

Homotopy types of complexes of hyperplanes in quasi-median graphs and applications to right-angled Artin groups

Carolyn Abbott, Anthony Genevois, and Eduardo Martínez-Pedroza

March 12, 2025

Abstract

In this article, we prove that, given two finite connected graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 , if the two right-angled Artin groups $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ are quasi-isometric, then the infinite pointed sums $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_1^{\boxtimes}$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_2^{\boxtimes}$ are homotopy equivalent, where Γ_i^{\boxtimes} denotes the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is Γ_i and whose simplices are given by joins. These invariants are extracted from a study, of independent interest, of the homotopy types of several complexes of hyperplanes in quasi-median graphs (such as one-skeleta of CAT(0) cube complexes). For instance, given a quasi-median graph X , the *crossing complex* $\text{Cross}^{\Delta}(X)$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes (or θ -classes) of X and whose simplices are collections of pairwise transverse hyperplanes. When X has no cut-vertex, we show that $\text{Cross}^{\Delta}(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to the pointed sum of the links of all the vertices in the prism-completion X^{\square} of X .

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries on quasi-median geometry	6
3	Homotopy types of complexes of hyperplanes	11
3.1	Contact complexes	13
3.2	Crossing complexes	13
3.3	Relative contact complexes	16
4	Applications to coset intersection complexes	22
4.1	Clique subgroups	24
4.2	Other parabolic subgroups	26
5	Applications to large-scale geometry of right-angled Artin groups	28
5.1	QI-characteristic parabolic subgroups	28
5.2	Quasi-isometric and commensurability invariants	31
6	Open questions	34
	References	36

2010 *Mathematics subject classification*. Primary 20F65. Secondary 05C25, 57Q05.

Key words and phrases. Quasi-median graphs, median graphs, right-angled Artin groups, graph products of groups, homotopy of simplicial complexes.

1 Introduction

Given a graph Γ , the *right-angled Artin group* $A(\Gamma)$ is given by the presentation

$$\langle u \text{ a vertex of } \Gamma \mid [u, v] = 1 \text{ whenever } u \text{ and } v \text{ are adjacent in } \Gamma \rangle.$$

Right-angled Artin groups interpolate between free groups (when “nothing commutes”, i.e. Γ has no edges) and free abelian groups (when “everything commutes”, i.e. Γ is a complete graph). Despite the early appearance of similar interpolations for other algebraic structures, such as monoids and algebras (see for instance [CF69, KMLNR80, Ber76]), as well as a few mentions of the groups in some articles [HR72, KR80, Dic81], the study of right-angled Artin groups started in earnest with the work of Baudisch [Bau77, Bau81] and Droms [Dro83, Dro87a, Dro87b, Dro87c]. Since then, many articles have been dedicated to right-angled Artin groups from various perspectives. In addition to being an instructive source of examples, right-angled Artin groups also led to interesting applications. Two major contributions in this direction include the Morse theory developed in [BB97] and the theory of special cube complexes introduced in [HW08].

Despite the fact that right-angled Artin groups have been extensively studied, a few very natural questions remain open, including the embedding problem, the classification up to commensurability, and, from the perspective of geometric group theory, the following question to which our article is dedicated:

(Quasi-isometry classification) Given two graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 , when are $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ quasi-isometric?


Two early major contributions to the subject include [BN08], which proves that right-angled Artin groups given by finite trees of diameters ≥ 3 are all quasi-isometric; and [BKS08], which shows that two right-angled Artin groups given by *atomic* graphs are quasi-isometric if and only if they are isomorphic. Thus, right-angled Artin groups may exhibit both some flexibility and some rigidity up to quasi-isometry. So far, no global picture seems to be accessible. It is worth noticing that [BN08] has been generalised in [BJN10]; and that important works of Huang [Hua17, Hua16] also generalise [BKS08], determining exactly when two right-angled Artin groups are quasi-isometric for a wide range of graphs. Many quasi-isometric invariants have also been computed for right-angled Artin groups, including, for instance, divergence [BC12, ABD⁺13], cut-points in asymptotic cones [BC12], splittings over cyclic subgroups [Mar20], and Morse boundaries [CCS23].

In this article, we contribute to the quasi-isometry classification of right-angled Artin groups by constructing new quasi-isometric invariants. More precisely, the main result of this article is:

Theorem 1.1. *Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite connected graphs. If the right-angled Artin groups $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ are quasi-isometric, then the infinite pointed sums $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_1^{\boxtimes}$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_2^{\boxtimes}$ are homotopy equivalent, where Γ_i^{\boxtimes} denotes the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is Γ_i and whose simplices are given by joins.*

As a baby example illustrating the theorem, notice that the right-angled Artin groups $A(C_4)$ and $A(C_5)$, associated to cycles of lengths 4 and 5, are not quasi-isometric. Indeed, C_4^{\boxtimes} is contractible, while C_5^{\boxtimes} is homotopy equivalent to a circle. As more interesting examples, let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_4$ be the graphs given below. By noticing that Γ_1^{\boxtimes} is homotopy equivalent to a point, Γ_2^{\boxtimes} to \mathbb{S}^1 , Γ_3^{\boxtimes} to $\mathbb{S}^2 \vee \mathbb{S}^1$, and Γ_4^{\boxtimes} to \mathbb{S}^2 , it follows from Theorem 1.1

that the right-angled Artin groups $A(\Gamma_1), A(\Gamma_2), A(\Gamma_3), A(\Gamma_4)$ are pairwise not quasi-isometric¹.



Strategy of the proof. In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we start by proving that a specific *coset intersection complex* [AMP24] is preserved by quasi-isometries. More precisely, given a graph Γ , define $J(\Gamma)$ as the simplicial complex

- whose vertices are the cosets $g\langle\Lambda\rangle$ where $g \in A(\Gamma)$ and where $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ is a join;
- and whose simplices are given by cosets $g_1\langle\Lambda_1\rangle, \dots, g_n\langle\Lambda_n\rangle$ such that the intersection $g_1\langle\Lambda_1\rangle g_1^{-1} \cap \dots \cap g_n\langle\Lambda_n\rangle g_n^{-1}$ is infinite.

One can deduce from the techniques introduced in [Hua17] that, given two finite connected graphs Γ_1 and Γ_2 , every quasi-isometry $A(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow A(\Gamma_2)$ naturally induces an isomorphism $J(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow J(\Gamma_2)$. However, determining whether two such complexes are isomorphic may be quite tricky in practice. Our main observation is that it is much simpler to compare them up to homotopy equivalence. More precisely, we show the complex $J(\Gamma)$ is homotopy equivalent to the infinite pointed sum $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma^{\infty}$, as defined in Theorem 1.1.

The key observation in order to identify the homotopy type of our complex is that $J(\Gamma)$ has a very convenient geometric interpretation. Roughly, it is homotopy equivalent to a simplicial complex that can be described using the *hyperplanes* of the *quasi-median graph*

$$\text{QM}(\Gamma) := \text{Cayl} \left(A(\Gamma), \bigcup_{u \in \Gamma} \langle u \rangle \setminus \{1\} \right),$$

as introduced in [Gen17]. This provides a good geometric framework in which various tools are available in order to study the homotopy type of the simplicial complex we are interested in. As we now discuss, our results in this direction are of independent interest.

Complexes of hyperplanes in quasi-median graphs. In the same way that *median graphs* (also known as one-skeleta of *CAT(0) cube complexes* in geometric group theory) can be defined as retracts of hypercubes, *quasi-median graphs* can be defined as retracts of *Hamming graphs* (i.e. products of complete graphs). See Section 2 for some background on the subject from the perspective of metric graph theory and geometric group theory.

¹Part of this conclusion can also be deduced from [Hua17, Hua16], because we tried to present examples that are as simple as possible. However, we can slightly perturb our examples so that [Hua17, Hua16] no longer applies while Theorem 1.1 still does, for instance by gluing an edge to each graph along a vertex.

It is worth mentioning that, similarly to median graphs, quasi-median graphs can be endowed with a higher-dimensional cellular structure that turns them into CAT(0) complexes. More specifically, given a quasi-median graph X , a *prism* refers to a product of *cliques* (i.e. maximal complete subgraphs). The *prism-completion* X^\square of X , which is obtained by filling all the prisms with products of simplices, can be naturally endowed with a CAT(0) metric [Gen17].

A fundamental tool in the study of quasi-median graphs is the notion of a *hyperplane* (or, in the language of metric graph theory, of a θ -class with respect to the *Djoković-Winkler relation* θ). In a quasi-median graph, a hyperplane is an equivalence class of edges with respect to the reflexive-transitive closure of the relation that identifies two edges whenever they are opposite in a 4-cycle or belong to a common 3-cycle; see Figure 1. The key idea to keep in mind is that the geometry of a quasi-median graph reduces to the combinatorics of its hyperplanes; see, for instance, Theorem 2.2 below.




Figure 1: A quasi-median graph and some of its hyperplanes. The orange hyperplane is transverse to the red, blue, and purple hyperplanes. The purple hyperplane is in contact with the red, blue, and orange hyperplanes. The orange and green hyperplanes are in contact. The red and blue hyperplanes are not in contact.

Given a quasi-median graph X , we refer vaguely to a *complex of hyperplanes* as a simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices correspond to collections of hyperplanes that interact in some specific way. For instance, two hyperplanes J and H are *in contact* (resp. *transverse*) whenever there exist two distinct edges in J and H that intersect (resp. that intersect and span a 4-cycle). The *contact complex* $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$ (resp. the *crossing complex* $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$) is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by hyperplanes pairwise in contact (resp. transverse). See Section 3 for a more detailed account on contact and crossing complexes. Of course, other natural constructions are possible, including the *contiguity complex* we introduce in Section 3.3. In order to be able to deal with all these complexes at once, we introduce the following notion of *contact complexes relative to collections of gated subgraphs*. We refer the reader to Section 2 for a precise definition of *gated subgraphs*; for now, they can be thought of as subgraphs satisfying a strong convexity condition.

Definition 1.2. Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a collection of gated subgraphs. The \mathbb{G} -*contact complex* $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is the graph whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by hyperplanes pairwise in contact that all cross a common subgraph from \mathbb{G} .

The contact (resp. crossing) complex of a quasi-median graph X then coincides with the \mathbb{G} -contact complex of X for $\mathbb{G} = \{X\}$ (resp. $\mathbb{G} = \{\text{prisms}\}$). See Figure 3 for a simple example of a relative contact complex.

In this article, we identify the homotopy type of various relative contact complexes under weak assumptions. The picture to keep in mind is that, given a quasi-median




Figure 2: A quasi-median graph, and its contact and crossing complexes.




Figure 3: A quasi-median graph X endowed with a collection of gated subgraphs \mathbb{G} and the corresponding \mathbb{G} -contact complex.

graph X and a collection of gated subgraphs \mathbb{G} that covers X , typically the relative contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to the pointed sums of all the links of the vertices of X in the cellular complex $\text{ConeOff}(X^\square, \mathbb{G})$ obtained from the prism-completion X^\square by gluing cones over the subgraphs of \mathbb{G} . Given a vertex $x \in X$, we have a simple model for the homotopy type of the link of x in our cone-off, namely the simplicial complex $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ whose vertices are the *cliques* (i.e. maximal complete subgraphs) of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of cliques contained in a common subgraph from \mathbb{G} .

As a simple case, when $\mathbb{G} = \{X\}$, the simplified links $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ are all simplices. Following our leitmotiv, we therefore expect the corresponding relative contact complex, namely the contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$, to be contractible. This turns out to be the case; see Section 3.1 for a short proof. A similar argument can be found in [Row23] for finite median graphs.

The next statement records Theorems 3.6 and 3.15, which constitute our main contribution to the study of complexes of hyperplanes in quasi-median graphs up to homotopy.

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be a quasi-median graph with no cut-vertex and \mathbb{G} a collection of gated subgraphs. Assume that $\mathbb{G} = \{\text{prisms}\}$ or that \mathbb{G} is star-covering. The \mathbb{G} -contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to the pointed sum $\bigvee_{x \in X} \text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$.*

An immediate consequence of Theorem 3.6 is that the crossing complex of a quasi-median graph X is connected if and only if X has no cut-vertex. This fact has been observed several times in various situations [KM02, BH08, Nib02]. In other words, $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$ is 0-connected if and only if the vertices of the prism-completion X^\square have 0-connected links. One can think of Theorem 1.3, when applied to crossing complexes, as a generalisation of this phenomenon to higher dimensions. For instance, $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$ is contractible if and only if links of vertices in X^\square are contractible.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Jingyin Huang for pointing out how Theorem 5.1 follows from results in [Hua16]. The first author was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-2106906 and DMS-2340341. The third author acknowledges funding by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada NSERC.

2 Preliminaries on quasi-median geometry

A central idea in geometric group theory is that, in order to study a given group, it is often fruitful to make it act on metric spaces with rich geometries. From this perspective, geometries with a combinatorial flavour are especially efficient because they are easier to construct in practice. Notable examples include buildings, small cancellation polygonal complexes, CAT(0) cube complexes (which coincide with cube-completions of median graphs), systolic complexes (which coincide with flag completions of bridged graphs). In this article, we are interested in another such combinatorial geometry: *quasi-median graphs*.

Median graphs, better known as one-skeleta of CAT(0) cube complexes in geometric group theory, have a long history in metric graph theory. Formally introduced during the 1960-70s [Ava61, Neb71, Mul78], they have deep roots in graph theory and related fields; see the surveys [BC08, Mul11]. Since then, many families of graphs generalising median graphs have been investigated. Inspired by the characterisation of median graphs as retracts of hypercubes, one can introduce *quasi-median graphs* [Mul80, BMW94] as retracts of *Hamming graphs* (i.e. products of complete graphs). From the perspective of geometric group theory, it was shown that median graphs coincide with one-skeleta of CAT(0) cube complexes [Ger98, Che00, Rol98]. CAT(0) cube complexes have been enlightened in [Gro87] as a convenient source of CAT(0) spaces and then in [Sag95] as a relevant higher-dimensional generalisation of trees. Since then, CAT(0) cube complexes have played a prominent role in geometric group theory. Quasi-median graphs were introduced in geometric group theory by the second-named author in [Gen17] and turn out to have applications in graph products of groups [Gen17, Val21, Gen22a, Gen23] and their automorphism groups [GM19, Gen18], in Thompson's groups [Gen17, Gen19a], and in wreath products of groups [Gen17, GT21a, GT21b].

It is worth mentioning that, similarly to median graphs, quasi-median graphs can be endowed with a higher-dimensional cellular structure that turns them into CAT(0) complexes. More precisely, prism-completions of quasi-median graphs, as defined below, can be endowed with a CAT(0) metric.

The definition of a quasi-median graph as a retract of a Hamming graph is not the simplest definition to work with nor to verify. In practice, there are other equivalent definitions, which are easier to deal with but also more technical and more difficult to digest. We refer for instance to [BMW94] for more details. Nevertheless, similarly to median graphs, the key point is to understand how hyperplanes behave. This is what we describe now.

Definition 2.1. Let X be a graph. A *hyperplane* J is an equivalence class of edges with respect to the reflexive-transitive closure of the relation that identifies two edges whenever they belong to a common 3-cycle or are opposite in some 4-cycle. A hyperplane J *crosses* a subgraph K if there is an edge of K that belongs to J . We denote by $X \setminus \setminus J$ the graph obtained from X by removing (the interiors of) all the edges of J . A connected component of $X \setminus \setminus J$ is a *sector*. The *carrier* of J , denoted by $N(J)$, is the subgraph induced by all the edges of J . The *fibres* of J are the connected components of $N(J) \setminus \setminus J$. Two distinct hyperplanes J_1 and J_2 are *transverse* if there exist two edges $e_1 \subset J_1$ and




Figure 4: A quasi-median graph and some of its hyperplanes. The orange hyperplane is transverse to the red, blue, and purple hyperplanes. The green and orange hyperplanes are tangent but not contiguous. The purple hyperplane is contiguous to the red and blue hyperplanes. The red and blue hyperplanes are neither transverse, nor tangent, nor contiguous.

$e_2 \subset J_2$ spanning a 4-cycle in X ; and they are *tangent* if they are not transverse but $N(J_1) \cap N(J_2) \neq \emptyset$.

See Figure 4 for examples of hyperplanes in a quasi-median graph. The (strong) connection between the graph-metric and hyperplanes is motivated by the following statement (which can be found verbatim in [Gen17, Propositions 2.15 & 2.30], but also in the literature of metric graph theory using a different terminology):

Theorem 2.2. *Let X be a quasi-median graph.*

- (i) *Every hyperplane J separates X , i.e. $X \setminus J$ contains at least two connected components.*
- (ii) *Carriers, fibres, and sectors are gated subgraphs.*
- (iii) *A path in X is geodesic if and only if it crosses every hyperplane at most once, i.e. it contains at most one edge from each hyperplane.*
- (iv) *The distance between two vertices coincides with the number of hyperplanes separating them.*

Recall that, in a graph X , a subgraph $Y \subset X$ is *gated* if every vertex $x \in X$ admits a *gate* (or a *projection*) in Y , i.e. a vertex $y \in Y$ such that, for every vertex $z \in Y$, at least one geodesic connecting x to z passes through y . Notice that, if the gate exists, it coincides with the unique vertex of Y at minimal distance. One can think of gatedness as a strong convexity condition. Notice that the intersection of gated subgraphs is gated. Also, as gated subgraphs are retracts of X , gated subgraphs in quasi-median graphs are also quasi-median graphs in their own right.

Gated subgraphs in quasi-median graphs are characterized in terms of local properties as follows. Recall that a *clique* is a maximal complete subgraph. Cliques are gated in quasi-median graphs [Gen17].

Proposition 2.3 ([Gen17, Proposition 2.6]). *Let X be a quasi-median graph. A connected subgraph Y is gated if and only if it satisfies the following properties:*

- (clique absorption)** *if C is a clique with an edge in Y , then C is contained in Y ; and*
- (local convexity)** *any 4-cycle in X with two adjacent edges in Y is contained in Y .*

Another interesting property satisfied by gated subgraphs is the so-called Helly property. The following statement is well-known, see for instance [Gen17, Proposition 2.8].

Lemma 2.4. *In a graph, any finite collection of pairwise intersecting gated subgraphs has a non-empty intersection.*

It is useful to understand how projections to gated subgraphs interact with hyperplanes. The following summarises results from [Gen17, Proposition 2.33, Lemmas 2.34 & 2.36, and Corollary 2.37].

Theorem 2.5. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and $Y, Z \subset X$ two gated subgraphs.*

- *For every vertex $x \in X$, a hyperplane separating x from its projection to Y separates x from Y .*
- *For all vertices $x, y \in X$, the hyperplanes separating their projections to Y coincide with the hyperplanes separating x, y and crossing Y . As a consequence, the projection to Y is 1-Lipschitz.*
- *For all vertices $y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$ minimising the distance between Y and Z , the hyperplanes separating y and z coincide with the hyperplanes separating Y and Z .*
- *The hyperplanes crossing the projection of Y to Z are exactly the hyperplanes crossing both Y and Z .*

In a quasi-median graph, given a vertex x contained in an edge of a hyperplane J , the unique clique containing this edge is called the *clique of J containing x* . Note that, as a consequence of the definition of a hyperplane, all the edges of this clique belong to J , so the clique is contained in $N(J)$. These cliques are central to most of our arguments.

Corollary 2.6. *Let X be a quasi-median graph, J a hyperplane, $Y \subset X$ a gated subgraph, and $x \in N(J) \cap Y$ a vertex. Then the clique of J containing x is contained in Y .*

Proof. Indeed, suppose that the clique C of J containing x is not contained in Y . Since Y is gated, Proposition 2.3 implies that no edge of C is contained in Y . Let z be a vertex of C distinct from x . Then J separates x and z by Theorem 2.2. By Theorem 2.5, since Y is gated, J separates z and Y . Hence J does not cross Y , which is a contradiction. \square

In the same way that one can think of median graphs as made of (hyper)cubes, one can think of quasi-median graphs as being made of *prisms*. More precisely, a *prism* is a subgraph that decomposes as a product of cliques. It is worth mentioning that prisms are also gated in quasi-median graphs [Gen17, Lemma 2.80].

Lemma 2.7. *Let X be a quasi-median graph. If J is a hyperplane crossing a prism P , then $P \subset N(J)$.*

Proof. Suppose that P decomposes as a finite product of cliques $C_1 \times \cdots \times C_n$, and fix a vertex x_i of C_i for each i . For convenience, we identify C_i , in the product, with all vertices of the form $(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, y, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$ with $y \in C_i$. Since J crosses P , we can assume that J contains an edge of C_1 , and hence all edges of C_1 belong to J . To prove that $P \subset N(J)$, we show that, for any vertex $\bar{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_j, \dots, y_n)$ and any edge e between \bar{y} and a vertex $\bar{y}' = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y'_j, \dots, y_n)$ with $y_j \neq y'_j$, the edge e belongs to J . We argue by induction on the distance between \bar{y} and C_1 in P . We have already addressed distance zero. Suppose the distance between \bar{y} and C_1 is positive (and larger than or equal to the distance between \bar{y}' and C_1). Then there is an index $i \neq 1$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$. Assume $i \neq j$; the case $i = j$ is analogous modulo the observation that $x_j \neq y_j, y'_j$. Let y'_i be a vertex of C_i distinct from y_i . Then the vertices $\bar{y}_0 = (y_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, y_j, \dots, y_n)$, $\bar{y}_1 = (y_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, y'_j, \dots, y_n)$, $\bar{y}' = (y_1, \dots, y_i, \dots, y'_j, \dots, y_n)$, and $\bar{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_i, \dots, y_j, \dots, y_n)$ form a 4-cycle in P . By induction, the edges $\bar{y}_0\bar{y}_1$ and $\bar{y}_0\bar{y}$ belong to J , and then Proposition 2.3 implies that the edge $\bar{y}\bar{y}'$ belongs to J . \square

The *prism-completion* X^\square of a quasi-median graph X refers to the cellular complex obtained from X by filling every prism with an appropriate product of simplices. The *cubical dimension* of a quasi-median graph is the maximal number of factors in a prism. Prism-completions of quasi-median graphs can be naturally endowed with a CAT(0) geometry [Gen17], like median graphs. In this article, we will only require the following weaker assertion:

Proposition 2.8. *Prism-completions of quasi-median graphs are contractible.*

There is a close connection between prisms and pairwise transverse hyperplanes. Hyperplanes all crossing the same prism must be pairwise transverse, and the converse may also hold:

Theorem 2.9 ([Gen17, Proposition 2.79]). *Let X be a quasi-median graph of finite cubical dimension. The map*

$$\{J_1, \dots, J_n\} \mapsto \bigcap_{i=1}^n N(J_i)$$

induces a bijection between the maximal collections of pairwise transverse hyperplanes and the maximal prisms of X .

For infinite collections of pairwise transverse hyperplanes, it may not be possible to find an infinite-dimensional prism that is crossed by all the hyperplanes. This is why the quasi-median graph in Theorem 2.9 is assumed to have finite cubical dimension.

Related to Theorem 2.9, one can describe the intersection of the carriers of a collection of pairwise transverse hyperplanes (when non-empty). In the next statement, given a collection of pointed graphs $\{(X_i, x_i), i \in I\}$, we denote by $\prod_{i \in I} (X_i, x_i)$ the graph whose vertices are the sequences $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ for which $a_i = x_i$ for all but finitely many $i \in I$ and whose edges connect two sequences whenever they differ at a single index j of I and the corresponding vertices of X_j are connected by an edge. This definition is motivated by the fact that, even though every X_i is connected, the product $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ cannot be connected if I is infinite (assuming that the X_i are all non-empty). In this case, $\prod_{i \in I} (X_i, x_i)$ coincides with the connected component of $\prod_{i \in I} X_i$ containing the vertex $(x_i)_{i \in I}$.

Proposition 2.10. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathcal{J} a collection of pairwise transverse hyperplanes. Suppose there exists a vertex $o \in \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$, and let C_J be the clique of J containing o for every hyperplane $J \in \mathcal{J}$. Then the map*

$$\begin{cases} \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J) & \rightarrow & F \times \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} (C_J, o) \\ x & \mapsto & \left(\text{proj}_F(x), (\text{proj}_{C_J}(x))_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \right) \end{cases}$$

is a graph isomorphism, where F denotes the intersection of all the fibres of the hyperplanes from \mathcal{J} containing o .

This proposition is a rather straightforward consequence of the following general decomposition criterion. In its statement and proof, we use $\mathcal{H}(\cdot)$ to denote the set of all the hyperplanes crossing a given subgraph.

Lemma 2.11. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and $\{Y_i : i \in I\}$ a collection of gated subgraphs. Assume that the following conditions hold:*

- *the intersection $Y := \bigcap_{i \in I} Y_i$ is non-empty;*
- $\mathcal{H}(X) = \bigsqcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}(Y_i)$;

- for all distinct $i, j \in I$, every hyperplane in $\mathcal{H}(Y_i)$ is transverse to every hyperplane in $\mathcal{H}(Y_j)$.

Then, for every vertex $o \in \bigcap_{i \in I} Y_i$, the map

$$\begin{cases} X & \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} (Y_i, o) \\ x & \mapsto (\text{proj}_{Y_i}(x))_{i \in I} \end{cases}$$

defines a graph isomorphism.

Proof. Let Ψ denote the map given by the lemma. We start by proving that Ψ is an isometric embedding. We will use the following notation: for all vertices $a, b \in X$, we denote by $\mathcal{H}(a|b)$ the set of the hyperplanes separating a and b . For all vertices $x, y \in X$, we deduce from Theorem 2.5 that

$$\begin{aligned} d(\Psi(x), \Psi(y)) &= \sum_{i \in I} d(\text{proj}_{Y_i}(x), \text{proj}_{Y_i}(y)) = \sum_{i \in I} |\mathcal{H}(x|y) \cap \mathcal{H}(Y_i)| \\ &= \left| \bigsqcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{H}(x|y) \cap \mathcal{H}(Y_i) \right| = |\mathcal{H}(x|y)| = d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus Ψ is indeed an isometric embedding. It remains to verify that Ψ is surjective.

Fix a vertex $(y_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{i \in I} (Y_i, o)$. Let y_1, \dots, y_n denote the finitely many coordinates y_i satisfying $\mathcal{H}(o|y_i) \neq \emptyset$. (Recall that $y_i = o$ for all but finitely many $i \in I$.) Let \mathcal{H} denote the set of the hyperplanes separating o from some y_i , i.e. $\mathcal{H} := \bigcup_i \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$. Notice that \mathcal{H} is finite. For all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $J \in \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$, let J^+ denote the sector delimited by J that contains y_i .

Claim 2.12. *The intersection $Q := \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{H}} J^+$ is non-empty.*

By Lemma 2.4, it suffices to verify that, for all hyperplanes $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{H}$, the intersection $J_1^+ \cap J_2^+$ is non-empty. If J_1 and J_2 are transverse, there is nothing to prove, so assume that they are not transverse. As a consequence, there must exist some $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that J_1 and J_2 both belong to $\mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$. But then $y_i \in J_1^+ \cap J_2^+$. This proves Claim 2.12.

Now, set $x := \text{proj}_Q(o)$. We want to prove that $\Psi(x) = (y_i)_i$. This will be a straightforward consequence of the following observation:

Claim 2.13. *The equality $\mathcal{H}(o|x) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$ holds.*

Suppose $J \notin \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$, and let J^+ denote the sector containing o and the y_i . Then, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $K \in \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$, we have $y_i \in K^+ \cap J^+$. By the Helly property for gated subgraphs, Lemma 2.4, it follows that $J^+ \cap Q$ is non-empty. Since $o \in J^+$, we have that J does not separate o and $x = \text{proj}_Q(o)$ as a consequence of Theorem 2.5. Conversely, if $J \in \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$ for some i , then J separates o from Q , and hence J separates o from x , completing the proof of Claim 2.13.

To conclude, note that, for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{H}(o|y_i) \subset \mathcal{H}(Y_i)$. Indeed, by Theorem 2.2, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $J \in \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$, since Y_i is gated and $o, y_i \in Y_i$, any geodesic in Y between o and y_i contains an edge of J and is contained in Y_i ; therefore $J \in \mathcal{H}(Y_i)$. We deduce from Claim 2.13 and Theorem 2.5 that

$$\mathcal{H}(\text{proj}_{Y_i}(x)|o) = \mathcal{H}(o|x) \cap \mathcal{H}(Y_i) = \mathcal{H}(o|y_i)$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since the Y_i are gated, this implies that $\text{proj}_{Y_i}(x) = y_i$ for every $i \in I$, and so $\Psi(x) = (y_i)_i$, as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.10. It suffices to verify that the assumptions of Lemma 2.11 apply to $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$ with respect to F and the C_J , $J \in \mathcal{J}$. First, the intersection $F \cap \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} C_J$ is non-empty since it contains the vertex o . Next, given a hyperplane K crossing $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$, either K belongs to \mathcal{J} , in which case $K \in \mathcal{H}(C_K)$; or K is transverse to all the hyperplanes in \mathcal{J} , which implies that it intersects F , i.e. $K \in \mathcal{H}(F)$. This shows that

$$\mathcal{H} \left(\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J) \right) = \mathcal{H}(F) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{H}(C_J).$$

Finally, any two distinct hyperplanes in \mathcal{J} are transverse by assumption, and it is clear that a hyperplane in \mathcal{J} is transverse to all the hyperplanes crossing F . \square

We conclude this section with a last preliminary lemma that will be used later.

Lemma 2.14. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and J a hyperplane. If P is a prism such that $P \subset N(J)$, then there is a prism Q such that $P \subset Q \subset N(J)$ and Q is crossed by J .*

Proof. If P is crossed by J , then it suffices to set $Q := P$. Suppose that J does not cross P . Let $o \in P \cap N(J)$, and let C be the clique of J containing o . By Proposition 2.10, there is a graph isomorphism $\Phi: (F, o) \times (C, o) \rightarrow N(J)$ where F is the fibre of J containing o . Observe that the projection of P to C does not contain edges of C , since otherwise J would cross P . It follows that the projection of P to C is the single vertex o . In other words, P is contained in F . In particular, P is contained in the subgraph Q of $N(J)$ obtained by considering the image of the product $P \times C$ by the isomorphism Φ . Since P is a prism and C is a clique, it follows Q is a prism. \square

3 Homotopy types of complexes of hyperplanes

By a complex of hyperplanes, we vaguely refer to a simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of some quasi-median graph and whose simplices are given by collections of hyperplanes that interact in some specific way.

Several graphs of hyperplanes have been already studied. For instance, crossing graphs appeared independently in the literature in several contexts, including [BD92, BC96] (as *incompatibility graphs*), [Rol98] (as *transversality graphs*), and [KM02, Hag14] (as crossing graphs). Tangency graphs also appear in [Ves05, KK07b] as τ -graphs; and contact graphs appear in [Bre05, KK07a] (as Θ -graphs) and in [Hag14] (as contact graphs).

However, very few higher-dimensional complexes of hyperplanes seem to have been studied. (With the exception of the crossing complex, that can also be found in [Row23] for finite median graphs.) In addition to the examples previously mentioned, we introduce *contiguity complexes* of quasi-median graphs in Section 3.3, which do not seem to have been considered elsewhere.

A word about crossing and contact complexes. From the perspective of geometric group theory, crossing and contact complexes play a particular role compared to the other complexes of hyperplanes, due to the analogy between curve graphs of surfaces and contact graphs as motivated in [Hag14] (for median graphs).

Recall that, given a (say closed) surface Σ , the *curve complex* $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ is the graph whose vertices are the (non-trivial) simple closed curves of Σ modulo homotopy and whose simplices are given by pairwise disjoint curves. Curve complexes have been quite useful

in the study mapping class groups from various perspectives. For instance, they provide convenient geometric models that can be used to extract some negative curvature [MM99, Bow08]; collectively, they can be used to recover the entire structure of a given mapping class group, as an isometry group [Iva97] or through a hierarchical structure [MM00]; they are algorithmically friendly [Lea02, Sha12, Web15]; and they have played an important role in computations of cohomology groups [Har86]. In geometric group theory, curve complexes have been often used as a motivation for various constructions and results. Now, it is clear that the connection between mapping class groups and their curve complexes is just one instance of a much more general phenomenon that commonly occurs in geometric group theory.

In the spirit of the previous paragraph, let us mention that contact graphs of (quasi-)median graphs are quasi-trees, and, in particular, hyperbolic. They can sometimes be used to construct hierarchical structures [BHS17], to get Ivanov-type theorems [Fio22], and they are algorithmically friendly [Gen22c].

Every graph (not necessarily connected) can be realised as the crossing graph of a median graph. This phenomenon has been noticed several times independently [Rol98, KM02, Hag14]. For instance, given a graph Γ , the graph $\Delta(\Gamma)$ whose vertices are the complete (possibly empty) subgraphs of Γ and whose edges connect two subgraphs whenever one can be obtained from the other by adding a single vertex is a median graph whose crossing graph is isomorphic to Γ . On the other hand, contact graphs have a much more restricted structure. For instance, contact graphs of quasi-median graphs are always connected and are 3-hyperbolic [Gen22c] (see [Hag14] for the median case). This is a major difference between crossing and contact graphs.

However, as highlighted in [Gen19b] (for median graphs), the difference between contact and crossing graphs becomes less apparent when one restricts oneself to 2-connected graphs of bounded degrees. For instance, in this case contact and crossing graphs turn out to be quasi-isometric, and so indistinguishable from the point of view of large-scale geometry.

Theorem 3.1 ([Gen22c]). *Let X be a quasi-median graph.*

- (i) *Cont(X) is connected, 3-hyperbolic, and quasi-isometric to a tree.*
- (ii) *Cross(X) is connected if and only if X is 2-connected.*
- (iii) *If X is 2-connected and has degree $\leq N$, then Cross(X) is $(3 + N/2)$ -hyperbolic and quasi-isometric to a tree.*
- (iv) *If X is 2-connected and has bounded degree, then Cross(X) and Cont(X) are quasi-isometric.*

Back to general complexes of hyperplanes. Given a quasi-median graph X , our goal in this section is to identify the homotopy types of various complexes of hyperplanes. In each case, the general strategy that we will follow is the following:

1. For every hyperplane J of X , we will introduce some contractible subspace $S(J)$ of the prism-completion X^\square of X .
2. The nerve complex of $\{S(J), J \text{ hyperplane}\}$ will coincide with the complex of hyperplanes we will be interested in.
3. Applying the nerve theorem, we will be able to identify, up to homotopy, our complex of hyperplanes with a specific subspace of X^\square .

4. Using the contractibility of X^\square , we will conclude that this subspace is homotopy equivalent to a pointed sum of specific spaces.

A key ingredient in this strategy is Leray's nerve theorem. Recall that, given a cover $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ of a simplicial complex Z by subcomplexes, the *nerve* of \mathcal{U} , denoted $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U})$, is the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is \mathcal{I} and whose simplices are the finite subsets $\sigma \subset \mathcal{I}$ such that the intersection $\bigcap_{i \in \sigma} U_i$ is non-empty.

Theorem 3.2 (Leray's Nerve Theorem, [Bjö81, Lemma 1.1]). *Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ be a cover of a simplicial complex Z by subcomplexes such that, for every finite $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{I}$, the set $\bigcap_{i \in \mathcal{J}} U_i$ is either empty or contractible. Then $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{U})$ is homotopy equivalent to Z .*

In Section 3.1 we apply this strategy to contact complexes, and in Section 3.2 to crossing complexes. Finally, in Section 3.3, we introduce and study a family of complexes that interpolate between crossing and contact graphs, including contiguity complexes.

3.1 Contact complexes

In this section, we focus on *contact complexes* of quasi-median graphs. See Figure 5 for an example.

Definition 3.3. Let X be a quasi-median graph. The *contact complex* $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by collections of hyperplanes pairwise in contact.




Figure 5: A quasi-median graph, and its contact and crossing complexes.

Let us verify the following observation (which can also be found in [Row23] for finite median graphs, based on a similar argument):

Proposition 3.4. *The contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$ of every quasi-median graph X is contractible.*

Proof. Let X be a quasi-median graph. Because two hyperplanes are in contact if and only if their carriers intersect, the nerve complex of the covering $\{N^\square(J), J \text{ hyperplanes}\}$ of X^\square coincides with the contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$. Given a collection \mathcal{J} of hyperplanes, if $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N^\square(J)$ is non-empty, then it coincides with the prism completion of the gated subgraph $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$. By Proposition 2.8, such an intersection has to be contractible. We deduce from the nerve theorem that $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to X^\square , and we conclude from Proposition 2.8 that our contact complex is contractible. \square

3.2 Crossing complexes

In this section, we focus on *crossing complexes* of quasi-median graphs. See Figure 5 for an example.

Definition 3.5. Let X be a quasi-median graph. The *crossing complex* $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by collections of pairwise transverse hyperplanes.

Our goal is to identify, up to homotopy, crossing complexes of quasi-median graphs with pointed sums. For this purpose, we need to introduce some terminology. Given a quasi-median graph X , the *link* of a vertex x in the prism-completion X^\square , which will be denoted by $\text{link}_{X^\square}(x)$, refers to the simplicial complex whose vertices are the edges of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of edges contained in a common prism. It can be thought of as the simplicial structure induced by the cellular structure of X^\square on a small sphere around the vertex x . Up to homotopy, this simplicial complex can be simplified. The *simplified link* $\text{slink}_{X^\square}(x)$ of our vertex x will refer to the simplicial complex whose vertices are the cliques of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of cliques contained in a common prism. The rest of the section is dedicated to the proof of the following statement.

Theorem 3.6. *Let X be a quasi-median graph. The crossing complex $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$ of X is homotopy equivalent to the union of pointed sums*

$$\bigsqcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \bigvee_{x \in Y} \text{link}_{Y^\square}(x),$$

where \mathcal{Y} is the set of 2-connected components of X ; or, equivalently, to the union

$$\bigsqcup_{Y \in \mathcal{Y}} \bigvee_{x \in Y} \text{slink}_{Y^\square}(x).$$

We begin by observing that links and simplified links are homotopy equivalent, which justifies why the two unions from our theorem are indeed homotopy equivalent. This is a particular case of Lemma 3.20 below, so we do not repeat an argument here.

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be a quasi-median graph. For every vertex $x \in X$, the link $\text{link}_{X^\square}(x)$ and the simplified link $\text{slink}_{X^\square}(x)$ are homotopy equivalent.*

Now, let us prove the following observation:

Proposition 3.8. *Let X be a quasi-median graph. The crossing complex $\text{Cross}^\Delta(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to $X^\square \setminus X$.*

A similar statement can be found in [Row23] for finite median graphs. Our proof follows essentially the same strategy.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. Given a hyperplane J , we set

$$N_-^\square(J) := N^\square(J) \setminus \bigcup_{F \text{ fibre of } J} F^\square.$$

The proposition will follow by applying the nerve theorem to $\{N_-^\square(J) \mid J \text{ hyperplane}\}$.

Claim 3.9. *We have $X^\square \setminus X = \bigcup_{J \text{ hyperplane}} N_-^\square(J)$.*

Given a point $x \in X^\square \setminus X$, let P be a prism of minimal cubical dimension whose prism completion contains x . Because x is not a vertex, P must have cubical dimension ≥ 1 . This implies that P is crossed by at least one hyperplane, say J . If x does not belong to $N_-^\square(J)$, then there must exist a fibre F of J such that $x \in (P \cap F)^\square$, contradicting the minimality of P .

Claim 3.10. *For all distinct hyperplanes J_1 and J_2 , $N_-^\square(J_1)$ and $N_-^\square(J_2)$ intersect if and only if J_1 and J_2 are transverse.*

If J_1 and J_2 are transverse, then there exists a prism P crossed by both J_1 and J_2 . An interior point of P necessarily belongs to $N_{-}^{\square}(J_1) \cap N_{-}^{\square}(J_2)$. Conversely, assume that $N_{-}^{\square}(J_1) \cap N_{-}^{\square}(J_2) \neq \emptyset$. A fortiori, $N(J_1)$ and $N(J_2)$ intersect, so J_1 and J_2 are either transverse or tangent. If they are tangent, then J_2 is contained in a single sector delimited by J_1 , so $N(J_1) \cap N(J_2)$ must be contained in a fibre of J_1 , say F . But this is not possible since F^{\square} is disjoint from $N_{-}^{\square}(J_1)$. Therefore, J_1 and J_2 must be transverse.

Claim 3.11. *For every finite collection of pairwise transverse hyperplanes \mathcal{J} , the intersection $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N_{-}^{\square}(J)$ is contractible.*

Fix a vertex $o \in \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$. Such a vertex exists because, as gated subgraphs, hyperplane-carriers satisfy the Helly property. For every $J \in \mathcal{J}$, the vertex o belongs to a (unique) clique $C_J \subset J$. Let F_J denote the fibre of J containing o , and set $F := \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} F_J$. According to Proposition 2.10, the map

$$\Psi : \begin{cases} \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J) & \rightarrow & F \times \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} C_J \\ x & \mapsto & (\text{proj}_F(x), (\text{proj}_{C_J}(x))_{J \in \mathcal{J}}) \end{cases}$$

is a graph isomorphism. A fortiori, Ψ induces a homeomorphism between the prism-completions of the two quasi-median graphs. Our goal now is to understand the images under Ψ of fibre-hyperplanes in order to conclude that Ψ induces a homeomorphism between our intersection $\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N_{-}^{\square}(J)$ and some product of contractible complexes.

Notice that, for every hyperplane $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and for every fibre L of J , we have

$$\Psi \left(L \cap \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{J}} N(I) \right) = F \times \{x\} \times \prod_{I \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{J\}} C_I$$

where x is the vertex such that $L \cap C_J = \{x\}$. This is due to the fact that L coincides with the vertices of $N(J)$ whose projection on C_J is x . It follows that

$$\Psi \left(L^{\square} \cap \bigcap_{I \in \mathcal{J}} N(I)^{\square} \right) = F^{\square} \times \{x\} \times \prod_{I \in \mathcal{J} \setminus \{J\}} C_I^{\square},$$

where, for convenience, we identify Ψ with the map it induces on the prism-completions. Consequently, the map Ψ induces a homeomorphism

$$\bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N_{-}^{\square}(J) \rightarrow F^{\square} \times \prod_{J \in \mathcal{J}} C_J^{\square} \setminus C_J.$$

Notice that each $C_J^{\square} \setminus C_J$ is the complement of the vertices in a simplex (of dimension ≥ 1) and that F^{\square} is the prism completion of a quasi-median graph, as F is a gated subgraph of X . Therefore, the right-hand side of the expression above is a product of contractible spaces, concluding the proof of Claim 3.11.

Claims 3.9 and 3.11 show that the nerve theorem applies, and hence $X^{\square} \setminus X$ is homotopy equivalent to the nerve complex of $\{N_{-}^{\square}(J) \mid J \text{ hyperplane}\}$. According to Claim 3.10, the latter coincides with the crossing complex $\text{Cross}^{\Delta}(X)$, completing the proof of the proposition. \square

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section, which uses the following fact from algebraic topology.

Fact 3.12. *Let C be a CW-complex and $A, B \subset C$ two subcomplexes satisfying $A \cup B = C$. If C and B are both contractible, then A deformation retracts on $A \cap B$.*




Figure 6: A quasi-median graph X endowed with a collection of gated subgraphs \mathbb{G} and the corresponding \mathbb{G} -contact complex.

Proof. Note that, by the Whitehead Theorem, it suffices to show that the inclusion map $A \cap B \rightarrow A$ induces an isomorphism on π_n for every $n \geq 0$. Since B and C are contractible, $\pi_n(A, A \cap B)$ is isomorphic to $\pi_n(C, B) = \{1\}$ for all n by [Hat02, Theorem 4.23, Chapter 4]). Then the long exact sequence of homotopy groups for the pair $(A, A \cap B)$ shows that $\pi_n(A \cap B) \rightarrow \pi_n(A)$ is an isomorphism, concluding the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. Because the decomposition

$$\text{Cross}^\Delta(X) = \bigsqcup_{Y \text{ 2-conn. comp. of } X} \text{Cross}^\Delta(Y)$$

is clear, we can and shall assume in the rest of the proof of X is 2-connected.

Let $T \subset X^\square$ be a spanning tree in the one-skeleton. Fix a small $\epsilon > 0$ and consider the thickening

$$T^+ := T \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} B(x, \epsilon).$$

Here, we endow X^\square with the length metric that extends the natural metrics on the prisms obtained from Euclidean realisations as polytopes. (This is a CAT(0) metric [Gen17], but we will not use this fact.) The key point to keep in mind is that the balls $B(x, \epsilon)$ are pairwise disjoint and that each sphere $S(x, \epsilon)$ is homeomorphic to $\text{link}_{X^\square}(x)$.

Clearly, T^+ is contractible. As X^\square is contractible as well, Fact 3.12 implies that $T^+ \setminus X$ is a deformation retract of $X^\square \setminus X$. But $T^+ \setminus X$ is homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{x \in X} S(x, \epsilon)$, or equivalently to $\bigvee_{x \in X} \text{link}_{X^\square}(x)$. The desired conclusion then follows from Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.7. \square

3.3 Relative contact complexes

In this section, we introduce and study *relative contact complexes* of quasi-median graphs. See Figure 6 for an example.

Definition 3.13. Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a collection of gated subgraphs. The \mathbb{G} -*contact complex* $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is the graph whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by hyperplanes pairwise in contact that all cross a common subgraph from \mathbb{G} .

In practice, we will always assume that \mathbb{G} is *prism-covering*, i.e. every prism of X is contained in some subgraph from \mathbb{G} . One can think of relative contact complexes as an interpolation between crossing complexes (when $\mathbb{G} = \{\text{prisms}\}$) and contact complexes (when $\mathbb{G} = \{X\}$).




Figure 7: A quasi-median graph and its contiguity complex.

A particular case of interest, distinct from crossing and contact complexes, is given by *contiguity complexes*. See Figure 7 for an example.

Definition 3.14. Let X be a quasi-median graph. Two hyperplanes are *contiguous* whenever their carriers contain a common clique. The *contiguity complex* $\text{Contg}^\Delta(X)$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by collections of hyperplanes with a common clique in their carriers.

For instance, the contiguity complex of a (2×2) -grid is the two-skeleton of a tetrahedron, so topologically a 2-sphere. We emphasize that, as illustrated by Figure 7, a collection of pairwise contiguous hyperplanes may not be globally contiguous. Therefore, contrary to crossing and contact complexes, a contiguity complex may not be flag.

The main result of this section deals with contact complexes relative to *star-covering* collections of gated subgraphs, i.e. for every clique C , there exists $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ such that Y contains all the prisms containing C . For a star-covering collection \mathbb{G} and for every vertex $x \in X$, we let $sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ be the simplicial graph whose vertices are the cliques of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of cliques contained in a common subgraph from \mathbb{G} . Let $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ denote the simplicial complex whose vertices are the edges of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of edges contained in a common subgraph from \mathbb{G} .

Theorem 3.15. *Let X be a 2-connected quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a star-covering collection of gated subgraphs. The relative contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopically equivalent to the pointed sum $\bigvee_{x \in X} sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. Equivalently, $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to the pointed sum $\bigvee_{x \in X} L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$.*

Notice that, when $\mathbb{G} = \{X\}$, each $sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is a simplex, so our theorem is compatible with Proposition 3.4. It is also worth noticing that the second pointed sum from our proposition makes sense because the complexes $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ are all connected:

Lemma 3.16. *If X is 2-connected and \mathbb{G} is prism-covering, then $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is connected for every $x \in X$.*

Proof. Fix a vertex $x \in X$ and let e, f be two edges of X containing x . As the prism-completion X^\square of X is simply connected, a local cut-point in X^\square is automatically a global cut-point. Therefore, since X is assumed to be 2-connected, links of vertices in X^\square must be connected, which implies that there exists a sequence of edges containing x , say

$$e = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n = f,$$

such that a_i and a_{i+1} are contained in a common prism for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Because \mathbb{G} is prism-covering, every prism must be contained in a subgraph from \mathbb{G} . Consequently, a_i and a_{i+1} must be adjacent in $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Thus, we have proved that e and f can be connected by a path in $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. \square

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 3.15, we gather a few facts relating hyperplanes and relative contact complexes.

Proposition 3.17. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} be a collection of gated subgraphs. For a finite collection of hyperplanes \mathcal{J} of X , the following statements are equivalent:*

- \mathcal{J} is a simplex of $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$;
- there exists $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ and $x \in Y \cap \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$ such that Y contains the clique of J containing x for each $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Moreover, if \mathbb{G} is a star-covering collection of gated subgraphs, the above statements are equivalent to:

- for every $x \in \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$, there exists $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ that contains the clique of J containing x for each $J \in \mathcal{J}$.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_n\}$ is a simplex of $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. Then there exists $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ such that $\{N(J_1), \dots, N(J_n)\} \cup \{Y\}$ is a collection of pairwise intersecting gated subgraphs, and the Helly property implies that $Y \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n N(J_i)$ is non-empty. Let $x \in Y \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n N(J_i)$. Since J_i crosses Y , the clique of J_i containing x is contained in Y by Corollary 2.6. That the second and third statements imply the first one follows directly from the definitions.

Let us prove that the first statement implies the third one assuming that \mathbb{G} is star-covering. Let $\mathcal{J} = \{J_1, \dots, J_n\}$ be a simplex of $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ and $x \in \bigcap_{J \in \mathcal{J}} N(J)$. The hyperplanes in \mathcal{J} are pairwise in contact, and there exists $Z \in \mathbb{G}$ such that each $J \in \mathcal{J}$ crosses Z . If $x \in Z \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n N(J_i)$, then Corollary 2.6 implies that the clique of J containing x is contained in Z for each $J \in \mathcal{J}$; in this case, it suffices to set $Y := Z$. Suppose that $x \notin Z \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n N(J_i)$ and let J be a hyperplane separating x from Z , which we can choose to be tangent to x . Let C be the clique of J containing x . Since \mathbb{G} is star-covering, there exists $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ containing all the prisms that contain C . For every $1 \leq i \leq n$, let C_i be the clique of J_i containing x . Since J is necessarily transverse to J_i , Proposition 2.10 implies that C and C_i span a prism containing x , and hence C_i is contained in Y . \square

The rest of the section is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.15. We fix a quasi-median graph X and a collection \mathbb{G} of gated subgraphs. The equivalence of the two statements of Theorem 3.15 will be proven in Lemma 3.20 by showing that for each vertex $x \in X$, $sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is homotopy equivalent to $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$.

Let X° be the *perforation* of X , i.e. the space obtained from the prism-completion X^\square of X by removing a small open ball around each vertex of a fixed radius $\epsilon < 1/2$, if we endow X^\square with a length metric that extends the Euclidean metrics on its prisms. Given a vertex $x \in X$, the sphere $S(x, \epsilon)$ can be identified with the link of x in the prism-completion X^\square . In other words, we can think of $S(x, \epsilon)$ as the simplicial complex whose vertices are the edges of X containing x and whose simplices are given by collections of edges contained in a common prism of X .

When \mathbb{G} is prism-covering, the complex $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ naturally contains $S(x, \epsilon)$ as a subcomplex, which allows us to define

$$X^{\mathbb{G}} := X^\circ \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$$

where each $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is glued to X° over $S(x, \epsilon)$.




Figure 8: A quasi-median graph X endowed with a collection \mathbb{G} of gated subgraphs, the perforation X° , and the corresponding complex $X^\mathbb{G}$.




Figure 9: The complexes $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ and $L_J(x)$ where \mathbb{G} is the collection of the prisms together with the yellow and pink subgraphs.

We refer the reader to Figure 8 for an illustration of our construction in a specific case. In order to prove Theorem 3.15, we start by showing that our relative contact complex is homotopy equivalent to the specific complex just constructed:

Proposition 3.18. *If \mathbb{G} is star-covering, then the \mathbb{G} -contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to $X^\mathbb{G}$.*

Proof. For all hyperplane J and vertex $x \in N(J)$, let $L_J(x)$ denote the subcomplex of $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ given by the union of all the simplices containing the simplex corresponding to the clique of J that contains x . See Figure 9. Set

$$S(J) := \left(N(J)^\square \cap X^\circ\right) \cup \bigcup_{x \in N(J)} L_J(x).$$

Notice that $\Omega := \{S(J) \mid J \text{ hyperplane}\}$ is a cover of $X^\mathbb{G}$. Indeed, let $p \in X^\mathbb{G}$ be an arbitrary point. If $p \in X^\circ$, then it belongs to the interior of some prism of cubical dimension ≥ 1 , hence $p \in S(J)$ where J is an arbitrary hyperplane crossing this prism by Lemma 2.7. Otherwise, if $p \in X^\mathbb{G} \setminus X^\circ$, then $p \in L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ for some vertex $x \in X$. A simplex of $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ containing p yields a subgraph $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ with an edge containing x . Let J be the hyperplane defined by this edge. Since Y is gated, Proposition 2.3 implies that Y contains the clique of J containing x , and therefore $p \in S(J)$.

Our goal is to apply the nerve theorem to our cover Ω of $X^\mathbb{G}$. First, let us verify that our nerve complex is isomorphic to $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. In other words, given a collection of

hyperplanes J_1, \dots, J_n , we claim that $S(J_1) \cap \dots \cap S(J_n)$ is non-empty if and only if J_1, \dots, J_n span a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$.

If J_1, \dots, J_n span a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$, then there exist a subgraph $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ crossed by J_1, \dots, J_n and a vertex $x \in Y$ such that $x \in N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n)$. Then the simplex of $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ given by Y is contained in $S(J_1) \cap \dots \cap S(J_n)$; see Corollary 2.6. Conversely, assume that $S(J_1) \cap \dots \cap S(J_n)$ is non-empty, and fix a point p in this intersection. If $p \in X^\circ$, then the smallest prism containing p , say P , must be contained in the carriers of J_1, \dots, J_n . In other words, each J_i crosses a prism containing P ; see Lemma 2.14. Since \mathbb{G} is star-covering, there exists some $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ that contains all the prisms containing P . In particular, all J_i cross Y . Clearly, J_1, \dots, J_n are pairwise in contact in Y , proving that they span a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. Otherwise, if $p \notin X^\circ$, then there exists some $x \in X$ such that $p \in L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. The smallest simplex of $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ containing p corresponds to a subgraph $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ satisfying $x \in Y$. Since this simplex must belong to $L_{J_i}(x)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$, it follows that J_1, \dots, J_n all cross Y . This implies that J_1, \dots, J_n span a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$.

Finally, given a collection of hyperplanes J_1, \dots, J_n spanning a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$, let us verify that the intersection $S(J_1) \cap \dots \cap S(J_n)$ is contractible. We can write our intersection as

$$\left((N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square \cap X^\circ \right) \cup \bigcup_{x \in N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n)} \bigcap_{i=1}^n L_{J_i}(x). \quad (1)$$

The picture to keep in mind is that $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square \cap X^\circ$ is the perforation of $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$, and that, for every vertex $x \in N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n)$, we glue $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$ on the link of x (when thinking of $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ as containing the link $S(x, \epsilon)$ of x). Our goal is to show that this gluing operation amounts, up to homotopy, to gluing a cone over the link of x in $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square \cap X^\circ$, proving that our intersection is homotopically equivalent to $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$, and therefore contractible.

Let us argue that $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$ is contractible. Since \mathbb{G} is star-covering, Proposition 3.17 implies that there is $Y \in \mathbb{G}$ containing the clique of J_i containing x , for every J_i . It follows that, in $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$, the subcomplex S induced by the edges starting from x and crossed by one of the J_1, \dots, J_n is a simplex, since all these edges belong to Y . The intersection $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$ then corresponds to the union of all the simplices containing this simplex S . Thus our intersection deformation retracts onto S .

Regard $S(x, \epsilon)$ as a subcomplex of $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. Let us show that $S(x, \epsilon) \cap (N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$ is a subcomplex of $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$. Let σ be a simplex of $S(x, \epsilon) \cap (N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$. Then σ consists of all edges containing x contained in a prism P of $N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n)$. For each J_i , the prism P is contained in a prism $Q_i \subset N(J_i)$ such that Q_i is crossed by J_i ; see Lemma 2.14. Since prisms are gated, Corollary 2.6 implies that Q_i contains the clique of J_i containing x . The prism Q_i thus induces a simplex of L_{J_i} that contains the simplex σ as a face. It follows that σ is a simplex of $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$.

Therefore, in the decomposition (1), adding the intersection $L_{J_1}(x) \cap \dots \cap L_{J_n}(x)$ to the perforation of $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$ amounts to putting back the ball of radius ϵ centred at x , proving that $S(J_1) \cap \dots \cap S(J_n)$ is homotopy equivalent to $(N(J_1) \cap \dots \cap N(J_n))^\square$, and hence contractible. \square

Thanks to Proposition 3.18, we are now ready to identify our relative contact complex as a pointed sum, namely:

Proposition 3.19. *If X is 2-connected and \mathbb{G} star-covering, then $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{x \in X} L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$.*

Proof of Proposition 3.19. We know from Proposition 3.18 that $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to $X^\mathbb{G}$, so we focus on $X^\mathbb{G}$. Fix a maximal subtree $T \subset X$. Fact 3.12 implies that

$$X^\circ = X^\square \setminus \bigcup_{x \in X} B(x, \epsilon)$$

deformation retracts onto

$$T^\circ := \left(T \setminus \bigcup_{x \in X} B(x, \epsilon) \right) \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} S(x, \epsilon),$$

since the contractible space X^\square is the union of X° and the contractible subspace $T \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} \overline{B(x, \epsilon)}$, and T° is the intersection of X° and $T \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} \overline{B(x, \epsilon)}$. It follows that there is a deformation retraction of

$$X^\mathbb{G} = X^\circ \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} L_\mathbb{G}(x)$$

onto

$$T^\mathbb{G} := T^\circ \cup \bigcup_{x \in X} L_\mathbb{G}(x).$$

Observe that $T^\mathbb{G}$ is a tree of spaces whose edge-spaces are single points and whose vertex-spaces are the $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$. Since the $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ are connected according to Lemma 3.16, we conclude that $X^\mathbb{G}$, and a fortiori $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$, is homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{x \in X} L_\mathbb{G}(x)$. \square

In order to conclude the proof of Theorem 3.15, it only remains to show that the complexes from the two pointed sums in the statement are homotopy equivalent, namely:

Lemma 3.20. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a prism-covering collection of gated subgraphs. For every vertex $x \in X$, $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ is homotopy equivalent to $\text{s}L_\mathbb{G}(x)$.*

Proof. For every clique C of X containing x , let $\Delta(C)$ denote the simplex of $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ given by the edges of C containing x , and let $\Delta^+(C)$ denote the union of $\Delta(C)$ with the interiors of all the simplices in $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ containing $\Delta(C)$. Our goal is to apply the nerve theorem to $\{\Delta^+(C) \mid C \text{ clique containing } x\}$.

Claim 3.21. *For any collection of cliques C_1, \dots, C_n containing x , the intersection $\Delta^+(C_1) \cap \dots \cap \Delta^+(C_n)$ is non-empty if and only if C_1, \dots, C_n span a prism contained in a subgraph from \mathbb{G} .*

We can assume without loss of generality that C_1, \dots, C_n are pairwise distinct, which implies that $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$ are pairwise disjoint by Proposition 2.3. A point in $\Delta^+(C_1) \cap \dots \cap \Delta^+(C_n)$ must then belong to the interiors of n simplices containing $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$ respectively. But, in a simplicial complex, two simplices whose interiors intersect must coincide, so it follows that there must exist a simplex in $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ containing all $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$. We conclude that C_1, \dots, C_n are contained in a common prism lying in some subgraph from \mathbb{G} . Conversely, it is clear that, if C_1, \dots, C_n are contained in a common prism lying in some subgraph from \mathbb{G} , say P , then P defines a simplex in $L_\mathbb{G}(x)$ containing all $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$.

Claim 3.22. *If C_1, \dots, C_n are cliques containing x , then $\Delta^+(C_1) \cap \dots \cap \Delta^+(C_n)$ is either empty or contractible.*

Assume that the intersection is non-empty. Also, we assume without loss of generality that C_1, \dots, C_n are pairwise distinct. If $n = 1$, then the conclusion is clear, so we assume that $n \geq 2$. It follows from Claim 3.21 that C_1, \dots, C_n pairwise span a prism

contained in a subgraph from \mathbb{G} , from which we deduce that C_1, \dots, C_n span a prism, say P . Let $\Delta(P)$ denote the simplex of $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ given by P . This is the simplex spanned by $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$. A point in $\Delta^+(C_1) \cap \dots \cap \Delta^+(C_n)$ has to belong to the interiors of simplices containing respectively $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$. As before, using the fact that, in a simplicial complex, two simplices whose interiors intersect must coincide, we deduce that $\Delta^+(C_1) \cap \dots \cap \Delta^+(C_n)$ coincides with the union of the interiors of all the simplices that contain $\Delta(C_1), \dots, \Delta(C_n)$, or equivalently, that contain $\Delta(P)$. Thus this subspace must be contractible, concluding the proof of Claim 3.22.

As a consequence of Claim 3.22, the nerve theorem applies to the covering $\{\Delta^+(C) \mid C \text{ clique containing } x\}$, and so $L_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is homotopy equivalent to the corresponding nerve complex. According to Claim 3.21, the latter coincides with $sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.15. The theorem is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.19 and Lemma 3.20. \square

4 Applications to coset intersection complexes

Given a graph Γ and a collection of groups $\mathcal{G} = \{G_u \mid u \in V(\Gamma)\}$ indexed by the vertices of Γ , the *graph product* $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ is defined as the quotient

$$\left(\ast_{u \in V(\Gamma)} G_u \right) / \langle\langle [g, h] = 1, \{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma), g \in G_u, h \in G_v \rangle\rangle,$$

where $E(\Gamma)$ denotes the edge-set of Γ [Gre90]. Usually, one says that graph products interpolate between direct sums (when the vertex-groups pairwise commute, i.e. Γ is a complete graph) and free products (when no two distinct vertex-groups commute, i.e. Γ has no edge). They include right-angled Artin groups (when all the vertex-groups are infinite cyclic) and right-angled Coxeter groups (when all the vertex-groups are cyclic of order two).

Convention. In all our article, vertex-groups of graph products will be always assumed to be non-trivial. There is no real loss of generality since every graph product can be naturally described as a graph product all of whose vertex-groups are non-trivial (and isomorphic to the previous vertex-groups—we just need to remove the trivial vertex-groups).

In this section, our goal is to investigate the structure of certain *coset intersection complexes* of graph products, defined by the first and third authors in [AMP24].

Definition 4.1. Let G be a group and \mathcal{P} a collection of subgroups. The *coset intersection complex* $\mathcal{K}(G, \mathcal{P})$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are the cosets of subgroups from \mathcal{P} and whose simplices are given by collections g_1P_1, \dots, g_nP_n of cosets such that $g_1P_1g_1^{-1} \cap \dots \cap g_nP_ng_n^{-1}$ is infinite.

Our study will be based on the quasi-median geometry of graph products combined with the results proved in the previous sections of this article.

Quasi-median geometry of graph products. As shown in [Gen17, Gen23], there is a close connection between quasi-median graphs and graph products of groups. On the one hand, every graph product $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ admits a natural quasi-median Cayley graph, namely

$$\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}) := \text{Cayl} \left(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \bigcup_{u \in V(\Gamma)} G_u \setminus \{1\} \right).$$

Conversely, it can be proved that every quasi-median graph can be realised as a gated subgraph of such a Cayley graph.

The cliques and prisms of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ can be described as follows. We refer the reader to [Gen17, Section 8] for more details.

Lemma 4.2. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . The cliques of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ are given by the cosets $g\langle u \rangle$ where $g \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}$ and $u \in V(\Gamma)$. The prisms of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ are given by the cosets $g\langle \Lambda \rangle$ where $g \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}$ and $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ is a complete subgraph.*

Corollary 4.3. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . The cubical dimension of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ is $\text{clique}(\Gamma) := \max\{\#\Lambda \mid \Lambda \subset \Gamma \text{ complete}\}$.*

The structure of hyperplanes can also be described. A useful observation is that all the edges of a given hyperplane are labelled by generators coming from the same vertex-group. Consequently, hyperplanes are naturally labelled by the vertices of Γ .

Lemma 4.4 ([Gen17, Lemma 8.12]). *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . In $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$, two transverse hyperplanes have adjacent labels.*

Given a group G acting on a quasi-median graph, the *rotative-stabiliser* of a hyperplane J is

$$\text{stab}_{\circlearrowleft}(J) := \{g \in G \mid gC = C \text{ for every clique } C \subset J\}.$$

We again refer the reader to [Gen17, Section 8] for more details.

Lemma 4.5. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . Fix a vertex $u \in \Gamma$, and let J_u denote the hyperplane of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ containing the clique $\langle u \rangle$. The following hold.*

- *The carrier of J_u is the subgraph $\langle \text{star}(u) \rangle \subset \text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$.*
- *The stabiliser of J_u is the subgroup $\langle \text{star}(u) \rangle \leq \Gamma\mathcal{G}$.*
- *The rotative-stabiliser of J_u is the subgroup $\langle u \rangle \leq \Gamma\mathcal{G}$. It freely and transitively permutes the sectors delimited by J_u .*

Let us conclude our preliminaries with the following straightforward observation:

Lemma 4.6. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by Γ . The graph $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ is 2-connected if and only if Γ is connected.*

Proof. By [Gen22c, Claim 3.3], a vertex of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ is a cut-vertex if and only if its simplified link is disconnected. But, according to Lemma 4.2, the cliques containing a vertex x are the cosets $x\langle u \rangle$, with $u \in \Gamma$, and two such cliques $x\langle u \rangle$ and $x\langle v \rangle$ span a prism if and only if u and v are adjacent in Γ . Therefore, the one-skeleton of the simplified link of x is isomorphic to Γ . The desired conclusion follows. \square

A word about the crossing complex. The crossing complex $\text{Cross}^{\Delta}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ of the quasi-median graph $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ can be described purely algebraically as the simplicial complex whose vertices are the conjugates of the vertex-groups and whose simplices are given by pairwise commuting subgroups.

It is worth mentioning that, when restricting to right-angled Artin groups, the crossing graph coincides with Kim and Koberda's *extension graph*. In [KK13], extension graphs are introduced and exploited to deal with the *embedding problem* for right-angled Artin

groups: given two graphs Φ and Ψ , is it possible to determine whether $A(\Phi)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $A(\Psi)$? The results in [KK13] are reproved and generalised to graph products by the second-named author in [Gen17] from a geometric perspective thanks to the quasi-median geometry of graph products. Thus, our crossing graphs here can be thought of as a generalisation of the extension graphs from [KK13]. (Note that, independently, this generalisation appears in [CRKdlNG21].)

4.1 Clique subgroups

We start our investigation of coset intersection complexes of graph products with respect to parabolic subgroups by considering clique subgroups. Our main result in this direction is:

Theorem 4.7. *Let Γ be a finite connected graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of infinite groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . Set $\mathcal{P} := \{\langle \Lambda \rangle \mid \Lambda \subset \Gamma \text{ clique}\}$. The coset intersection complex $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ is a quasi-tree and is homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of infinitely many copies of the flag completion Γ^Δ of Γ .*

The key observation is that the coset intersection complex we are interested in turns out to be closely connected to the crossing complex. More precisely:

Proposition 4.8. *Let Γ be a finite connected graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of infinite groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . Set $\mathcal{P} := \{\langle \Lambda \rangle \mid \Lambda \subset \Gamma \text{ clique}\}$. The coset intersection complex $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ is quasi-isometric and homotopy equivalent to the crossing complex $\text{Cross}^\Delta(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ of the quasi-median graph $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$.*

We start by proving the following preliminary observation:

Lemma 4.9. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . For every collection of prisms $\{P_i \subset \text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}), i \in I\}$,*

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} \text{stab}(P_i) = \langle \text{stab}_\circ(J), J \text{ crosses all the } P_i \rangle.$$

Proof. We begin by proving a couple of general observations.

Claim 4.10. *For every prism P in $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$,*

$$\text{stab}(P) = \bigoplus_{J \text{ hyp. inter. } P} \text{stab}_\circ(J).$$

According to Lemma 4.2, up to translating P by an element of $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$, we can write $P = \langle \Lambda \rangle$ for some complete subgraph $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$. Then, it follows from Lemma 4.5 that

$$\text{stab}(P) = \langle \Lambda \rangle = \bigoplus_{u \in \Lambda} \langle u \rangle = \bigoplus_{u \in \Lambda} \text{stab}_\circ(J_u).$$

Since the J_u for $u \in \Lambda$ are exactly the hyperplanes intersecting P , the desired conclusion follows.

Claim 4.11. *If K and L are two transverse hyperplanes, then $\text{stab}_\circ(L)$ stabilises each sector delimited by K .*

Because K and L are transverse, there must exist a prism crossed by both K and L . According to Lemma 4.2, up to translating such a prism by an element of $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$, we can assume that $K = J_u$ and $L = J_v$ for some adjacent vertices $u, v \in \Gamma$. We already know from Lemma 4.5 that $\text{stab}_\circ(L) = \langle v \rangle$ stabilises K . Given an element $g \in \text{stab}_\circ(L)$ and a vertex $x \in \langle u \rangle$, there is a 4-cycle $(1, x, g \cdot x, g \cdot 1)$ in $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$. Since the edges $[1, x]$

and $[g \cdot 1, g \cdot x]$ both belong to $J_u = K$, the vertices x and $g \cdot x$ belong to the same sector delimited by K . Thus, g stabilises the sector delimited by K that contains x . Since this is true for every element $g \in \text{stab}_\circ(L)$ and every vertex $x \in \langle u \rangle$, this concludes the proof of Claim 4.11.

Now, let us prove the equality from the statement of the lemma. The inclusion

$$\langle \text{stab}_\circ(J), J \text{ crosses all the } P_i \rangle \subset \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{stab}(P_i)$$

follows immediately from Claim 4.10. For the reverse inclusion, let $g \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{stab}(P_i)$ be an element. Fix an $\ell \in I$. Let J_1, \dots, J_n denote the hyperplanes crossing all the P_i , and let H_1, \dots, H_m denote the hyperplanes crossing P_ℓ but not all the P_i . According to Claim 4.10, we can decompose g as a product $g_1 \cdots g_n h_1 \cdots h_m$ where $g_i \in \text{stab}_\circ(J_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $h_i \in \text{stab}_\circ(H_i)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$. Moreover, the g_i and h_j pairwise commute. Assume for contradiction that one h_j is non-trivial, say h_1 . We know that H_1 does not cross some P_k , $k \in I$. Because h_1 sends the sector delimited by H_1 that contains P_k to a distinct sector delimited by H_1 , we know that H_1 separates P_k and $h_1 P_k$. We deduce from Claim 4.11 that H_1 also separates P_k and $g P_k$. Thus, g does not stabilise P_k , contrary to our assumption. Therefore, all the h_j must be trivial, and so g must belong to $\langle \text{stab}_\circ(J_i), 1 \leq i \leq n \rangle$, as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.8. As a consequence of Lemma 4.2, the cosets of the form $g\langle \Lambda \rangle$ with $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ a clique coincide with the maximal prisms in $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$. Hence, according to Theorem 2.9, there is a natural bijection between such cosets and the maximal collections of pairwise transverse hyperplanes in $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$; or equivalently, with the maximal simplices in the crossing complex $\text{Cross}^\Delta(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$. Notice that, as a consequence of Lemma 4.9, for any collection of cliques $\{\Phi_i \subset \Gamma, i \in I\}$ and any collection of elements $\{g_i \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}, i \in I\}$, the conjugates $g_i \langle \Phi_i \rangle g_i^{-1}$ have an infinite total intersection if and only if there exists a hyperplane crossing all the maximal prisms $g_i \langle \Phi_i \rangle$, which amounts to saying that the corresponding maximal simplices in $\text{Cross}^\Delta(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ intersect.

Thus, we have proved that the coset intersection complex $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ coincides with the nerve complex of $\text{Cross}^\Delta(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ relative to its maximal simplices. This implies that $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ and $\text{Cross}^\Delta(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ are both quasi-isometric and homotopy equivalent, by Leray's nerve theorem. \square

In order to deduce Theorem 4.7, it remains to describe the crossing complexes of the quasi-median graphs associated to graph products.

Proposition 4.12. *Let Γ be a connected graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of groups indexed by the vertices of Γ . The crossing complex of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to a bouquet of infinitely many copies of Γ^Δ , the flag completion of Γ .*

Proof. As a consequence of Theorem 3.6 and Lemma 3.7, it suffices to verify that, for every vertex x of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$, $\text{slink}(x)$ is homeomorphic to the flag completion Γ^Δ of Γ . Since $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ acts vertex-transitively on $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$, we can assume without loss of generality that $x = 1$. By definition, $\text{slink}(1)$ coincides with the simplicial complex whose vertices are the cliques containing 1 and whose simplices are given by collections of cliques spanning prisms. But, according to Lemma 4.2, these cliques are given by the cosets $\langle u \rangle$ for $u \in V(\Gamma)$, and a collection of cliques $\langle u_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle u_n \rangle$ span a prism if and only if u_1, \dots, u_n span a complete subgraph in Γ . This is the description of the flag completion of Γ . \square

Proof of Theorem 4.7. The desired conclusion follows by combining Theorem 3.1 with Propositions 4.8 and 4.12. \square

4.2 Other parabolic subgroups

We now turn to other parabolic subgroups of graph products. The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.13. *Let Γ be a connected graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of infinite groups indexed by Γ . Fix a collection \mathcal{S} of subgraphs of Γ such that:*

- *for every $\Lambda \in \mathcal{S}$, there is no vertex $v \in \Gamma$ such that $\Lambda \subset \text{link}(v)$;*
- *for every $v \in \Gamma$, there exists $\Lambda \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\text{star}(v) \subset \Lambda$.*

The coset intersection complex $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \{\langle \Lambda \rangle, \Lambda \in \mathcal{S}\})$ is homotopy equivalent to the pointed sum of infinitely many copies of the simplicial complex $\Gamma^{\mathcal{S}}$ whose vertex-set is Γ and whose simplices are given by the subgraphs in \mathcal{S} .

For instance, the theorem applies to maximal join subgroups, which we will consider in Section 5.2. The first step towards the proof of Theorem 4.13 is to give a geometric interpretation of the coset intersection complexes under consideration. This will be possible thanks to the following observation:

Lemma 4.14. *Let Γ be a graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of infinite groups indexed by Γ . For all subgraphs $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n \subset \Gamma$ and all elements $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}$, the intersection*

$$g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle g_1^{-1} \cap \dots \cap g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle g_n^{-1}$$

is infinite if and only if there exists a hyperplane in $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ that crosses all the subgraphs $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle, \dots, g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle$.

Proof. We argue by induction on n . If $n = 1$, then $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle g_1^{-1}$ is infinite if and only if Λ_1 is non-empty, which amounts to saying that the subgraph $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle$ is not reduced to a single vertex of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$, or equivalently that $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle$ is crossed by at least one hyperplane. Now, assume that $n \geq 2$. It follows from [Gen22b, Theorem 1.7] and its proof that there exist $g \in g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle$ and $\Xi \subset \Lambda_1$ such that the projection of $g_2\langle \Lambda_2 \rangle$ on $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle$ agrees with $g\langle \Xi \rangle$ and

$$g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle g_1^{-1} \cap g_2\langle \Lambda_2 \rangle g_2^{-1} = g\langle \Xi \rangle g^{-1}.$$

By induction, we know that

$$g\langle \Xi \rangle g^{-1} \cap g_3\langle \Lambda_3 \rangle g_3^{-1} \cap \dots \cap g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle g_n^{-1}$$

is infinite if and only if there exists a hyperplane crossing all $g\langle \Xi \rangle, g_3\langle \Lambda_3 \rangle, \dots, g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle$. But, by Theorem 2.5, the hyperplanes crossing the projection $g\langle \Xi \rangle$ are exactly the hyperplanes crossing both $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle$ and $g_2\langle \Lambda_2 \rangle$. Consequently, there exists a hyperplane crossing all $g\langle \Xi \rangle, g_3\langle \Lambda_3 \rangle, \dots, g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle$ if and only if there exists a hyperplanes crossing all $g_1\langle \Lambda_1 \rangle, \dots, g_n\langle \Lambda_n \rangle$. This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.14 motivates the following definition. See Figure 10 for an example.

Definition 4.15. Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a collection of gated subgraphs. The *skewering complex* $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ is the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is \mathbb{G} and whose simplices are given collections of subgraphs crossed by a common hyperplane.

Using this vocabulary, Lemma 4.14 then implies that coset intersection complexes with respect to parabolic subgroups can be described as skewering complexes of the corresponding quasi-median graphs. The connection with relative contact complexes is described by the following statement:




Figure 10: A quasi-median graph X endowed with a collection \mathbb{G} of gated subgraphs and the corresponding skewering complex $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$.

Proposition 4.16. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a parallelism-free collection of gated subgraphs. The skewering complex $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ and the \mathbb{G} -contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ are homotopy equivalent.*

In this statement, we refer to two gated subgraphs as *parallel* if they are crossed by exactly the same hyperplanes. The collection \mathbb{G} is *parallelism-free* whenever no two distinct subgraphs from \mathbb{G} are parallel.

In order to prove Proposition 4.16, the following observation will be needed:

Lemma 4.17. *Let X be a quasi-median graph and Y_1, \dots, Y_n gated subgraphs. There exists a gated subgraph Y such that a hyperplane of X crosses Y if and only if it crosses all Y_1, \dots, Y_n .*

Proof. Let Y'_1 denote the projection of Y_n on Y_1 . According to Theorem 2.5, a hyperplane crosses Y'_1 if and only if it crosses both Y_1 and Y_n . Consequently, a hyperplane crosses all Y_1, \dots, Y_n if and only if it crosses all $Y'_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1}$. Similarly, if Y''_1 denotes the projection of Y_{n-1} on Y'_1 , then a hyperplane crosses all $Y''_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-2}$ if and only if it crosses all $Y'_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_{n-1}$. After $n - 1$ iterations of this argument, we find a gated subgraph Y such that a hyperplane crosses Y if and only if it crosses all Y_1, \dots, Y_n . \square

Proof of Proposition 4.16. For every $Y \in \mathbb{G}$, let \mathcal{J}_Y denote the subcomplex of the contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ induced by the set of the hyperplanes of X that cross Y . Set $\mathcal{J} := \{\mathcal{J}_Y \mid Y \in \mathbb{G}\}$. First, notice that \mathcal{J} covers $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. Indeed, a simplex in $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ corresponds to a collection of hyperplanes pairwise in contact in \mathcal{J}_Y for some $Y \in \mathbb{G}$. Then, notice that the nerve complex of \mathcal{J} is isomorphic to $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. More precisely, the map $Y \mapsto \mathcal{J}_Y$ induces an isomorphism from $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ to the nerve complex of \mathcal{J} . Indeed, $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathbb{G}$ span a simplex in $\text{Skew}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$ if and only if there exists a hyperplane crossing all of them, which amounts to saying that $\mathcal{J}_{Y_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{J}_{Y_n} \neq \emptyset$, or that $\mathcal{J}_{Y_1}, \dots, \mathcal{J}_{Y_n}$ span a simplex in the nerve complex of \mathcal{J} .

Finally, given $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathbb{G}$, let us justify that $\mathcal{J}_{Y_1} \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{J}_{Y_n}$ is either empty or contractible. If the intersection is empty, there is nothing to prove; so we assume that it is non-empty. Clearly, the intersection coincides with the contact complex of the gated subgraph given by Lemma 4.17. The desired contractibility follows from Proposition 3.4. The lemma then follows from the nerve theorem applied to the covering \mathcal{J} of $\text{Cont}^\Delta(X, \mathbb{G})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.13. For convenience, set $\mathcal{P} := \{\langle \Lambda \rangle, \Lambda \in \mathcal{S}\}$. It follows from Lemma 4.14 that the coset intersection complex $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{P})$ is isomorphic to the skewering complex $\text{Skew}^\Delta(\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}), \mathbb{G})$, where $\mathbb{G} := \{g\langle \Lambda \rangle \mid g \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}, \Lambda \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Let us verify that \mathbb{G} is parallelism-free.

Suppose there exist two distinct subgraphs $g\langle\Phi\rangle, h\langle\Psi\rangle \in \mathbb{G}$ that are parallel. First of all, notice that $\Phi = \Psi$. Indeed, Φ (resp. Ψ) can be described as the subgraph of Γ given by the vertices that label the hyperplanes crossing $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ (resp. $h\langle\Psi\rangle$), so the fact that $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $h\langle\Psi\rangle$ are crossed by exactly the same hyperplanes immediately implies that $\Phi = \Psi$. Next, fix two vertices $x \in g\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $y \in h\langle\Psi\rangle$ minimising the distance between $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $h\langle\Psi\rangle$. Since we chose distinct cosets, $x \neq y$. Let J be a hyperplane containing the first edge of some geodesic connecting x to y . By Theorem 2.5, J separates $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $h\langle\Psi\rangle$. Since $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $h\langle\Psi\rangle$ are crossed by exactly the same hyperplanes, it follows that all the hyperplanes crossing $g\langle\Phi\rangle$ are transverse to J . We deduce from Lemma 4.4 that the vertex of Γ labelling J is adjacent to all the vertices in Φ . In other words, $\Phi \subset \text{link}(\text{label}(J))$. This contradicts our assumptions about \mathcal{S} .

Thus, Proposition 4.16 applies and shows that $\text{Skew}^\Delta(\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}), \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to the \mathbb{G} -contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}), \mathbb{G})$.

To see that \mathbb{G} is star-covering, let C be a clique of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$. Up to translating by an element of $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$, we know from Lemma 4.2 that we can write $C = \langle u \rangle$ for some vertex $u \in \Gamma$. Also by Lemma 4.2, the prisms containing C are exactly the $\langle \Lambda \rangle$ with $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$ a complete subgraph containing u . Therefore, the union of all the prisms containing C is contained in $\langle \text{star}(u) \rangle$. But we know by assumption that there exists some $\Xi \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\text{star}(u) \subset \Xi$, so our union must be contained in $\langle \Xi \rangle \in \mathbb{G}$.

Thus, Theorem 3.15 applies (also thanks to Lemma 4.6) and shows that the contact complex $\text{Cont}^\Delta(\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G}), \mathbb{G})$ is homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{x \in \text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})} \text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$. Recall that $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is the simplicial complex with vertices corresponding to cliques of $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ containing x and simplices corresponding to collections of cliques contained in some common subgraph $\Lambda \in \mathcal{S}$. Since $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ acts vertex-transitively on $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$, each $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$ is isomorphic to $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(1)$, so it only remains to verify that $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(1)$ is isomorphic to $\Gamma^{\mathcal{S}}$.

But, according to Lemma 4.2, the cliques containing 1 are exactly $\langle u \rangle$ for $u \in \Gamma$. Finitely many such cliques $\langle u_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle u_n \rangle$ are contained in some subgraph of \mathbb{G} if and only if there exists $\Lambda \in \mathcal{S}$ containing u_1, \dots, u_n . We conclude that $\text{sL}_{\mathbb{G}}(1)$ can indeed be identified with $\Gamma^{\mathcal{S}}$. \square

5 Applications to large-scale geometry of right-angled Artin groups

The problem of distinguishing right-angled Artin groups up to quasi-isometry is still open in full generality. Here, we use the characterisation of the homotopy types of coset intersection complexes obtained in Theorem 4.13 to construct new quasi-isometry invariants. As illustrated in the introduction, these invariants can be used to distinguish the quasi-isometry types of right-angled Artin groups that could not previously be distinguished. We also consider, more generally, graph products of infinite groups. In this context, we use coset intersection complexes to construct new commensurability invariants of such groups.

5.1 QI-characteristic parabolic subgroups

In this section, we show that a quasi-isometry between right-angled Artin groups induces an isomorphism of their respective coset intersection complexes with respect to maximal join subgroups. First, we show that maximal join subgroups are coarsely preserved under quasi-isometry.

We thank Jingyin Huang for pointing out how the following statement follows from results in [Hua16].

Theorem 5.1. *Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite graphs. For every quasi-isometry $\eta: A(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow A(\Gamma_2)$, there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that the following holds. For every element $g \in A(\Gamma_1)$ and every maximal join $\Phi \subset \Gamma_1$, there exist an element $h \in A(\Gamma_2)$ and a maximal join $\Psi \subset \Gamma_2$ such that $\eta(g\langle\Phi\rangle)$ lies at Hausdorff distance $\leq C$ from $h\langle\Psi\rangle$.*

Before turning to Theorem 5.1, we prove the following observation:

Lemma 5.2. *Let Γ be a finite graph, $\Phi, \Psi \subset \Gamma$ two subgraphs, and $g \in A(\Gamma)$ an element. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *in $A(\Gamma)$, $\langle\Phi\rangle$ is contained in a neighbourhood of $g\langle\Psi\rangle$;*
- (ii) *$\langle\Phi\rangle \subset g\langle\Psi\rangle$;*
- (iii) *$\Phi \subset \Psi$ and $g \in \langle\text{star}(\Phi)\rangle\langle\Psi\rangle$.*

Proof. The implications (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) and (ii) \Rightarrow (i) are clear, so it suffices to prove that (i) \Rightarrow (iii).

If Φ is not contained in Ψ , fix a vertex u that belongs to Φ but not to Ψ . If $\pi_u: A(\Gamma) \rightarrow \langle u \rangle$ denotes the canonical retraction that sends all the generators but u to 1, then π_u sends $\langle\Phi\rangle$ to the entire line $\langle u \rangle$ but it sends $g\langle\Psi\rangle$ to the single point $\{\pi_u(g)\}$. Since π_u is 1-Lipschitz, this contradicts the fact that $\langle\Phi\rangle$ is contained in a neighbourhood of $g\langle\Psi\rangle$. Thus, we have proved that $\Phi \subset \Psi$. It remains to verify that $g \in \langle\text{star}(\Phi)\rangle\langle\Psi\rangle$.

If $\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $g\langle\Psi\rangle$ intersect, then the inclusion $\langle\Phi\rangle \subset g\langle\Psi\rangle$ must hold since $\Phi \subset \Psi$. If so, then $g\langle\Psi\rangle$ contains 1, hence $g \in \langle\Psi\rangle$. From now on, we assume that $\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $g\langle\Psi\rangle$ are disjoint. Also, we think of $A(\Gamma)$ as the median graph $\text{Cayl}(A(\Gamma), \Gamma)$. In the rest of the proof, we assume some familiarity with the geometry of this graph, which is similar to those of the quasi-median graphs associated to graph products.

Notice that every hyperplane crossing $\langle\Phi\rangle$ has to cross $g\langle\Psi\rangle$. Otherwise, let J be a hyperplane of $\langle\Phi\rangle$ that does not cross $g\langle\Psi\rangle$. If $u \in \Phi$ denotes the generator labelling the edges of J and if $h \in N(J) \cap \langle\Phi\rangle$, then the $\langle huh^{-1} \rangle$ -translates of J are pairwise non-transverse and they all cross $\langle\Phi\rangle$. Then, for every $n \geq 1$, either hu^n or hu^{-n} is separated from $g\langle\Psi\rangle$ by at least $n - 1$ hyperplanes, namely $J, hu^{\pm 1}J, \dots, hu^{\pm(n-1)}J$. Since such a vertex belongs to $\langle\Phi\rangle$, this contradicts the assumption that $\langle\Phi\rangle$ is contained in a neighbourhood of $g\langle\Psi\rangle$, proving our claim.

Fix two vertices $a \in \langle\Phi\rangle$ and $b \in g\langle\Psi\rangle$ at minimal distance. Consider a path connecting 1 to g that decomposes as the concatenation of a path α_1 connecting 1 to a in $\langle\Phi\rangle$, a geodesic α_2 connecting a to b , and a path α_3 connecting b to g in $g\langle\Psi\rangle$. Clearly, α_1 is labelled by a word in $\langle\Phi\rangle$ and α_3 is labelled by a word in $\langle\Psi\rangle$. As a consequence of Theorem 2.5, the hyperplanes crossing α_2 separate $\langle\Phi\rangle$ and $g\langle\Psi\rangle$, and consequently must be transverse to all the hyperplanes of $\langle\Phi\rangle$. Therefore, the hyperplanes crossing α_2 are labelled by vertices in $\text{link}(\Phi)$. Thus, α_2 is labelled by a word in $\text{link}(\Phi)$. We conclude that g , which is equal in $A(\Gamma)$ to the word labelling $\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3$, belongs to

$$\langle\Phi\rangle\langle\text{link}(\Phi)\rangle\langle\Psi\rangle = \langle\text{star}(\Phi)\rangle\langle\Psi\rangle,$$

as desired. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By [Hua17, Theorem 2.10], it suffices to show that every maximal join Φ of a right-angled Artin group $A(\Gamma)$ is stable in the sense of [Hua17, Definition 3.13]. To see that this is indeed sufficient, note that the definition of stability implies that, for any $g \in G$, if $\eta: A(\Gamma) \rightarrow A(\Gamma')$ is a quasi-isometry, there exists some $\Phi' \subseteq \Gamma'$ and $h \in A(\Gamma')$ such that $\eta(g\langle\Phi\rangle)$ and $h\langle\Phi'\rangle$ are at uniformly finite Hausdorff distance.

By [Hua17, Theorem 2.10], the subgraph Φ' is a join. Suppose $\Omega \supseteq \Phi'$ is a maximal join, and let η^{-1} be any quasi-inverse of η . Again by stability, we see that $\eta^{-1}(h\langle\Omega\rangle)$ is at finite Hausdorff distance from a join $k\langle\Phi''\rangle$ in $A(\Gamma)$. So $\langle\Phi\rangle$ is contained in a neighbourhood of $k\langle\Phi''\rangle$. It follows from Lemma 5.2 that $\langle\Phi\rangle \subset k\langle\Phi''\rangle$, and in particular that $\Phi \subset \Phi''$. Hence $\Phi = \Phi''$ by maximality of Φ . Then, we also deduce from Lemma 5.1 that $\langle\Phi\rangle = k\langle\Phi''\rangle$. Necessarily, the Hausdorff distance between $h\langle\Phi'\rangle$ and $h\langle\Omega\rangle$ must be finite. We deduce from Lemma 5.1 that $\Omega = \Phi'$. A fortiori, Φ' is a maximal join, and the result follows.

Thus our goal is to show that a maximal join $\Phi \subseteq \Gamma$ is stable. A key fact that we will use repeatedly is that, for any vertex $v \in \Gamma$, either $\text{star}(v)$ or $\text{link}(v)$ is stable [Hua17, Lemma 5.1].

Let $\Phi = \Phi_1 * \Phi_2 * \cdots * \Phi_k$ be the minimal join decomposition of Φ , that is, a decomposition such that Φ_1 is a complete graph, and, if $i \neq 1$, then Φ_i is not a complete graph and does not split as a join. We consider two cases, depending on whether $\Phi_1 = \emptyset$ or not.

Case 1: $\Phi_1 \neq \emptyset$. Fix $v \in \Phi_1$. Then $\Phi \subseteq \text{star}(v)$, and, since $\text{star}(v)$ is a join, the maximality of Φ implies that $\Phi = \text{star}(v)$. If $\text{star}(v)$ is stable, then we are done, so suppose that $\text{link}(v) = \Phi - \{v\}$ is stable. Let

$$V = \{w \in \Gamma \mid w \text{ is adjacent (but not equal) to every vertex in } \text{link}(v)\}$$

be the full orthogonal complement of $\text{link}(v)$. Then [Hua16, Lemma 3.16] implies that $V * \text{link}(v)$ is stable. The vertex v is in V , and so $\Phi \subseteq V * \text{link}(v)$. Maximality of Φ again implies that $\Phi = V * \text{link}(v)$, and we conclude that Φ is stable.

Case 2: $\Phi_1 = \emptyset$. For each i , let $W_i = \Phi - \Phi_i$, and, for each $w \in W_i$, let Ω_w be either $\text{star}(w)$ or $\text{link}(w)$, whichever is stable. Finally, let

$$\Omega_i = \bigcap_{w \in W_i} \Omega_w.$$

Since Ω_i is a finite intersection of stable subgraphs, it is stable by [Hua16, Lemma 3.14]. Our first goal is to show that $\Phi_i = \Omega_i$.

The first step is to show that $\Omega_i \cap W_i = \emptyset$. Let $v \in W_i$, so that $v \in \Phi_j$ for some $j \neq i$. There exists a vertex $w \in \Phi_j - \{v\}$ that is not adjacent to v , as otherwise Φ_j would split as a join $\{v\} * (\Phi_j - \{v\})$, contradicting that $j \neq 1$. Since w is not adjacent to v , it follows that $v \notin \Omega_w$. Since $w \in W_i$, this implies that $v \notin \Omega_i$, and so $\Omega_i \cap W_i = \emptyset$, as desired.

Since $\Omega_i \cap W_i = \emptyset$, it follows from the definition of Ω_i that every vertex of Ω_i is in the link of every vertex in W_i . Thus Ω_i and W_i form a join $W_i * \Omega_i$. Notice that

$$\Phi_i \subset \bigcap_{w \in W_i} \text{link}(w) \subset \bigcap_{w \in W_i} \Omega_w = \Omega_i.$$

Therefore $\Phi \subseteq W_i * \Omega_i$, and the maximality of Φ implies that $\Phi = W_i * \Omega_i$. The definition of W_i thus implies that $\Phi_i = \Omega_i$.

We have shown that each Φ_i is stable. Since Φ is a maximal join, it is also stable by [Hua16, Lemma 3.24]. \square

We are now ready to show the invariance of coset intersection complexes.

Corollary 5.3. *Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite graphs. Every quasi-isometry $\eta: A(\Gamma_1) \rightarrow A(\Gamma_2)$ induces an isomorphism between the coset intersection complexes*

$$\mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma_1), \{\langle\Phi\rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma_2), \{\langle\Psi\rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\}).$$

Proof. By Theorem 5.1, the quasi-isometry η is a quasi-isometry of pairs

$$\eta: (A(\Gamma_1), \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\}) \rightarrow (A(\Gamma_2), \{\langle \Psi \rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\}).$$

Let $\dot{\eta}: \mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma_1), \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma_2), \{\langle \Psi \rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\})$ be an induced map on coset intersection complexes. By [AMP24, Proposition 4.9], the map $\dot{\eta}$ is a simplicial map, and we will show that it is an isomorphism.

First, note that, for any finite graph Γ and any subgraph $\Lambda \subset \Gamma$, the commensurator $\text{Comm}(\langle \Lambda \rangle)$ of $\langle \Lambda \rangle$ is equal to its normalizer $N(\langle \Lambda \rangle)$ in $A(\Gamma)$ [God23, Theorem 0.1] (see also Lemma 5.7 below). Moreover, $N(\langle \Lambda \rangle) = \langle \Lambda \rangle \times \langle \text{link}(\Lambda) \rangle$ [AM15, Proposition 3.13]. If Λ is a maximal join, then $\text{link}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$, and so $N(\langle \Lambda \rangle) = \langle \Lambda \rangle$. In the terminology of [AMP24], this is equivalent to saying that the group pairs

$$(A(\Gamma_1), \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\}) \text{ and } (A(\Gamma_2), \{\langle \Psi \rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\})$$

are both reduced. Therefore, by [AMP24, Proposition 4.9], the map $\dot{\eta}$ is an isomorphism, as desired. \square

A finite collection of subgroups \mathcal{P} of a finitely generated group G is called *qi-characteristic* if each subgroup P has finite index in $\text{Comm}_G(P)$ and the collection of left cosets $\{gP \mid g \in G, P \in \mathcal{P}\}$ is preserved up to uniform Hausdorff distance by any self quasi-isometry of G , see [MPSSn22]. Since any maximal join subgroup of a $A(\Gamma)$ is self commensurated [God23, Theorem 0.1], Theorem 5.1 implies that the collection of maximal join subgroups $\{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma \text{ maximal join}\}$ of $A(\Gamma)$ is qi-characteristic. This property has the following consequence.

Corollary 5.4. *Let Γ be a finite graph. If G is a finitely generated group quasi-isometric to $A(\Gamma)$, then G admits a cellular action on $\mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma), \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma \text{ maximal join}\})$ with finitely many G -orbits of 0-cells.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{P} = \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma \text{ maximal join}\}$ of $A(\Gamma)$ is a qi-characteristic collection of subgroups of $A(\Gamma)$, a consequence of [MPSSn22, Theorem 1.1] is that there is a finite collection of subgroups \mathcal{Q} of G such that the group pairs $(A(\Gamma), \mathcal{P})$ and (G, \mathcal{Q}) are quasi-isometric. By [AMP24, Theorem 1.5 & Proposition 2.9], we can assume that $Q = \text{Comm}_G(Q)$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. It follows that the group pairs $(A(\Gamma), \mathcal{P})$ and (G, \mathcal{Q}) are quasi-isometric and reduced. By [AMP24, Proposition 4.9], the coset intersection complexes $\mathcal{K}(A(\Gamma), \mathcal{P})$ and $\mathcal{K}(G, \mathcal{Q})$ are isomorphic as simplicial complexes. Since \mathcal{Q} is a finite collection, G acts with finitely many orbits of vertices in $\mathcal{K}(G, \mathcal{Q})$. \square

5.2 Quasi-isometric and commensurability invariants

In this section, we gather quasi-isometry and commensurability invariants that can be read off the defining graph of a graph product. We begin with the case of right-angled Artin groups. Recall that, given a simplicial graph Γ , the space Γ^\boxtimes is the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is Γ and whose simplices are given by joins.

Theorem 5.5. *Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite connected graphs. If $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ are quasi-isometric, then $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_1^\boxtimes$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_2^\boxtimes$ are homotopy equivalent.*

Proof. If $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ are quasi-isometric, then we know from Corollary 5.3 that the corresponding coset intersection complexes relative to maximal join subgroups are isomorphic. But, according to Theorem 4.13, these two complexes are respectively homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_1^\boxtimes$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_2^\boxtimes$, concluding the proof. \square

We now turn our attention to more general graph products of infinite groups. In this setting, we again use the coset intersection complex with respect to maximal join subgroups, and we obtain the following commensurability invariant, rather than the quasi-isometry invariant obtained for right-angled Artin groups.

Theorem 5.6. *Let Γ_1 (resp. Γ_2) be a finite connected graph and \mathcal{G}_1 (resp. \mathcal{G}_2) a collection of infinite groups indexed by Γ_1 (resp. Γ_2). If $\Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2$ are commensurable, then $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_1^{\boxtimes}$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_2^{\boxtimes}$ are homotopy equivalent.*

The proof of the above theorem relies on the relationship between the respective coset intersection complexes with respect to maximal join subgroups; see Lemma 5.9. The proof of the lemma assumes familiarity with the well-known *normal form theorem* for graph products, see [Gre90].

Lemma 5.7. *Let Γ be a finite connected graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of infinite groups indexed by Γ . Then any maximal join subgroup of $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ is self-commensurated.*

Proof. Suppose first that P_1 and P_2 are two parabolic subgroups of $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ such that P_1 is a finite-index subgroup of P_2 . We will show that $P_1 = P_2$. By conjugating, we may assume that $P_1 = \langle\Phi\rangle$ and $P_2 = g\langle\Lambda\rangle g^{-1}$ for $\Phi, \Lambda \subseteq \Gamma$ and $g \in \Gamma\mathcal{G}$. It follows from [AM15, Corollary 3.8] that $\Phi \subseteq \Lambda$. If $\Phi \subsetneq \Lambda$, then there exists a vertex $u \in \Lambda \setminus \Phi$. Define a map $\pi_u: \Gamma\mathcal{G} \rightarrow G_u$ that is the identity map on G_u and sends G_v to 1 for all $v \neq u$. Since $u \in \Lambda$, we see that $\pi_u(P_2) = G_u$, which is infinite by assumption. On the other hand, $u \notin \Phi$ implies that $\pi_u(P_1) = 1$, which contradicts that P_1 is finite index in P_2 . Therefore $\Lambda = \Phi$, and so $P_1 = P_2$.

We now show that, if P is a parabolic subgroup, then $\text{Comm}(P) = N(P)$. It is clear that $N(P) \subseteq \text{Comm}(P)$, so suppose $g \in \text{Comm}(P)$. Then $P' = gPg^{-1} \cap P$ is a finite-index subgroup of P . Since the intersection of parabolic subgroups is parabolic [AM15, Proposition 3.4], the subgroup P' is parabolic. By the argument above, it follows that $P' = P$, and so $g \in N(P)$.

Finally, suppose P is a maximal join subgroup. By conjugating, we may assume $P = \langle\Phi\rangle$. We have $N(P) = \langle\Phi, \text{lk}(\Phi)\rangle$ [AM15, Proposition 3.13], but $\text{lk}(\Phi) = \emptyset$, since Φ is a maximal join. Therefore, we have $\text{Comm}(P) = N(P) = \langle\Phi\rangle = P$, and P is self-commensurated, as desired. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let Γ be a finite graph and $G = \Gamma\mathcal{G}$ be the graph product of a family of non-trivial groups \mathcal{G} indexed by Γ . If $H \leq G$ is a subgroup such that no conjugate of H is contained in a vertex group or a join subgroup, then there exists $h \in H$ such that the centraliser of h^k is virtually cyclic for every $k \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let G_0 denote the parabolic closure of H in G . The assumption on H implies that G_0 is neither conjugate to a vertex group nor a join subgroup. Applying [MO15, Corollary 6.20] to G_0 yields an isometric action of G_0 on a tree and an element $h \in H$ that is a loxodromic WPD element with respect to this action. By [Osi16, Corollary 6.9], the centraliser $C_{G_0}(h^k)$ of h^k in G_0 is virtually cyclic for all $k \neq 0$.

The centraliser $C_G(h^k)$ of h^k in G is the product of $C_{G_0}(h^k)$ and $\langle\text{lk}(G_0)\rangle$. If $\text{lk}(G_0)$ is non-empty, then H is contained in a join subgroup, which contradicts our assumption. Thus $C_G(h^k) = C_{G_0}(h^k)$ is virtually cyclic. \square

Lemma 5.9. *Let Γ_1 (resp. Γ_2) be a finite connected graph with at least two vertices and \mathcal{G}_1 (resp. \mathcal{G}_2) a collection of infinite groups indexed by Γ_1 (resp. Γ_2). If $\Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2$ are commensurable, then the coset intersection complexes*

$\mathcal{K}(\Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1, \{\langle\Phi\rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\})$ and $\mathcal{K}(\Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2, \{\langle\Psi\rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\})$
are isomorphic.

Proof. Let $A_i = \Gamma_i \mathcal{G}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, let $G = A_1 \cap A_2$, let $\mathcal{J}_i = \{\langle \Phi \rangle \mid \Phi \subset \Gamma_i \text{ maximal join}\}$ and let T_i be a right transversal of the subgroup G of $\Gamma_i \mathcal{G}_i$. Observe that $\{tJ : t \in T_i, J \in \mathcal{J}_i\}$ is a collection of representatives of G -orbits of the G -set of left cosets $A_i/\mathcal{J}_i = \{gJ \mid g \in A_i, J \in \mathcal{J}_i\}$.

Let us argue that, for each left coset $t\langle \Delta \rangle$, where $t \in T_1$ and Δ is a maximal join of Γ_1 , there exist $g \in A_2$ and a maximal join Λ of Γ_2 such that

$$t\langle \Delta \rangle t^{-1} \cap G \leq g\langle \Lambda \rangle g^{-1}. \quad (2)$$

To simplify notation, let H denote the subgroup $t\langle \Delta \rangle t^{-1}$ of A_1 . Since Γ_2 is a finite graph, it suffices to show that $H \cap G$ is contained in a join subgroup of A_2 . There are three cases to consider. First, if Γ_2 is a join, then trivially $H \cap G$ is a subgroup of a join subgroup of A_2 . Second, if $H \cap G$ is conjugate to a subgroup of a vertex of group of A_2 , then $H \cap G$ is a subgroup of a join subgroup of A_2 since Γ_2 is a connected graph with at least two vertices. For the third case, suppose $H \cap G$ is not a subgroup of a conjugate of a vertex group of A_2 and that Γ_2 is not a join. Suppose, by contradiction, that $H \cap G$ is not contained in a join subgroup of A_2 . Applying Lemma 5.8 to the subgroup $H \cap G$, we obtain $h \in H \cap G$ such that the centraliser $C_{A_2}(h^k)$ is virtually infinite cyclic for every $k \neq 0$. In particular, $C_{H \cap G}(h^k)$ is virtually infinite cyclic, as well. Since Δ is a join of Γ_1 , it follows that the group H is a product $H_1 \times H_2$ of infinite subgroups. Let us assume that $h = (h_1, h_2)$. Up to replacing h with some power h^k , we can assume that h_1 and h_2 are each either infinite-order or trivial. Since $H \cap G$ is a finite-index subgroup of H , we have that $C_H(h) = C_{H_1}(h_1) \times C_{H_2}(h_2)$ is a virtually infinite cyclic subgroup. But $C_{H_1}(h_1)$ and $C_{H_2}(h_2)$ are both infinite groups, and so $C_H(h)$ is not virtually cyclic, which contradicts that $C_{H \cap G}(h)$ is virtually cyclic. Therefore $H \cap G$ must be contained in a join subgroup of A_2 . This completes the proof of the claim at the beginning of the paragraph.

It follows that there is a G -equivariant function $f: A_1/\mathcal{J}_1 \rightarrow A_2/\mathcal{J}_2$ such that if $t \in T_1$ and Δ is a maximal join of Γ_1 , then $f(t\langle \Delta \rangle) = g\langle \Lambda \rangle$ where Λ is a maximal join of Γ_2 , $g \in A_2$, and (2) holds. By symmetry, there is a G -equivariant map $f': A_2/\mathcal{J}_2 \rightarrow A_1/\mathcal{J}_1$ such that, for any $t\langle \Delta \rangle \in A_2/\mathcal{J}_2$, if $f'(t\langle \Delta \rangle) = g\langle \Lambda \rangle$ then (2) holds as well. To conclude the proof, we prove that f is a simplicial isomorphism

$$f: \mathcal{K}(\Gamma_1 \mathcal{G}_1, \{\langle \Phi \rangle, \Phi \subset \Gamma_1 \text{ maximal join}\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{K}(\Gamma_2 \mathcal{G}_2, \{\langle \Psi \rangle, \Psi \subset \Gamma_2 \text{ maximal join}\}).$$

Let us first argue that f is a simplicial map. Let $\{a_1 J_1, \dots, a_n J_n\} \subset A_1/\mathcal{J}_1$ be a simplex of $\mathcal{K}(A_1, \mathcal{J}_1)$, and suppose that $f(a_i J_i) = b_i K_i$. Then $\bigcap_{i=1}^n a_i J_i a_i^{-1}$ is an infinite subgroup of A_1 . Since G is finite index in A_1 , the intersection $G \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n a_i J_i a_i^{-1}$ is infinite as well. By definition of f , we have that $\bigcap_{i=1}^n a_i J_i a_i^{-1} \cap G \leq \bigcap_{i=1}^n b_i K_i b_i^{-1}$ and hence $\{b_1 K_1, \dots, b_n K_n\}$ is a simplex of $\mathcal{K}(A_2, \mathcal{J}_2)$. Hence f is a simplicial map and, by an analogous argument, f' is as well. To conclude that f is an isomorphism, we show that f' is its inverse. Let $aJ \in A_1/\mathcal{J}_1$ and suppose that $f(aJ) = bK$ and $f'(bK) = cL$. By the definitions of f and g , we have that

$$aJa^{-1} \cap G \leq bKb^{-1} \cap G \leq cLc^{-1}.$$

Since J and L are maximal join subgroups of A_1 , it follows that $aJa^{-1} = cLc^{-1}$. Indeed, it follows from [AM15, Corollary 3.8] that the support of J is contained in that of L , and hence by maximality $J = L$. The equality $aJa^{-1} = cLc^{-1}$ follows by the fact that maximal join subgroups are self-commensurated; see Lemma 5.7. Therefore $f' \circ f$ is the identity map on A_1/\mathcal{J}_1 , and similarly $f \circ f'$ is the identity map on A_2/\mathcal{J}_2 . It follows that f and g are simplicial isomorphisms. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 5.6.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. If our graph products $\Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2$ are commensurable, then we know from Lemma 5.9 that the corresponding coset intersection complexes relative to maximal join subgroups are isomorphic. But, according to Theorem 4.13, these two complexes are respectively homotopy equivalent to $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_1^{\boxtimes}$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_2^{\boxtimes}$. This concludes the proof of our theorem. \square

We end with one final quasi-isometry invariant of right-angled Artin groups.

Theorem 5.10. *Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite connected graphs that do not contain two non-adjacent vertices u, v satisfying $\text{link}(u) \subset \text{star}(v)$. If $A(\Gamma_1)$ and $A(\Gamma_2)$ are quasi-isometric, then $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_1^{\Delta}$ and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}}\Gamma_2^{\Delta}$ are homotopically equivalent.*

Proof. Under our assumptions, [Hua16, Theorem 2.20] shows that the crossing complexes of $\text{QM}(\Gamma_1, \mathcal{G}_1)$ and $\text{QM}(\Gamma_2, \mathcal{G}_2)$ are isomorphic, and a fortiori homotopy equivalent. Thus, Theorem 4.7 yields the desired conclusion. \square

6 Open questions


In this final section, we record some questions that are naturally raised by the results proved so far.

Other relative contact complexes. Given a quasi-median graph X and a prism-covering collection \mathbb{G} of gated subgraphs, we have identified the homotopy type of the \mathbb{G} -contact complex $\text{Cont}(X, \mathbb{G})$ when $\mathbb{G} = \{\text{prisms}\}$ (Theorem 3.6) and when \mathbb{G} is star-covering (Theorem 3.15). Roughly speaking, we have

$$\text{crossing complex} \subset \text{contiguity complex} \subset \text{contact complex},$$

and our results deal with crossing complexes and everything lying between contiguity and contact complexes. However, relative contact graphs lying between crossing and contiguity complexes remain to be investigated.

A difference between the proofs of Theorems 3.6 and 3.15 comes from the definitions of the subspaces associated to hyperplanes: in the first case, fibres are ignored, but they are included in our subspaces in the second case. In both cases, the key property to have is that two subspaces intersect if and only if the corresponding hyperplanes are adjacent in the relative contact complex under consideration.



However, in full generality, three hyperplanes may have a fibre in common while only two of them are adjacent in the relative contact complex. As a consequence, one is tempted to both keep and remove the fibre from our subspaces. As a concrete example, our results do not allow us to identify the homotopy type of the coset intersection complex of the right-angled Artin group illustrated on the left.

Problem 6.1. Generalise Theorem 3.15 to arbitrary prism-covering collections.

Other quasi-isometric invariants. Most of our results apply to graph products of infinite groups. The only step that is specific to right-angled Artin groups is Theorem 5.1. Therefore, it is natural to ask:

Question 6.2. Let Γ_1, Γ_2 be two finite graphs and $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ two collections of finitely generated infinite groups indexed by Γ_1, Γ_2 . Given a quasi-isometry $\eta : \Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2$, does there exist a constant $C \geq 0$ such that η sends every coset of a maximal join subgroup of $\Gamma_1\mathcal{G}_1$ at Hausdorff distance $\leq C$ from the coset of a maximal join subgroup of $\Gamma_2\mathcal{G}_2$?

A positive answer is plausible. It would allow one to generalise Theorem 1.1 to graph products of arbitrary infinite groups.

In another direction, Theorem 1.1 is obtained by considering coset intersection complexes relative to maximal join subgroups, but, in practice, there usually exist other collections of parabolic subgraphs that are preserved by quasi-isometries (see Theorem 5.10). Thus, our techniques may lead to other quasi-isometric invariants. This is, in our opinion, an interesting direction to investigate.

For instance, the second-named author introduced in [Gen18] the *small crossing graph* of the quasi-median graph $\text{QM}(\Gamma, \mathcal{G})$ associated to the graph product $\Gamma\mathcal{G}$ and noticed that, whenever Γ does not have two vertices with the same link or the same star (which can always be assumed), the automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\Gamma\mathcal{G})$ naturally acts on it. Is the small crossing graph also preserved by quasi-isometries? Can we identify the homotopy type of its flag completion?

More geometrically, given a quasi-median graph X , say a hyperplane is *maximal* if none of its fibres is contained in the carrier of another hyperplane; and define the *small crossing complex* $\text{sCross}^\Delta(X)$ to be the simplicial complex whose vertices are the maximal hyperplanes of X and whose simplices are given by pairwise transverse hyperplanes.

Question 6.3. Given a quasi-median graph X , what is the homotopy type of its small crossing complex $\text{sCross}^\Delta(X)$?

It is worth noticing that the proof of Proposition 3.8 generalises, proving that $\text{sCross}^\Delta(X)$ is homotopy equivalent to the complement in the prism-completion X^\square of the edges contained in hyperplanes that are not maximal. Can this description be further simplified?

Right-angled Coxeter groups. The characterisation of the homotopy type of coset intersection complexes provided by Theorem 4.13 only deals with graph products of infinite groups. It would be interesting to have a similar result for graph products of finite groups, such as right-angled Coxeter groups. This would allow us to compare two right-angled Coxeter groups up to quasi-isometry, but also to compare right-angled Coxeter groups to right-angled Artin groups, which is a widely open problem.

Question 6.4. Let Γ be a finite graph and \mathcal{G} a collection of finite groups indexed by Γ . What is the homotopy type of the coset intersection complex

$$\mathcal{K}(\Gamma\mathcal{G}, \{\langle \Lambda \rangle, \Lambda \subset \Gamma \text{ maximal large join}\})?$$

Here, we refer to a join $\Lambda_1 * \dots * \Lambda_n$ as *large* if each Λ_i contains at least two non-adjacent vertices. Such coset intersection complexes also have a geometric interpretation, in the same vein as Lemma 4.14. Given a quasi-median graph X and a collection \mathbb{G} of gated subgraphs, define the *double skewering complex* $\text{dSkew}(X, \mathbb{G})$ as the simplicial complex whose vertex-set is \mathbb{G} and whose simplices are given by collections of subgraphs all crossed by two non-transverse hyperplanes. Then the proof of Lemma 4.14 generalises and shows that our coset intersection complexes can be described as double skewering complexes. However, identifying the homotopy type of a double skewering complex does not seem to be straightforward, and the problem remains to be investigated.

Notice that a solution to Question 6.4 would already provide invariants allowing us to compare right-angled Coxeter groups with other right-angled Coxeter groups or with right-angled Artin groups up to commensurability. For a comparison up to quasi-isometry, another difficulty towards the generalisation of our results to graph products of finite groups is Theorem 5.1. An extension of this quasi-isometric rigidity is plausible, though. In fact, we can ask much more generally:

Question 6.5. Let G_1, G_2 be two groups acting geometrically and specially on two (quasi-)median graphs X_1, X_2 . Given a quasi-isometry $\eta : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$, does there exist a constant $C \geq 0$ such that η sends every maximal product subgraph of X_1 at Hausdorff distance $\leq C$ from some maximal product subgraph of X_2 ?

Theorem 5.1 gives a positive answer for median graphs of right-angled Artin groups and [Oh22] also yields a positive answer for median graphs of cubical dimension two.

Rigid homotopy equivalence. Despite the fact that we consider coset intersection complexes up to homotopy, Corollary 5.3 shows that we do not only have a homotopy equivalence between our complexes but a genuine isomorphism. Extracting metric (compared to homotopy) invariants from such an isomorphism would be interesting. In this direction:


Problem 6.6. Let X be a quasi-median graph and \mathbb{G} a collection of gated subgraphs. Find metric connections between $\text{Cont}(X, \mathbb{G})$ and the simplicial graphs $sL_{\mathbb{G}}(x)$, $x \in X$.

For instance, it would be interesting to compare up to quasi-isometry two right-angled Artin groups $A(\Gamma_1), A(\Gamma_2)$ where Γ_1 is “made of” cycles of length 5 while Γ_2 is “made of” cycles of length 6.

As justified in the introduction, we focus on the homotopy types of our coset intersection complexes because they are much easier to identify than their metric types. But, of course, we lose a lot of information in the process. It would be interesting to identify a relevant intermediate notion of equivalence between isomorphism and homotopy equivalences, keeping more information than homotopy equivalence but easier to identify than isomorphism.

Question 6.7. Is there a “more rigid” notion of homotopy equivalence such that the rigid homotopy equivalence type of relative contact complexes of quasi-median graphs can be identified?

For instance, let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ denote the three graphs below. Homotopically, $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_1^{\boxtimes}, \bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_2^{\boxtimes}$, and $\bigvee_{\mathbb{N}} \Gamma_3^{\boxtimes}$ are identical. However, $A(\Gamma_1)$ is not quasi-isometric to $A(\Gamma_2)$ but it is quasi-isometric to $A(\Gamma_3)$. (In fact, $A(\Gamma_3)$ can be realised as a subgroup of index two in $A(\Gamma_1)$.) It would be interesting to distinguish Γ_2^{\boxtimes} and Γ_3^{\boxtimes} up to “rigid homotopy.”



References

- [ABD⁺13] A. Abrams, N. Brady, P. Dani, M. Duchin, and R. Young. Pushing fillings in right-angled Artin groups. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 87(3):663–688, 2013.
- [AM15] Yago Antolín and Ashot Minasyan. Tits alternatives for graph products. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 704:55–83, 2015.
- [AMP24] C. Abbott and E. Martínez-Pedroza. The quasi-isometry invariance of the Coset Intersection Complex. *arXiv:2404.16628*, 2024.
- [Ava61] S. Avann. Metric ternary distributive semi-lattices. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 12:407–414, 1961.
- [Bau77] A. Baudisch. Kommutationsgleichungen in semifreien Gruppen. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 29(3-4):235–249, 1977.

- [Bau81] A. Baudisch. Subgroups of semifree groups. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 38(1-4):19–28, 1981.
- [BB97] M. Bestvina and N. Brady. Morse theory and finiteness properties of groups. *Invent. Math.*, 129(3):445–470, 1997.
- [BC96] H.-J. Bandelt and V. Chepoi. Graphs of acyclic cubical complexes. volume 17, pages 113–120. 1996. *Discrete metric spaces* (Bielefeld, 1994).
- [BC08] H.-J. Bandelt and V. Chepoi. Metric graph theory and geometry: a survey. In *Surveys on discrete and computational geometry*, volume 453 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 49–86. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
- [BC12] J. Behrstock and R. Charney. Divergence and quasimorphisms of right-angled Artin groups. *Math. Ann.*, 352(2):339–356, 2012.
- [BD92] H.-J. Bandelt and A. Dress. A canonical decomposition theory for metrics on a finite set. *Adv. Math.*, 92(1):47–105, 1992.
- [Ber76] G. Bergman. The global dimension of mixed coproduct/tensor product algebras. *Unpublished note*, 1976.
- [BH08] B. Brešar and A. Horvat. Crossing graphs of fiber-complemented graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 308(7):1176–1184, 2008.
- [BHS17] J. Behrstock, M. Hagen, and A. Sisto. Hierarchically hyperbolic spaces, I: Curve complexes for cubical groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(3):1731–1804, 2017.
- [BJN10] J. Behrstock, T. Januszkiewicz, and W. Neumann. Quasi-isometric classification of some high dimensional right-angled Artin groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 4(4):681–692, 2010.
- [Bjö81] Anders Björner. Homotopy type of posets and lattice complementation. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 30(1):90–100, 1981.
- [BKS08] M. Bestvina, B. Kleiner, and M. Sageev. The asymptotic geometry of right-angled Artin groups. I. *Geom. Topol.*, 12(3):1653–1699, 2008.
- [BMW94] H.-J. Bandelt, M. Mulder, and E. Wilkeit. Quasi-median graphs and algebras. *J. Graph Theory*, 18(7):681–703, 1994.
- [BN08] J. Behrstock and W. Neumann. Quasi-isometric classification of graph manifold groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 141(2):217–240, 2008.
- [Bow08] B. Bowditch. Tight geodesics in the curve complex. *Invent. Math.*, 171(2):281–300, 2008.
- [Bre05] B. Brešar. Coloring the θ -graph of a median graph. *Problem 2005.3, Maribor Graph Theory Problems*, 2005.
- [CCS23] R. Charney, M. Cordes, and A. Sisto. Complete topological descriptions of certain Morse boundaries. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 17(1):157–184, 2023.
- [CF69] P. Cartier and D. Foata. *Problèmes combinatoires de commutation et réarrangements*, volume No. 85 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1969.
- [Che00] V. Chepoi. Graphs of some CAT(0) complexes. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 24(2):125–179, 2000.
- [CRKdING21] M. Casals-Ruiz, I. Kazachkov, and J. de la Nuez González. On the elementary theory of graph products of groups. *arxiv:2106.03782*, 2021.
- [Dic81] W. Dicks. An exact sequence for rings of polynomials in partly commuting indeterminates. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 22(3):215–228, 1981.
- [Dro83] C. Droms. *GRAPH GROUPS (ALGEBRA, KIM, ROUSH, MAGNUS)*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1983. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Syracuse University.
- [Dro87a] C. Droms. Graph groups, coherence, and three-manifolds. *J. Algebra*, 106(2):484–489, 1987.
- [Dro87b] C. Droms. Isomorphisms of graph groups. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 100(3):407–408, 1987.
- [Dro87c] C. Droms. Subgroups of graph groups. *J. Algebra*, 110(2):519–522, 1987.
- [Fio22] E. Fioravanti. Automorphisms of contact graphs of CAT(0) cube complexes. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (5):3278–3296, 2022.
- [Gen17] A. Genevois. Cubical-like geometry of quasi-median graphs and applications to geometric group theory. *PhD thesis, arxiv:1712.01618*, 2017.
- [Gen18] A. Genevois. Automorphisms of graph products of groups and acylindrical hyperbolicity. *arXiv:1807.00622, to appear in Memoirs of the AMS*, 2018.

- [Gen19a] A. Genevois. Embeddings into Thompson’s groups from quasi-median geometry. *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, 13(4):1457–1510, 2019.
- [Gen19b] A. Genevois. Hyperbolicities in CAT(0) cube complexes. *Enseign. Math.*, 65(1-2):33–100, 2019.
- [Gen22a] A. Genevois. Quasi-isometrically rigid subgroups in right-angled Coxeter groups. *Algebraic & Geometric Topology*, 22(2):657–708, 2022.
- [Gen22b] A. Genevois. Rotation groups, mediangle graphs, and periafroups: a unified point of view on Coxeter groups and graph products of groups. *arXiv:2212.06421*, 2022.
- [Gen22c] A. Genevois. Translation lengths in crossing and contact graphs of (quasi-) median graphs. *arxiv:2209.06441*, 2022.
- [Gen23] A. Genevois. Special cube complexes revisited: a quasi-median generalization. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 75(3):743–777, 2023.
- [Ger98] V. Gerasimov. Fixed-point-free actions on cubings [translation of *algebra, geometry, analysis and mathematical physics (russian) (novosibirsk, 1996)*, 91–109, 190, Izdat. Ross. Akad. Nauk Sibirsk. Otdel. Inst. Mat., Novosibirsk, 1997; MR1624115 (99c:20049)]. *Siberian Adv. Math.*, 8(3):36–58, 1998.
- [GM19] A. Genevois and A. Martin. Automorphisms of graph products of groups from a geometric perspective. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 119(6):1745–1779, 2019.
- [God23] Eddy Godelle. On parabolic subgroups of Artin-Tits groups. *J. Algebra*, 632:520–534, 2023.
- [Gre90] Elisabeth Ruth Green. *Graph products of groups*. Phd thesis, University of Leeds, 1990. Available at <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/236/>.
- [Gro87] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.
- [GT21a] A. Genevois and R. Tessera. Asymptotic geometry of lamplighters over one-ended groups. *arXiv:2105.04878*, 2021.
- [GT21b] A. Genevois and R. Tessera. A note on morphisms to wreath products. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09822*, 2021.
- [Hag14] M. Hagen. Weak hyperbolicity of cube complexes and quasi-arboreal groups. *J. Topol.*, 7(2):385–418, 2014.
- [Har86] J. Harer. The virtual cohomological dimension of the mapping class group of an orientable surface. *Invent. Math.*, 84(1):157–176, 1986.
- [Hat02] A. Hatcher. *Algebraic topology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [HR72] K. Hauschild and W. Rautenberg. Interpretierbarkeit in der Gruppentheorie. *Algebra Universalis*, 1:136–151, 1971/72.
- [Hua16] J. Huang. Quasi-isometry classification of right-angled Artin groups II: several infinite out cases. *arXiv:1603.02372*, 2016.
- [Hua17] J. Huang. Quasi-isometric classification of right-angled Artin groups I: the finite out case. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(6):3467–3537, 2017.
- [HW08] F. Haglund and D. Wise. Special cube complexes. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 17(5):1551–1620, 2008.
- [Iva97] N. Ivanov. Automorphism of complexes of curves and of Teichmüller spaces. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (14):651–666, 1997.
- [KK07a] S. Klavžar and M. Kovše. On Θ -graphs of partial cubes. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, 27(2):313–321, 2007.
- [KK07b] S. Klavžar and M. Kovše. Partial cubes and their τ -graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 28(4):1037–1042, 2007.
- [KK13] S.-H. Kim and T. Koberda. Embedability between right-angled Artin groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(1):493–530, 2013.
- [KM02] S. Klavžar and H. Mulder. Partial cubes and crossing graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 15(2):235–251, 2002.
- [KMLNR80] K. H. Kim, L. Makar-Limanov, J. Neggers, and F. Roush. Graph algebras. *J. Algebra*, 64(1):46–51, 1980.
- [KR80] K. H. Kim and F. W. Roush. Homology of certain algebras defined by graphs. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 17(2):179–186, 1980.

- [Lea02] J. Leasure. *Geodesics in the complex of curves of a surface*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2002. Thesis (Ph.D.)—The University of Texas at Austin.
- [Mar20] A. Margolis. Quasi-isometry classification of right-angled Artin groups that split over cyclic subgroups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 14(4):1351–1417, 2020.
- [MM99] H. Masur and Y. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity. *Invent. Math.*, 138(1):103–149, 1999.
- [MM00] H. Masur and Y. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(4):902–974, 2000.
- [MO15] A. Minasyan and D. Osin. Acylindrical hyperbolicity of groups acting on trees. *Math. Ann.*, 362(3-4):1055–1105, 2015.
- [MPSSn22] Eduardo Martínez-Pedroza and Luis Jorge Sánchez Saldaña. Quasi-isometric rigidity of subgroups and filtered ends. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 22(6):3023–3057, 2022.
- [Mul78] M. Mulder. The structure of median graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 24(2):197–204, 1978.
- [Mul80] M. Mulder. *The interval function of a graph*, volume 132 of *Mathematical Centre Tracts*. Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [Mul11] M. Mulder. Median graphs. A structure theory. In *Advances in interdisciplinary applied discrete mathematics*, volume 11 of *Interdiscip. Math. Sci.*, pages 93–125. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2011.
- [Neb71] L. Nebeský. Median graphs. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae*, 12:317–325, 1971.
- [Nib02] G. Niblo. The singularity obstruction for group splittings. *Topology Appl.*, 119(1):17–31, 2002.
- [Oh22] S. Oh. Quasi-isometry invariants of weakly special square complexes. *Topology Appl.*, 307:Paper No. 107945, 46, 2022.
- [Osi16] D. Osin. Acylindrically hyperbolic groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(2):851–888, 2016.
- [Rol98] M. Roller. Pocsets, median algebras and group actions; an extended study of Dunwoody’s construction and Sageev’s theorem. *dissertation*, 1998.
- [Row23] R. Rowlands. Relating CAT(0) cubical complexes and flag simplicial complexes. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 147:Paper No. 102502, 35, 2023.
- [Sag95] M. Sageev. Ends of group pairs and non-positively curved cube complexes. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 71(3):585–617, 1995.
- [Sha12] K. Shackleton. Tightness and computing distances in the curve complex. *Geom. Dedicata*, 160:243–259, 2012.
- [Val21] M. Valiunas. Acylindrical hyperbolicity of groups acting on quasi-median graphs and equations in graph products. *Groups, Geometry, and Dynamics*, 15(1):143–195, 2021.
- [Ves05] A. Vesel. Characterization of resonance graphs of catacondensed hexagonal graphs. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 53(1):195–208, 2005.
- [Web15] R. Webb. Combinatorics of tight geodesics and stable lengths. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 367(10):7323–7342, 2015.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY, WALTHAM, MA, USA
E-mail address: carolynabbott@brandeis.edu

UNIVERSITY OF MONTPELLIER, INSTITUT MATHÉMATIQUES ALEXANDER GROTHENDIECK.
 PLACE EUGÈNE BATAILLON, 34090 MONTPELLIER, FRANCE
E-mail address: anthony.genevois@umontpellier.fr

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN’S, NL, CANADA
E-mail address: emartinezped@mun.ca