

GRAPHS AND GROUPS WITH UNIQUE GEODESICS

MURRAY ELDER, GILES GARDAM, ADAM PIGGOTT, DAVIDE SPRIANO, AND KANE TOWNSEND

ABSTRACT. A connected graph is called *geodetic* if there is a unique geodesic between each pair of vertices. In this paper we prove that if a finitely generated group admits a Cayley graph which is geodetic, then the group must be virtually free. Before now, it was open whether finitely generated and geodetic implied hyperbolic. In fact we prove something more general: if a quasi-transitive locally finite connected undirected graph is geodetic then it is quasi-isometric to a tree. Our main tool is to define a *boundary* of a graph and understand how the local behaviour influences it when the graph is geodetic. Our results unify, and represent significant progress on, research initiated by Ore, Shapiro, and Madlener and Otto.

1. INTRODUCTION

Trees are of fundamental importance to the study of graphs; *free groups*, the groups that admit Cayley graphs that are trees, are of fundamental importance to the study of groups; *free reduction*, an algorithm for solving the word problem in free groups that exploits the geometry of trees, is the archetypal solution to the word problem in infinite groups. It is natural to seek generalisations of trees, free groups and free reduction. The class of *geodetic graphs* is a straightforward generalisation of trees: a graph is called geodetic if there is a unique shortest path between each pair of vertices. Within this context, one may consider the *geodetic groups*, the groups that admit a finite generating set such that the corresponding undirected Cayley graph is geodetic, to be the appropriate generalisation of free groups, and *reduction via a finite set of confluent inverse-closed length-reducing rewriting rules* to be the appropriate generalisation of free reduction. This point of view unifies three ongoing programs of research. In 1962, Ore proposed the program of classifying all geodetic graphs [18, Problem 3, p.105]; in 1997, Shapiro asked whether the geodetic groups are exactly the plain groups (isomorphic to a free product of finitely many finite groups and a free group, a proper subclass of the virtually free groups) [21, p.286] (see also [4, Section 7]); in 1987, Madlener and Otto [15] conjectured that the groups that admit presentation by finite confluent length-reducing rewriting systems are exactly the plain groups.

Our main results are the following:

Theorem A. Let Γ be a quasi-transitive locally finite undirected simple geodetic graph. Then Γ is quasi-isometric to a tree.

Theorem B. Let G be a geodetic group. Then G is virtually free. Furthermore, if $g \in G$ has infinite order, then the centraliser of g is infinite cyclic, and if C is a 2-ended subgroup of G , then C is isomorphic to either the infinite cyclic or the infinite dihedral group. In particular, the class of geodetic groups forms a strict subclass of the virtually free groups.

Theorem C. A finitely generated group G is geodetic if and only if G admits presentation by a finite inverse-closed confluent length-reducing rewriting system.

Date: April 1, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C75, 05C12, 20F65, 20F67, 68Q42.

Key words and phrases. geodetic graph, quasi-transitive graph, virtually free group, isometrically embedded circuit, geodesic boundary.

Theorem A is a significant contribution to Ore’s program. Prior progress has been almost exclusively limited to finite graphs; an overview of the state of Ore’s problem is presented in [11], with recent work regarding geodetic graphs and groups in [6, 7, 10, 22]. Our techniques differ from those used to obtain prior results for infinite geodetic graphs in that we make use of topological properties of the *geodesic boundary* (Definition 4.1) of the graph inspired by methods from hyperbolic groups [12].

Theorem B represents important progress on Shapiro’s question. The only previous progress made was in 1993, where Papasoglu showed that hyperbolic geodetic groups are virtually free [19]. Hence, our result excludes the possibility of ‘wild’ examples of geodetic groups, such as finitely generated but not finitely related groups, and pushes the question into a proper subclass of the virtually free groups. The description of 2-ended subgroups of G in Theorem B generalises Shapiro [21], who showed that a 2-ended geodetic group must be either cyclic or infinite dihedral.

Theorem C reduces Shapiro’s question to the inverse-closed case of Madlener and Otto’s conjecture, and, for the first time, justifies the likening made in the first paragraph between free groups/free reduction and geodetic groups/finite inverse-closed confluent length-reducing rewriting systems.

The key to proving Theorem A is to combine local control and asymptotic geometry of infinite graphs in a novel way. The local control comes from isometrically embedded circuits (see §2.2), which form the “building blocks” of geodetic graphs. The asymptotic geometry comes from the study of the *geodesic boundary* of Γ (see §4), a set on which $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ always acts, but that for general graphs lacks any sort of meaningful structure. For geodetic graphs, however, the geodesic boundary can be topologised to be a compact, metrisable space on which $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts by homeomorphisms. Our proof of Theorem A exploits a clash between these local and global attributes.

The fact that our results are general enough to apply to quasi-transitive graphs fits with an emerging theme that results concerning Cayley graphs may extend to quasi-transitive graphs (see, for example, [13, 20, 3]). The assumption that Γ is quasi-transitive is indeed necessary, as seen in Remark 5.7 where we give an example of a geodetic graph with bounded vertex degree that has IECs of unbounded size and is not quasi-isometric to a tree.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we introduce notation and vocabulary, including terms used above and below. The bulk of the paper, Sections 3-5, is devoted to the proof of Theorem A. Theorems B and C follow quickly from Theorem A, and are proved in Section 6. Lastly in Section 7 we relate the geodesic boundary to the Gromov boundary.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we introduce the preliminary notation and results used in this paper.

2.1. Standing assumptions about a graph Γ . A (simple undirected) graph Γ comprises a non-empty *vertex* set $V(\Gamma)$ and an *edge* set $E(\Gamma) \subseteq \{X \subseteq V(\Gamma) : |X| = 2\}$. Distinct vertices u and v are called *adjacent* if $\{u, v\}$ is an edge. We say that Γ is *infinite* if $V(\Gamma)$ is infinite, and *locally finite* if no vertex is adjacent to infinitely many vertices.

Define $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ and, for each pair $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a \leq b$, define $[a, b] := \{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$. A map $\alpha: [0, n] \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ is a *path* in Γ if for all i such that $0 \leq i < n$ we have that $\alpha(i)$ is adjacent to $\alpha(i + 1)$. The *length* of α , denoted by $\ell(\alpha)$, is n . The *initial vertex* and *terminal vertex* of α are $\alpha(0)$ and $\alpha(n)$ respectively. We say that Γ is *connected* if for every pair of vertices u and v , there exists a path with initial vertex u and terminal vertex v .

Throughout the remainder of this paper, unless stated otherwise, Γ is a simple undirected locally finite connected infinite graph.

2.2. More about paths and circuits. The *inverse path* of α , denoted $\bar{\alpha}$, is the path defined by $\bar{\alpha}(i) := \alpha(n - i)$. Given two paths $\alpha: [0, n_1] \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ and $\beta: [0, n_2] \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ with $\alpha(n_1) = \beta(0)$, define the *concatenation* $\alpha * \beta$ of α and β by

$$\alpha * \beta(i) := \begin{cases} \alpha(i) & \text{for } i \in [0, n_1], \\ \beta(i - n_1) & \text{for } i \in [n_1, n_1 + n_2]. \end{cases}$$

We say that a path α is a *subpath* of a path β , written $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ if there exist paths α_0, α_1 (possibly of length 0) such that $\alpha_0 * \alpha * \alpha_1$ is defined and is equal to β . A path α is called a *geodesic* if there is no shorter path with initial vertex $\alpha(0)$ and terminal vertex $\alpha(n)$. Define a metric $d_\Gamma: V(\Gamma) \times V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ on $V(\Gamma)$ such that $d_\Gamma(u, v)$ is equal to the length of a geodesic path from u to v . Given vertices u and v in a geodetic graph Γ , we write $[u, v]$ for the unique geodesic path with initial vertex u and terminal vertex v . We extend d_Γ to a metric on $V(\Gamma) \cup E(\Gamma)$ by declaring each edge to be isometric to the unit interval. A subgraph of $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ is *convex* if it contains every geodesic in Γ between any pair of vertices in Γ' .

A path α is called a *circuit* if $n \geq 2$ and $\alpha(0) = \alpha(n)$. A circuit α is *embedded* if $n \geq 3$ and the vertices $\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \dots, \alpha(n-1)$ are distinct. An embedded circuit α is *isometrically embedded* if for all $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i \leq j$ we have $d_\Gamma(\alpha(i), \alpha(j)) = \min\{j - i, n - j + i\}$. We will use the acronym IEC for isometrically embedded circuit and denote an IEC Θ by a sequence of adjacent vertices $[\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \dots, \alpha(n)]$ with $\alpha(0) = \alpha(n)$. We note that, when Γ is geodetic, the length of any IEC is odd and the geodesic connecting any two vertices of an IEC lies on the IEC. Furthermore, each IEC of Γ is a convex subgraph.

A map $\alpha: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ is a *ray* in Γ if for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $\alpha(i)$ is adjacent to $\alpha(i+1)$ and the vertices $\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \alpha(2), \dots$ are distinct. A ray is *geodesic* if for each $a \in \mathbb{N}$ the path $\alpha|_{[0, a]}$ is a geodesic. A ray α is *based* at $o \in V(\Gamma)$ if $\alpha(0) = o$.

2.3. Automorphisms of Γ . An *automorphism* of Γ is a permutation $g: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$, denoted $u \mapsto g \cdot u$, such that for all vertices u and v in Γ we have $\{u, v\} \in E(\Gamma)$ if and only if $\{g \cdot u, g \cdot v\} \in E(\Gamma)$. The *automorphism group* of Γ , denoted $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, is the group of all automorphisms of Γ equipped with composition. Since each automorphism of Γ preserves adjacency, $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts on Γ by isometries. A graph Γ is called *quasi-transitive* if there are only finitely many orbits of vertices under $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$, and *vertex-transitive* if there is only one orbit of vertices.

2.4. Spanning trees. A *spanning tree* of Γ is a subgraph T of Γ with $V(T) = V(\Gamma)$ and such that T is a tree. For a fixed basepoint $o \in V(\Gamma)$, a *geodesic spanning tree* T_o is a spanning tree such that for all $v \in V(T)$ the path with initial vertex o and terminal vertex v is a geodesic in Γ . Every graph admits geodesic spanning trees, but what sets geodetic graphs apart is their uniqueness. Given Γ geodetic and $o \in \Gamma$, the set $T_o := \bigcup_{v \in V(\Gamma)} [o, v]$ is a tree and hence the (unique) geodesic spanning tree for Γ based at o . Moreover, the converse is true: a graph Γ is geodetic if and only if T_o is tree for all $o \in \Gamma$.

2.5. Quasi-isometry. Let (M_1, d_1) and (M_2, d_2) be two metric spaces. Let $\lambda \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$ be real numbers. Then a map $\varphi: M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ is called a (λ, ϵ) -*quasi-isometric embedding* if for all $x, y \in M_1$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}d_1(x, y) - \epsilon \leq d_2(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) \leq \lambda d_1(x, y) + \epsilon.$$

The map φ is called *quasi-onto* if there exists a $C \geq 0$ such that for all $x_2 \in M_2$ there exists an $x_1 \in M_1$ with $d_2(\varphi(x_1), x_2) \leq C$. The map φ is a *quasi-isometry* if it is both quasi-onto and a quasi-isometric embedding.

Remark 2.1. If M_1, M_2 are graphs with the metric induced by lengths of geodesics between vertices, then to prove M_1 and M_2 are quasi-isometric it suffices to find a quasi-isometric embedding $\varphi: V(M_1) \rightarrow V(M_2)$ which is quasi-onto.

3. GEODETIC GRAPHS WITH BOUNDED IECs ARE QUASI-ISOMETRIC TO A TREE

The following key lemma for geodesic graphs was proven in [9, Prop. 6.3] and can also be found in [6, Lemma 11]. It is also implicit within an earlier algebraic characterisation of geodesic graphs [17, Lemma 1, IV].

Lemma 3.1. *Let Γ be a geodesic graph. Suppose that $\alpha: [0, n] \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ and $\beta: [0, m] \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ are geodesics such that $\alpha(0) = \beta(0)$, $\alpha(1) \neq \beta(1)$ and $\alpha(n)$ is adjacent to $\beta(m)$. Then $n = m$ and $[\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \dots, \alpha(n), \beta(n), \beta(n-1), \dots, \beta(0)]$ is an IEC.*

Note that the references assume $m = n$ but this is immediate since the triangle inequality gives $m \leq n + 1$ and $n \leq m + 1$ and the geodesic hypothesis forces these to be strict inequalities.

To prove Theorem A, we show that there is a bound on the length of IECs in quasi-transitive geodesic graph. This will be sufficient due to the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Γ be a geodesic graph so that every IEC of Γ has length at most $2n + 1$. Then Γ is $(2n, 0)$ -quasi-isometric to a tree.*

Proof. Fix $o \in V(\Gamma)$ and consider the spanning tree T_o . We aim to show that the identity map $\iota: \Gamma \rightarrow T_o$ is a quasi-isometry. Firstly, ι is quasi-onto with $C = 0$. We now show that ι is a $(2n, 0)$ -quasi-isometric embedding. For any $v, w \in V(\Gamma)$ we have $d_\Gamma(v, w) \leq d_{T_o}(v, w) = d_{T_o}(\iota(v), \iota(w))$, since T_o is a spanning subgraph of Γ . We claim $d_{T_o}(v, w) \leq 2nd_\Gamma(v, w)$. Indeed, let $v = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k = w$ be the vertices of a geodesic in Γ between v and w . We will now inductively build a path α_i in T_o between x_0 and x_i such that $\ell(\alpha_i) \leq i2n$. Suppose that such a path α_i has been built for $i \geq 0$ and consider the edge $e = (x_i, x_{i+1})$. If $e \in T_o$, then $\alpha_{i+1} = \alpha_i * e$ and $\ell(\alpha_i * e) = \ell(\alpha_i) + 1 \leq i2n + 1 \leq (i + 1)2n$. So, suppose $e \notin T_o$. Then $[o, x_i]$ and $[o, x_{i+1}]$ are two geodesics starting from the same point that end at distance one apart. Let $u \in [o, x_i] \cap [o, x_{i+1}]$ be furthest vertex from o . By Lemma 3.1, $[u, x_i] * e * [x_{i+1}, u]$ is an IEC. By hypothesis, $d(u, x_i) = d(u, x_{i+1}) \leq n$. Moreover, $[x_i, u] * [u, x_{i+1}] \subseteq T_o$ by definition of T_o . Then, define α_{i+1} as $\alpha_i * [x_i, u] * [u, x_{i+1}]$. We have

$$\ell(\alpha_{i+1}) = \ell(\alpha_i * [x_i, u] * [u, x_{i+1}]) = \ell(\alpha_i) + \ell([x_i, u] * [u, x_{i+1}]) \leq i2n + 2n \leq (i + 1)2n,$$

yielding the quasi-isometry. □

4. THE GEODESIC BOUNDARY OF Γ AND ITS PROPERTIES

We start with the following definition. Let Γ be a connected locally finite graph.

Definition 4.1. Given two geodesic rays $\alpha, \beta: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$, we say that α and β are equivalent, denoted by $\alpha \sim \beta$, if there exist $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\alpha(t_1 + i) = \beta(t_2 + i)$. It is clear that \sim is an equivalence relation on the set of geodesic rays in Γ . The *geodesic boundary* of Γ , denoted $\partial\Gamma$, is the set of \sim -equivalence classes of geodesic rays in Γ .

Example 4.2. Figure 1 shows part of the undirected Cayley graph of $C_4 * C_4 = \langle a, b \mid a^4 = b^4 = 1 \rangle$. Consider the set of geodesic rays starting at 1 and such that the even vertices form the sequence $a^2, a^2b^2, a^2b^2a^2$ and so on. Each such ray can, at every odd vertex, either “go up or go down”, or more precisely follow a positive or negative power of a or b . Thus, two rays are equivalent if the corresponding sequences differ only on a finite set. In other words, according to Definition 4.1 there will be $2^{\mathbb{N}}$ equivalence classes of rays in the geodesic boundary.




FIGURE 1. Part of the Cayley graph of $C_4 * C_4 = \langle a, b \mid a^4 = b^4 = 1 \rangle$.

We observe that $\partial\Gamma$ is equipped with a natural $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ action. Fix $g \in \text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ and $\gamma \in \partial\Gamma$ as follows. Let α be a geodesic ray based at some $o \in V(\Gamma)$ which is a representative of γ . We define $g \cdot \gamma$ as the \sim -equivalence class of $g \cdot \alpha$, that is the geodesic ray based at $g \cdot o$ given by the vertex sequence $g \cdot \alpha(i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This is clearly a well-defined action of $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ on Γ since geodesic rays $\alpha \sim \beta$ if and only if $g \cdot \alpha \sim g \cdot \beta$.

We recall a standard notion.

Definition 4.3. Let $\gamma: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow V(\Gamma)$ be a geodesic ray. The *Busemann function* $b_\gamma: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by

$$(\star) \quad b_\gamma(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t)$$

Lemma 4.4. *The limit in (\star) is attained and moreover $d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t$ is eventually constant.*

Proof. We first note that the limit exists (which is true even in a general metric space, where we would consider rays defined on $[0, \infty)$ instead of \mathbb{N}). By the triangle inequality, $d_\Gamma(\gamma(0), \gamma(t)) \leq d_\Gamma(\gamma(0), x) + d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t))$, and thus

$$d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t \geq -d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(0)).$$

For $s \leq t$ the triangle inequality gives $d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) \leq d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(s)) + d_\Gamma(\gamma(s), \gamma(t))$ which is equivalent to

$$d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(s)) - s \geq d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t$$

so $d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t$ is monotone decreasing and bounded below so the limit exists.

For a graph, the values of the sequence $d_\Gamma(x, \gamma(t)) - t$ are integers, so it must eventually be constant. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $o \in V(\Gamma)$ and let α be a geodesic ray in Γ . Then there exists a geodesic ray β based at o with $\alpha \sim \beta$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $t \geq t_0$ we have $d_\Gamma(o, \alpha(t_0)) - t_0 = d_\Gamma(o, \alpha(t)) - t$. Thus $d_\Gamma(o, \alpha(t)) = d_\Gamma(o, \alpha(t_0)) + (t - t_0)$ so that $[o, \alpha(t_0)] * [\alpha(t_0), \alpha(t)]$ is a geodesic. Thus $\beta = [o, \alpha(t_0)] * \alpha|_{[t_0, \infty)}$ is the desired geodesic ray. \square

4.1. Properties of $\partial\Gamma$ when Γ is geodetic. For the remainder of this section we assume that Γ is geodetic. We will show that the geodetic nature of Γ imbues $\partial\Gamma$ with some key properties, including the uniqueness of representatives of $\partial\Gamma$ based at a chosen vertex and a natural topology that is independent of the choice of basepoint.

Corollary 4.6. *Let Γ be a geodetic graph, $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ and $o \in V(\Gamma)$. Then there exists a unique representative ξ_o of ξ based at o .*

Proof. Existence follows from Lemma 4.5. For uniqueness, suppose α and β are distinct representatives of ξ based at o . Then there exist $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i < j$, $\alpha(j) = \beta(j)$ and $\alpha(i) \neq \beta(i)$. Since $\alpha(0) = \beta(0)$, this leads to a contradiction of the assumption that Γ is geodetic. \square

For comparison, in Example 4.2 where the graph is not geodetic, there are uncountably many geodesic rays based at a given vertex for each element of the geodesic boundary.

If $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$, then the unique representative geodesic ray in Γ based at some $o \in \Gamma$ is denoted ξ_o . We say that two geodesic rays α and β with the same basepoint r -coincide if $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$ for all $i \leq r$. Given a vertex $o \in V(\Gamma)$, we define a topology \mathcal{T}_o for $\partial\Gamma$. We define a basis of \mathcal{T}_o by the collection of sets

$$\mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o) := \{\eta \in \partial\Gamma \mid \eta_o \text{ and } \xi_o \text{ } r\text{-coincide}\},$$

where $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 4.7. *Let Γ be a geodetic graph. For any $o \in V(\Gamma)$, the topological space $(\partial\Gamma, \mathcal{T}_o)$ is Hausdorff.*

Proof. Let ξ, η be distinct points in $\partial\Gamma$. Since they are distinct, there exists $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\xi_o(r) \neq \eta_o(r)$. Then $\mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o) \cap \mathcal{U}(\eta, r, o) = \emptyset$. \square

We are now ready to prove a crucial property of the geodesic boundary for geodetic graphs: the topology we have defined does not depend on the choice of basepoint.

Theorem 4.8. *Let Γ be a geodetic graph, and $o, p \in V(\Gamma)$. Then $(\partial\Gamma, \mathcal{T}_p)$ is homeomorphic to $(\partial\Gamma, \mathcal{T}_o)$ via the identity map on $\partial\Gamma$.*

Proof. It suffices prove the result for the case $d_\Gamma(o, p) = 1$, since any two points further apart can be connected by a geodesic and homeomorphism is a transitive relation.

It suffices to show that the identity map $\text{id}: (\partial\Gamma, \mathcal{T}_p) \rightarrow (\partial\Gamma, \mathcal{T}_o)$ is continuous, as then an entirely similar argument, interchanging the roles of o and p , shows that id^{-1} is continuous. Thus it suffices to show that for each $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ and $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $r' \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\mathcal{U}(\xi, r', p) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o)$.

Let $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ and let $r \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Consider the rays ξ_o and ξ_p . If $\xi_o(1) = p$, then it is immediate from the definition of r -coincides that $\mathcal{U}(\xi, r, p) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o)$. Similarly if $\xi_p(1) = o$, then $\mathcal{U}(\xi, r+1, p) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o)$. Thus we may assume that $\xi_o(1) \neq p$ and $\xi_p(1) \neq o$. Since $\xi_o \sim \xi_p$, the rays meet at some point y . We note that $[y, o]$ and $[y, p]$ satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 3.1, so have the same length, and we have the situation illustrated in Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. The rays ξ_o and ξ_p meeting at a point y

Let $r' = \max\{r, |[o, y]|\} + 1$. Let $\eta \in \mathcal{U}(\xi, r', p)$; thus η_p and ξ_p at least r' -coincide. Our goal is to show $\eta \in \mathcal{U}(\xi, r, o)$; that is, we must show that η_o and ξ_o must r -coincide. Let x be the last vertex in $\eta_p \cap \xi_p$ (which exists since Γ is geodetic). It follows that $d_\Gamma(p, x) > d_\Gamma(o, y)$ and hence $x \neq y$ and $x \in \xi_o$. Thus we have $\xi_o = [o, y] * [y, x] * \xi_x$, $\xi_p = [p, y] * [y, x] * \xi_x$ and $\eta_p = [p, y] * [y, x] * \eta_x$, as shown in Figure 3.

Let $\alpha = [o, x] * \eta_x$. Since $|[o, x]| \geq r' > r$, to show that η_o and ξ_o r -coincide it suffices to show that α is a geodesic ray (and hence equal to η_o). For the sake of contradiction, assume that α is not a geodesic ray. Define $i = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha|_{[0, j]}$ is not a geodesic $\}$. Since $[o, x]$ is a geodesic, $\alpha(i) \neq x$ and $\alpha(i)$ lies on η_x . Let z be the last vertex in $\alpha \cap [o, \alpha(i)]$. We cannot have that z lies on η_p because this would contradict that fact that η_p is a geodesic ray. Hence we have that $z \neq y$ and z lies on $[o, y]$. This information is depicted in Figure 4.

By Lemma 3.1 the concatenation $[p, \alpha(i)] * [\alpha(i), o] * [o, p]$ is an IEC, which we denote by Θ . However, the geodesic between z and y lies on ξ_o and not on the IEC Θ . This contradicts the convexity of IECs. \square




FIGURE 3. The rays ξ_o , ξ_p and η_p .




FIGURE 4. $[p, \alpha(i)] * [\alpha(i), o] * [o, p]$ is an IEC with an impossible shortcut between z and y on ξ_o

Corollary 4.9. $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ acts on $\partial\Gamma$ by homeomorphisms.

5. QUASI-TRANSITIVE LOCALLY FINITE GEODETIC GRAPHS HAVE BOUNDED IECs

In this section we prove that if Γ is geodesic, locally finite and quasi-transitive, then there is a bound on the size of IECs. This is the final step to prove Theorem A.

Recall that the *ray graph* is the only graph with one vertex of degree one and all the other vertices of degree two, namely the graph R with $V(R) = \mathbb{N}$ and edges $(n, n + 1)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Call the degree one vertex of R the *origin* of R .

Definition 5.1 (Ray extension of a graph). Let Γ be a graph and $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. The *ray extension* of (Γ, A) is the graph $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ obtained from Γ by gluing to each vertex $v \in A$ a copy of the ray graph R along the origin of R .

The following is a straightforward observation.

Lemma 5.2 (Effect of ray extension). *Let Γ be a graph and $A \subseteq V(\Gamma)$. Then*

- (1) Γ is geodesic (resp. locally finite) if and only if $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ is.
- (2) If Γ' is isometrically embedded in Γ then it is also isometrically embedded in $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$.
- (3) If Θ is an IEC in Γ and $a \in A$ lies on Θ , then the subgraph of $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ consisting of Θ and the ray with base a is convex in $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$.

Proof. Since geodesic between points of $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ can be uniquely decomposed as a concatenations between geodesics of Γ and of the attached rays, the first point follows (local-finiteness is immediate by definition). In particular, the new added rays do not provide any shorter path between points in Γ , so the second statement follows. For the last point, let L be the obtained subgraph. Then any geodesic with endpoints on L can be decomposed as the concatenations of geodesics with endpoints on Θ or on a ray. □

Definition 5.3 (Onion). Let Γ be a graph. An *onion* of Γ is a subgraph of Γ consisting of a bi-infinite geodesic labelled by vertices $(\dots, s_i, \dots, s_1, s_0, r_0, r_1, \dots, r_j, \dots)$ and a family of IECs $\{\Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ so that Θ_i contains the geodesic $[s_i, r_i]$ and $\Theta_i \neq \Theta_j$ for $i \neq j$. See Figure 5. We denote the data of an onion by the set $\{r_i, s_i, \Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.




FIGURE 5. An onion as per Definition 5.3.

Proposition 5.4. *Let Γ be a quasi-transitive, locally finite graph. If Γ contains IECs of unbounded size, then Γ contains an onion.*

Proof. Suppose there is no upper bound on the size of IECs in Γ , and consider a sequence \mathbf{K} of IECs of strictly increasing size. Since Γ is quasi-transitive, there exists an $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ -orbit of vertices of Γ that intersects infinitely many elements of \mathbf{K} . Fix a vertex r_0 of such an orbit. Given $\Theta' \in \mathbf{K}$ such that Θ' has length k and there exists $r' \in \Theta'$ in the same $\text{Aut}(\Gamma)$ -orbit of r_0 , there is an automorphism of Γ sending r' to r_0 , and hence r_0 itself lies on an IEC of length k . Thus, we can find an infinite family \mathbf{L} of IECs of increasing size each of which contains r_0 .

Since Γ is locally finite, by the pigeonhole principle there exists a vertex s_0 adjacent to r_0 contained in an infinite subfamily $\mathbf{L}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{L}$. Let $\Theta_0 \in \mathbf{L}_0$ be the IEC in \mathbf{L}_0 of shortest length, which exists since the elements of \mathbf{L}_0 have increasing length.

For $i \geq 1$, we will define inductively an infinite subfamily $\mathbf{L}_i \subsetneq \mathbf{L}_{i-1}$ of IECs of increasing size, points r_i, s_i , and an IEC Θ_i such that r_i and s_i are adjacent to r_{i-1} and s_{i-1} respectively, the sequence $r_i, r_{i-1}, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_i$ is a geodesic contained in Θ_i , and $\Theta_i \neq \Theta_j$ for $j < i$.

So, assume we have defined \mathbf{L}_{i-1} , Θ_{i-1} , r_{i-1} , and s_{i-1} with the required properties. By the pigeonhole principle, we can find an infinite subfamily $\mathbf{L}_i \subseteq \mathbf{L}_{i-1} \setminus \{\Theta_{i-1}\}$ and vertices $s_i, r_i \notin [r_{i-1}, s_{i-1}]$ adjacent to r_{i-1}, s_{i-1} respectively so that each element of \mathbf{L}_i contains r_i and s_i . Since \mathbf{L}_i contains IECs of unbounded size, we conclude that the sequence $r_i, r_{i-1}, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_i$ is a geodesic. Let Θ_i be a shortest IEC in \mathbf{L}_i . By construction, $[r_i, s_i] \subseteq \Theta_i$ and $\Theta_i \neq \Theta_j$ for $j < i$. Thus, $(\dots, s_i, \dots, s_0, r_1, \dots, r_i, \dots)$ is a bi-infinite geodesic, yielding that $\{r_i, s_i, \Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an onion. \square

Proposition 5.5. *A geodetic graph cannot contain an onion.*

Proof. Let Γ be a geodetic graph and let $\{s_i, r_i, \Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an onion in Γ . For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ define a_i to be the unique point on Θ_i such that $d(a_i, r_0) = d(a_i, s_0)$. Let $A = \{a_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ be the graph obtained from Γ as defined by Definition 5.1, and let α_i be the ray that belongs to $(\widehat{\Gamma}_A \setminus \Gamma) \cup A$ and is based at a_i . See Figure 6.

By Lemma 5.2, $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ is geodesic, and since Γ is isometrically embedded in $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$, we have that $\{s_i, r_i, \Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an onion in $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ as well.

Let $\xi_i \in \partial \widehat{\Gamma}_A$ be the boundary point defined by α_i . Our strategy is to consider the limit point of the sequence $(\xi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Recall that since $\partial \Gamma$ is Hausdorff (Lemma 4.7), if the sequence has a limit point, it must be unique. We will explicitly compute the limit of the sequence by considering representatives with respect to different basepoints, and discover that the sequence has different limits when considering different basepoints. However, Theorem 4.8 tells us that if




FIGURE 6. The onion $\{r_i, s_i, \Theta_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with rays attached to vertices a_i in $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$.

Γ is geodesic, then the (unique) limit of a sequence is the same when considering any basepoint, and so we contradict that Γ is geodesic.

Let $(\xi_i)_{r_0}$ be the representative of ξ_i based at r_0 . By construction of $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$, we have $(\xi_i)_{r_0} = [r_0, a_i] * \alpha_i$. In particular, $[r_0, r_i] \subseteq (\xi_i)_{r_0}$. Let $\eta_r \in \partial \widehat{\Gamma}_A$ be the boundary point represented by the ray $\{r_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ based at r_0 . We have that $\ell((\xi_i)_{r_0} \cap (\eta_r)_{r_0}) \geq i$. By Theorem 4.8, the choice of representative does not matter, so we conclude

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \xi_i = \eta_r.$$

Let us now consider the representatives of each ξ_i with basepoint s_0 . We have $(\xi_i)_{s_0} = [s_0, a_i] * \alpha_i$. Let η_s be the boundary point represented by the ray $\{s_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ based at s_0 , an argument analogous to the previous case shows that $[s_0, s_i] \subseteq (\xi_i)_{s_0}$ and hence $\ell((\xi_i)_{s_0} \cap (\eta_s)_{s_0}) \geq i$. In particular, we conclude

$$\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \xi_i = \eta_s.$$

Finally, observe that $\eta_r \neq \eta_s$, as they can be represented by disjoint rays (as per Definition 4.1), and so we obtain a contradiction to the fact that $\widehat{\Gamma}_A$ is geodesic. Hence, our initial assumption that Γ contains an onion is false. \square

Proof of Theorem A. Let Γ be locally finite and quasi-transitive. If Γ contains IECs of unbounded size, then it contains an onion by Proposition 5.4. Thus, Γ cannot be geodesic by Proposition 5.5. By the contrapositive of the above argument, we have that a locally finite, quasi-transitive geodesic graph has a bound on the size of IECs. By Lemma 3.2, Γ is quasi-isometric to a tree. \square

Remark 5.6. It is possible to strengthen Theorem A. In particular, one can prove that for each geodesic graph with bounded IECs there is a constant d so that each non-degenerate geodesic triangle (see [7, Definition 2]) in the graph has side-lengths at most d . This can be achieved by adapting arguments found in the proof of [7, Theorem A] to a purely graph theoretic setting. This is a stronger result since any graph with bounded non-degenerate geodesic triangles is quasi-isometric to a geodesic spanning tree.

Remark 5.7 (Necessity of the assumptions). Both the quasi-transitive and locally finite assumptions only appear in Proposition 5.4. However, we remark that Theorem A is not true anymore when dropping either. For the quasi-transitive assumption, consider the graph Ψ in Figure 7. This is the graph obtained by considering a geodesic ray $\alpha = \{n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and gluing a

cycle graph of length $2n + 3$ to each vertex $n \in \alpha$. The graph Ψ is geodesic and locally finite (in fact each vertex has degree at most 4), but not quasi-transitive, and it fails the conclusion of Theorem A as it is not hyperbolic.

For the local finiteness assumption, consider the Cayley graph of the group $G = *_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_{2n+1}$ with respect to the standard generating set, where C_n represent the cyclic group of order n . This graph is geodesic, transitive, but not locally finite, and again it fails the conclusion of Theorem A as it is not hyperbolic.




FIGURE 7. Geodesic graph Ψ , which has bounded degree but is not quasi-transitive.

6. APPLICATIONS TO GEODETIC GROUPS AND REWRITING SYSTEMS

In this section we switch our attention to groups and explain how Theorems B and C follow directly from Theorem A. We do so by connecting existing results from the different perspectives considered in the introduction. See [6] for more details.

Recall that a group G is *geodetic* if it admits a finite generating set Σ such that the (undirected) Cayley graph $\text{Cay}(G, \Sigma)$ is geodesic.

Proof of Theorem C. If G is a geodetic group with respect to a finite inverse-closed generating set Σ , then by Propositions 5.4 and 5.5 there are finitely many words in Σ that label an IEC. Hence, (Σ, T) with

$$T := \{(aa^{-1}, 1) \mid a \in \Sigma\} \cup \{(u, v) \in \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \mid uv^{-1} \text{ labels an IEC in } \Gamma \text{ and } |u| = |v| + 1\}$$

is an inverse closed finite confluent length-reducing rewriting system for G . □

Proof of Theorem B. Since Cayley graphs are locally finite and vertex transitive, and the virtually free groups are exactly the groups for which every Cayley graph is quasi-isometric to a tree [5] (see also [1, 3]), Theorem A gives that geodetic groups are virtually free. The fact that in geodetic groups the centralisers of infinite order elements are cyclic is an immediate consequence of Theorem C and a result by Madlener and Otto [16, Corollary 2.4] concerning centralisers of infinite order elements in groups presented by finite confluent length-reducing rewriting systems.

Let C be a 2-ended subgroup of a geodetic group G , in particular C is virtually $\langle c \rangle$ for some infinite order element $c \in G$. Hence, C stabilises a pair $\xi = \{\xi^+, \xi^-\} \subseteq \partial_\infty \Gamma$, where $\partial_\infty \Gamma$ denotes the Gromov boundary of Γ (see, for instance, [14, Proposition 4.2.1]). By [2, III.H.3.2], there exists a geodesic γ of Γ with endpoints ξ , such a geodesic is unique by Lemma 7.1. Thus C stabilises γ . Since C is a group that acts on a combinatorial geodesic (an infinite, 2-valence simplicial tree) without vertex stabilisers, C is homeomorphic to \mathbb{Z} in the case when C fixes ξ pointwise, and homeomorphic to \mathbb{D}_∞ when it permutes the endpoints, which proves the final claim. □

7. RELATING GEODESIC AND GROMOV BOUNDARIES

Recall that the Gromov boundary of a hyperbolic graph can be defined, as a set, as

$$\partial_\infty \Gamma = \{\text{geodesic rays}\} / \approx,$$

where $\alpha \approx \beta$ if there exists some constant C such that the images of α and β are contained in the C -neighbourhood of one another. By definition of \sim (Definition 4.1), $\alpha \sim \beta$ implies $\alpha \approx \beta$. In particular, this means that the map $\partial\Gamma \rightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma$ induced by the identity on the set of rays is well defined and surjective. We would like to investigate when this map is injective.

As seen in Example 4.2 the natural map from the geodesic boundary of $C_4 * C_4$ to its Gromov boundary has uncountable fibers, so is definitely not injective. In this example, the Cayley graph is not geodetic, which we will now show is a sufficient condition for the identity map $\partial\Gamma \rightarrow \partial_\infty \Gamma$ to be bijective.

Lemma 7.1 (Consequence of [8, Corollary 3.4]). *Let Γ be a quasi-transitive geodetic graph. If $\alpha \not\sim \beta$, then $\alpha \not\approx \beta$.*

Proof. Suppose $\alpha \approx \beta$. Then there exists $C > 0$ such that every point of α has a point of β at distance at most C from itself. As α and β are infinite, this contradicts [8, Corollary 3.4], yielding that α and β must intersect. If they intersect in a finite number of vertices, one can find subrays $\alpha' \subseteq \alpha$ and $\beta' \subseteq \beta$ that are disjoint. However, we necessarily still have $\alpha' \approx \beta'$ and the same reasoning as before applies. Thus, α and β intersect in infinitely many vertices. Note that $\alpha \cap \beta$ needs to be connected, otherwise we would contradict that Γ is geodetic. Thus, we conclude $\alpha \sim \beta$. \square

We summarise the above in the following proposition.

Proposition 7.2. *If Γ is a quasi-transitive geodetic graph, the identity map from the geodesic boundary to the Gromov boundary is a bijection.*

It is straightforward to see that if the map is not a bijection, then the graph cannot be geodetic. We wonder what we can say about the converse. In this light, we ask the following:

Question. *Let Γ be a Cayley graph such that the natural map from the geodesic boundary to the Gromov boundary is a bijection. Is Γ geodetic?*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by Australian Research Council (ARC) under grant DP210100271, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Project-ID 506523109 (Emmy Noether), and under Germany's Excellence Strategy EXC 2044-390685587 and EXC-2047/1 - 390685813. The authors would like to thank Patrick Nairne for invaluable inputs on early versions of this project, Babak Miraftab for helpful discussions regarding quasi-transitive graphs, and the Australian National University Mathematical Sciences Institute (MSI) for hosting collaborative visits in 2022 and 2023.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yago Antolín. On Cayley graphs of virtually free groups. *Groups Complex. Cryptol.*, 3(2):301–327, 2011.
- [2] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [3] Volker Diekert and Armin Weiß. Context-free groups and their structure trees. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 23(3):611–642, 2013.

- [4] Volker Diekert and Armin Weiß. Context-free groups and Bass-Serre theory. In *Algorithmic and geometric topics around free groups and automorphisms*, Adv. Courses Math. CRM Barcelona, pages 43–110. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [5] M. J. Dunwoody. The accessibility of finitely presented groups. *Invent. Math.*, 81(3):449–457, 1985.
- [6] Murray Elder and Adam Piggott. Rewriting systems, plain groups, and geodetic graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 903:134–144, 2022.
- [7] Murray Elder and Adam Piggott. On groups presented by inverse-closed finite confluent length-reducing rewriting systems. *J. Algebra*, 627:106–131, 2023.
- [8] Murray Elder, Adam Piggott, and Kane Townsend. On k -geodetic graphs and groups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 33(6):1169–1182, 2023.
- [9] Andrew Elvey Price. Geodesics in Cayley graphs. Master’s thesis, University of Melbourne, 2014.
- [10] Asaf Etgar and Nati Linial. On the connectivity and diameter of geodetic graphs. *European J. Combin.*, 116:Paper No. 103886, 10, 2024.
- [11] Carlos E. Frasser. The Open Problem of Finding a General Classification of Geodetic Graphs. *Deutsche internationale Zeitschrift für zeitgenössische Wissenschaft*, 36:7–9, July 2022.
- [12] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic groups. In *Essays in group theory*, volume 8 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 75–263. Springer, New York, 1987.
- [13] Matthias Hamann, Florian Lehner, Babak Miraftab, and Tim Rühmann. A Stallings type theorem for quasi-transitive graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 157:40–69, 2022.
- [14] Ilya Kapovich and Nadia Benakli. Boundaries of hyperbolic groups. In *Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001)*, volume 296 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 39–93. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [15] Klaus Madlener and Friedrich Otto. Groups presented by certain classes of finite length-reducing string-rewriting systems. In *Rewriting techniques and applications (Bordeaux, 1987)*, volume 256 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 133–144. Springer, Berlin, 1987.
- [16] Klaus Madlener and Friedrich Otto. Commutativity in groups presented by finite Church-Rosser Thue systems. *RAIRO Inform. Théor. Appl.*, 22(1):93–111, 1988.
- [17] Ladislav Nebeský. An algebraic characterization of geodetic graphs. *Czechoslovak Math. J.*, 48(123)(4):701–710, 1998.
- [18] Oystein Ore. *Theory of graphs*, volume Vol. XXXVIII. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1962.
- [19] Panagiotis Papasoglu. *Geometric methods in group theory*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1993. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Columbia University.
- [20] Emanuele Rodaro. Generalizations of the Muller-Schupp theorem and tree-like inverse graphs, 2023. arXiv:2302.06664.
- [21] Michael Shapiro. Pascal’s triangles in abelian and hyperbolic groups. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 63(2):281–288, 1997.
- [22] Florian Stober and Armin Weiß. Geodetic graphs: Experiments and new constructions, 2023. arXiv:2308.08970.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY, BROADWAY NSW 2007, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `murray.elder@uts.edu.au`

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY

Email address: `gardam@math.uni-bonn.de`

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, CANBERRA ACT 2601, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `adam.piggott@anu.edu.au`

CHRIST CHURCH COLLEGE, SAINT ALDATES, OX1 1DP OXFORD, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: `spriano@maths.ox.ac.uk`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY SYDNEY, BROADWAY NSW 2007, AUSTRALIA

Email address: `kane.townsend@uts.edu.au`