a finite area of play, instead of being able to freely move on the underlying infinite graph. A precise definition of the Lamplighter game and the proof of Theorem 1.4 are the contents of Section 3.

In this note, we also prove the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Thompson's group F has infinite weak-cop number.*

We present two proofs of this result. The second one is due to Francesco Fournier-Facio who communicated us a simpler argument after a first version of this article was made public. Nevertheless, we present both proofs here, since our original argument introduces a new pursuit and evasion type game that may be of interest to the game theory community.

The first argument to prove that Thompson's group F has infinite weak-cop number follows a similar strategy to the one for wreath products. We introduce a new game called *Tree Builder* based on the representation of elements of F by "forest diagrams" developed by Belk and Brown [BB05]. As Lamplighter is an analog to Weak-Cops and Robbers on Cayley graphs of wreath products, Tree Builder is an analog to Weak-Cops and Robbers on the Cayley graph of *Thompson's group F* . Tree Builder is a game played between a *builder* and n *copiers*. In this game, the builder plays by traversing a finite section of a pair of infinite binary forests, adding and removing edges and vertices to trees. The copiers play on similar pairs of forests, attempting to approximate the pattern of trees made by the builder. We find a winning strategy for the builder against any finite number of copiers, and then show that this gives a winning strategy for the robber in Weak-Cops and Robbers on a Cayley graph of Thompson's group F . Let us emphasize that Tree Builder is a variation of the weak-cops and robbers on a particular Cayley graph of Thompson's group F , where the robber player imposes on himself a finite area of play. A precise description of this game as well as our argument proving Theorem 1.4 is the content of Section 4.

The second argument proving Theorem 1.4 due Fournier-Facio is more algebraic and reduces to the existence of a retraction of F into a free abelian group of rank

two, and two results by Lee et al. [LMPRQ23] on weak-cop numbers, see Subsection 4.7 for details.

Let us conclude the introduction with a question related to Theorem 1.3. The Diestel-Leader graphs $DL(m, n)$ for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ are connected, locally finite, vertex-transitive graphs which are regarded as generalizations of Cayley graphs of Lamplighter groups $\mathbb{Z}_n \wr \mathbb{Z}$. It is a remarkable result of Eskin, Fisher and Whyte that $D(m, n)$ is quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph of a finitely generated group if and only if $m = n$; see [EFW12]. The graph $D(m, m)$ is quasi-isometric to a Cayley graph of the Lamplighter group $\mathbb{Z}_m \wr \mathbb{Z}$ which has infinite weak-cop number by Theorem 1.3.

Question 1.5. Does $D(m, n)$ have infinite weak-cop number for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$?

Organization. The rest of the article is organized into three sections. The first section contains some preliminaries and the precise definition of the weak-cop number for graphs. Section 3 contains the proof of the first statement of Theorem 1.3, and the last section contains the proof of the second statement on Thompson's group.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Francesco Fournier-Facio for comments on a first version of the article and for bringing to our attention the existence of retractions of F onto \mathbb{Z}^2 and an alternative proof of Theorem 1.4. We also thank Florian Lehner and Danny Dyer for comments on preliminary versions of this work. The first author acknowledges funding by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada NSERC, via the Undergraduate Student Research Award (USRA). The second author acknowledges funding by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada NSERC.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Graph theory language. A *graph* Γ is a pair (V, E) , where V is called the set of *vertices* of Γ , and $E \subset \binom{V}{2}$ contains subsets of cardinality 2 in V , called the *edges* of Γ . We denote by $V(\Gamma)$ and $E(\Gamma)$ the vertex set and the edge set of Γ , respectively. Two vertices $u, v \in V$ are said to be *adjacent* in Γ if $\{u, v\} \in E$. Observe that this definition encompasses *simple* graphs, i.e. graphs that have no edges from a vertex to itself (no loops), and each edge appears at most once in E (no multiple edges). A graph is *trivial* if it has only one vertex, and is *infinite* if it has infinite vertex set. By an *isomorphism* from a graph G to a graph H , we mean a bijection $\Phi: V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ such that $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ if and only if $\{\Phi(u), \Phi(v)\} \in E(H)$.

By a *path* in a graph Γ we mean a sequence of vertices $v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k$ such that, for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, $\{v_i, v_{i-1}\}$ is an edge in Γ . The *length* of such path is defined as k . A graph is *connected* if there is a path between any two vertices. In a connected graph, the length of the shortest path between two vertices u, v is called the *distance* between them and is denoted by $\text{dist}_\Gamma(u, v)$. A path v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k is a *geodesic* if $\text{dist}_\Gamma(v_0, v_k) = k$. Note that in a connected graph, there is a geodesic between any pair of points. The *diameter* of Γ is the supremum of the distances between any pair of vertices, in particular, a graph can have infinite diameter. Note that if the graph has infinite diameter, then there are geodesics of arbitrarily large length. A graph Γ is *locally finite* if for any vertex v , the set of vertices at distance one from v is finite.

By the *infinite path* P_∞ we mean the graph with vertex \mathbb{Z} and edge set $\{(n, n+1) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. As usual, the *n-path* P_n is the graph with vertex set $n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ and edge set $\{(k, k+1) \mid 0 \leq k < n-1\}$; the *n-cycle* C_n is the graph with vertex set n and edge set $E(P_n) \cup \{0, n-1\}$.

Let G be a group with a generating set $S \subset G$ that does not contain the identity. The *Cayley graph* of G with respect to S , denoted $\text{Cay}(G, S)$, is the graph with $V(\text{Cay}(G, S)) = G$, and $E(\text{Cay}(G, S)) = \{g, gs \mid g \in G, s \in S\}$. It is a simple exercise to show that $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is a connected graph. Observe that if S is finite then $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is a locally finite graph. In particular, if G is an infinite group and S is a finite generating set, then $\text{Cay}(G, S)$ is a locally finite, infinite, connected graph, and therefore by König's lemma, it contains geodesics of arbitrarily large length.

2.2. Definition of the weak-cop number. Given a connected graph Γ , Weak-Cops and Robbers is played on Γ as follows. There are two players, with one playing the robber, and one playing a set of n cops for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Before the game begins, the cops choose two positive integers σ and ρ , called the cop's *speed* and *reach*, respectively. Knowing these values, the robbers then choose positive integers ψ and R , along with a vertex v of Γ ; these parameters are called the robber's *speed*, the *radius of the area of play* and the *center of the area of play* respectively.

Once the parameters have been chosen, each of the cops choose a vertex for their initial positions. Knowing the choices made by each of the cops, the robber chooses a vertex for their own initial position. The cops and robber move in alternating turns, starting with the cops. On the cops' turn, each one can move to a vertex at distance at most σ from their current position. The robber is *captured* during this turn if any of the cops move to within distance ρ of him. On the robber's turn, he can move to a vertex at distance at most ψ from his current position, provided he has a path to that vertex that contains no vertex within distance ρ from any of the cops. The cops win if they can eventually protect the ball of radius R centered at v . This means that either the robber is captured or, beginning on some turn, they can permanently prevent the robber from moving within distance R of the vertex v .

We say that the graph Γ is $\text{CopWin}(n, \sigma, \rho, \psi, R)$ if for any $v \in V(\Gamma)$, n cops with speed σ and reach ρ can eventually protect the ball of radius R centered at v . Γ is *n-weak cop win* if they can choose σ and ρ such that Γ is always $\text{CopWin}(n, \sigma, \rho, \psi, R)$ for any ψ and R chosen by the robber. Symbolically,

$$\Gamma \text{ is } n\text{-weak cop win} \iff \exists \sigma, \rho \forall \psi, R : \Gamma \text{ is } \text{CopWin}(n, \sigma, \rho, \psi, R).$$

The *weak-cop number* of Γ , denoted $\text{wCop}(\Gamma)$, is the smallest n such that Γ is n -weak cop win. If no such integer exists, we say $\text{wCop}(\Gamma) = \infty$.

3. THE WEAK-COP NUMBER OF WREATH PRODUCTS

3.1. The Lamplighter game. Lamplighter is a perfect information game played with $P \geq 2$ players on a single underlying object called a *streetmap*, essentially a graph where the vertices represent lamps that can take on a variety of states. One player, the *lamplighter*, moves along the graph, changing the states of lamps. The other $P - 1$ players, the *copiers*, move along their own graphs, working together




FIGURE 1. An illustration of an M -board over the streetmap $M = (C_5, a, P_\infty)$.

in an attempt for one of them to approximate the lamplighter's pattern of lamps. Before describing the game, we introduce some terminology.

Definition 3.1 (Streetmap). A *streetmap* is a triple $M = (\Omega, \omega, \Lambda)$, where Ω and Λ are simple, connected graphs, and ω is some distinguished point of Ω . The vertices of Λ are called *lamps*, and the vertices of Ω are called *states*.

The reader is encouraged to think about the lamp states as different ways the lamps can be “lit”. For example, when Ω is the 2-path with vertices labelled 0 and 1, one can imagine that a lamp being in state 0 means it is unlit, and that a lamp in state 1 is lit. When Ω has more than two vertices, one can consider the nonzero states as being different *colours* that the lamp can take, and the adjacency relation on Ω describes how the colors of the lamp can be changed. The vertex ω of Ω can be thought of as the default state of a lamp.

Definition 3.2 (Board). Let M be a streetmap. An M -Board is a triple $B = (M, p, \phi)$, where $p \in V(\Lambda)$ and $\phi : V(\Lambda) \rightarrow V(\Omega)$ is a mapping with $\phi(v) = \omega$ for all but finitely many $v \in V(\Lambda)$. The lamp p is called the player's *position* (in the street map), and for each $v \in V(\Lambda)$, $\phi(v)$ is called the *state* of the lamp v .

At any stage of the game, each player is assigned a board. The board of each player changes with the moves that the player does.

Example 3.3. Consider the 5-cycle C_5 and label its vertices by a, b, c, d, e , the infinite path P_∞ with vertices labelled by \mathbb{Z} in the natural way, and let

$$\phi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{a, b, c, d, e\}, \quad \phi(n) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } |n| \geq 3 \text{ or } n = -1, \\ b & \text{if } n = 0, \\ c & \text{if } n = -2, \\ e & \text{if } n = 1, 2. \end{cases}$$

Figure 1 illustrates the street map $M = (C_5, a, P_\infty)$ and the M -Board $(M, 1, \phi)$. In the illustration, each lamp is represented by a circle; the vertex labels of the lamps are below and to the right of the corresponding circle; the state of the lamp $\phi(v)$

is inside the corresponding circle. The downwards arrow represents the player's position.

Now we are ready to describe the game.

3.1.1. Initial setup of the Lamplighter game. Lamplighter is a perfect information game played with $P \geq 2$ players on a *streetmap* M . There is a distinguished player called the *Lamplighter* and the other $P - 1$ players are called *copiers*.

- The copiers collectively choose two positive integers ρ and σ , called the *copier reach* and *copier speed*, respectively. The speed is a measure of how many moves each copier can take in a single *turn*.
- Knowing the values of ρ and σ , the lamplighter chooses positive integers ψ and r called the *lamplighter speed* and *radius of play*, respectively, as well as a vertex v of Λ called the *center of the area of play*. The *area of play* is defined as the ball of radius r centered at v in Λ which we denote by $\Lambda_r(v)$.
- The copiers each choose a starting board for themselves, i.e., they select their initial position p and the initial states of their lamps ϕ .
- The lamplighter, knowing the starting board for each of the copiers, chooses his starting board. All of the lamps that are not in state ω on this board, as well as the lamplighter's position, must lie within the area of play.

3.1.2. Turns and player movement. After all of the parameters are selected, play happens in turns, starting with the copiers. On the copiers' turn, they all play in unison. The copiers are able to communicate with one another and coordinate their moves. On each turn, every player has a number of possible moves, and they choose a number of moves to play up to their speed. Let $B = (M, p, \phi)$ be the player's board on a given turn. There are two types of moves, each one changing the player's board:

- The first type of move is to change positions to a new lamp p' that is adjacent to p , in other words, the new board becomes

$$B' = (M, p', \phi), \text{ where } p' \in \Lambda_r(v) \text{ such that } \{p, p'\} \in E(\Lambda).$$

If the lamplighter chooses this option, the lamp p' must be in the area of play.

- The second possible type of move is to change the state of the lamp at their current position in accordance to the relation given by the edges of Ω . That is, if the state of the lamp at the player's current position is $s = \phi(p)$, he can choose to change the lamp to a new state s' , where s and s' are adjacent vertices in Ω . In this case the new board becomes

$$B' = (M, p, \phi'), \text{ where } \phi'(v) = \begin{cases} s' & \text{if } v = p, \\ \phi(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The copiers, on each of their turns, move up to a total of σ times (being able to select any of their available moves each time), followed by the lamplighter similarly moving up to ψ times.

Example 3.4. Let Ω be the graph with six vertices labelled by a, b, c, d, e, f illustrated in Figure 2. Consider the streetmap $M = (\Omega, a, P_\infty)$. The figure illustrates the turn of a player in the Lamplighter game, where the given player has speed ≥ 3




FIGURE 2. An example of a turn in Lamplighter. In this case there is a move of type 1, follow by a move of type 2, and then a move of type 1 again.

by showing player's board at the beginning of the turn plus the boards after three moves.

3.1.3. *Lamplighter move restriction.* The lamplighter plays the entire game within the area of play. That means at each stage of the game, if (M, p, ϕ) is a board representing the lamplighter then p is a vertex in the area of play.

3.1.4. *Win conditions.* Given a streetmap M , we denote by $\mathcal{B}(M)$ the set of all possible boards on M . The *distance* between two boards in $\mathcal{B}(M)$ is defined as the minimum number of moves required to change one board into the other.

The goal of the copiers is to come "close enough" to copying the lamplighter's board. Specifically, the *copiers win* if at any point during either player's turn, the lamplighter's board is at distance ρ or less from any of the copiers' boards. Conversely, the lamplighter wins if he can devise a strategy that will let him avoid coming within the copiers' reach indefinitely.

Example 3.5. Consider the Lamplighter game on the street map M defined in Example 3.4 with three copiers. Figure 3 shows the boards of all the players at some stage of the game. If $\rho \geq 3$ in this game, then the copiers have won here,




FIGURE 3. An example of a game state in Lamplighter. If in this game $\rho \geq 3$, then the copiers have won.

since the third copier c_3 is three moves away from copying the lamplighter's board (change lamp -1 to state a , move to lamp -2 , change lamp -2 to state c).

3.1.5. *The copier-win number $\text{wCop}^*(M)$.* If a streetmap M admits a strategy that allows n copiers to choose values of ρ and σ that will always allow them to win, no matter what values of ψ , r , and v the lamplighter chooses, then the streetmap M is called n -copier win. The *copier-win number* of M , which we will denote $\text{wCop}^*(M)$, is the smallest positive integer n for which M is n -copier win. If M is not n -copier win for any $n \geq 1$, we say $\text{wCop}^*(M) = \infty$.

3.2. General winning strategy for the Lamplighter.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $M = (\Omega, \omega, \Lambda)$ be a streetmap. If Λ is a connected graph with infinite diameter and Ω is nontrivial connected graph, then for any $n \geq 1$, the lamplighter has a winning strategy in a game of Lamplighter on M against n cops, i.e. $\text{wCop}^*(M) = \infty$.*

Proof. Choosing the lamplighter's parameters: Suppose, at the beginning of the game, the copiers choose their reach and speed to be ρ and σ , respectively. Then the lamplighter chooses speed $\psi = 3n + \sigma + \rho + 1$ and radius of play $r = \lceil \frac{\sigma + \rho}{2} \rceil + n$.

Since Λ has infinite diameter, it contains a geodesic path P consisting of $\sigma + \rho + 2n$ lamps. In particular, for any pair of vertices in P , the distance in Λ equals their distance in P ; so there are no "shortcuts" in Λ between them. Define the center of the area of play v the central vertex of the path P , and observe that the vertices of P are contained in the area of play. From one endpoint of P to the other, in order, label these lamps

$$\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_{\sigma+\rho}, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n.$$

Since Ω is nontrivial and connected, we can pick a state $\omega_1 \in V(\Omega)$ such that ω and ω_1 are distinct adjacent vertices in Ω . From here on, we denote the states ω and ω_1 as 0 and 1 respectively.

After the copiers choose their initial boards, the lamplighter chooses his initial board as follows. Denote the copiers by c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n in some arbitrary order, and let $B_i = (M, p_i, \phi_i)$ be the initial board of copier c_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the

lamplighter chooses his initial board B_0 to be

$$B_0 = (M, \ell_1, \phi_0), \text{ with } \phi_0(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in \{\ell_i, r_i\} \text{ for some } i \leq n \text{ and } \phi_i(v) = 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have that $\phi_0(\ell_j) \neq \phi_j(\ell_j)$ and $\phi_0(r_j) \neq \phi_j(r_j)$. Moreover, the lamplighter starts the game at the end of the path P labelled by ℓ_1 .

The lamplighter's strategy: On each of his turns, he walks to the opposite end of the path (i.e., from ℓ_1 to r_n , or from r_n to ℓ_1). As he travels, if he encounters a vertex ℓ_i or r_i in $\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n\}$ that is the same state as the corresponding vertex in B_i , switch it to the opposite state (0 or 1). This guarantees that, at the beginning of the copiers' turn, for each copier c_i there are at least two lamps (ℓ_i and r_i) whose states are different from the corresponding lamp on the lamplighter's board. Observe that the lamplighter will be playing the entire game within the area of play.

Proof that the lamplighter's speed ψ is sufficient: In moving from one end of the path of lamps to the other, he must move between $2r+1$ lamps, and therefore requires $2r = 2(\lceil \frac{\sigma+\rho}{2} \rceil + n) \leq \sigma + \rho + 1 + 2n$ changes in position. Additionally, he has to change the states of at most n lamps, since at most one lamp per copier will differ in state from that copier's board. Therefore, we can complete the given strategy in at most $3n + \sigma + \rho + 1$ moves per turn, and our chosen speed is sufficient.

Proof that the lamplighter wins with the above strategy: We want to show that if, on the copiers' turn, no copier c_i can change their board to come within distance ρ of the lamplighter's board. Namely, if at the beginning of the copiers' turn, $\phi_i(\ell_i) \neq \phi_0(\ell_i)$ and $\phi_i(r_i) \neq \phi_0(r_i)$, then during the entirety of the copiers' turn, the distance between the lamplighter's board and any of the copier's boards is strictly greater than ρ .

As the copiers begin their turn, choose an arbitrary copier c_i . In order to match the lamplighter's board, c_i must switch both the lights ℓ_i and r_i . However, no matter what position c_i is in at the beginning of the turn, they need to use at least 1 move to change the state of the lamp, and then traverse through the middle sequence of $\rho + \sigma$ lamps, which requires at least $\rho + \sigma + 1$ moves. However, they only *have* at most σ moves available to them, which means at the end of their turn they still require at least $(\rho + \sigma + 2) - \sigma = \rho + 2 > \rho$ moves to match the lamplighter's board. Therefore every copier ends their turn at distance strictly greater than ρ from the lamplighter, and thus the copiers do not win on their turn.

We must additionally show that the copiers do not win during the *lamplighter's* turn. In other words, we must show that the lamplighter can execute the above strategy without coming within distance ρ of a copier.

Note that, for each copier c_i , the argument above only relies on the position of c_i and the states of lights ℓ_i and r_i . In particular, the position of the lamplighter does not affect this fact, nor do the states of the other lamps. Therefore, changing the lamplighter's position does not cause the copiers to win. Additionally, this means that changing the state of a lamp ℓ_i or r_i does not bring any copier c_j with $j \neq i$ within distance ρ of the lamplighter; in fact, it strictly *increases* the distance from the lamplighter to copier c_i . Thus, the copiers do not win during the lamplighter's turn.

Therefore, the lamplighter can avoid the copiers indefinitely for any number n of copiers, and so $\text{wCop}^*(M) = \infty$. \square

Let us record a few properties of the strategy that we described in the proof above, since they are used in the proof of the main result of the section.

Remark 3.7. In the proof of Theorem 3.6, the strategy for the lamplighter playing on M against n copiers with speed σ and reach ρ has the following properties:

- The lamplighter chooses his speed to be $\psi = 3n + \sigma + \rho + 1$, and his radius of play to be $r = \lceil \frac{\sigma + \rho}{2} \rceil + n$.
- The lamplighter fixes a geodesic path P in Λ with $2n + \sigma + \rho$ vertices, and lets the center of the area of play be the central vertex of P .
- The lamplighter fixes a state ω_1 such that ω and ω_1 are distinct, adjacent vertices in Ω .
- Any board (M, p, ϕ) representing the lamplighter during any stage of the game satisfies that: p is a vertex of P , ϕ only takes values in $\{\omega, \omega_1\}$, and $\phi^{-1}(\omega_1)$ is a finite subset of vertices of P .
- If $(M, v, 0)$ is a board where v is the central vertex of P and 0 represents the constant function $V(\Lambda) \rightarrow \{\omega\}$, then distance between $(M, v, 0)$ and any board (M, p, ϕ) representing the lamplighter at some stage of the game is at most $6r + 1$.

Indeed to move from $(M, v, 0)$ to (M, p, ϕ) one needs to first use r moves to move to an endpoint of P at maximal distance from p , then transverse the path P to the other end while correcting the discrepancies between 0 and ϕ which require at most $4r + 1$ moves, and finally move back to p which needs at most r moves.

- Analogously, if (M, p_1, ϕ_1) and (M, p_2, ϕ_2) are boards representing the lamplighter during distinct stages in the game then (M, p_1, ϕ_1) and (M, p_2, ϕ_2) are at distance at most $R = 2(6r + 1)$.

3.3. The wreath product of graphs. In this section, we defined the (*restricted wreath product*) of graphs, a notion that is heavily related to the Lamplighter game. We first introduce some notation.

Definition 3.8. Let X and Y be sets, where X has some distinguished base element a . We define

$$X_a^{(Y)} = \{f: Y \rightarrow X \mid f(y) = a \text{ for all but finitely many values of } y\}.$$

In other words, we can view $X_a^{(Y)}$ as either the set of finitely-supported *functions* from Y to X based at a , or as the set of finitely-supported *X -sequences* indexed by Y , based at a .

Note that we often use two interchangeably notations for a function $f: Y \rightarrow X$, namely, as the sequence $(f(y))_{y \in Y}$ or as a sequence $(x_y)_{y \in Y}$ with $f(y) = x_y$. The following definition is a version of the one given by Donno [Don15], expanded to include infinite graphs.

Definition 3.9 (Restricted Wreath Product of Graphs). Let $\Lambda = (V, E)$ and $\Omega = (W, F)$ be graphs, where Ω has base point ω . The (*restricted wreath product*) is the graph $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ whose vertex set is the Cartesian product $W_\omega^{(V)} \times V$, where two vertices (f, v) and $(f', v') \in V(\Omega \wr \Lambda)$ are adjacent if:

- (1) $v = v' =: \bar{v}$, $f(w) = f'(w)$ for every $w \neq \bar{v}$, and $\{f(\bar{v}), f'(\bar{v})\} \in F$. An edge of this type is called an edge of type 1.
- (2) $f = f'$ and $\{v, v'\} \in E$. An edge of this type is called an edge of type 2.



(A) The graph wreath product $P_2 \wr P_2$ is isomorphic to C_8 .(B) The graph wreath product $P_2 \wr C_3$ is isomorphic to the truncated cube graph.

FIGURE 4. Two examples of the wreath products of small graphs.

A pair of examples illustrating the wreath product of some finite graphs is shown in Figure 4. In our context, the wreath product of infinite graphs is more relevant but their geometry is complex and in general difficult to visualize.

3.4. Relation Between Lamplighter and Weak-cops and Robbers. In order to use our Lamplighter game to derive results about Weak-cops and robbers, we must establish some additional theory.

Definition 3.10. Let $M = (\Omega, \omega, \Lambda)$ be a streetmap. Define a graph $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M)$ as follows.

- (1) $V(\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M)) = \mathcal{B}(M)$, the set of possible M -boards, and
- (2) two boards are adjacent in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M)$ if they differ by a single move.

We call $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M)$ the *graph of M -boards*.

Proposition 3.11. Let $M = (\Omega, \omega, \Lambda)$ be a streetmap. Then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M) \cong (\Omega \wr \Lambda)$.

Proof. Let $\Omega = (V, E)$ and $\Lambda = (W, F)$. Define the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{B}(M) &\rightarrow V(\Omega \wr \Lambda) \\ (M, p, \phi) &\mapsto (\phi, p), \end{aligned}$$

which is well-defined since $\phi \in W_\omega^{(V)}$ and $p \in V$. This is a bijection since it has an obvious inverse

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{-1} : V(\Omega \wr \Lambda) &\rightarrow \mathcal{B}(M) \\ (f, v) &\mapsto (M, v, f). \end{aligned}$$

Now all that is left to prove is that the edges induced by Φ are the same as those in the graph $\Omega \wr \Lambda$. Let $(M, p, \phi) \in \mathcal{B}(M)$. Then there are two types of edges from (M, p, ϕ) .

- (1) First, there are the edges corresponding to changing the state of the lamp at the current position, to an adjacent state in Ω . This means that the given edge is connected to (M, p, ϕ') , where $\{\phi'(p), \phi(p)\} \in F$ and $\phi'(v) = \phi(v)$ for $v \neq p$. This description makes it clear that the target edge $\{(\phi, p), (\phi', p)\}$ is exactly an edge of type 1 in $\Omega \wr \Lambda$.
- (2) Secondly, there are the edges corresponding to moves that change positions. For a position $p \in V$, the player can move to a position $p' \in V$ with $\{p, p'\} \in E$. Therefore such an edge is connected to (M, p', ϕ) , and therefore this edge is mapped to $\{(\phi, p), (\phi, p')\}$ in $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ with $\{p, p'\} \in E$, which are exactly the edges of type 2 in $\Omega \wr \Lambda$.

Therefore Φ is a graph isomorphism from $\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(M)$ to $\Omega \wr \Lambda$. \square

There is a straightforward connection between the Lamplighter game and the Weak-cops and robbers game, described as follows.

Proposition 3.12. *Let Λ be a connected graph with infinite diameter and Ω a nontrivial connected graph. If $M = (\Omega, \omega, \Lambda)$ is a streetmap and n a positive integer, then the winning strategy for the lamplighter given by Theorem 3.6 for the game of Lamplighter on M with n copiers, provides a winning strategy for the robber in a game of Weak-Cops and Robbers on $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ with n cops.*

Proof. By the isomorphism in Proposition 3.11, we regard the vertices of $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ as M -boards and adjacency defined according to the moves in the Lamplighter game.

It follows that moving in a game of Lamplighter on M (either changing positions or changing states) is equivalent to moving between vertices in Weak-cops and robbers on $\Omega \wr \Lambda$. Consequently, the *lamplighter speed*, *copier reach*, and *copier speed* in the Lamplighter game correspond exactly with the *robber speed*, *reach*, and *cop speed*, respectively in the Weak-cops and robbers game. The only parameters that do not align exactly are the *radius of the area of play* and the *center of the area of play*. According to the winning strategy for the lamplighter given by Theorem 3.6 via Remark 3.7, we have that $r = \lceil \frac{\sigma + \rho}{2} \rceil + n$ is the radius of the area of play, and the center of the area of play $v \in V(\Lambda)$ is at the center of a geodesic path P in Λ with $2r + 1$ vertices. Moreover, if (M, p_1, ϕ_1) and (M, p_2, ϕ_2) are boards representing the lamplighter during distinct stages in the game then the distance between them is bounded from above by $R = 2(6r + 1)$.

The center of the area of play in the Weak-Cops and Robbers game is defined to be the board $(M, v, 0)$ where 0 denotes the constant function $V(\Lambda) \rightarrow \{w\}$ and the radius of the area of play is defined as R . Note that Remark 3.7 states that any board representing the lamplighter is at distance at most R from $(M, v, 0)$.

Since the vertices of $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ have been identified with boards, the strategy for the robber in the Weak-cops and robbers game is defined as our winning strategy for the lamplighter against n copiers that reproduce the moves of the cops in the

Weak-Cops and Robbers game. Then, since at any stage of the Lamplighter game, the board representing the lamplighter is at distance larger than ρ than any board representing a copier, we have that the robber is never captured. We show in the previous paragraph that any stage of the game, the board representing the lamplighter (and hence the robber) is in the R -ball about the center of play $(M, v, 0)$ in $\Omega \wr \Lambda$ the Weak-cops and robbers game. Thus, this constitutes a winning strategy for the robber. \square

The above results gives us the following corollary that shows that the weak-cop number of a larger class of wreath products of graphs is infinite.

Corollary 3.13. *If Λ be a connected graph with infinite diameter and Ω is a non-trivial connected graph then $\text{wCop}(\Omega \wr \Lambda) = \infty$.*

3.5. Weak-cop number of wreath-products of groups. Let us recall the definition of the restricted wreath product of groups. Given groups G and H , the *restricted wreath product* of G by H , denoted by $G \wr H$, is defined as the group on the set $\bigoplus_H G \rtimes H$ with operation

$$((g_h)_{h \in H}, h_1) ((g'_h)_{h \in H}, h_2) = \left((g_h g'_{h_1^{-1}h})_{h \in H}, h_1 h_2 \right).$$

The groups G and H have natural identifications as subgroups of $G \wr H$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_G: G &\hookrightarrow G \wr H \\ g &\mapsto ((g^{\delta(e_H, h)})_{h \in H}, e_H) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_H: H &\hookrightarrow G \wr H \\ h &\mapsto ((e_G)_{h \in H}, h) \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta(e_H, h) = 1$ if $h = e_H$, the identity of H , and is 0 otherwise. It is an exercise to verify that if S and T generating sets of G and H then $\iota_G(S) \cup \iota_H(T)$, which we will denote $S \cup T$, is a finite generating set for $G \wr H$. In particular, if G and H are finitely generated, then $G \wr H$ is finitely generated. A notable example is $\mathbb{Z}_2 \wr \mathbb{Z}$ which is known as the *Lamplighter group*.

Proposition 3.14. *Let G and H be groups with finite generating sets S and T , respectively. Then $\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T) = \text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)$.*

Proof. Note that $V(\text{Cay}(G, S)) = G$ and $V(\text{Cay}(H, T)) = H$, so $V(\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T)) = G^{(H)} \times H = V(\text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T))$. Now we need only show that the edge sets of the two graphs are equal. Take an arbitrary element $x = ((g_h)_{h \in H}, h_0) \in G^{(H)} \times H$.

- (1) There are the edges of type 1 in $\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T)$. For each $s \in S$, the vertex (ϕ, h_0) is adjacent to the vertex (ϕ', h_0) , where $\phi'(h_0) = \phi(h_0)s$, and $\phi'(h) = \phi(h)$ for all $h \in H \setminus \{h_0\}$. This aligns with edges of the form $x \iota_G(s)$ in $\text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} x \iota_G(s) &= ((\phi(h))_{h \in H}, h_0) ((s^{\delta(e_H, h)})_{h \in H}, e_H) \\ &= ((\phi(h) s^{\delta(e_H, h_0^{-1}h)})_{h \in H}, h_0) \\ &= (\phi', h_0). \end{aligned}$$

- (2) Secondly, we have the edges of type 2. For each $t \in T$, the vertex (ϕ, h_0) is adjacent to the vertex (ϕ, h_0t) . This aligns with edges of the form $x\iota_H(t)$ in $\text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)$, since

$$\begin{aligned} x\iota_H(t) &= ((\phi(h))_{h \in H}, h_0)((e_H)_{h \in H}, t) \\ &= (\phi(h)_{h \in H}, h_0t) \\ &= (\phi, h_0t). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T)$ and $\text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)$ are isomorphic as graphs. \square

We now have all of the tools we need to derive our main result.

Theorem 3.15. *Let G and H be finitely generated groups. If G is nontrivial and H is infinite, then $\text{wCop}(G \wr H) = \infty$.*

Proof. Pick finite generating sets S and T for G and H , respectively. By Corollary 3.13, $\text{wCop}(\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T)) = \infty$. Since $\text{Cay}(G, S) \wr \text{Cay}(H, T) = \text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)$ by Proposition 3.14, we have $\text{wCop}(\text{Cay}(G \wr H, S \cup T)) = \infty$, and therefore $\text{wCop}(G \wr H) = \infty$. \square

4. THE TREE BUILDER GAME AND THOMPSON'S GROUP F

In this section, we define another game related to Weak-Cops and Robbers, called *Tree Builder*. Specifically, Tree Builder is related to playing Weak-Cops and Robbers on a specific Cayley graph of Thompson's group F . Tree Builder is played with $P \geq 2$ players, each with a structure called a *forest diagram*. One player, the *builder*, modifies his forest diagram, building and demolishing binary trees. The rest of the players, called the *copiers*, attempt to copy the pattern of trees created by the builder. A more detailed description is as follows.

4.1. Preliminary Definitions. This work relies on results of Belk and Brown [BB05]. They devise structures called *forest diagrams* to represent elements of Thompson's group F , and it is these forest diagrams on which we base our game. First, we require some preliminary definitions.

Definition 4.1. An *ordered binary tree*, which we will call an "OBT", is a finite tree where:

- (1) One vertex is designated as the *root*, which has degree either zero or two.
- (2) Every non-root vertex has degree either one or three.
- (3) For each vertex v , the adjacent vertex closer to the root is called the *parent*. If there are two other adjacent vertices, one is labelled the *left child* of v and the other is labelled the *right child* of v .

Given an OBT T , the set of leaves of T is denoted $L(T)$. There is a linear order on the vertices of T , where each left child is less than its parent, and the parent is less than its right child. We call this linear order the *parental linear order* on T . In particular, $L(T)$ inherits a linear order and this order on $L(T)$ completely determines the parental linear order on the vertices of T .

In an OBT, vertices with two children are called *nodes*, and vertices with no children are called *leaves*. A *caret* refers to some parent node together with its two children. The *trivial OBT* is the tree consisting of a single root vertex with no children.

Example 4.2. There exist distinct OBTs for which their underlying trees are isomorphic. Figure 5 shows examples of the induced ordering on the leaves of two OBTs. On each tree, the root is drawn at the top. There is a node at each junction, and the non-root vertices are labeled “L” or “R” depending on whether they are a left child or right child of their parent vertex, respectively. The vertices labeled with black dots are the leaves. Note that while they are mirror images of each other, they are different OBTs. As ordinary trees, they would be isomorphic; however they are distinct when drawn as OBTs.




FIGURE 5. Two (distinct) examples of OBTs, and how they are drawn.

Definition 4.3 (Ordered Binary Forest). An *ordered binary forest*, which we will call an “OBF”, is a bi-infinite sequence of ordered binary trees, all but finitely many of which are trivial.

Let \mathfrak{T} be an OBF. Denote by $L(\mathfrak{T})$ the set of leaves of \mathfrak{T} , i.e. the disjoint union of the sets of leaves $L(T)$ of each $T \in \mathfrak{T}$. Note that there is an induced linear order on $L(\mathfrak{T})$ that restricts to the order of $L(T)$ for each T .

Example 4.4. Figure 6 shows an example of the induced ordering on the leaves of an OBF. The necessary trees are drawn from left to right in the order they appear in the sequence, and there is assumed to be an infinite sequence of trivial OBTs in either direction. The leaves are then ordered from left to right, both within the trees, and from tree to tree.



FIGURE 6. An example of an OBF. Note that the leaves are ordered from left to right.

An OBF \mathfrak{T} is represented by a finite subsequence (T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n) of consecutive trees in \mathfrak{T} containing all nontrivial trees of \mathfrak{T} . In other words, if \mathfrak{T} is represented by (T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n) , then \mathfrak{T} is

$$\dots, \bullet, \bullet, \bullet, T_0, T_1, \dots, T_n, \bullet, \bullet, \bullet, \dots$$

where \bullet represents the trivial ordered binary tree. Note that there is more than one way to represent the same OBF, and two tuples represent the same OBF if they differ only by adding or removing a finite number of trivial trees from the beginning or end.

Example 4.5. The OBF in Example 4.4, which we will denote \mathfrak{T} , can be represented by either the drawing in Figure 6, or by the tuple

$$(T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5).$$

Letting \bullet represent the trivial tree, we can see there are an infinite number of equivalent representations that can be obtained by adding or removing trivial trees on either side of a tuple, as in the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{T} &= (\bullet, T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5) \\ &= (\bullet, \bullet, T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5, \bullet) \\ &= (T_0, T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T_5, \bullet, \bullet, \bullet, \bullet) \\ &\quad \vdots \end{aligned}$$

These OBTs and OBFs will form the basis for our Tree Builder game. In order to have some sort of player input, we require a way to navigate them — therefore we must define a closely related term, which we call a *marked OBF*.

Definition 4.6 (Marked OBF). A *marked OBF* is an OBF with a *pointer* that distinguishes one of its trees.

Note that two marked OBFs are the same if they have the same underlying OBF, with pointers to the same tree; i.e. two marked OBFs can have the same underlying forest, but be different as marked OBFs because their pointers are on different trees.

Example 4.7. Two examples of marked OBFs are shown in Figure 7.




FIGURE 7. Two examples of marked OBFs.

We now have all of the information to define a *forest diagram*, the sort of “board” on which Tree Builder is played. Forest diagrams were developed by Belk and Brown [BB05] to describe elements of Thompson’s group F .

Definition 4.8. A *forest diagram* is a triple $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{S}, \phi)$, where \mathfrak{T} and \mathfrak{S} are marked OBFs, and $\phi: L(\mathfrak{T}) \rightarrow L(\mathfrak{S})$ is an order-preserving bijection. Here, \mathfrak{T} and \mathfrak{S} are called the *top forest* and *bottom forest*, respectively.

In practice, we represent a forest diagram $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{S}, \phi)$ by a pair

$$\left((T_0, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T_k}, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{S_\ell}, \dots, S_m) \right),$$


where $(T_0, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T_k}, \dots, T_n)$ is a representation of \mathfrak{T} , $(S_0, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{S_\ell}, \dots, S_m)$ is a representation of \mathfrak{S} , and the leftmost leaf in T_0 is mapped to the leftmost leaf in S_0 by ϕ . Note that this pair completely defines a forest diagram, since ϕ is fully determined by the image of a single leaf.

We can represent forest diagrams in two ways. If we wish to discuss a particular forest diagram, we represent it by drawing its two OBFs, with the top forest drawn on top, and the bottom forest drawn (upside-down) on the bottom. When we draw it in this way, for each leaf $v \in L(\mathfrak{T})$, we draw $\phi(v) \in L(\mathfrak{S})$ directly below it. In contrast, when we have an arbitrary or unspecified forest diagram, we usually represent them as a pair of representations of its two marked OBFs, as described above.

Example 4.9. We call the forest diagram represented by

$$\left(\left(\overset{\downarrow}{\cdot} \right), \left(\overset{\uparrow}{\cdot} \right) \right)$$

the *trivial forest diagram*. We can also draw the trivial forest diagram as in Figure 8a.



(A) A drawing of the trivial forest diagram.

(B) An example drawing of a (non-trivial) forest diagram.

FIGURE 8. Two examples of drawings of forest diagrams.

Example 4.10. An example of a forest diagram is shown in Figure 8b. The top forest \mathfrak{T} is drawn on top and the bottom forest \mathfrak{S} is drawn, upside-down, on the bottom.

It is sometimes possible to *reduce* a forest diagram by removing opposing carets in the following sense.

Definition 4.11 (Reducing a forest diagram). The forest diagram $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{S}, \phi)$ is *reducible* if there are consecutive leaves $u, v \in \mathfrak{T}$ such that u, v form a caret, and the leaves $\phi(u), \phi(v) \in \mathfrak{S}$ form a caret as well. These two carets are called a *cancellable pair of carets*. Reducing the forest diagram means deleting all four leaves in these two carets, such that their corresponding parents become leaves in the new top and bottom forests, respectively. In the resulting forest diagram the parental order on vertices on the forests, the bijection ϕ on the remaining leaves,

and the position of the markers are respected. A forest diagram is *reduced* if it is not reducible.

In terms of the representations of forest diagrams, a reduction can be interpreted as follows. Suppose that the following forest diagram

$$\left((T_0, \dots, T_i, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T_k}, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, \underset{\uparrow}{S_j}, \dots, S_m) \right)$$

contains a pair of cancellable carets using two leaves of T_i and two leaves of S_j . In this case, reducing the forest diagram entails removing the corresponding leaves of T_i and S_j , obtaining the OBTs T_i^* and S_j^* , respectively. Then the reduction of the above forest diagram is

$$\left((T_0, \dots, T_i^*, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T_k}, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, \underset{\uparrow}{S_j^*}, \dots, S_m) \right).$$

In the case that the marker on top forest was on T_i , then the marker after the reduction is on T_i^* , and similarly for the marker on the bottom after a reduction.

Now we illustrate reduction of forest diagram with some concrete examples.

Example 4.12. An example of a reducible forest diagram can be seen on the left side of Figure 9. It has one pair of cancellable carets. Applying this reduction once gives the reduced diagram on the right. This example also demonstrates how the position of the markers are conserved.




FIGURE 9. An example of reducing a forest diagram, which demonstrates how the position of the markers are retained.

Example 4.13. Another example of reducing a forest diagram is shown in Figure 10. This example shows that reducing a forest diagram may take multiple steps, even if there is initially only one pair of cancellable carets.

Forest diagrams are equivalent up to this reduction. This reduction is always possible and the resulting reduced forest diagram is unique, as shown by Belk and Brown [BB05] and stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.14 ([BB05, Proposition 3.2.4]). *Every forest diagram has a unique reduced form.*

From this point, any forest diagrams that we discuss are assumed to be in reduced form.




FIGURE 10. A step-by-step example of reducing a forest diagram.

4.2. Playing the Tree Builder Game. What follows is the definition of the game itself. We note that the game is largely similar to the Lamplighter game defined in Chapter 3. The game is played between a player called the *builder*, and $n \geq 1$ other players called the *copiers*. At the beginning of the game, a series of constraints are chosen by the players.

- The copiers collectively choose two positive integers ρ and σ , called the *copier reach* and *copier speed*, respectively.
- Knowing the values of ρ and σ , the builder chooses positive integers ψ and R called the *builder speed* and *size limit*, respectively.
- The copiers each choose a forest diagram on which to start the game.
- Finally the builder, knowing the starting forest diagram of each of the copiers, chooses their own forest diagram on which to start.

The game essentially consists of the builder traversing through forest diagrams, adding and removing caret from trees, while the copiers do the same with their own individual forest diagrams in an attempt to copy the builder's pattern of trees. In the following subsection, we describe the actions a player can take in detail.

4.3. Turns and Player Movement. The game is played in a series of alternating turns, starting with the copiers. Say a player starts a turn with forest diagram

$$\left((T_0, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T}_k, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{S}_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right)$$

for $m, n \geq 0$, $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$. At any point, a player has four available types of moves. They can either move their position (left or right), or they can choose to “build” (up or down). A more detailed description of each of these moves is as follows.

- (1) A player can move their position one tree to the left. So, if $k = 0$, then that player's forest diagram becomes

$$\left((\overset{\downarrow}{\cdot}, T_0, \dots, T_k, \dots, T_n), (\cdot, S_0, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{S}_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right)$$

where \cdot represents the trivial OBT. Otherwise it becomes

$$\left((T_0, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T}_{k-1}, T_k, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, \overset{\uparrow}{S}_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right).$$

An example can be seen in Figure 11, which shows a player taking two moves in a row to the left.




FIGURE 11. An example of a Tree Builder player moving to the left, twice in a row.

- (2) A player can move their position one tree to the right. So, if $k = n$, then their new forest diagram is

$$\left((T_0, \dots, T_n, \downarrow), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, S_m, \cdot) \right).$$

Otherwise, that player's forest diagram becomes

$$\left((T_0, \dots, T_k, T_{k+1}^\downarrow, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right).$$

An example can be seen in Figure 12, which shows a player taking two moves in a row to the right.




FIGURE 12. An example of a Tree Builder player moving to the right, twice in a row.

- (3) A player can "build upwards" by connecting the current tree with the next one to the right. Therefore the forest diagram becomes

$$\left((T_0, \dots, T_k^\downarrow, T_{k+2}, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right),$$

where T_k^\downarrow is a new OBT, consisting of a root whose left child is the root of T_k , and whose right child is the root of T_{k+1} — recalling that T_{n+1} is seen as a trivial OBT. If T_k and T_{k+1} are both trivial, note that this may "cancel" a caret in the bottom forest if one exists. An example of building up twice in a row is shown in Figure 13, where the first build cancels a caret in the bottom forest, and the second places a caret on the top.

- (4) Finally, a player can "build downwards". This means that, if T_k is not trivial, its root is deleted, and the remaining vertices are split into two separate trees. The player's position then moves to the left of the two trees created this way. Formally,

$$N' = \left((T_0, \dots, T_k^L, T_k^R, \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right),$$





FIGURE 13. An example of a Tree Builder player building up, twice in a row.


where T_k^L and T_k^R are the subtrees of T_k rooted at the left and right child of its root, respectively. Otherwise, if T_k is trivial, this adds a “branch” to the corresponding leaf on the bottom forest. More specifically, since T_k is trivial, its sole vertex is also the i^{th} leaf in \mathfrak{T} for some positive integer i . Then this move will take the i^{th} leaf in \mathfrak{S} and add a “branch”. In other words, the i^{th} leaf in \mathfrak{S} becomes a node and has two leaves added to it, which become the new i^{th} and $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ leaves respectively. We must then add a new trivial tree in the top forest, to the right of the player’s current position, in order to retain the relative ordering of the leaves in the top and bottom forests. So, the player’s new forest diagram becomes

$$N' = \left((T_0, \dots, \overset{\downarrow}{T_k}, T', \dots, T_n), (S_0, \dots, S_{r-1}, \overset{\uparrow}{S'_r}, S_{r+1}, \dots, S_\ell, \dots, S_m) \right),$$

where T' is the new trivial tree and S_r , the tree that contains the i^{th} leaf, is replaced by S'_r , the same tree with two children added to that i^{th} leaf. There are examples of both deleting a caret and building on the bottom forest in Figures 14a and 14b, respectively.



(A) A Tree Builder player building downwards and deleting a caret.



(B) A Tree Builder player building downwards into the bottom forest.

FIGURE 14. Two examples of building downwards in Tree Builder.

We say that the “distance” between two forest diagrams is the minimum number of moves required to change one of them into the other.

The copiers all move simultaneously, and each knows where the others are going to move, i.e. they are able to coordinate with each other. They each move up to a total of ψ times in a turn, being able to select any of their available moves each time.

The builder similarly chooses up to σ moves on their turn. The builder, however, has an additional restriction: his forest diagram can never be at distance greater than R from the trivial forest diagram. This restriction is important to relating this game to Weak-Cops and Robbers, as it translates to playing inside of a ball with some chosen radius.

4.4. Win Conditions. The goal of the copiers is to come “close enough” to copying the builder’s forest diagram. In particular, the copiers win if, at any point during any player’s turn, the distance from any of the copiers’ forest diagrams to the builder’s is less than or equal to ρ . Conversely, the builder wins if he can show that he can permanently avoid letting the copiers come close enough to win.

4.5. A Winning Strategy for the Builder.

Theorem 4.15. *Let n be a positive integer. Then the builder has a winning strategy in a game of Tree Builder against n copiers.*

Proof. Assume we have n copiers (called c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n in some arbitrary order, with forest diagrams D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n respectively) with speed σ and reach ρ , and let $\mu = \max\{\sigma, \rho\}$.

Choosing the builder’s parameters: The builder, whose forest diagram we will call D , then chooses speed $\psi = 6n + 2\mu$ and size limit $R = 8n + 4\mu$. The initial forest diagram is as shown in Figure 15. The bottom forest contains only trivial trees. The top forest is as follows. There is a trivial tree aligned with the forest diagram’s center. Outwards from this central tree, on both sides, there is a row of μ more trivial trees, followed by a row of n pairs of leaves. From left to right, label the pairs of leaves on the left-hand side by $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n$, and the pairs on the right by r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n . For each pair ℓ_i , there is a caret connecting them if and only if the corresponding leaves on D_i are *not* connected by a caret. Similarly, there is a caret at r_i if and only if there is not a caret connecting the corresponding pair on D_i . The builder’s position starts at the leftmost tree within this setup, i.e., on the left vertex of ℓ_1 if there is no caret on ℓ_1 , or if there is a caret there, begin at its root.

The builder’s strategy: On each of the builder’s turns, they move their position from the leftmost tree to the rightmost tree, or vice-versa. While they travel between these trees, they add or delete carets on each pair of vertices ℓ_i and r_j to ensure that the difference condition on our initial forest diagram still holds — i.e., each of the pairs ℓ_i, r_j has a caret connecting them if and only if a caret is not present in the same location on D_i or D_j , respectively.

Proof that the builder’s speed ψ is sufficient: Suppose the builder begins his turn on the left side of the board. Depending on whether or not a caret exists at ℓ_i or r_j , and depending on whether the builder needs to add or remove a caret, they require a certain number of moves within each pair. Firstly, there are the n moves required on either side to move between the pairs of vertices (including the move to and from the central vertices) for a total of $2n$ moves, as well as some




FIGURE 15. The builder's initial configuration in a game against n copiers.

number of moves *within* each pair to add or remove caret if necessary. The four possibilities are as follows.

- If we have a caret to be erased, we need 2 additional moves (build down, move right).
- If we have to place a caret, we need 1 move (build up).
- If we have no caret and do not need to add one, we need 1 move (move right).
- If we have a caret and do not need to remove it, we need no extra moves.

Therefore, the builder requires at most 2 extra moves within each pair. He also requires 2μ moves to move from ℓ_n to r_1 . Consequently, the total number of moves required for the builder in this case is $n + 2n + 2\mu + 2n + n = 6n + 2\mu$. The calculation for moving from right to left is similar, except we must confirm that we need at most 2 moves within each pair. The four possibilities in this case are as follows.

- If we have a caret to be erased, we need 1 additional move (build down).
- If we have to place a caret, we need 2 moves (move left, build up).
- If we have no caret and do not need to add one, we need 1 move (move left).
- If we have a caret and do not need to remove it, we need no extra moves.

Thus on every turn, the builder can complete his strategy in at most $6n + 2\mu$ moves.

Proof that the builder's radius R is sufficient: Let $D' = (\mathfrak{T}', \mathfrak{S}', \phi')$ be an arbitrary forest diagram that belongs to the builder at some point in the above strategy, where \mathfrak{T}' and \mathfrak{S}' have pointers at $T_{k'}$ and $S_{\ell'}$, respectively. We can construct D' from the trivial forest diagram as follows.

Starting in the default position on the trivial forest diagram, label the pairs ℓ_i and r_j as in our strategy. If $k' \leq \ell'$, i.e. the desired position is to the left of the forest diagram's center, we begin by moving our position to the right leaf of r_n , move left to ℓ_1 while building up as necessary to create the required carets along the way, and then moving the position to k' from the left. If $k' > \ell'$, we begin by moving to ℓ_1 , moving right to r_n while building up the necessary carets, and then move back to k' . This requires at most $n + \mu$ moves for the initial movement, $2(n + \mu)$ moves to move to the other side, $4n$ moves within the carets (as argued

above), and then at most $n + \mu$ moves to return to position k' . Therefore no forest diagram reached by the builder during this strategy is at distance greater than $4(n + \mu) + 4n = 8n + 4\mu$ from the trivial forest diagram.

Proof that the builder wins with the above strategy: We wish to show that, at every one of the builder's moves, the builder is at distance at least ρ from each of the copiers. Assume a copier c_k starts their turn such that each of the pairs ℓ_k and r_k contain a caret if and only if the same vertices in N_k do not. If there are no carets among the middle $2\mu + 1$ vertices, then it would take at least $2\mu + 2$ moves to move from any of the pairs ℓ_i to any of the pairs r_j , or vice-versa. This means that, even if a copier changes one of ℓ_i or r_i to match up with the builder's board, they still have to reach the other one within the same turn. However, since their position is at least $2\mu + 2$ moves away from the trees on the other side, even after $\sigma \leq \mu$ moves, we are still at least $\mu + 2 > \mu \geq \rho$ moves away from the builder.

Note that the copiers can "close the gap" between ℓ_i and r_i on D_i by placing carets in the center. For each such caret a builder places, they connect two trees, thus decreasing the number of places their position needs to move to travel between the left pairs and right pairs by 1. However, since there are no carets in the middle section of the builder's board, placing carets in that section of the copier's board additionally increases the distance, by at least the 1 move needed to erase that caret. Therefore placing carets in the middle does not decrease the distance between D and D_i , thus the distance between them will remain strictly larger than ρ , and the copiers do not win on their turn.

Similarly, on the builder's turn, we note that the above argument does not take into account the position of the builder. This shows us that the builder changing his position, does not affect whether or not his distance to the copiers is less than ρ . Other than changing his position, the only other moves the builder takes are to add and remove carets in positions that increase his distance from the copiers. Therefore, the builder stays further than ρ moves away from all copiers on any given move during his turn, and the copiers do not win on the builder's turn. \square

4.6. Thompson's Group F and its Weak Cop Number. We have now defined Tree Builder, and shown that the builder can always win against any finite number of copiers. Now, we wish to use this to prove that, on some Cayley graph of Thompson's group F , the robber can beat any finite number of cops in a game of Weak-Cops and Robbers. We begin by defining another graph to play Weak-Cops and Robbers on, which effectively captures the structure of Tree Builder.

Definition 4.16. Let Θ be the graph whose vertex set is the set of possible forest diagrams, where two forest diagrams are adjacent if one can be reached from the other by a single move in the Tree Builder game.

Theorem 4.17. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If the builder has a winning strategy in a Tree Builder game against n copiers, then the robber has a winning strategy in a game of Cops and Robbers on Θ against n cops.*

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose the builder has a winning strategy against n copiers in Tree Builder. Then, for any possible values of copier reach ρ and copier speed σ that the copiers choose, the builder chooses some builder speed $\psi_{\rho, \sigma}$ and size limit $R_{\rho, \sigma}$, respectively.

Suppose that, in a game of cops and robbers on Θ against n cops, the cops choose reach ρ and speed σ . The robber then follows by choosing speed $\psi_{\rho,\sigma}$, the radius R to be $R_{\rho,\sigma}$, and v to be the vertex that represents the trivial forest diagram.

Now, we simply take the builder's winning strategy in Theorem 4.15 and translate it into the language of Cops and Robbers. At any point where the builder has forest diagram f , we wish for the robber to be on the vertex in Θ that represents f . By the definition of tree builder, then, the robber travels throughout the graph Θ , travelling at most $\psi_{\rho,\sigma}$ vertices per turn, staying within the ball of radius $R_{\rho,\sigma}$ centered at v and always staying at distance greater than ρ from each of the cops. \square

Corollary 4.18. *Θ has infinite weak-cop number.*

Finally, we wish to translate our results about Θ into results about a Cayley graph of Thompson's group F , which from this point on, we will simply call F . First, we must define the group in question.

Theorem 4.19 (Presentation of F). *F has the following presentation by generators and relations:*

$$F = \langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots \mid x_i^{-1}x_jx_i = x_{j+1} \text{ for } i < j \rangle.$$

It is clear from this presentation that F is generated by x_0 and x_1 , since for each of the other generators x_i with $i \geq 2$, we have $x_i = x_0^{-i}x_1x_0^i$. We wish to use the elements of this group to represent the possible forest diagrams in a game of Tree Builder.

The set of possible forest diagrams in Tree Builder has identical structure to F , in a very particular way. The proof of this fact is very straightforward, given the following results of Belk and Brown [BB05], translated into terms of forest diagrams and Tree Builder moves.

Lemma 4.20 ([BB05, Prop. 3.2.4]). *Every element of F can be represented by a unique reduced forest diagram.*

Lemma 4.21 ([BB05, Prop. 3.3.1, Prop. 3.3.5]). *Given a forest diagram representing $f \in F$, the forest diagrams obtained by moving right, moving left, building upwards, and building downwards are represented by x_0f , $x_0^{-1}f$, x_1f and $x_1^{-1}f$, respectively.*

Corollary 4.22. *The Tree Builder graph Θ is isomorphic to $\text{Cay}(F, \{x_0, x_1\})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.20, there is a bijection ψ between the set of possible forest diagrams and the elements of F . By Lemma 4.21, edges in Θ are mapped under ψ to edges corresponding to left-multiplication by an element in $\{x_0, x_0^{-1}, x_1, x_1^{-1}\}$. Therefore ψ is a graph isomorphism from Θ to $\text{Cay}(F, \{x_0, x_1\})$. \square

Corollary 4.23. *Thompson's group F has infinite weak-cop number.*

4.7. Alternative Argument for $\text{wCop}(F) = \infty$. In this part we describe an argument communicated to the authors by Francesco Fournier-Facio.

One can deduce that $\text{wCop}(F) = \infty$, from the following three statements.

Theorem 4.24. [LMPRQ23, Theorem E] *Let H be a subgroup of a finitely generated group G . If H is a retract of G , then $\text{wCop}(H) \leq \text{wCop}(G)$.*

Theorem 4.25. [LMPRQ23, Theorem C] $\text{wCop}(\mathbb{Z}^2) = \infty$.

The following statement is well-known among experts on Thompson's group F , and is implicit in expositions on generalizations of Thompson's groups, see [BS16] or the recent work [BFFZ24, Cor. 3.10].

Theorem 4.26. *Thompson's group F retracts onto \mathbb{Z}^2 .*

Let us share an explanation of the above statement based on [BFFZ24, Sec. 3]. Regard Thompson's group F as the subgroup of homeomorphisms of the unit interval consisting of orientation-preserving, piecewise linear homeomorphisms whose non-differentiable points are dyadic rationals and whose slopes are all powers of 2. Given an element $g \in F$, let $\chi_0(g) = \log_2 g'(0)$ and $\chi_1(g) = \log_2 g'(1)$, where $g'(0)$ and $g'(1)$ denote the slopes of the piece-wise linear homeomorphism g at 0 and at 1. Let $g_0 \in F$ such that $g'_0(0) = 2$ and $\text{Supp}(g_0) = \{x \in [0, 1] \mid g_0(x) \neq x\} = [0, 1/2]$; then, let $g_1 \in F$ such that $g'_1(1) = 2$ and $\text{Supp}(g_1) = [1/2, 1]$. Observe that the subgroup $H = \langle g_0, g_1 \rangle$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^2 , $r(g_0) = (1, 0)$, and $r(g_1) = (0, 1)$. Hence $r: F \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ is a retraction.

The Bieri-Strebel groups are generalizations of Thompson's group, see [BS16] for definitions. An analogous argument provides a retraction $G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$ for G any Bieri-Strebel group with a finitely generated slope group. Hence any group in this class has infinite weak-cop number.

REFERENCES

- [ABGK23] Gideon Amir, Rangel Baldasso, Maria Gerasimova, and Gady Kozma. Fire retainment on Cayley graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 346(1):Paper No. 113176, 11, 2023.
- [ABK20] Gideon Amir, Rangel Baldasso, and Gady Kozma. The firefighter problem on polynomial and intermediate growth groups. *Discrete Math.*, 343(11):112077, 4, 2020.
- [BB05] James M. Belk and Kenneth S. Brown. Forest diagrams for elements of Thompson's group F . *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 15(5-6):815–850, 2005.
- [BFFZ24] Sahana Balasubramanya, Francesco Fournier-Facio, and Matthew C. B. Zaremsky. Hyperbolic actions of Thompson's group F and generalizations, 2024.
- [BS16] Robert Bieri and Ralph Strebel. On groups of pl-homeomorphisms of the real line, 2016.
- [Don15] Alfredo Donno. Generalized wreath products of graphs and groups. *Graphs Combin.*, 31(4):915–926, 2015.
- [EFW12] Alex Eskin, David Fisher, and Kevin Whyte. Coarse differentiation of quasi-isometries I: Spaces not quasi-isometric to Cayley graphs. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 176(1):221–260, 2012.
- [Leh19] Florian Lehner. Firefighting on trees and Cayley graphs. *Australas. J. Combin.*, 75:66–72, 2019.
- [LMPRQ23] Jonathan Lee, Eduardo Martínez-Pedroza, and Juan Felipe Rodríguez-Quinche. Coarse geometry of the cops and robber game. *Discrete Math.*, 346(12):Paper No. 113585, 23, 2023.
- [MPPa23] Eduardo Martínez-Pedroza and Tomasz Prytuł a. Coarse geometry of the fire retaining property and group splittings. *Geom. Dedicata*, 217(2):Paper No. 40, 18, 2023.
- [NW83] Richard Nowakowski and Peter Winkler. Vertex-to-vertex pursuit in a graph. *Discrete Math.*, 43(2-3):235–239, 1983.
- [Qui78] Alain Quilliot. *Jeux et pointes fixes sur les graphes*. PhD thesis, Ph. D. Dissertation, Université de Paris VI, 1978.

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN'S, NL, CANADA
Email address: `accconnect@mun.ca`

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN'S, NL, CANADA
Email address: `emartinezped@mun.ca`