

LANDING RAYS AND RAY CANNON-THURSTON MAPS

RAKESH HALDER, MAHAN MJ, AND PRANAB SARDAR

ABSTRACT. For a hyperbolic subgroup H of a hyperbolic group G , we describe sufficient criteria to guarantee the following.

- (1) Geodesic rays in H starting at the identity land at a unique point of the boundary of G .
- (2) The inclusion of H into G does not extend continuously to the boundary.

As a consequence we obtain sufficient conditions that provide a mechanism to guarantee the non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps. One such criterion we use extensively is an adaptation of a property proven by Jeon, Kapovich, Leininger and Ohshika. As a consequence we describe a number of classes of examples demonstrating the non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps. We recover, in the process, a simple counter-example lying at the heart of Baker and Riley's examples.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 2 |
| 1.1. Main results | 3 |
| 1.2. Techniques and criteria | 5 |
| 1.3. Motivation from complex dynamics | 7 |
| 1.4. Motivation from asymptotic extrinsic geometry | 8 |
| 2. Cannon-Thurston maps and its relatives | 9 |
| 2.1. Preliminaries on hyperbolic spaces | 9 |
| 2.2. Landing Rays, Cannon-Thurston maps, Laminations | 11 |
| 2.3. Trees of metric spaces and Cannon-Thurston maps | 12 |
| 3. Malnormality and limits | 14 |
| 3.1. Criteria for malnormal quasiconvexity | 14 |
| 3.2. Some special limiting sequences | 16 |
| 4. Criteria for existence and non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps | 17 |
| 4.1. Laminations and the strong JKLO criterion | 17 |
| 4.2. Group theoretic criteria for nonexistence of CT maps | 19 |
| 4.3. Group-theoretic criterion for ray CT maps to exist | 22 |
| 5. Normal and commensurated subgroups | 23 |
| 5.1. Pairs from normal subgroups | 24 |
| 5.2. Pairs from commensurated hyperbolic subgroups | 26 |
| 5.3. Points of (dis)continuity | 28 |
| 5.3.1. Setup and preliminary lemmas | 28 |
| 5.3.2. Determining the points of discontinuity | 29 |
| 6. Endomorphisms of free groups | 31 |

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 20F65, 20F67 (Primary) 30C10, 37F10 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Hyperbolic group, graph of groups, Cannon-Thurston map, commensurated subgroup.

| | |
|---|----|
| 6.1. Ascending HNN extensions | 32 |
| 6.2. On the Baker-Riley Examples | 33 |
| 7. Other Examples and Constructions | 34 |
| 7.1. On the Matsuda-Oguni construction | 34 |
| 7.2. Pairs from highly distorted examples | 35 |
| 7.2.1. Background on Distortion | 35 |
| 7.2.2. Non-CT pairs with high distortion | 36 |
| 7.3. Graphs of groups | 37 |
| References | 43 |

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is two-fold. First, we develop the hyperbolic groups analog of the notion of landing rays in complex dynamics. Second, we develop sufficient criteria to provide a family of examples of hyperbolic subgroups G_1 of hyperbolic groups G for which

- (1) All geodesic rays in G_1 starting at the identity *land*, i.e. for all $\xi \in \partial G_1$, a semi-infinite geodesic ray $[1, \xi)$ in a Cayley graph of G_1 accumulates on a unique point of ∂G .
- (2) Nevertheless, the pair (G_1, G) does not admit a Cannon-Thurston map.

Throughout the paper, we shall use the following notation. Given a finitely generated group A , Γ_A will denote a Cayley graph of A with respect to a finite generating set. The following question was posed by the second author in the first version of Bestvina's problem list.

Question 1.1. [Bes00, Question 1.19] (see also [Mit98b, p. 136], [Mit98c, p. 354])

Let $G_1 < G$ be a pair of (*Gromov*) hyperbolic groups. Does the inclusion $i : G_1 \rightarrow G$ extend to a continuous map $\partial i : \partial G_1 \rightarrow \partial G$?

Such a continuous extension, if it exists, is known as a *Cannon-Thurston* (CT) map [Mit98a, Mit98b] after the pioneering work of Cannon and Thurston in ([CT85, CT07]). If, for a pair $G_1 < G$ of hyperbolic groups, every geodesic ray in G_1 lands in the above sense, then we have a well-defined map $\partial i_r : \partial G_1 \rightarrow \partial G$. Such a boundary extension ∂i_r will be referred to as a *ray Cannon-Thurston* map (ray CT map for short). Note that ∂i_r need not be continuous. In fact, an aim of this paper is to provide examples where ∂i_r exists but is not continuous. However, there are no examples known to us of pairs $G_1 < G$ where a ray Cannon-Thurston map does not exist (see Question 1.11 below).

Some positive answers to Question 1.1 were given in [Mit98a, Mit98b]. Since then a number results on the existence and structure of CT maps have been proven. See for instance [Mit97, KL15, DKT16, JKLO16, BR20, KS24] for a sample of results in the context of hyperbolic subgroups of hyperbolic groups. We refer the reader to [Mj19] for a survey. Baker and Riley [BR13] produced a clever example of a free subgroup F of a hyperbolic group G for which the inclusion $F \rightarrow G$ does *not* admit a Cannon-Thurston map. This example was obtained using small cancellation theory starting from a class of small-cancellation hyperbolic groups discovered by Rips [Rip82]. Later, Matsuda and Oguni [MO14] used the work of Baker-Riley to show that any non-elementary hyperbolic group can be embedded in another hyperbolic group for which there is no CT map. These

were the only known examples that answer the above question negatively. In a different non-hyperbolic setup negative answers were obtained in [BCG⁺22, CCG⁺25].

1.1. Main results. In this paper, we provide a range of examples that furnish a negative answer to Question 1.1. To illustrate the simplicity of these examples, we provide one straight away (see Corollary 5.5).

Example 1.2 (Basic Example:). *Let K denote either a free group \mathbb{F}_n , $n \geq 3$ or $\pi_1(S)$, where S is a closed orientable surface of genus at least 2. Let Q denote a free group \mathbb{F}_n , $n \geq 3$. Let $H = K \rtimes Q$ be hyperbolic. For $K = \pi_1(S)$, existence of such a hyperbolic H was proven by Mosher [Mos97]. For $K = \mathbb{F}_n$, $n \geq 3$ existence of such a hyperbolic H was proven by Bestvina-Feighn-Handel [BFH97].*

*Next, let $L = Q *_\phi$ denote a hyperbolic ascending HNN extension, i.e. L is an ascending HNN extension corresponding to a hyperbolic endomorphism ϕ . We allow ϕ to be a hyperbolic automorphism, in which case $L = Q \rtimes_\phi \mathbb{Z}$. Let t denote the stable letter in L . Set $G = H *_Q L$ and $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$. Then*

- (1) $G = H *_Q L$ is hyperbolic, cf. Theorem 3.5. (Of course, so also is G_1).
- (2) All geodesic rays in G_1 starting at the identity land, i.e. the pair (G_1, G) admits a ray Cannon-Thurston map.
- (3) Nevertheless, the pair (G_1, G) does not admit a Cannon-Thurston map.

In a certain sense, Example 1.2 was hiding in plain sight. The pair (K, H) does admit a Cannon-Thurston map. This example lies in the intersection of the examples covered in [Mit98a] and [Mit98b]. Further, the pair (H, G) admits a Cannon-Thurston map [Mit98b]. Hence the pair (K, G) admits a Cannon-Thurston map. Example 1.2 asserts that, if we simply replace K by $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$, then the pair (G_1, G) fails to admit a Cannon-Thurston map. But only just. Let Γ_{G_1} be a Cayley graph of G_1 with respect to a finite generating set. For $\xi \in \partial G_1$ consider a semi-infinite geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_{G_1}$. Then for any $\xi \in \partial G_1$ the pair $([1, \xi)_{G_1}, G)$ continues to admit a Cannon-Thurston map.

We generalize Example 1.2 in primarily three directions in this paper. For all these three classes, the ambient hyperbolic group G is of the form $G = H *_Q L$, where

- (1) Q is a free group \mathbb{F}_n , $n \geq 2$.
- (2) $L = Q *_\phi$ is a hyperbolic ascending HNN extension corresponding to a hyperbolic endomorphism ϕ of Q . (Note that \mathbb{F}_2 admits hyperbolic endomorphisms, but no hyperbolic automorphisms. Thus, for ϕ a hyperbolic endomorphism $n \geq 2$ suffices. For ϕ a hyperbolic automorphism, $n \geq 3$ becomes necessary.)

Let t denote the stable letter of $L = Q *_\phi$. In all the three classes mentioned above, G_1 will be of the form $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$, where K is an appropriately chosen subgroup of H .

The pair (G_1, G) in the three principal different classes of examples discussed in this paper thus depends on three different classes of pairs (K, H) of a hyperbolic group H and a hyperbolic subgroup K as three different starting points.

- (1) K normal in H with non-elementary quotient H/K : in this case, Q is the image of a section of a malnormal quasiconvex free subgroup of H/K . This case is dealt with in Section 5.1, particularly Theorem 5.2.
- (2) K is commensurated by H : in this case Q is a malnormal quasiconvex free subgroup of H intersecting K trivially. This case is dealt with in Section 5.2, particularly Theorem 5.8.

- (3) K free, and H is a hyperbolic multiple ascending HNN extension of K , i.e. if $K = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$, $n \geq 2$, and ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_m , $m \geq 2$ are hyperbolic endomorphisms of K , then a presentation of H is given by

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\} \{t_j x_i t_j^{-1} = \phi_j(x_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m\} \langle \cdot \rangle.$$

In this case, $Q < H$ is the free malnormal quasiconvex subgroup generated by the stable letters $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$. This case is dealt with in Section 6.1, particularly Theorem 6.3.

The following theorem combines Theorems 5.2, 5.8 and 6.3.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $G_1 < G$ be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic groups constructed in one of the three above ways. Then*

- (1) (G_1, G) admits a ray Cannon-Thurston map.
- (2) (G_1, G) does not admit a Cannon-Thurston map.

In fact, in the classes of examples given by

- (1) normal subgroups (class 1), and
- (2) commensurated subgroups (class 2),

our techniques allow us to identify the precise set where the ray Cannon-Thurston map of Theorem 1.3 is continuous (see Proposition 5.14).

As mentioned above, Baker-Riley [BR13] gave the first example of a pair (G_1, G) not admitting a Cannon-Thurston map. Their construction is in two HNN extension steps (both involving a small cancellation $C'(1/6)$ presentation). We show that the pair (G_1, G) of hyperbolic groups obtained at the end of the first step of their construction already satisfies the conditions of Theorem 6.3 and hence provides an example of a pair of hyperbolic groups not admitting a Cannon-Thurston map (see Theorem 6.7). We thus don't really need to go to their second HNN extension step. We should point out that in [BR13, Remark 8], the authors remark that a more elaborate form of the argument in that paper for the 2-step pair yields the result that the pair of hyperbolic groups at the end of the first step fails to admit a Cannon-Thurston map. We subsequently leverage our proof of the simpler case to obtain the main theorem of [BR13]. Thus, our proof inverts the approach of [BR13]. It uses the JKLO criterion 1.7 below in an essential way. See Section 6.2 for details.

Examples of pairs (H, G) were given in [Mit98b, pg. 159] exhibiting a distortion function that is (at least) an iterated exponential. These can be leveraged to produce interesting examples of pairs (G_1, G) that satisfy the conclusions of Theorem 1.3, and have a distortion function that is (at least) an iterated exponential (see Section 7.2). Matsuda-Oguni's techniques from [MO14] can be used to embed a number of our examples where G_1 is free in arbitrary non-elementary hyperbolic groups (see Section 7.1).

We should finally point out that many of the groups G considered above admit small cancellation $C'(1/6)$ presentations. Hence, by work of Wise [Wis04], they are cubulable, and hence embed in $Sl(n, \mathbb{Z})$. Finally, a beautiful recent theorem [DFWZ23] of Douba, Flechelles, Weisman, and Zhu shows that every cubulated hyperbolic group admits an Anosov representation. Thus, we expect many of the groups G occurring in Theorem 1.3 to enjoy many nice properties, and they begin to address [Mj19, Question 6.16].

1.2. Techniques and criteria. We now come to the techniques that go into proving Theorem 1.3 and establishing Example 1.2.

Criterion for the existence of ray CT maps:

The following Lemma (see Corollary 4.20) is what we use to prove the existence of ray Cannon-Thurston maps (we have changed the notation from the statement of Corollary 4.20 to make it consistent with the notation in Example 1.2 and the following paragraphs.)

Lemma 1.4. *Let $G = H *_Q L$ be a hyperbolic group, and $G_1 = K * V$ be a hyperbolic subgroup respecting the graph of groups decomposition of G (i.e. $K \cap Q = V \cap Q = \{1\}$) such that*

- (1) Q is malnormal quasiconvex in H ,
- (2) The pairs (K, G) and (V, G) admit ray CT maps.

Then (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

Using Lemma 1.4 above, and using the main theorems of [Mit98a, Mit98b] to guarantee the existence of CT maps for the appropriate pair (K, G) , the first statement of Theorem 1.3 follows.

Criteria for the non-existence of CT maps:

We describe the basic geometric criterion we shall use to disprove the existence of Cannon-Thurston maps for a pair (G_1, G) . Let $i : \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma$ be an inclusion of Cayley graphs (with respect to finite generating sets) corresponding to the inclusion $i : G_1 \rightarrow G$ (thus we are assuming implicitly that the generating set of G includes that of G_1).

Criterion 1.5 (Strong JKLO criterion). (Corollary 4.5) Let $G_1 < G$ be a pair of hyperbolic groups as above. Let $[1, \xi)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_1$ and $[1, \eta)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_1$, with $\xi \neq \eta \in \partial G_1$ be landing rays accumulating at the same point $\zeta \in \partial G$. Further assume that $i([1, \xi)_{G_1}) \subset \Gamma$ is a quasigeodesic in Γ . Then (G_1, G) does not admits a CT map.

We will say below where Criterion 1.5 comes from. But for now, we show how to adapt it to our situation. We shall often use Criterion 1.5 in the form of Criterion 1.7 below as the latter is more adapted to the setup of Theorem 1.3 and Example 1.2.

Lemma 1.6. *Let H be a hyperbolic group. Let K, Q be two hyperbolic subgroups of H such that*

- (1) Q is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H .
- (2) $Q \cap K = \{1\}$.

*Next, let $\phi : Q \rightarrow Q$ be a hyperbolic endomorphism of Q , $L = Q *_\phi$ the associated ascending HNN extension, and $G = H *_Q L$. Let t be the stable letter for the HNN extension. Suppose further that the following holds:*

Criterion 1.7. There is a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in K converging to a point of ∂K such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n \in \partial G$.

Next, let G_1 be the subgroup of G generated by $K \cup \{t\}$. Then

- (1) G is hyperbolic
- (2) $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ is hyperbolic,
- (3) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

The first conclusion of Lemma 1.6 is a straightforward consequence of the Bestvina-Feighn combination theorem [BF92]. Establishing that $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ follows from normal forms. The third conclusion of Lemma 1.6 is what is significant, and it is here that Criterion 1.7 plays a crucial role.

Criterion 1.7 appears marginally more general than Criterion 1.5 as we allow an arbitrary sequence $\{y_n\}$ in K in Criterion 1.7. However, since $\{y_n\}$ converges to a point ξ of ∂K , we will assume in all our applications that $\{y_n\}$'s lie along a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_K \subset \Gamma_K$. Let $t^n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ converge to $t^\infty \in \partial G_1 = \partial(K * \langle t \rangle)$. Then $[1, \xi)_K$ includes into Γ_{G_1} as a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_{G_1}$. Let $[1, t^\infty)_{G_1}$ be a geodesic ray in Γ_{G_1} converging to $t^\infty \in \partial G_1$. Then Criterion 1.7 reduces to Criterion 1.5 by observing that

- (1) $[1, t^\infty)_{G_1}$ is a quasigeodesic in Γ_G ,
- (2) $\xi \neq t^\infty$ in ∂G_1 .

Applying Criterion 1.5:

We now indicate how to apply Criterion 1.5 to prove that the pair (G_1, G) in Example 1.2 is not a CT pair. The proof goes in two steps:

Step 1: Observe that since K is normal in H , a *surjective* Cannon-Thurston map $\partial i_{K,H} : \partial K \rightarrow \partial H$ exists [Mit98a]. In particular, since $Q < H$ is quasiconvex, ∂Q embeds in ∂H and for every point $\eta \in \partial Q \subset \partial H$, there exists $\xi_\eta \in \partial K$ such that $\partial i_{K,H}(\xi_\eta) = \eta$.

Step 2: Since Q is normal in L , a *surjective* Cannon-Thurston map $\partial i_{Q,L} : \partial Q \rightarrow \partial L$ exists [Mit98a]. In particular, there exists $\eta \in \partial Q$ such that $\partial i_{Q,L}(\eta) = t^\infty$.

Hence $\partial i_{Q,L} \circ \partial i_{K,H}(\xi_\eta) = t^\infty$. Now, apply Criterion 1.5 to the rays $[1, \xi_\eta)$ and $[1, t^\infty)$ in $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$. This establishes that the pair (G_1, G) in Example 1.2 is not a CT pair. The arguments for the three cases of Theorem 1.3 follow the above scheme. Some technical strife needs to be gone through to make sure that the scheme works. We refer to Sections 5.1, 5.2, and 6 for details.

Genesis of Criterion 1.5: As promised above, we shall say a word about where Criterion 1.5. For a hyperbolic group G , $\partial^2 G$ denotes the set of distinct pairs on ∂G . For a pair (G_1, G) , the collection of landing rays define a G_1 -invariant subset \mathcal{L}_p of $\partial^2 G_1$ consisting of pairs (ξ, η) such that $[1, \xi)_{G_1}$ and $[1, \eta)_{G_1}$ land at the same point of ∂G . We call such a G_1 -invariant subset an *algebraic pre-lamination* (see discussion preceding Definition 2.7). If the pair (G_1, G) indeed admits a Cannon-Thurston map, then it is easy to see that \mathcal{L}_p must be closed [Mit99, Lemma 2.2]. On the other hand, if $[1, \xi)_{G_1}$ is a quasigeodesic in Γ_G , then the closure of the set of its G_1 -translates must contain a bi-infinite quasigeodesic, whose end-points are necessarily distinct in ∂G . Thus, if Criterion 1.5 is satisfied, \mathcal{L}_p cannot be closed. Hence the pair (G_1, G) cannot admit a Cannon-Thurston map.

We refer to Criterion 1.5 as the strong JKLO criterion (after Jeon, Kapovich, Leininger, Ohshika [JKLO16]), as the condition that $[1, \xi)_{G_1}$ is a quasigeodesic in Γ_G is stronger than what is needed to ensure the non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps. In fact, the paper [JKLO16] deals with the more general context of convergence group actions. Even in the context of hyperbolic groups [JKLO16, Theorem A] implies the following (see Proposition 4.7) where the hypothesis is weaker (and so the conclusion is stronger).

Proposition 1.8. *Let $G_1 < G$ be a pair of hyperbolic groups. Let $\{g_n\}, \{h_n\}$ be sequences in G_1 converging to two distinct points of ∂G_1 , but to the same point ξ of ∂G . If $\xi \in \partial G$ is a conical limit point of G_1 , then (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.*

1.3. Motivation from complex dynamics. There are two principal sources of motivation for the study of Cannon-Thurston maps that are relevant to the present paper:

- (1) In the study of Kleinian groups acting on the Riemann sphere, they are used to establish that connected limit sets of finitely generated Kleinian groups are locally connected.
- (2) In geometric group theory, they are used to study the coarse extrinsic geometry of hyperbolic subgroups of hyperbolic groups.

We dwell on the first theme in this subsection and the second in the next. (The original paper [CT85] has, in addition, exerted considerable influence on the theory of foliations in hyperbolic 3-manifolds, but this is somewhat orthogonal to the theme of the present paper).

It is known [Mj14a, Mj17] that for finitely generated Kleinian groups, Cannon-Thurston maps exist unconditionally and that connected limit sets are locally connected. In particular, for any simply degenerate Kleinian surface group $G < PSL(2, \mathbb{C})$, there is a single domain of discontinuity D biholomorphic to the unit disk, such that

- (1) every radial ray in D , starting at the origin o say, lands on the limit set $\Lambda_G \subset \hat{\mathbb{C}}$,
- (2) further, the landing point on Λ_G depends continuously on the angle that a radial ray makes with a reference ray.

Thus, there is no analog of the phenomenon described in Theorem 1.3 in the world of Kleinian groups. On the other hand holomorphic dynamics on $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ provides a more flexible framework. We start with a toy example.

Example 1.9. *Let \mathbb{G} denote the closure of the topologist's sine curve, i.e. the set $\{(x, \sin 1/x) : x \in (0, 1]\}$ in the plane \mathbb{C} . Let $U = \hat{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathbb{G}$. Let $\mathbb{D} \rightarrow U$ denote the Riemann uniformizing map sending 0 to ∞ . Then it is easy to check that the image in U of every radial ray in \mathbb{D} lands on \mathbb{G} . However, the landing point does not depend continuously on the radial angle at $0 \in \mathbb{D}$. Else, \mathbb{G} would be locally connected by the Caratheodory extension theorem. It is not.*

The dynamics of transcendental functions provides examples illustrating the phenomenon described in Theorem 1.3 and Example 1.2. In [DK84, DT86], Devaney and his collaborators show that for certain transcendental holomorphic functions, every ray lands, but the Julia set is not locally connected. In particular, the parametrization in terms of angle is *not continuous*. This is the complex dynamics analog of the phenomenon illustrated by Theorem 1.3. In fact, for $f(z) = \lambda e^z$, with $\lambda < 1/e$, [DK84, p. 50], the Julia set is a Cantor bouquet of curves: each curve is accumulated on by other curves. Further, the tips of these curves are accessible from infinity, so that all rays land. However, to the best of our knowledge, the following is unknown.

Question 1.10. Does there exist a polynomial function $f : \hat{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ with connected Julia set $J(f)$ such that

- (1) Every ray from infinity lands on $J(f)$, but
- (2) $J(f)$ is *not locally connected*? Equivalently, the landing point does *not* depend continuously on the radial angle (in the sense of Example 1.9)?

On the other hand, a host of examples of non-locally connected Julia sets exist for polynomials f . For all the known examples, there exists some ray r from infinity such that the set of accumulation points of r on the Julia set $J(f)$ is a non-trivial compactum, i.e. it contains more than one point.

In the light of Theorem 1.3, the analogous phenomenon is unknown in the world of hyperbolic groups:

Question 1.11. Does there exist a hyperbolic subgroup G_1 of a hyperbolic group G and a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_{G_1}$ such that the collection of accumulation points of $[1, \xi)_{G_1}$ in ∂G consists of more than one point?

In the light of Theorem 1.3, Question 1.11 refines Question 1.1. In short, as Questions 1.10 and 1.11 illustrate, such observed phenomena in rational holomorphic dynamics and hyperbolic groups are complementary in nature. The intersection of these two worlds may be regarded as the world of Kleinian groups, where neither of these exotic phenomena occur by the main theorems of [Mj14a, Mj17]. In a sense, therefore, the present paper introduces a new line in the Sullivan dictionary—this time by making the Kleinian side broader by including the study of hyperbolic groups and their subgroups.

1.4. Motivation from asymptotic extrinsic geometry. We turn now to the second major motivation for the study of Cannon-Thurston maps in the context of hyperbolic subgroups of hyperbolic groups. In geometric group theory, coarse and asymptotic perspectives are often conflated. However, in the context of extrinsic geometry of subgroups, it is worth distinguishing between these two. Roughly, for a hyperbolic subgroup G_1 of a hyperbolic group G ,

- (1) the coarse perspective gives rise to distortion and filling invariants [Gro93] (see Section 7.2.1), whereas
- (2) the asymptotic perspective gives rise to Cannon-Thurston maps and landing rays.

It has been known for a while that while distortion of G_1 in G is a quantitative measure of the properness of the embedding of *points* of G_1 into G , existence of a Cannon-Thurston map is equivalent to the properness of the embedding of *pairs of points* in a specific sense. Here, a pair of points $g, h \in G_1$ codes two geodesics $[g, h]_{G_1}$ and $[g, h]_G$, one each in G_1, G . If $d_G(1, [g, h]_G)$ is a proper function of $d_{G_1}(1, [g, h]_{G_1})$, a Cannon-Thurston map exists. See Lemma 2.9 for a precise statement where a slight variant of the proper function is denoted by η . This perspective was exploited thoroughly in [MS13, MS17]. Quantitative versions of this proper function give rise to the modulus of continuity of Cannon-Thurston maps [Miy06, BR20].

For landing rays $i_\xi : [1, \xi)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_G$, a similar proper function M_ξ exists. This is explicated in Remark 4.8.

In [BR20] Baker and Riley provided examples of hyperbolic subgroups that have arbitrarily large recursive functions as distortion functions. However, they show that Cannon-Thurston maps exist for all of these. With the examples of Theorems 1.3 and 7.7 in place, we thus see that the *asymptotic extrinsic geometry* of G_1 in G and the *coarse extrinsic geometry* of G_1 in G are really two different notions.

In [Mit98c, p. 357-8] it was suggested that one needs finer invariants than distortion to understand asymptotic extrinsic geometry. In the presence of a ray Cannon-Thurston map, we thus have two functions:

- (1) the distortion function for the embedding $i_\xi : [1, \xi)_{G_1} \subset \Gamma_G$, and

(2) the function M_ξ mentioned in Remark 4.8.

Together, this collection, parametrized by $\xi \in \partial G_1$ would give a rather comprehensive picture of the asymptotic extrinsic geometry of G_1 in G .

A more interesting picture emerges when we consider the ray-CT pre-lamination $\mathcal{L}_r(G_1, G)$ (Definition 2.7) under the assumption that a ray CT map exists for the pair (G_1, G) . As mentioned in [MR18, Section 1.2], it is useful to think that the directions of maximal distortion for the inclusion $G_1 < G$ are captured by $\mathcal{L}_r(G_1, G)$. Of course, in [MR18], the authors were interested in the Cannon-Thurston lamination, see Definition 2.8. But the idea is the same. In fact, as it emerges from the existence of ray CT maps established in this paper, the existence of genuine Cannon-Thurston maps may not really be necessary for the study of extrinsic asymptotic geometry.

Let l be any leaf of $\mathcal{L}_r(G_1, G)$. Then l is asymptotic in both forward and backward directions to a point $l(\pm\infty) \in \partial G$. Thus $l \cup l(\pm\infty)$ is, topologically a circle embedded in $\Gamma_G \cup \partial G$. In the classical differential geometry of curves in \mathbb{R}^3 , the radius of curvature of the osculating circle at a point p of a curve gives the inverse of the curvature of the curve at p . It is extremely tempting to think of $\hat{l} := l \cup l(\pm\infty)$ as an asymptotic analog of this infinitesimal notion of an osculating circle in the following sense. Fix a base-point and an arc-length parametrization of l . Let $\lambda_n \subset \Gamma_G$ denote the geodesic (in G) joining $l(-n), l(n)$. Let l_n denote the subsegment of l bounded by $l(-n), l(n)$. Then $\hat{l}_n := l_n \cup \lambda_n$ are (maps of) larger and larger circles into Γ_G , touching G_1 along l_n . However, λ_n (or the center of \hat{l}_n in any reasonable sense) converges to $l(\pm\infty)$. Thus, we may think of \hat{l} as a "generalized horocycle" with center at $l(\pm\infty)$. For a surface in \mathbb{R}^3 , the locus of the centers of circles osculating the curvature lines is called the *evolute* or the *focal surface*. A natural asymptotic analog thus exists: the locus of the points $l(\pm\infty) \in \partial G$ as l ranges over $\mathcal{L}_r(G_1, G)$.

In the case of a simply degenerate Kleinian surface group G , the limit set Λ_G is a dendrite. Let $E \subset \Lambda_G$ denote set of ends of Λ_G , i.e. it is the collection of points that do not separate Λ_G . Then the locus of all points of the form $l(\pm\infty)$ is precisely equal to $\Lambda_G \setminus E$. This follows from the structure of Cannon-Thurston maps established in [Mj14b].

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to Xavier Buff, Misha Lyubich, Curt McMullen, and Dennis Sullivan for useful correspondence pertaining to the state of the art in holomorphic dynamics. The authors also thank Sabyasachi Mukherjee for helpful discussions on the same theme. Much of Section 1.3 is based on these inputs. We also thank Mladen Bestvina for helpful correspondence. We thank Harish Seshadri for valuable inputs on a previous draft. Finally, MM would like to acknowledge that a key idea that inspired this project appeared first in RH's thesis done under the guidance of PS.

2. CANNON-THURSTON MAPS AND ITS RELATIVES

2.1. Preliminaries on hyperbolic spaces. We refer the reader to [Gro87], [BH99, Chapter III.H] and [GdlH90] for background on hyperbolic groups. We fix notions and notation here. Let (X, d) be a geodesic metric space. A geodesic segment joining x and y is denoted by $[x, y]_X$ or simply by $[x, y]$ when X is understood.

Let $k \geq 1$ and $\epsilon \geq 0$. A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ between two metric spaces is said to be a (k, ϵ) -quasi-isometric embedding (or qi embedding for short) if for all $x, x' \in X$, we have

$$\frac{1}{k}d_X(x, x') - \epsilon \leq d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq kd_X(x, x') + \epsilon.$$

By a k -qi embedding, we mean a (k, k) -qi embedding. A map $\alpha : I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$ is said to be a k -quasigeodesic if it is a k -qi embedding. We say f (resp. α) is a qi embedding if f (resp. α) is k -qi embedding for some $k \geq 1$. When working with a quasigeodesic $\alpha : I \subseteq \mathbb{R} \rightarrow X$, we often conflate the map α with its image and think of the quasigeodesic as a subset of X . A geodesic ray is an isometric embedding $\alpha : I \rightarrow X$ where I is a semi-infinite closed interval of \mathbb{R} .

Let $K \geq 0$. A subset $A \subset X$ is said to be K -quasiconvex if $[a, b] \subseteq N_K(A)$ for all $a, b \in A$ and for all geodesics $[a, b]$. We say that A is quasiconvex in X if A is K -quasiconvex for some $K \geq 0$.

Definition 2.1. A map $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to be proper if the inverse image of a bounded set is bounded.

A map $f : (Y, d_Y) \rightarrow (X, d_X)$ between two metric spaces is said to be metrically ϕ -proper (or simply ϕ -proper) for some proper map $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ if $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq r$ implies that $d_X(x, x') \leq \phi(r)$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

We say that a map $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a proper embedding if it is ϕ -proper for some proper map $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Let (X, d) be a proper hyperbolic metric space. The (Gromov) boundary of X , consisting of asymptote classes of geodesic rays in X , will be denoted by ∂X .

Let $X \cup \partial X = \bar{X}$ denote the Gromov compactification. A geodesic ray starting at $x \in X$ and accumulating at $\xi \in \partial X$ is denoted $[x, \xi)$ and is said to join x to ξ . Similarly, a bi-infinite geodesic accumulating at ξ^- and ξ^+ is denoted as (ξ^-, ξ^+) and is said to join ξ^- and ξ^+ .

In this paper we shall work with hyperbolic spaces which are either proper or (Bass-Serre) trees. We have the following:

Lemma 2.2. [BH99, p. 427-428] Suppose X is either a proper hyperbolic space or a tree. Then for any $\xi \in \partial X$ and $p \in X \cup \partial X$, there is a geodesic ray or bi-infinite geodesic joining ξ and p .

Let $Hd(A, B)$ denote the Hausdorff distance between sets A, B . If α, β are geodesic rays or bi-infinite geodesics joining the same pair of points of $X \cup \partial X$ then $Hd(\alpha, \beta) \leq 2\delta$.

We recall the following basic property of the topology on \bar{X} that is relevant.

Lemma 2.3. Suppose $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence in X and $\xi \in \partial X$. Then $x_n \rightarrow \xi$ if and only if $d(x, [x_n, \xi)) \rightarrow \infty$.

We will need to deal with a pair of spaces $Y \subset X$ and a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in Y where we need to consider the limits of $\{y_n\}$ in both \bar{X} and \bar{Y} . To distinguish between such limits we shall use the notation $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X y_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^Y y_n$ to indicate where the limit is taken.

Suppose we have a hyperbolic metric space X and a subset $Y \subseteq X$. Then $\xi \in \partial X$ is called a **limit point** of Y (in ∂X) if there is a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in Y such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X y_n = \xi$. When a group H acts by isometries on a hyperbolic metric space X , a limit point of H is a limit point of some (any) orbit in X .

Definition 2.4. Let X be a hyperbolic space and Y a subspace of X . The limit set $\Lambda_X Y$ of Y in ∂X is defined to be the collection of limit points of Y . For an action of a group H by isometries on X , the limit set $\Lambda_X H$ of H in ∂X is defined to be the collection of limit points of a(ny) orbit of H .

A limit point $\xi \in \Lambda_X(Y) \subseteq \partial X$ of Y is said to be conical limit point of Y if for some (hence any) (quasi)geodesic ray α in X with $\alpha(\infty) = \xi$ there is $R \geq 0$ such that $\text{diam}\{Y \cap N_R(\alpha)\}$ is infinite. For an action of a group H by isometries on X , a conical limit point of H is a conical limit point of an orbit.

For a hyperbolic group G and a subgroup H of G , the limit set of H in ∂G is defined to be the limit set of H for its action on a Cayley graph of G and it is denoted by $\Lambda_G(H)$ or simply $\Lambda(H)$ when G is understood.

2.2. Landing Rays, Cannon-Thurston maps, Laminations. We start by recalling some of the basics about Cannon-Thurston maps and associated laminations from [Mit98b, MR18]. We provide context for and introduce the principal new player, the *ray Cannon-Thurston map*.

Definition 2.5. [Mit98a, Mit98b] Let $(X, d_X), (Y, d_Y)$ denote hyperbolic metric spaces. We assume that there is an inclusion map $i : Y \rightarrow X$. We say that the pair (Y, X) admits a Cannon-Thurston (CT) map if i extends continuously to a map $\partial i : \partial Y \rightarrow \partial X$. Equivalently, we say that (Y, X) is a CT pair.

Let $H < G$ be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group. Let $\partial H, \partial G$ denote their Gromov boundaries. We choose a finite generating set for G containing a generating set for H , so that there is an inclusion $i : \Gamma_H \rightarrow \Gamma_G$ of Cayley graphs Γ_H, Γ_G with respect to these generating sets. We say that the pair (H, G) admits a Cannon-Thurston (CT) map if i extends continuously to a map $\partial i : \partial H \rightarrow \partial G$. Equivalently, we say that (H, G) is a CT pair.

Definition 2.6. Let $H < G$ be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group with Cayley graphs Γ_H, Γ_G and boundaries $\partial H, \partial G$. Let $\xi \in \partial H$ and $[1, \xi) \subset \Gamma_H$ be a geodesic ray. Let $i : \Gamma_H \rightarrow \Gamma_G$ denote the inclusion map and let $i_\xi : [1, \xi) \rightarrow \Gamma_G$ denote the restriction of i to $[1, \xi)$. We say that the ray $[1, \xi)$ is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) if i_ξ extends continuously to a map $\partial i_\xi : \xi \rightarrow \partial G$. Equivalently, $[1, \xi)$ is a landing ray if the pair $([1, \xi), \Gamma_G)$ admits a Cannon-Thurston map.

If $[1, \xi)$ is a landing ray for all $\xi \in \partial H$, we say that (H, G) admits a ray-Cannon-Thurston (ray-CT) map.

The following notions of laminations and their relatives are based on work of a number of authors, notably Bestvina-Feighn-Handel [BFH97], the second author [Mit97], Coulbois, Hilion, Kapovich, Lustig [CHL07, KL10, KL15] and others. We adopt the exposition of [MR18] by the second author and Rafi.

An **algebraic pre-lamination** for a hyperbolic group H is an H -invariant, flip invariant, non-empty subset $\mathcal{L}_p \subseteq \partial^2 H = (\partial H \times \partial H \setminus \Delta)$, where Δ is the diagonal in $\partial H \times \partial H$ and the flip is given by $(x, y) \sim (y, x)$. An **algebraic lamination** for a hyperbolic group H is an H -invariant, flip invariant, non-empty closed subset $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \partial^2 H = (\partial H \times \partial H \setminus \Delta)$. Here ∂H is equipped with the Gromov topology, and $\partial^2 H$ with the subspace topology of the product topology. Here, we follow the convention of [MR18] instead of [Gro87]. In the latter, $\partial^2 H$ denotes $(\partial H \times \partial H \setminus \Delta) / \sim$. Since we shall in general be dealing with

directed instead of undirected bi-infinite geodesics, we prefer not to quotient out by the flip.

Definition 2.7. *Suppose that (H, G) admits a ray-Cannon-Thurston map ∂i_r . The ray-CT pre-lamination is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_r(H, G) := \left\{ \{p, q\} \in \partial^2 H : \partial i_r(p) = \partial i_r(q) \right\}.$$

Definition 2.8. *Suppose that (H, G) admits a Cannon-Thurston map ∂i . The CT-lamination is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_{CT}(H, G) := \left\{ \{p, q\} \in \partial^2 H : \partial i(p) = \partial i(q) \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}_{CT}(H, G)$ is indeed a lamination (see [Mit99, Lemmas 2.2] for instance).

Lemma 2.9. *[Mit98b] Suppose $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a map between two proper hyperbolic metric spaces. Let $y_0 \in Y$ be some base-point. Then f admits a CT map if and only if there is a function $\eta : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with $\eta(r) \rightarrow \infty$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$ such that the following holds:*

For any $y, y' \in Y$, and any geodesic β in Y joining them and any geodesic α in X joining $f(y), f(y')$, one has

$$d_X(f(y_0), \alpha) \leq r \text{ implies } d_Y(y_0, \beta) \leq \eta(r).$$

Remark 2.10. The function η above depends on y_0 . However, if there is a group Γ acting by isometries on X and Y so that f is Γ -equivariant and the Γ -action on Y is cobounded then a uniform function η can be chosen that works for any base point $y \in Y$ provided there is such a function for some point $y_0 \in Y$. For instance, for a pair of hyperbolic groups $H < G$, a CT map exists if and only if there is a uniform η such that the criterion in Lemma 2.9 holds.

The main result of [Mit98a] that we shall need in this paper can now be stated.

Theorem 2.11. *[Mit98a] Let H be a normal hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Then (H, G) is a CT pair.*

2.3. Trees of metric spaces and Cannon-Thurston maps. We recall the notion of trees of metric spaces from [BF92] as adapted in [Mit98b].

Definition 2.12. *Suppose T is a simplicial tree and X is a geodesic metric space. Then $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ is called a **tree of metric spaces** if there is a proper map $\phi : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with the following properties:*

- (1) π is 1-Lipschitz
- (2) For all $v \in V(T)$, $X_v := \pi^{-1}(v)$ is a geodesic metric space with path metric d_v induced from X . Moreover, with respect to these metrics, the inclusion $X_v \rightarrow X$ is a ϕ -proper embedding.
- (3) Suppose e is an edge in T joining $v, w \in V(T)$ and $m_e \in T$ is the midpoint of this edge. Then $X_e := \pi^{-1}(m_e)$ is a geodesic metric space with respect to the path metric d_e induced from X . Moreover, there is a map $\vartheta_e : X_e \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(e) \subseteq X$ such that
 - (a) $\pi \circ \vartheta_e$ is the projection map onto $[v, w]$.
 - (b) ϑ_e restricted to $X_e \times (0, 1)$ is an isometry onto $\pi^{-1}(\text{int}(e))$ where $\text{int}(e)$ denotes the interior of e .

(c) ϑ_e restricted to $X_e \times \{0\} \simeq X_e$ and $X_e \times \{1\} \simeq X_e$ are ϕ -proper embeddings from X_e into X_v and X_w respectively with respect to their induced path metrics. We denote these restriction maps by $\vartheta_{e,v}$ and $\vartheta_{e,w}$ respectively and we refer to these maps as incident maps.

Further, $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ is said to be a *tree of hyperbolic metric spaces with the qi embedded condition* [BF92] if, in addition, there exist $\delta \geq 0, K \geq 1, \epsilon \geq 0$ such that

- (1) each X_v is δ -hyperbolic for all $v \in V(T)$,
- (2) $\vartheta_{e,v}$ and $\vartheta_{e,w}$ are (K, ϵ) -qi embeddings for each edge e of T .

We refer the reader to [Ser03, SW79] for basics on graphs of groups. Let \mathcal{G} be a finite graph, with vertex set $V(\mathcal{G})$ and edge set $E(\mathcal{G})$. Let $\{G_v\}, \{G_e\}$ for $v \in V(\mathcal{G})$ and $e \in E(\mathcal{G})$ be associated vertex and edge groups. Along with injective homomorphisms $i_{e,v} : G_e \rightarrow G_v$ whenever e is incident on v , we obtain a graph of groups G with underlying graph \mathcal{G} . Note that G is the fundamental group of the graph of spaces where G_v (resp. G_e) is replaced by a $K(G_v, 1)$ (resp. $K(G_e, 1)$) and $i_{e,v}$ by a map in the appropriate homotopy class inducing $i_{e,v}$.

We assume now that G_v, G_e are finitely generated. We choose finite symmetric generating sets S_v, S_e of G_v, G_e such that $i_{e,v}(S_e) \subset S_v$. Let Γ_v, Γ_e be Cayley graphs of G_v, G_e with respect to S_v, S_e . Since $i_{e,v}(S_e) \subset S_v$, there is a natural simplicial map $i_{e,v} : \Gamma_e \rightarrow \Gamma_v$ (we use the same notation $i_{e,v}$ for the inclusion of Cayley graphs). Let T denote the associated Bass-Serre tree. Then G acts on T with stabilizers of vertices (resp. edges) conjugates of G_v (resp. G_e). This gives a tree of spaces $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ as in Definition 2.12 with vertex and edge spaces Γ_v, Γ_e and edge-to-vertex space maps $i_{e,v} : \Gamma_e \rightarrow \Gamma_v$.

If, in addition, each G_v, G_e is hyperbolic and $i_{e,v} : \Gamma_v \rightarrow \Gamma_e$ are qi-embeddings, we say that the graph of groups associated to \mathcal{G} is a *graph of hyperbolic groups satisfying the qi-embedded condition*. The tree of spaces $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ will be referred to as the tree of spaces (more specifically Cayley graphs) associated to the graph of hyperbolic groups satisfying the qi-embedded condition.

Remark 2.13. For a graph of groups with underlying graph \mathcal{G} , a further simplification can be implemented as follows. Let $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{G}$ be a maximal spanning tree. Then there exists a subgroup $G_{\mathcal{T}} < G$ corresponding to \mathcal{T} . Further, each edge $e \in \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{T}$ gives rise to two inclusion maps $i_e^{\pm} : G_e \rightarrow G_{\mathcal{T}}$. Then G admits a new graph of groups decomposition, where the underlying graph is a rose \mathcal{R} , i.e. a wedge of n circles, where n equals the number of edges in $\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{T}$. Thus \mathcal{R} has a single vertex v , n edges e_1, \dots, e_n , a single vertex group $G_v = G_{\mathcal{T}}$, and n pairs of subgroups $G_j^{\pm} \subset G_v$ with G_j^+, G_j^- isomorphic to the edge group G_{e_j} . Further, there exist isomorphisms $\phi_j : G_j^+ \rightarrow G_j^-$. Fix a finite presentation of $G_v = G_{\mathcal{T}}$. Let s_1, \dots, s_n be stable letters corresponding to e_1, \dots, e_n . Then G admits a presentation, where the additional generators are given by s_1, \dots, s_n , and relations of the form $s_j g_j s_j^{-1} = \phi_j(g_j)$ with $g_j \in G_j^+$.

The subgroup $F = \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \rangle$ maps isomorphically to $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ and s_j can be naturally identified with the generator of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ corresponding to e_j . Equivalently, F can be identified with a natural section of the surjective homomorphism $G \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ defining the graph of groups structure on G with one vertex v and n edges e_1, \dots, e_n .

The main theorem of [Mit98b] follows.

Theorem 2.14. [Mit98b, Theorem 3.10, Corollary 3.11] Let $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ be a tree of hyperbolic metric spaces satisfying the qi-embedded condition. Let v be a vertex of T and X_v be the associated vertex space. Then (X_v, X) is a CT pair.

Let G be a hyperbolic group acting cocompactly without inversions on a tree T with hyperbolic edge and vertex stabilizers. Further, assume that every inclusion of an edge stabilizer into a vertex stabilizer is a quasi-isometric embedding. Let H be an edge or vertex stabilizer. Then (H, G) is a CT pair.

3. MALNORMALITY AND LIMITS

Definition 3.1. Let $F < H$ be a subgroup of a group. We say that F is malnormal (resp. weakly malnormal) in H if for all $h \in H \setminus F$, $hFh^{-1} \cap F$ is trivial (resp. finite).

The following result is a direct consequence of the definition.

Lemma 3.2. Suppose $K < H < G$ are groups such that K is malnormal (weakly malnormal) in H and H is malnormal (resp. weakly malnormal) in G . Then K is malnormal (resp. weakly malnormal) in G .

We shall make use of the following basic lemma a number of times later on.

Lemma 3.3. Suppose G is any group which has no subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $N \triangleleft G$ is a torsion free subgroup. Let $Q = G/N$ and $\pi : G \rightarrow Q$ be the quotient map. Suppose H is a malnormal torsion free subgroup of Q . Suppose $g : H \rightarrow G$ is a group theoretic section of π over H . Then $g(H)$ is a malnormal subgroup of G .

Proof. Let $L = g(H)$. Suppose $x \in G$ and $L \cap xLx^{-1} \neq (1)$. Applying π we have that $H \cap \pi(x)H\pi(x)^{-1} \neq (1)$. Thus $\pi(x) \in H$ by malnormality of H in Q . Thus $x \in \langle L, N \rangle = G_1$, say. As $N \triangleleft G$ we note that G_1 is the semi-direct product of L and N . Hence, we can uniquely write $x = a.t$ where $a \in N, t \in L$. It follows that $L \cap aLa^{-1} \neq (1)$. Hence, there are elements $u, v \in L$ such that $v = aua^{-1}$. Taking the natural quotient map $G_1 \rightarrow L$ we see that $u = v$. Hence, we have $u = aua^{-1}$. As G has no subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, and N and L are torsion free, we have $a = 1$. Thus $a = 1$ and $x \in L$. \square

3.1. Criteria for malnormal quasiconvexity. In the examples that we construct in the following sections, we shall need some sufficient conditions guaranteeing that a subgroup of a hyperbolic group is malnormal, quasiconvex. We start with the following theorem. When G is torsion-free, this is due to Ilya Kapovich [Kap99]. The technical modifications necessary to generalize this to the case where G is allowed to have torsion is by the first and third authors [HS25].

Theorem 3.4. Suppose G is a hyperbolic group and $H < G$ is a quasiconvex subgroup. Moreover, we assume that $H \simeq F_n$ for $n \geq 2$. Then given $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find a free subgroup $F < H$ of rank m such that $F \times A < G$ where A is a finite subgroup of G and $F \times A$ is weakly malnormal, quasiconvex in G .

We shall also need the following, for which the forward direction of (2) is essentially due to Matsuda and Oguni [MO14]. For the proof of the reverse implication of (2), we need to use some standard notions and results from the theory of relatively hyperbolic groups and spaces. For details we refer the reader to [Far98] or [DM17, Section 2.5].

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose $G = H_1 *_K H_2$ is an amalgamation such that H_1, H_2 are hyperbolic, and K is infinite, weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H_1 . (Hence K is hyperbolic.) Then:*

- (1) G is hyperbolic, and H_2 is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in G .
- (2) (H_1, G) is a CT pair if and only if (K, H_2) is a CT pair.

Proof.

(1) Since K is infinite, weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H_1 , so by [Bow12, Theorem 7.11], H_1 is hyperbolic relative to K . Then by [Dah03, Theorem 0.1 (2)], G is hyperbolic relative H_2 . Again, since H_2 is hyperbolic, G is hyperbolic by [Osi06b, Corollary 2.41].

Note also that G is hyperbolic relative to H_2 . Then by [Osi06a, Theorem 1.5] H_2 is quasiconvex and weakly malnormal in G .

(2) We first give a proof of the forward direction of (2). This is due to Matsuda-Oguni [MO14] and we include it for completeness. Since K is quasiconvex in H_1 and the composition of CT maps is a CT map, we have that (K, G) is a CT pair.

Now suppose that (K, H_2) is not a CT pair. Let $\{k_n\}, \{k'_n\} \subseteq K$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K k_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K k'_n \in \partial K$ but $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{H_2} k_n \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{H_2} k'_n$ in ∂H_2 . By (1), H_2 is quasiconvex in G , so we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G k_n \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G k'_n$ in ∂G .

On the other hand, (K, G) is a CT pair, so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G k_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G k'_n \in \partial G$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, we are done.

Now we shall prove the reverse direction of (2). Suppose that (K, H_2) is a CT pair. To show that (H_1, G) is a CT pair we use Lemma 2.9. For this we need to compare geodesics in G and in H_1 , joining any pair points of H_1 . One way to do this is to look at the tree of space structure $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ of G given by the amalgamated free product decomposition of G as $H_1 *_K H_2$. Let Y be a vertex space corresponding to H_1 . We shall show that given $D \geq 0$ there exists $D' \geq 0$ such that for a fixed $y_0 \in Y$, and for any $y, y' \in Y$, and

- (1) geodesic β in Y joining y, y' ,
- (2) geodesic α in X joining y, y' ,

$d_X(y_0, \alpha) \leq D$ implies $d_Y(y_0, \beta) \leq D'$.

From this tree of spaces, we deduce the following.

- (1) As H_2 is quasiconvex in G , by coning off various cosets of H_2 in G we get a hyperbolic graph say \widehat{G} . In this the diameter of the various cosets of K is 2. Thus if we cone off the cosets of K too, then we get a quasi-isometric graph that we continue to denote by \widehat{G} (abusing notation slightly).
- (2) Let us denote the graph obtained from H_1 by coning off the cosets of K by \widehat{H}_1 . Then \widehat{H}_1 is qi embedded in \widehat{G} .

Now, given any $x, y \in H_1$, we can find a uniform quasigeodesic without back-tracking, say γ , in \widehat{H}_1 joining x, y . A de-electrification (see [DM17, Section 2.5.2] for instance) of γ in H_1 gives a uniform quasigeodesic, say α , in H_1 . By (1), H_2 is quasiconvex, weakly malnormal in G , so that G is strongly hyperbolic relative to H_2 . By a similar de-electrification of γ in G , we obtain a uniform quasigeodesic, say β , in G . Suppose $p \in \beta$ and $d_G(1, p) \leq D$. If $p \in \gamma \cap H_1$ then $d_{H_1}(1, p) \leq D'$ for some D' depending on D as finitely generated subgroups of a finitely generated group are properly embedded. Otherwise, the point p is contained in a segment β_1 of β with end points $x_1, y_1 \in H_1$ such that $\beta_1 \subset x_1 H_2$. In this case, one compares a geodesic joining x_1, y_1 in $x_1 K \subset H_1$ with

β_1 . As any geodesic in G joining 1 to p must pass through x_1K , if $p_1 \in x_1K$ is a point on such a geodesic then $d_G(1, p_1) \leq D$ and $d_G(p_1, p) \leq D$. Now, we use the fact that (K, H_2) is a CT pair and that H_2 is quasiconvex in G . Suppose η is a proper function as in Lemma 2.9 for the pair (K, H_2) . (See Remark 2.10.) This means that if σ is a geodesic in x_1K joining x_1, y_1 then $d_{x_1K}(p_1, \sigma) \leq \eta(D)$. Thus $d_{H_1}(1, \alpha) \leq d_{H_1}(1, p_1) + d_{H_1}(p_1, \sigma)$ is uniformly bounded in terms of D and the quasiconvexity constant of H_2 in G . Applying Lemma 2.9 we are through. \square

3.2. Some special limiting sequences. We shall, in the construction of the examples in the following sections, need criteria to guarantee that a conical limit point in ∂G of the form t^∞ is also accumulated upon by a sequence in a distorted subgroup K (see the notation in Example 1.2). The aim of this subsection is to develop a couple of basic criteria to this effect (Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8 below). We start with the following basic fact whose proof we omit.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose X is a δ -hyperbolic space and γ is a quasigeodesic ray in X . Suppose $\{x_n\}$ is a sequence of points in X and let $y_n \in \gamma$ be a nearest point projection of x_n on γ for all n . Suppose $d_X(\gamma(0), y_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X x_n = \gamma(\infty)$.*

We shall use Lemma 3.6 in the proof of the following.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose G is a hyperbolic group and γ is a quasigeodesic ray in (a Cayley graph of) G starting at 1. Let $g_n = \gamma(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi = \gamma(\infty) \in \partial G$. Suppose $h \in G$ is such that $d_G(1, g_n h g_n^{-1}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G g_n h g_n^{-1} = \xi$.*

In particular, if $g, h \in G$ are infinite order elements and $h \notin \text{Comm}_G(\langle g \rangle)$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G g^n h g^{-n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G g^n$.

Proof. Suppose Γ_G is the Cayley graph of G with respect to a finite generating set. Suppose Γ_G is δ -hyperbolic for some $\delta \geq 0$. Suppose γ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic in Γ_G . Let $\gamma(a_n)$ be the nearest point projection of $g_n h g_n^{-1}$ on γ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then by Lemma 3.6 it is enough to show that $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

If that is not the case, then $\{a_n\}$ has a bounded subsequence $\{a_{n_k}\}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\{a_{n_k}\}$ is constant, say $a_{n_k} = a$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma(a) = x$. It is easy to see using stability of quasigeodesics that the nearest point projection, say x_k , of $g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}$ on $[g_1, g_{n_k}]$ is uniformly close to x . Suppose $d(x, x_k) \leq R$ for some constant R (We note that R depends only on K, ϵ, δ .)

We note that $d(g_1, g_{n_k}) = d(g_{n_k} h, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1})$. Hence, for large values of k , x_k belongs to $[g_1, g_{n_k}]$. Now, it follows using δ -slimness of the triangle with vertices $g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}, x_k$ and g_{n_k} that $d(x_k, [g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}, g_{n_k}]) \leq 4\delta$. Suppose $y_k \in [g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}, g_{n_k}]$ is such that $d(x_k, y_k) \leq 4\delta$. Similarly by considering the triangle with vertices $g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}, g_{n_k}$ and $g_{n_k} h$, we have a point $z_k \in [g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}, g_{n_k} h]$ such that $d(y_k, z_k) \leq \delta + d(g_{n_k}, g_{n_k} h) = \delta + d(1, h)$. Thus $d(x_k, z_k) \leq 5\delta + d(1, h)$. Considering the quadrilateral with vertices $x_k, g_{n_k}, g_{n_k} h$ and z_k , and using the triangle inequality it follows that $d(z_k, g_{n_k} h) \geq d(x_k, g_{n_k}) - d(x_k, z_k) - d(g_{n_k}, g_{n_k} h)$, i.e. $d(z_k, g_{n_k} h) \geq d(x_k, g_{n_k}) - 5\delta - 2d(1, h)$. As $x_k \in [g_1, g_{n_k}]$ and $d(g_1, g_{n_k}) = d(g_{n_k} h, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1})$, it follows from an easy calculation that $d(z_k, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1})$ is bounded. Since $d(g_1, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}) \leq d(g_1, x) + d(x, x_k) + d(x_k, z_k) + d(z_k, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1})$, the sequence $\{d(g_1, g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1})\}$ is also bounded. Hence $\{g_{n_k} h g_{n_k}^{-1}\}$ is a bounded sequence. This contradicts the hypothesis that $d_G(1, \{g_n h g_n^{-1}\}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The second part of the lemma follows from the first part. We recall the standard fact that infinite cyclic subgroups are qi embedded in a hyperbolic group. Hence, $\{g^n\}$ is the vertex set of a quasigeodesic ray in Γ_G converging to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G g^n$. It remains to check that $d_G(1, g^n h g^{-n}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If that is not the case, then there is a bounded subsequence $\{g^{n_k} h g^{-n_k}\}$ of the sequence $\{g^n h g^{-n}\}$. Then it follows by the pigeon hole principle that $g^{n_i} h g^{-n_i} = g^{n_j} h g^{-n_j}$ for some integers $i \neq j$. Thus if $l = n_i - n_j$ then we have $g^l h g^{-l} = h$ which contradicts the hypothesis that $h \notin \text{Comm}_G(\langle g \rangle)$. \square

We shall also need the following basic combination theorem.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose H is a hyperbolic group and Q is a weakly malnormal quasiconvex subgroup of H . Suppose $\phi : Q \rightarrow Q$ is a hyperbolic endomorphism of Q and $L = Q *_\phi$ is the ascending HNN extension corresponding to ϕ with stable letter t , i.e. the extra relations are of the form $t q t^{-1} = \phi(q)$ for $q \in Q$. Let $G = H *_Q L$. Then*

- (1) G is hyperbolic.
- (2) L is quasiconvex in G .
- (3) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n \in \Lambda_L(Q)$.
- (4) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n \in \Lambda_G(Q)$.

Proof. Since $G = H *_Q L$ and L is hyperbolic, so (1) and (2) follows from Theorem 3.5 (1).

(3) For any $q \in Q$, $t^n q t^{-n} = \phi^n(q) \in Q$ is unbounded in Q since ϕ is hyperbolic. Hence, by Lemma 3.7, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n \in \Lambda_L(Q)$.

(4) Since L is quasiconvex in G , so by (3), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n \in \Lambda_G(Q)$. \square

4. CRITERIA FOR EXISTENCE AND NON-EXISTENCE OF CANNON-THURSTON MAPS

4.1. Laminations and the strong JKLO criterion.

Lemma 4.1. *Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Assume that a ray-CT map exists for the pair (H, G) . Let $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ denote the ray-CT pre-lamination. If $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ is not a lamination, i.e. it is not a closed subset of $\partial^2 H$, then a Cannon-Thurston map does not exist for the pair (H, G) .*

Proof. This follows from the fact that a Cannon-Thurston map exists if and only if the ray-CT map is continuous. And continuity of the ray-CT map forces the ray-CT pre-lamination $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ to be the Cannon-Thurston lamination $\mathcal{L}_{CT}(H, G)$ (that the latter is indeed a lamination follows from [Mit99, Lemmas 2.2] for instance). \square

Definition 4.2. *Let H be hyperbolic. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \partial^2 H$ be an algebraic pre-lamination. A geodesic realization of \mathcal{L} consists of bi-infinite geodesics $(p, q)_H$ for all $\{p, q\} \in \mathcal{L}$.*

Next, assume that H is a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . We say that \mathcal{L} contains arbitrarily long (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic segments of G , if for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $\{p, q\} \in \mathcal{L}$ and $p_i, q_i \in (p, q)_H$ such that $[p_i, q_i]_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic in Γ_G and $d_G(p_i, q_i) \geq N$.

Corollary 4.3. *Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Assume that a ray-CT map exists for the pair (H, G) . Let $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ denote the ray-CT pre-lamination. If $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ contains arbitrarily long (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic segments of Γ_G for some $K \geq 1, \epsilon \geq 0$, then a Cannon-Thurston map does not exist for the pair (H, G) .*

In particular, if a geodesic realization of $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ contains a geodesic ray $[h, \xi)_H$ for some $h \in H$ and $\xi \in \partial H$, such that $[h, \xi)_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic of Γ_G for some $K \geq 1, \epsilon \geq 0$, then a Cannon-Thurston map does not exist for the pair (H, G) .

Proof. By Definition 4.2, there exist K, ϵ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ the following holds: there exists $\{p, q\} \in \mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ and $p_i, q_i \in (p, q)_H$ such that $[p_i, q_i)_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic in Γ_G and $d_G(p_i, q_i) \geq 2N$. Since $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ is a pre-lamination, it is H -invariant. Hence, translating by an element of H if necessary, we can assume that $1 \in [p_i, q_i)_H$, and $d(1, p_i) \geq N/3$ and $d(1, q_i) \geq N/2$. Passing to a limit we obtain a bi-infinite geodesic $(p_\infty, q_\infty) \subset \Gamma_H$ such that (p_∞, q_∞) is a bi-infinite (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic in Γ_G . Since (p_∞, q_∞) is a quasigeodesic, its ideal end-points in ∂G are necessarily distinct. In particular, $\{p_\infty, q_\infty\}$ cannot belong to $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_r(H, G)$ is not a lamination. By Lemma 4.1, a Cannon-Thurston map does not exist for the pair (H, G) .

The second statement follows from the first since $[h, \xi)_H$ contains arbitrarily long (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic segments of Γ_G . \square

The hypotheses of Corollary 4.3 can be weakened further. It is not necessary to assume that a ray-CT map exists for the pair (H, G) .

Definition 4.4. Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Let \mathcal{R}_H denote the collection of $\xi \in \partial H$ such that $[1, \xi)_H$ is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) . Then the weak CT pre-lamination $\mathcal{L}_w(H, G)$ consists of distinct pairs $\xi \neq \eta \in \mathcal{R}_H$ such that $[1, \xi)_H$ and $[1, \eta)_H$ land at the same point in ∂G .

Corollary 4.5. Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Let $\xi \neq \eta \in \partial H$ such that $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{L}_w(H, G)$. Further, assume that $[1, \xi)_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic of Γ_G for some $K \geq 1, \epsilon \geq 0$. Then a Cannon-Thurston map does not exist for the pair (H, G) .

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as that of Corollary 4.3 and we omit it. \square

Definition 4.6. Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G . Let $\xi \neq \eta \in \partial H$ such that $(\xi, \eta) \in \mathcal{L}_w(H, G)$. Further, assume that $[1, \xi)_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic of Γ_G for some $K \geq 1, \epsilon \geq 0$. Then we shall say that the pair (H, G) satisfies the strong JKLO criterion for the non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps.

The term JKLO criterion in Definition 4.6 is named after Jeon, Kapovich, Leininger and Ohshika. The following is a special case of [JKLO16, Theorem A(2)]. We include a proof for completeness (see Definition 2.4 for the notion of a conical limit point). For X a hyperbolic space with boundary ∂X , and a sequence $x_n \in X$ converging to $\xi \in \partial X$, we shall write $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X x_n = \xi$.

Proposition 4.7. [JKLO16] Let G be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G' such that there is a CT map $\partial\rho : \partial G \rightarrow \partial G'$ for the pair (G, G') . Then for any conical limit point $\xi \in \partial G'$ of G , $(\partial\rho)^{-1}(\xi)$ is a singleton.

More generally, assume that a hyperbolic group G acts properly by isometries on a proper hyperbolic metric space X . Let $\rho : G \rightarrow X$ be an orbit map $g \rightarrow g.x$ where $x \in X$. Suppose that there exist two sequences $\{g_n\}, \{g'_n\}$ in G such that

- (1) $\{g_n\}, \{g'_n\}$ converge to two distinct points of ∂G ,
- (2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X g_n x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X g'_n x = \xi \in \partial X$,
- (3) ξ is a conical limit point of G .

Then ρ does not admit a CT map.

Proof. The first assertion clearly follows from the second; so we prove the second assertion only.

Suppose X is δ -hyperbolic. Suppose there is a CT map $\partial\rho : \partial G \rightarrow \partial X$. Let γ be a geodesic ray in X joining x to ξ such that for some $R > 0$, there is a sequence $\{h_n\}$ in G with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G g_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G h_n = \eta \in \partial G$, say, and $d_X(h_n x, \gamma) \leq R$. Then it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X h_n x = \partial\rho(\eta) = \xi$.

As $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X g'_n x = \xi$, if γ_n is a geodesic joining x and $g'_n x$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ then (up to passing to a subsequence) γ_n 's converge (uniformly on compact subsets) to a geodesic ray $\tilde{\gamma}$, say, joining x to ξ . By Lemma 2.2, $Hd(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma}) \leq 2\delta$. Hence, there is a subsequence of natural numbers $\{n_i\}$, and a sequence of real numbers $\{r_i\}$ such that $d_X(h_i x, \gamma_{n_i}(r_i)) \leq R + 2\delta + 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. As the G -action is by isometries on X , it follows that the geodesic $h_i^{-1} \gamma_{n_i}$ in X joining $h_i^{-1} x$ and $h_i^{-1} g'_{n_i} x$ passes through the $(R + 2\delta + 1)$ -radius ball centered at x .

On the other hand, as the sequences $\{h_n\}$ and $\{g'_n\}$ are converging to different points in ∂G , it follows that $d_G(h_m, [1, g'_n]) \rightarrow \infty$ as $m, n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $d_G(h_i, [1, g'_{n_i}]) \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $d_G(1, [h_i^{-1}, h_i^{-1} g'_{n_i}]) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

This violates Lemma 2.9 contradicting the assumption that $\rho : G \rightarrow X$ admits the CT map. \square

A pair (H, G) as in Proposition 4.7 will be said to satisfy the *JKLO criterion* (as opposed to the strong JKLO criterion of Definition 4.6). The aim of the authors in [JKLO16] was to characterize conical limit points in the presence of a Cannon-Thurston map. Definition 4.6 and Proposition 4.7 turn this around into a criterion for the non-existence of Cannon-Thurston maps. Further, Definition 4.6 makes the stronger demand that $[1, \xi]_H$ is a (K, ϵ) -quasigeodesic of Γ_G and not just that $[1, \xi]_H$ is a landing ray with its ideal end point in ∂G a conical limit point. Hence the terminology *strong JKLO criterion* in Definition 4.6.

Remark 4.8. Let H be a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group G such that there is a ray CT map $\partial i_r : \partial H \rightarrow \partial G$ for the pair (H, G) . By Lemma 2.9 we have the following. For every $\xi \in \partial H$, there is a proper function $M_\xi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: For $p_i, q_i \in [1, \xi]$ with $d_H(1, p_i) \geq N$ and $d_H(1, q_i) \geq N$, $d_G(1, [p_i, q_i]_G) \geq M_\xi(N)$.

Then the ray CT map $\partial i_r : \partial H \rightarrow \partial G$ is continuous if and only if there is a proper function $M : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $M_\xi(N) \geq M(N)$ for all ξ . Equivalently, the ray CT map ∂i_r is a CT map if and only if the collection $\{M_\xi\}$ of proper functions is uniformly proper. Viewed this way, all our examples in the following sections violate this extra uniformity condition.

4.2. Group theoretic criteria for nonexistence of CT maps. In this subsection we shall establish two criteria for the nonexistence of CT maps for pairs of hyperbolic groups $H < G$. These are deduced from the strong JKLO criterion (Definition 4.6 and Corollary 4.5) and the JKLO criterion (Proposition 4.7).

Recall (Definition 2.4) that for $H < G$ a hyperbolic subgroup of a hyperbolic group, the *limit set* $\Lambda_G H$ of H in ∂G is the set of accumulation points of an orbit $H.g$ for some (any) vertex $g \in \Gamma_G$.

Proposition 4.9. *Suppose $G_1 < G$ are hyperbolic groups and K, P are two infinite hyperbolic subgroups of G_1 such that the following hold:*

- (1) P is quasiconvex in G .

- (2) K is quasiconvex in G_1 .
- (3) $P \cap K$ is finite.
- (4) There is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in K such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K x_n \in \partial K$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n \in \Lambda_G(P)$.

Then (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

Proof. First, we note that P is quasiconvex in G_1 since it is so in the larger group G . Let $\xi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n$. As P is quasiconvex in G , ξ is a conical limit point of P and hence it is a conical limit point of G_1 . Let γ_1 be a geodesic ray in P starting from 1 such that $\partial i_{P,G}(\gamma_1(\infty)) = \xi$. Let γ_2 be a geodesic ray in K starting from 1 such that $\gamma_2(\infty) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K x_n$. As P, K are both quasiconvex in G_1 , so γ_1, γ_2 are both quasigeodesics in G_1 . Since $P \cap K$ is finite, $\Lambda_{G_1}P \cap \Lambda_{G_1}K = \Lambda_{G_1}(P \cap K) = \emptyset$ [Sho91]. Hence, γ_1, γ_2 converge to two different points of ∂G_1 . If (G_1, G) is a CT pair, then $\gamma_1(\infty), \gamma_2(\infty) \in \partial G_1$ would be two distinct points in $\partial i_{G_1,G}^{-1}(\xi)$. This violates the JKLO criterion (Proposition 4.7). \square

Definition 4.10. Let F be a hyperbolic group. An endomorphism $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ is said to be hyperbolic if the associated ascending HNN extension $F *_{\phi}$ is hyperbolic.

We have the following immediate corollary of Proposition 4.9.

Corollary 4.11. Let H be a hyperbolic group. Let F, K be two hyperbolic subgroups of H . Suppose, moreover, that the following hold.

- (1) F is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H .
- (2) $F \cap K = \{1\}$.
- (3) Let $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ be a hyperbolic endomorphism of F . Let $G = H *_{F, \phi}$ be the induced HNN extension of H along F . Let t be the stable letter for the HNN extension and let G_1 be the subgroup of G generated by $K \cup \{t\}$.
- (4) There is a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in K converging to a point of ∂K such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n \in \partial G$.

Then

- (1) G_1, G are hyperbolic,
- (2) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

Proof. We first note that the hyperbolicity of G and G_1 follows from hypotheses (1), (2) and (3) as follows. Since $F \cap K = \{1\}$, it follows from Britton's lemma that $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$. Hyperbolicity of G_1 is immediate. Hyperbolicity of G follows from an easy case of the Bestvina-Feighn combination theorem [BF92] (see Theorem 3.5(1) and its proof for instance).

Next, clearly, K and $\langle t \rangle = P$, say, are retracts of G_1 whence they are both quasiconvex in G_1 . Since P is cyclic, it is quasiconvex in G as well. Thus hypotheses (1), (2) of Proposition 4.9 are satisfied. Hypothesis (3) of Proposition 4.9 is immediate, since $P \cap K = \{1\}$. Hypothesis (4) of Proposition 4.9 is an immediate consequence of hypothesis (4) of the present corollary. Hence, by Proposition 4.9 (G_1, G) is not a CT pair. \square

Remark 4.12. In subsequent sections of the paper we find explicit examples of non-CT pairs using Corollary 4.11. In many of these examples we have $\Lambda_H(K) = \partial H$ whence hypothesis (4) of Corollary 4.11 holds automatically.

Here is another group theoretic criterion for building non-CT pairs of hyperbolic groups.

Proposition 4.13. *Suppose $G_1 < G$ are hyperbolic groups and K, L are two hyperbolic subgroups of G_1 with the following properties.*

- (1) (K, G_1) and (K, G) are CT pairs.
- (2) L is quasiconvex in G .
- (3) *There exists $(\xi^+, \xi^-) \in \mathcal{L}_{CT}(K, G)$ such that*
 - (a) $(\xi^+, \xi^-) \notin \mathcal{L}_{CT}(K, G_1)$
 - (b) $\partial i_{K,G}(\xi^+) = \partial i_{K,G}(\xi^-) \in \Lambda_G(L)$.

Then (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

Proof. Let $\xi = \partial i_{K,G}(\xi^+) = \partial i_{K,G}(\xi^-)$. As $\xi \in \Lambda_G(L)$, and L is quasiconvex in G , so ξ is a conical limit point of L . Hence, ξ is a conical limit point of G_1 as well since $L < G_1$. Choose two sequences $\{h_n\}, \{h'_n\}$ in G_1 such that $h_n \rightarrow \xi^+$ and $h'_n \rightarrow \xi^-$. We may now apply the JKLO criterion Proposition 4.7 to conclude that (G_1, G) is not a CT pair. \square

We conclude this section with a rather general group-theoretic criterion guaranteeing that a pair (G_1, G) is not a CT pair. We will not need a statement in this generality for the applications in succeeding sections. However, it generalizes all the previous criteria we have stated and we thought it worth the while to include it for possible future use. The reader may skip over it at a first reading.

Corollary 4.14. *Suppose we have two hyperbolic groups G_1, G_2 along with hyperbolic subgroups $H_i, K_i < G_i$, $i = 1, 2$ and an isomorphism $\phi : H_1 \rightarrow K_2$ such that the following conditions hold:*

- (1) H_i is quasiconvex in G_i , $i = 1, 2$.
- (2) (K_1, G_1) and (K_2, G_2) are CT pairs.
- (3) $H_i \cap K_i = (1)$, $i = 1, 2$.
- (4) H_1 is weakly malnormal in G_1 .
- (5) *There is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in H_1 converging to some point in ∂H_1 such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} x_n \in \Lambda_{G_1}(K_1)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_2} \phi(x_n) \in \Lambda_{G_2}(H_2)$.*

*Let $G = G_1 *_{H_1 \simeq K_2} G_2$ be the amalgamated free product obtained using ϕ . Let K be the subgroup of G generated by K_1 and H_2 .*

Then

- (1) G is hyperbolic,
- (2) $K \simeq K_1 * H_2$ is hyperbolic and
- (3) (K, G) is a non-CT pair.

In particular, the same conclusions hold if the condition (5) above is replaced with the following stronger hypothesis.

- (5') $\Lambda_{G_1}(H_1) \subset \Lambda_{G_1}(K_1)$ and $\Lambda_{G_2}(H_2) \cap \Lambda_{G_2}(K_2) \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. We note that the natural map $K_1 * H_2$ onto $K < G$ is injective by the normal form theorem for amalgamated free products. Thus the hyperbolicity of G and K follow readily from Theorem 3.5 (1). This proves (1) and (2).

By Theorem 3.5 (1), G_2 is quasiconvex in G and K_1, H_2 are quasiconvex in K . As H_2 is quasiconvex in G_2 , it follows that H_2 is quasiconvex in G . These observations are used to conclude (3) as follows.

By the hypothesis (2), (K_1, G_1) is a CT pair. Hence, by (5) there exist sequences $\{x_n\}$ in H_1 and $\{y_n\}$ in K_1 such that

- (1) $\{x_n\}$ converges to some point in ∂H_1 ,

$$(2) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} y_n.$$

On the other hand, (G_1, G) is a CT pair by Theorem 3.5 as (K_2, G_2) is a CT pair (see hypothesis (2)). Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G \phi(x_n)$. As H_2 is quasiconvex in G_2 , it follows from hypothesis (5) that there is a quasi-geodesic sequence $\{z_n\}$ in H_2 converging to some point in $\partial H_2 \subset \partial G_2$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_2} z_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_2} \phi(x_n)$. As G_2 is quasiconvex in G , we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G \phi(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G z_n$. Hence, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G z_n$.

Finally, as K_1, H_2 are quasiconvex in K and $K_1 \cap H_2 = (1)$, $\Lambda_K(K_1) \cap \Lambda_K(H_2) = \emptyset$ by [Sho91]. Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K y_n \neq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K z_n$. Since H_2 is quasiconvex in G , $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G z_n$ is a conical limit point of K in ∂G . This proves (3) by the JKLO criterion. \square

4.3. Group-theoretic criterion for ray CT maps to exist.

Definition 4.15. Let $G = A *_C B$ be a group. A subgroup $H = U *_W V$ of G is said to respect the graph of groups decomposition of G if

- (1) $U \subset A, V \subset B, W \subset C$
- (2) the Bass-Serre tree for H embeds into that of G naturally.

(This is equivalent to the intersection property in Bass-Serre theory [Bas93, Proposition 2.7, 2.15].)

Now, let $G = A *_C B$ be a hyperbolic group, with A, B, C hyperbolic. Let $H = U *_W V$ be a hyperbolic subgroup, with U, V, W hyperbolic, and respecting the graph of groups decomposition of G . Thus words $u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k$ in normal form in H are also in normal form in G . Let \mathcal{T} denote the Bass-Serre tree for G with respect to the given graph of groups decomposition. We say that a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_H \subset \Gamma_H$ in normal form is \mathcal{T} -infinite if its projection to \mathcal{T} is infinite. Else it is said to be \mathcal{T} -finite. Note that the projection of a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_H \subset \Gamma_H$ in normal form is necessarily a (reparametrized) geodesic in \mathcal{T} . In this section, we provide a sufficient criterion for the pair (H, G) to admit a ray CT map.

Definition 4.16. For (X, d) a hyperbolic metric space, and $A \subset X$, the weak hull $\mathcal{CH}(A)$ is defined to be the union $\bigcup_{a, b \in A} [a, b]_X$.

We start with the following general lemma.

Lemma 4.17. Let $G, A, B, C, H, U, V, W, \mathcal{T}$ be as above. Further, assume that C is malnormal quasiconvex in A . Suppose that a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_H \subset \Gamma_H$ in normal form is \mathcal{T} -infinite. Then $[1, \xi)_H$ is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) .

Proof. Since C is malnormal quasiconvex in A , it follows from Theorem 3.5 that B is quasiconvex in G . Let $u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k \dots$ denote a normal form for $[1, \xi)_H$. Suppose that $\{u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k\}$ belongs to the left coset $h_k B$ of B in G .

Since B is quasiconvex in G , for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist a finite number $M(N)$ such that the weak hulls $\mathcal{CH}(h_k B)$ of at most $M(N)$ left cosets of B intersect $B_N(1) \subset \Gamma_G$ [GMRS98]. Further, each $\mathcal{CH}(h_k B)$ (coarsely) separates Γ_G . Hence for every N there exists k_0 such that for all $k \geq k_0$, the weak hull of $[1, \xi)_H \setminus [1, u_1 v_1 \dots u_k v_k]$ lies outside $B_N(1)$. The Lemma now follows from Lemma 2.9. \square

Lemma 4.18. Let $G, A, B, C, H, U, V, W, \mathcal{T}$ be as above. Further suppose that the pairs (U, G) and (V, G) admit ray CT maps. Suppose that a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_H \subset \Gamma_H$ in normal form is \mathcal{T} -finite. Then $[1, \xi)_H$ is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) .

Proof. By the hypothesis, $[1, \xi)_H$ can be decomposed as a concatenation $[1, u] \cup [u, \xi)_H$, where $[u, \xi)_H$ lies entirely in a coset of either U or V . Since the pairs (U, G) and (V, G) admit ray CT maps, $[u, \xi)_H$ is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) . Since $[1, u]$ is finite, the conclusion follows. \square

Assembling Lemmas 4.17 and 4.18 we have the following.

Proposition 4.19. *Let $G = A *_C B$ be a hyperbolic group, and $H = U *_W V$ be a hyperbolic subgroup respecting the graph of groups decomposition of G . Suppose that A, B, C, U, V, W are hyperbolic, and the following hold.*

- (1) C is malnormal quasiconvex in A .
- (2) The pairs (U, G) and (V, G) admit ray CT maps.

Then (H, G) admits a ray CT map.

Proof. Consider a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_H \subset \Gamma_H$ in normal form. If it is \mathcal{T} -infinite (resp. \mathcal{T} -finite), it follows from Lemma 4.17 (resp. Lemma 4.18) that it is a landing ray for the pair (H, G) . \square

As a consequence of Proposition 4.19, we have the following.

Corollary 4.20. *Let $G = A *_C B$ be a hyperbolic group, and $H = U * V$ be a hyperbolic subgroup respecting the graph of groups decomposition of G such that A, B, C, U, V, W are hyperbolic, and the following hold.*

- (1) $U \cap C = V \cap C = \{1\}$,
- (2) C is malnormal quasiconvex in A ,
- (3) The pairs (U, G) and (V, G) admit ray CT maps.

Then (H, G) admits a ray CT map.

Proof. By Proposition 4.19, it suffices to show that H respects the graph of groups decomposition of G . This follows from the hypothesis that $U \cap C = V \cap C = \{1\}$ and $W = \{1\}$ in this case. \square

5. NORMAL AND COMMENSURATED SUBGROUPS

In this section, we apply the criteria discussed so far to produce pairs of hyperbolic groups $H < G$ such that

- (1) (H, G) is not a CT pair (using the criteria in Sections 4.1 and 4.2), but
- (2) (H, G) admits a ray-CT map (using the criteria from Section 4.3).

Our starting point will be a pair $K < H$ of hyperbolic groups, where

- (1) K is normal in H (in Section 5.1),
- (2) more generally K is commensurated by H (in Section 5.2).

Examples with K normal in H have been around for long and we deal with this case first for concreteness. This will help us delineate the core ideas of our construction. Once this case is dealt with, the modifications necessary for the more general commensurated case will be easy to describe.

Given the pair (K, H) we shall embed H in a hyperbolic group G in which there is an infinite order element $t \in G$ such that

- (1) $G_1 = \langle K, t \rangle = K * \langle t \rangle$,
- (2) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair,
- (3) (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

5.1. Pairs from normal subgroups. We will need the following result of Mosher [Mos96, Theorem A].

Theorem 5.1. *Let G be a non-elementary hyperbolic group and K a non-elementary hyperbolic normal subgroup. Then the quotient group H/K is hyperbolic.*

We are now in a position to provide the first general class of examples of this paper. For F a subgroup of a group H , and ϕ an endomorphism of F , we let

- (1) $L := F *_\phi$ denote the ascending HNN extension corresponding to the endomorphism ϕ ,
- (2) $H *_F \phi$ denote the free product with amalgamation $H *_F L$. Equivalently, $H *_F \phi$ is an HNN extension with vertex group H and characteristic subgroups $F, \phi(F) < H$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let H be a non-elementary hyperbolic group with a non-elementary hyperbolic normal subgroup K . Moreover, suppose that the quotient H/K is not virtually cyclic. Then there is a weakly malnormal quasiconvex subgroup F of H and an endomorphism $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ such that the following hold.*

- (1) *The HNN extension $G = H *_F \phi$ is hyperbolic.*
- (2) *The subgroup, say G_1 , of G generated by K and the stable letter t of the HNN extension is hyperbolic.*
- (3) *(G_1, G) is not a CT pair.*
- (4) *(G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.*

Proof. Existence of F : By Theorem 5.1 H/K is hyperbolic. Since H/K is not virtually cyclic, it must be a non-elementary hyperbolic group. Thus by Theorem 3.4 there exists a finitely generated free subgroup F_1 , and a finite group A_1 such that $F' = F_1 \times A_1$ is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H/K . We note that the quotient map $H \rightarrow H/K$ splits over the free group F_1 . Let $F_2 < H$ be such that the quotient map $H \rightarrow H/K$ restricted to F_2 is an isomorphism onto F_1 . We note that F_2 is quasiconvex in H since homomorphisms between finitely generated groups are Lipschitz maps and the splitting gives a quasi-isometric section. Again, by Theorem 3.4 there is a non-elementary finitely generated subgroup $F_3 < F_2$ and a finite subgroup $A < H$ such that $A \times F_3$ is weakly malnormal in H . It is a standard fact that any finitely generated subgroup of a finitely generated free group is quasiconvex. Hence, F_3 is quasiconvex in F_2 and in H . It follows that $A \times F_3$ is a quasiconvex subgroup of H . We define $F = A \times F_3$. It thus follows that F is a weakly malnormal and quasiconvex subgroup of H .

Proof of (1, 2, 3): Now, let ϕ be any hyperbolic endomorphism of F which is the identity on A . Let G and G_1 be defined as mentioned in the statement of Theorem 5.2. We apply Corollary 4.11 to complete the proof. For this we note that the hypotheses (1), (2) and (3) of Corollary 4.11 are true in this case. Therefore, as noted in the first line of the proof of Corollary 4.11, hyperbolicity of G and G_1 follows.

Finally, hypothesis (4) of Corollary 4.11 follows from Lemma 3.8 as follows. Let L be the subgroup of G generated by F and t . We note that L is hyperbolic as ϕ is a hyperbolic endomorphism of F . By Lemma 3.8(2) L is also quasiconvex in G and by part (3) of the same lemma there is a sequence $\{x_n\}$ in F such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n$. As L is quasiconvex in G , (L, G) is a CT pair. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n$. Next by normality of K in H , $\Lambda_H(K) = \partial K$. Therefore, there is a sequence $\{y_n\}$ in K such that

$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^H y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^H x_n$. Finally, by Theorem 2.14, we know that (H, G) is a CT pair. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n$.

Proof of (4): This is a direct consequence of Corollary 4.20 (or Proposition 4.19). \square

The following corollary is immediate from the proof of Theorem 5.2. Malnormality of F follows from malnormality of Q' .

Corollary 5.3. *Suppose we have an exact sequence of infinite torsion free hyperbolic groups*

$$1 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} H \xrightarrow{\pi} Q \rightarrow 1.$$

*Let $Q' < Q$ be a non-elementary malnormal quasiconvex subgroup of Q over which the exact sequence has a splitting $Q' \rightarrow H$ with image F . Suppose $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ is a hyperbolic endomorphism and $G = H *_{F, \phi}$ is the HNN extension obtained using ϕ . Let t be the stable letter for the HNN extension. (We assume that the additional relations are of the form $tqt^{-1} = \phi(q)$ for $q \in F$.) Then the following hold:*

- (1) G is hyperbolic.
- (2) The subgroup, G_1 of G generated by $i(K)$ and t is hyperbolic.
- (3) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.
- (4) (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

Remark 5.4. In the context of Theorem 5.2, given a semi-direct product $K \rtimes Q$ where Q is a non-elementary hyperbolic group, existence of malnormal, free, quasiconvex subgroups of Q follows from Theorem [Kap99, Theorem 7.7] when Q is torsion free. In general, one may apply Theorem 3.4 to construct virtually free, weakly malnormal quasiconvex subgroup of Q .

The following corollary which is immediate from the last corollary gives two sets of explicit and concrete examples of non-CT pairs.

Corollary 5.5. *Suppose we have an exact sequence infinite hyperbolic groups*

$$1 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} H \xrightarrow{\pi} Q \rightarrow 1$$

where $Q = \mathbb{F}_n$ - a free group on n letters for some $n \geq 3$ and K is one of the following types.

- (1) $K = \pi_1(\Sigma_g)$ where Σ_g is a closed, orientable surface of genus $g \geq 2$.
- (2) $K = \mathbb{F}_k$ - a free group of rank $k \geq 3$.

Suppose $\psi : Q \rightarrow H$ is a splitting of the exact sequence with image F and suppose $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ is a hyperbolic automorphism of F .

Then

- (1) $G = H *_{\phi}$ is hyperbolic.
- (2) If G_1 is the subgroup of G generated by $i(K)$ and t then $G_1 = i(K) * \langle t \rangle$ is hyperbolic.
- (3) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.
- (4) (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

Remark 5.6. We note that the existence of an exact sequence of hyperbolic groups as in the above lemma follows from [Mos97] (for $K = \pi_1(\Sigma_g)$) and [BFH97] (for $K = \mathbb{F}_k$).

The ambient group G was constructed by the second author in [Mit98b, pgs 158,159]. It was further observed in [Mit98b, pgs 158,159] that the pair (K, G) is indeed a CT pair. The key new player is the subgroup $G_1 = i(K)* \langle t \rangle$, and Corollary 5.5 shows that (G_1, G) is not a CT pair, though (G_1, G) does admit a ray CT map.

5.2. Pairs from commensurated hyperbolic subgroups. The main theorem of this subsection is Theorem 5.8, generalizing Theorem 5.2 to the case where our starting point is a commensurated hyperbolic subgroup K of a hyperbolic group H . Examples beyond the normal subgroup case where K is a surface group were furnished by Min [Min11] and examples where K is free were furnished by [GM22]. It was established in [LMM24] that such a K necessarily has to be (up to finite index) a free product of surface and free groups. We start with some definitions to make sense of the statements that follow.

Definition 5.7. *Suppose G is any group with a finite symmetric generating set S and H is a commensurated subgroup of G . Then the Cayley-Abels graph for the pair (G, H) with respect to S , denoted by $\mathcal{G}_{G/H} = \mathcal{G}(G, H, S)$, is the simplicial graph such that*

- *the vertex set of $\mathcal{G}_{G/H}$ is G/H , i.e. the set of left cosets of H in G , and*
- *the edge set of $\mathcal{G}_{G/H}$ is $\{(gH, gsH) : g \in G, s \in S\}$.*

We summarize the properties of the Cayley-Abels graph that we will need ([Mar22, LMM24]):

- (1) $\mathcal{G}_{G/H}$ is connected, and locally finite but depends on the generating set S . However, for any two finite generating sets of G , the corresponding Cayley-Abels graphs are quasi-isometric (see for instance [Mar22, Proposition 2.17-2.19]).
- (2) The natural G -action on G/H induces an action on $\mathcal{G}_{G,H}$.
- (3) If $H \triangleleft G$ then $\mathcal{G}_{G/H}$ is the Cayley graph of G/H . In particular, $\mathcal{G}(G, 1, S)$ is the Cayley graph of G with respect to S .
- (4) If H is an infinite hyperbolic group and K is an infinite commensurated hyperbolic subgroup then any Cayley-Abels graph $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ is a hyperbolic graph [LMM24, Corollary 5.13].

We are now ready to describe the examples of pairs (G_1, G) coming from commensurated subgroups. The commensurator of K in H will be denoted as $Comm_H(K)$.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose $K < H$ are non-elementary hyperbolic groups such that $H = Comm_H(K)$, and the (Gromov) boundary of the Cayley-Abels graph $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ contains at least 3 points.*

Then there is a weakly malnormal quasiconvex subgroups F of H and an endomorphism $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ such that the following hold.

- (1) *The HNN extension $G = H *_F \phi$ is hyperbolic.*
- (2) *The subgroup, say G_1 , of G generated by K and the stable letter t of the HNN extension is hyperbolic.*
- (3) *(G_1, G) is not a CT pair.*
- (4) *(G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.*

The proof follows that of Theorem 5.2 in broad outline. However, the first step, i.e. the construction of the subgroup F is somewhat more involved, as we need a construction from an action of H on the Cayley-Abels graph $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$.

As the first step of the proof we shall need to prove the following result ensuring the existence of the required subgroup F .

Proposition 5.9. *Suppose $K < H$ are non-elementary hyperbolic groups such that $H = \text{Comm}_H(K)$, and the (Gromov) boundary of the Cayley-Abels graph $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ contains at least 3 points. Then we can find a free subgroup $F_1 < H$ of rank $n \geq 2$ and a finite subgroup $A < H$ such that*

- (1) $F := \text{Comm}_H(F_1) = F_1 \times A$ is weakly malnormal quasiconvex in H and
- (2) $F_1 \cap K = \{1\}$. In particular $F \cap K = A \cap K$ is finite.

The proof of Proposition 5.9 will need the following two facts from the literature.

Theorem 5.10. ([Woe93, Theorem 3, Corollary 4]) *Suppose G is a group acting by isometries on a proper hyperbolic metric space X . Then exactly one of the following holds.*

- (1) G contains two hyperbolic elements, say g_1 and g_2 , without common fixed points in ∂X such that $\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ is a free group consisting only hyperbolic elements and the action of $\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ on X is properly discontinuous.
- (2) G fixes a nonempty compact subset of X .
- (3) G fixes a unique point in ∂X .
- (4) G fixes a unique pair of points in ∂X .

Proposition 5.11. ([LMM24, Proposition 1.3 (3)]) *Suppose H, K and $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ are as in Proposition 5.9. If $|\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}| > 2$ then the action of H on $\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ does not fix a point of $\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.9. Consider the H -action on $X = \mathcal{G}_{H/K}$. As the action on the vertex set of $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ is transitive it follows that $\Lambda_X(H) = \partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$. Thus $\Lambda_X(H)$ has more than 2 points by the hypothesis $|\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}| \geq 3$. By Proposition 5.11, H does not fix a point of $\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$. Hence, by Theorem 5.10, there is a subgroup $F_0 \simeq \mathbb{F}_2$ of H all whose non-trivial elements act by hyperbolic isometries on $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ and the action of F_0 on $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ is properly discontinuous. It follows that the action of F_0 on $\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ is fixed point free. In particular, $F_0 \cap K = \{1\}$.

Now, suppose $F_0 = \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$. We note that $\{g_1^{\pm\infty}\} \cap \{g_2^{\pm\infty}\} = \emptyset$ in ∂H since $\{g_1^{\pm\infty}\} \cap \{g_2^{\pm\infty}\} = \emptyset$ in $\partial\mathcal{G}_{H/K}$ by Theorem 5.10. Hence there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the subgroup $F'_0 = \langle g_1^m, g_2^m \rangle < H$ of F_0 is a quasiconvex in H by the ping-pong Lemma. The subgroup F'_0 is isomorphic to \mathbb{F}_2 . Finally, by Theorem 3.4, there exists $F_1 < F'_0$ a free subgroup of rank $n \geq 2$ such that $\text{Comm}_H(F_1) = F_1 \times A$ is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in H where $A < H$ is a finite subgroup of H . We note that $F_1 \cap K = \{1\}$ as $F_1 < F_0$ and $F_0 \cap K = \{1\}$. \square

Armed with Proposition 5.9, the proof of Theorem 5.8 is a reprise of that of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 5.8:

Proof of (1), (2), (3): Let $F = F_1 \times A$ where F_1 and A are as in Proposition 5.9. Let $\phi_1 : F_1 \rightarrow F_1$ be any hyperbolic endomorphism and let $\phi = \phi_1 \times \text{Id}_A$ be the corresponding product endomorphism on $F = F_1 \times A$. Clearly then ϕ is a hyperbolic endomorphism of F . We note that $K \cap F = A \cap K$ is finite. We recall that G is the HNN extension of H with respect to ϕ and $G_1 = \langle K, t \rangle$ where t is the stable letter for the HNN extension. Statements (1), (2), (3) of the theorem now follows from Corollary 4.11 and Lemma 3.8 as in the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of (4): This is a direct consequence of Corollary 4.20 (and Proposition 4.19). \square

5.3. Points of (dis)continuity. In (Theorem 5.2 and) Theorem 5.8 above, we constructed examples of pairs of hyperbolic groups (G_1, G) for which the ray CT maps exist, but a CT map does not exist. In this subsection (see Proposition 5.14 below), we describe precisely the set on which the ray CT map is discontinuous. For ease of exposition, we shall assume that H is torsion free whence it will follow that F is malnormal in H . However, we shall assume that ϕ is an automorphism of F . See Remark 5.15 for the relevance of this.

5.3.1. Setup and preliminary lemmas. Let us summarize the setup for easy reference. We collect together the facts we have already established.

- (1) H is a hyperbolic groups and F, K are hyperbolic subgroups.
- (2) K is commensurated in H ; (K, H) is a CT pair.
- (3) F is malnormal and quasiconvex in H , $F \cap K = \{1\}$.
- (4) $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ is a hyperbolic automorphism.
- (5) $L = \langle F, t \rangle \simeq F \rtimes \langle t \rangle$ is quasiconvex in G . Here, t is the stable letter.
- (6) $G = H *_F L$.
- (7) $G_1 = \langle K, t \rangle$ is isomorphic to $K * \langle t \rangle$.
- (8) The amalgamated free decomposition of G_1 as above respects the amalgamated free product decomposition of G as $H *_F L$, i.e. any element in normal form in G_1 is also in normal form in G .

Let \mathcal{T} be the Bass-Serre tree for the amalgamated free decomposition of G .

- (9) Let $\partial i_r : \partial G_1 \rightarrow \partial G$ denote the ray CT map.

Finally we recall that a geodesic ray $[1, \xi)_{G_1} \subseteq \Gamma_{G_1}$ in normal form is \mathcal{T} -infinite if its projection to \mathcal{T} is infinite. Else it is said to be \mathcal{T} -finite.

We need a couple of elementary facts. The following straightforward lemma is about the Gromov compactification $\bar{X} = X \cup \partial X$ of a proper hyperbolic space X . All that we need is that \bar{X} is in fact metrizable [BH99, Chapter III.H].

Lemma 5.12. *Suppose X is a proper hyperbolic space and $\xi \in \partial X$. Suppose that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have a sequence $\{x_k(n)\}$ in X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X x_k(n) = \xi_k \in \partial X$. Finally suppose that $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then*

- (1) *There is a subsequence of natural numbers $\{n_k\}$ such that $x_k(n_k) \rightarrow \xi$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*
- (2) *If $\{m_k\}, \{r_k\}$ are any subsequences of natural numbers such that $x_{m_k}(r_k) \rightarrow \xi'$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\xi' \in \partial X$ then $\xi' = \xi$.*

Lemma 5.13. *Suppose $X \subset Y$ are proper hyperbolic spaces, $\xi \in \partial X$ and $\eta \in \partial Y$ such that for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ in X with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X x_n = \xi$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^Y x_n = \eta$. Then the following hold:*

Suppose for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x_k(n)\}$ is a sequence in X such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X x_k(n) = \xi_k \in \partial X$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^Y x_k(n) = \eta_k \in \partial Y$. Moreover, suppose that $\xi_k \rightarrow \xi$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then $\eta_k \rightarrow \eta$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Suppose the conclusion of the proposition is false. Then, up to passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\eta_k \rightarrow \eta'$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\eta' \neq \eta \in \partial Y$.

Then by the Lemma 5.12(1) there is a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ of natural numbers such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^Y x_k(n_k) = \eta'$. As X is proper, if necessary by passing to subsequence, we may assume that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^X x_k(n_k) = \xi'$ for some $\xi' \in \partial X$. By Lemma 5.12(2) then $\xi' = \xi$. Then, by the hypothesis of the proposition, $\eta' = \eta$. \square

5.3.2. *Determining the points of discontinuity.*

Proposition 5.14. *Let $\Omega = \{h.t^{\pm\infty} : h \in G_1\} \subseteq \partial G_1$. Let Ω^c be the complement of Ω in ∂G_1 . Then*

- (1) *for each $\xi \in \Omega$ the ray CT map $\partial i_r : \partial G_1 \rightarrow \partial G$ is discontinuous at ξ , and*
- (2) *for any $\xi \in \Omega^c$ the ray CT map $\partial i_r : \partial G_1 \rightarrow \partial G$ is continuous at ξ .*

We set up some further notation and make some preliminary observations before proving the proposition.

(A) We shall denote the points $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^{\pm n} \in \partial G$ by $t^{\pm\infty}$ respectively. Abusing notation, we shall denote $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} t^{\pm n} \in \partial G_1$ also by $t^{\pm\infty}$.

(B) The inclusion of $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ into $G = H *_F L$ induces an inclusion of Bass-Serre trees. By geodesics in G or G_1 we shall mean the geodesics in the corresponding tree of spaces. Let \mathcal{T} denote the Bass-Serre tree of G_1 with respect to the decomposition $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$.

(C) We shall assume that a generating set of form $S \cup \{t\}$ is chosen for G_1 where S is a generating set for K , so that K and $\langle t \rangle$ are isometrically embedded in G_1 . Moreover, the tree of spaces structure of $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ then shows that any geodesic ray β in G_1 satisfies exactly one of the following:

- β eventually lies in a coset of K ,
- β eventually lies in a coset of $\langle t \rangle$, or
- the projection of β onto the Bass-Serre tree of $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ is an infinite unparametrized geodesic ray.

(D) We recall that in the proof of Theorem 5.8, a sequence $\{y_n\} \subseteq K$ was obtained such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^K y_n \in \partial K$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n \in \partial G$. As the pair (K, G) is a CT pair, without loss of generality we may assume that there is a geodesic ray $\alpha : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$ such that $\alpha(n) = y_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\partial i_r(\alpha(\infty)) = t^\infty \in \partial G$

(E) As ϕ is an automorphism, it is easy to find another geodesic ray $\alpha' : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$ such that $\partial i_r(\alpha'(\infty)) = t^{-\infty} \in \partial G$, by switching the role of ϕ with that of ϕ^{-1} in the proof of Theorem 5.8.

Proof of Proposition 5.14: (1) We note that α is a geodesic ray in G_1 as well, as K is isometrically embedded in G_1 . Let α_n be the geodesic ray in G_1 , obtained by multiplying α on the left by t^{-n} , i.e. $\alpha_n(k) = t^{-n}\alpha(k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then clearly, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G \alpha_n(k) = t^{-n} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G \alpha(k) = t^{-n} \partial i_r(\alpha(\infty)) = t^{-n} t^\infty = t^\infty$. Thus $\partial i_r(\alpha_k(\infty)) = t^\infty \in \partial G$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. However, clearly, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} \alpha_k(\infty) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} t^{-k} \cdot \alpha(\infty) = t^{-\infty} \in \partial G_1$ as $\alpha(\infty) \neq t^{\pm\infty} \in \partial G_1$. As $\partial i_r(\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} t^{\pm k}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^{\pm n}$, it follows that ∂i_r is discontinuous at $t^{-\infty} \in \partial G_1$.

Similarly, we can show that ∂i_r is discontinuous at $t^\infty \in \partial G_1$ using the remark (E) and replacing α by α' . Finally, as Ω is the union of the G_1 -orbits of $t^{\pm\infty} \in \partial G_1$ and the ray CT map is clearly G_1 -equivariant, it follows that the ray CT map is discontinuous at all points of Ω . This proves (1).

(2) Let $\xi \in \Omega^c$. We will show that for any sequence $\{x_n\}$ in G_1 such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} x_n = \xi$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G x_n = \partial i_r(\xi)$. However, this will follow if instead we show that such a sequence always has a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G x_{n_k} = \partial i_r(\xi)$. Finally, the continuity of ∂i_r at ξ will then follow from Lemma 5.13.

Now, let γ be a geodesic ray in G_1 starting at 1 such that $\gamma(\infty) = \xi$. We may assume that γ is in normal form. Let $\{x_n\} \subseteq G_1$ be any sequence in G_1 such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} x_n = \xi$. There are the following two cases to consider depending the types of ξ (by remark (C) above).

Case 1: Suppose ξ is a limit point in ∂G_1 of a coset of K , so that γ is \mathcal{T} -finite. It follows from tree of spaces structure of G_1 that there exists $g \in G_1$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma(i) \in gK$ for all $i \geq m$. However, as the ray CT map is G_1 -equivariant, it is enough to prove the statement in case $\gamma \subset K$.

Let $z_n \in K$ be the point at which the geodesic $[1, x_n]_{G_1}$ in G_1 exits K . We note that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} z_n = \xi$ as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^{G_1} x_n = \xi$ and clearly $d_{G_1}(1, [z_n, x_n]_{G_1}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since (K, G) is a CT pair we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G z_n = \partial i_r(\xi)$. Now, we note that $\{z_n L : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an infinite subset of G/L as $K \cap F = \{1\}$. Thus we may find a subsequence $\{z_{n_k}\}$ of $\{z_n\}$ such that $d_G(1, z_{n_k} L) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Finally as L is quasiconvex in G , it follows from the tree of spaces structure of G that for any geodesic $[z_n, x_n]_G \subset G$ joining z_n, x_n , $d_G(1, [z_n, x_n]_G) \geq d_G(1, z_n L)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $d_G(1, [z_{n_k}, x_{n_k}]_G) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G x_{n_k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G z_{n_k} = \partial i_r(\xi)$, as required.

Case 2: Suppose ξ is not a limit point of any coset of K in ∂G_1 , i.e. in this case the projection of γ onto the Bass-Serre tree \mathcal{T} is an infinite unparametrized geodesic ray $\bar{\gamma}$. We note that on $\bar{\gamma}$ the vertices are of two types given by the cosets of (i) K and (ii) $\langle t \rangle$ in G_1 . They appear alternately. Let $\{w_n\}$ be the sequence in G_1 such that $\{w_n \langle t \rangle\}$ is the sequence of vertices of type (ii) appearing on $\bar{\gamma}$. We note that this is equivalent to saying that $\{w_n L\}$ is the sequence of vertices on $\bar{\gamma}$ when $\bar{\gamma}$ is seen as a ray in the Bass-Serre tree for $G = H *_F L$. Let

$$A_n = \{x \in G : \exists \text{ a geodesic } [1, x]_G \subset G \text{ such that } [1, x]_G \cap w_n L \neq \emptyset\}$$

We note the following properties of A_n :

- (1) Since $w_n L$ are uniformly quasiconvex in G and A_n is the union of $w_n L$ with a set of geodesic segments in G starting from $w_n L$, A_n 's are uniformly quasiconvex in G .
- (2) Also we note that $A_{n+1} \subset A_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (3) There is a constant R depending only on the hyperbolicity constant of G and the quasiconvexity constant of $w_n L$'s such that $|d_G(1, w_n L) - d_G(1, A_n)| \leq R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $d_G(1, A_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Then there is a point $\eta \in \partial G$ such that for any choice of points $p_n \in A_n$ we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G p_n = \eta$. One way to see this is to note that $\bar{G} = G \cup \partial G$ admits a visual metric (see [BH99, Chapter III.H]) so that \bar{G} is a compact metric space and $\bar{A}_n = A_n \cup \Lambda_G(A_n)$ is a descending sequence of compact subsets whose diameters are going to zero. Then $\eta = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{A}_n$. Finally, we note that there is a subsequence $\{x_{n_k}\}$ of $\{x_n\}$ such that $x_{n_k} \in A_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we have $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty}^G x_{n_k} = \eta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G \gamma(n) = \partial i_r(\xi)$. This completes the proof of Case (2) and along with it the second part of the proposition. \square

Remark 5.15. In Proposition 5.14 we have dealt with the case where ϕ is an automorphism. If, instead ϕ is a non-surjective endomorphism, then the proof of Proposition 5.14 shows that $G_1.t^{-\infty}$ is a set of points of discontinuity of ∂i_r . However, the behavior at $G_1.t^\infty$ is not clear.

6. ENDOMORPHISMS OF FREE GROUPS

We refer the reader to Section 2.3 and Remark 2.13 for our conventions regarding graphs of groups. Our starting point in this section is a graph of groups H with underlying graph \mathcal{G} with one vertex v and n unoriented edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n where $n \geq 2$. For the purposes of this section, we fix the following.

- (1) The vertex group $K = G_v$ is a finitely generated free group \mathbb{F}_m with $m \geq 2$.
- (2) The edge groups G_{e_j} are all isomorphic to K for $1 \leq j \leq n$.
- (3) For any edge e_j , one of the two edge-to-vertex homomorphisms $G_{e_j} \rightarrow G_v$ is the identity map. We denote these edge-to-vertex homomorphisms by $i_j^+ : G_{e_j} \rightarrow G_v$.
- (4) There exist endomorphisms $\phi_j : K \rightarrow K$, so that the other edge-to-vertex homomorphisms $i_j^- : G_{e_j} \rightarrow G_v$ are given by ϕ_j .
- (5) Each ϕ_j is a hyperbolic endomorphism.
- (6) The resulting group H associated to \mathcal{G} is hyperbolic.

We recall from Remark 2.13 that if, in general, $K = \langle S | R \rangle$ is a presentation of K then

$$\langle S \cup \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\} | R \cup \{t_j x t_j^{-1} \phi_j(x)^{-1} : x \in S, 1 \leq j \leq n\} \rangle$$

gives a presentation of H . We note that $F = \langle t_i : 1 \leq i \leq n \rangle$ is a free quasiconvex subgroup of H on n generators. Moreover, it is malnormal in H by Lemma 3.3.) Below we refer to such an H as a **multiple ascending HNN extension** of K and we refer to the t_i 's as the **stable letters**.

We refer the reader to [BFH97, Rey11, Mut20b, Mut20a, Mut21] for the relevant background on hyperbolic endomorphisms of the free group, in particular notions of fully irreducible endomorphisms, train-track representatives and the following results:

- (1) [Mut20a, Corollary 7.3] shows that if ϕ_j is fully irreducible then the ascending HNN extension $K *_{\phi_j}$ is hyperbolic if and only if it contains no Baumslag-Solitar subgroup.
- (2) [Rey11, Sections 3.2, 3.3] along with the train-track theory developed in [BFH97] guarantee the existence of hyperbolic H associated to \mathcal{G} as above.

Thus, if a collection of fully irreducible non-surjective endomorphisms $\{\phi_j\}$ have

- train-track representatives acting on the same underlying graph, and
- distinct fixed points on the boundary of outer space [Rey11, Theorem 1.3]

then, after raising each ϕ_j to a large enough positive power if necessary, the resulting multiple ascending HNN extension H may be taken to be hyperbolic. The argument when each ϕ_j is an automorphism is given in [BFH97]. The original argument when K is a surface group instead of a free group is due to Mosher [Mos97], and the key lemma that is needed to prove this is the 3-out-of-4 stretch lemma in [Mos97]. The same argument goes through so long as the leaves of the laminations corresponding to different ϕ_j 's have bounded overlap (see [Min11, GM22] for instance). But this is true here as the ϕ_j 's are assumed to be fully irreducible, forcing the laminations to be minimal. Further, since the ϕ_j 's have distinct fixed points on the boundary of outer space [Rey11, Theorem 1.3], the leaves of the associated minimal laminations have bounded overlap.

Alternately, one may use small cancellation conditions as in [Rip82] to construct a hyperbolic multiple ascending HNN extension.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathbb{F}_n = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ be the free group on n generators, $n \geq 2$. An endomorphism $\phi : \mathbb{F}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_n$ is said to be positive if for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $\phi(x_i)$ is a positive word w_i , i.e. w_i contains only positive powers of the x_j 's.

6.1. Ascending HNN extensions. Our strategy is similar to the proofs of Theorems 5.2 and 5.8. We start with a free group K , and construct a multiple ascending HNN extension H . Then H contains a quasiconvex malnormal subgroup Q generated by the stable letters. Let L be an ascending HNN extension with stable letter s given by $L = Q*_\psi$, where ψ is a positive hyperbolic endomorphism of Q . We set $G = H *_Q L$, and $G_1 = \langle K, s \rangle = K * \langle s \rangle$. We show below that the pair (G_1, G) is not a CT pair, but admits a ray CT map. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. Let ϕ be a positive hyperbolic endomorphism of $Q = \mathbb{F}_n = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$. Let $L = Q*_\phi$ be the resulting hyperbolic ascending HNN extension. Then (Q, L) is a CT pair. There is a positive infinite geodesic ray γ in Q such that $\partial i_{Q,L}(\gamma(\infty)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L \gamma(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n$.

Proof. First, note that (Q, L) is a CT pair by Theorem 2.14. Let x be one of the basis elements of Q . As ϕ is hyperbolic, $\{\phi^n(x)\}$ is an unbounded sequence in Q . Suppose t is the stable letter for the HNN extension. It follows that $d_L(1, t^n x t^{-n}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, $x \notin \text{Comm}_H(\langle t \rangle)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.7 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L \phi^n(x)$. Since the elements $\phi^n(x)$ are positive words in Q , we can extract a subsequence of $\{\phi^n(x)\}$ which converges to a positive ray. \square

Theorem 6.3. Let H be a hyperbolic multiple ascending HNN extension of a free group K with n stable letters t_1, \dots, t_n associated to positive hyperbolic endomorphisms ψ_1, \dots, ψ_n respectively. Let $Q = \langle t_1, \dots, t_n \rangle$. Let $\phi : Q \rightarrow Q$ be a positive, hyperbolic endomorphism of Q . Let G be the HNN extension given by

$$G = H *_Q, \phi = \langle H, t : t t_i t^{-1} = \phi(t_i), i = 1 \dots, n \rangle.$$

Then

- (1) G and $G_1 = \langle K, t \rangle = K * \langle t \rangle$ are hyperbolic.
- (2) There is a quasigeodesic sequence $\{y_n\}$ in K such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n$.
- (3) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.
- (4) (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

We start with the following Lemma.

Lemma 6.4. Suppose $\mathcal{Q} = \{\gamma(\infty) : \gamma \text{ is a positive infinite geodesic ray in } Q\}$. Then $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \partial i_{K,H}(\partial K)$.

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 3.7. We just need to note that if γ is a positive infinite ray in Q then for any non-trivial element $x \in K$, $\gamma(n)x\gamma(n)^{-1} \in K$ satisfies $d_K(1, \gamma(n)x\gamma(n)^{-1}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.3: By Lemma 3.3 Q is a malnormal quasiconvex subgroup of H and $Q \cap K = (1)$. Then (1) follows from Lemma 3.8.

The third assertion follows from the second using the strong JKLO criterion Corollary 4.5. The second is checked as follows. Let L be the subgroup of G generated by t and Q . We note that L is the ascending HNN extension of Q with respect to the endomorphism ϕ and it is hyperbolic. Since ϕ is a positive endomorphism of Q , Lemma 6.2 gives

a positive infinite geodesic ray γ in Q (starting from 1) converging to $\gamma(\infty) = \xi \in \partial Q$ such that $\partial i_{Q,L}(\xi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^L t^n$.

Since Q is quasiconvex in H , and L is quasiconvex in G by Theorem 3.5, so $\partial i_{H,G}(\xi) = t^\infty \in \partial G$. By Lemma 3.8, L is quasiconvex in G . Hence, (Q, G) is a CT pair; in particular, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G \gamma(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n$. On the other hand, by Lemma 6.4 above, we can find a quasigeodesic sequence $\{y_n\} \subseteq K$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^H y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^H \gamma(n)$. Since (H, G) is a CT pair (Theorem 2.14) we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G \gamma(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^G t^n$ as desired. This completes the proof of (2) and hence (3).

Assertion (4) is again a direct consequence of Corollary 4.20 as in Theorems 5.2 and 5.8. \square

Remark 6.5. In the proof of Theorem 6.3, the only place where the hypothesis that the stable letters t_i correspond to positive hyperbolic endomorphisms ψ_i is used is in the proof of Lemma 6.4 to conclude that $d_K(1, \gamma(n)x\gamma(n)^{-1}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This can be relaxed immediately as follows. We can assume that all the ψ_i 's have train-track representatives with the same underlying graph. With this assumption, it follows that if the element x in Lemma 6.4 is represented by an immersed loop σ , then so is $\Psi(\sigma)$ for any Ψ corresponding to a positive word. This allows the conclusion of Lemma 6.4, and hence that of Theorem 6.3 to go through.

6.2. On the Baker-Riley Examples. We quickly recall Baker-Riley's small cancellation example from [BR13]. Suppose $F(c_1, c_2)$ and $F(d_1, d_2)$ are two free groups of rank 2 with free bases $\{c_1, c_2\}$ and $\{d_1, d_2\}$ respectively. Suppose

$$\begin{aligned} C &= c_1 c_2 c_1 c_2^2 c_1 c_2^3 \cdots c_1 c_2^r \\ C_i &= c_1 c_2^{ri+1} c_1 c_2^{ri+2} c_1 c_2^{ri+3} \cdots c_1 c_2^{ri+r} \\ D_j &= d_1 d_2^{rj+1} d_1 d_2^{rj+2} d_1 d_2^{rj+3} \cdots d_1 d_2^{rj+r} \\ D_{ij} &= d_1 d_2^{r(il+j)+1} d_1 d_2^{r(il+j)+2} d_1 d_2^{r(il+j)+3} \cdots d_1 d_2^{r(il+j)+r} \end{aligned}$$

where $r \geq 17$, $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} G_{cd} &:= \langle c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 | c_i d_j c_i^{-1} = D_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq 2 \rangle, \\ G_{bcd} &:= \langle G_{cd}, b | b c_i b^{-1} = C_i, 1 \leq i \leq 2 \rangle \text{ and} \\ G &:= \langle G_{bcd}, a | a b a^{-1} = b C^{-1}, a d_j a^{-1} = b D_j b^{-1}, 1 \leq j \leq 2. \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.6. ([BR13, Theorem 1]) *The groups defined above have the following properties:*

- (1) $F(d_1, d_2)$ is a subgroup of G_{cd} .
- (2) $F(c_1, c_2)$ is also a subgroup of G_{cd} and $F(c_1, c_2) \cap F(d_1, d_2) = \{1\}$.
- (3) G_{bcd} is an HNN extension of G_{cd} with stable letter b and defining monomorphism $F(c_1, c_2) \rightarrow G_{bcd}$ sending $c_i \mapsto C_i$ for $i = 1, 2$.
- (4) $H = \langle b, d_1, d_2 \rangle \subseteq G_{bcd}$ is a free subgroup of rank 3.
- (5) G is an HNN extension of G_{bcd} with stable letter a .

Then, (H, G) is not a CT pair.

We shall first show the following instead. In [BR13, Remark 8], the authors assert that 'more elaborate versions' of their argument for Theorem 6.6 proves Theorem 6.7. Since this follows in a straightforward way from Theorem 6.3, and since no published proof exists, we include proof below. The pair (H, G_{bcd}) is clearly contained in the pair

(H, G) . Thus, Theorem 6.7 inverts the approach of [BR13] and directly establishes the non-existence of CT maps in the simpler constituents examples building up the example in Theorem 6.6 above.

Theorem 6.7. *With notation as in Theorem 6.6,*

- (1) (H, G_{bcd}) is not a CT pair,
- (2) The pair (H, G_{bcd}) admits a ray-CT map.

Proof. Note that G_{cd} is a multiple ascending HNN extension of the free group $\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle \simeq \mathbb{F}_2$ with stable letters c_1, c_2 . Since the presentation is $C''(1/6)$, G_{cd} is hyperbolic. Thus, in the setup of Theorem 6.3,

- (1) $\langle d_1, d_2 \rangle \simeq \mathbb{F}_2$ takes the place of K .
- (2) G_{cd} takes the place of H .
- (3) $\langle c_1, c_2 \rangle \simeq \mathbb{F}_2$ takes the place of Q .
- (4) Since G_{bcd} is an HNN extension of G_{cd} using a positive endomorphism on the free group $\langle c_1, c_2 \rangle$, G_{bcd} takes the place of G .
- (5) $H = \langle d_1, d_2, b \rangle$ takes the place of G_1 .

The theorem is now an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.3. □

We now leverage the techniques of Theorem 6.7 to prove Theorem 6.6.

Proof of Theorem 6.6: To recover Theorem 6.6 we consider the following words following notation as in the theorem. Let

- (1) $u_{n,i} = b^n c_i b^{-n}$, $i = 1, 2$. Note that $u_{n,i} \in F(c_1, c_2)$ for all n with length in $F(c_1, c_2)$ growing exponentially in n ,
- (2) $w_{n,i,j} = u_{n,i} d_j u_{n,i}^{-1}$, $i = j, 2$. Note that $w_{n,i,j} \in F(d_1, d_2)$ for all n with length in $F(d_1, d_2)$ growing doubly exponentially in n ,
- (3) Set

$$u_n = u_{n,1} = b^n c_1 b^{-n},$$

and

$$w_n = w_{n,1,1} = b^n c_1 b^{-n} d_1 b^n c_1^{-1} b^{-n}$$

for convenience of exposition.

We then note that u_n, w_n are Dehn-reduced words, and hence give word geodesics $[1, u_n], [1, w_n]$ in Γ_G . Further, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, u_n, w_n , regarded as elements of G converge to $b^\infty \in \partial G$, since they have initial geodesic segments of the form $[1, b^n]$. Also, the Gromov inner product $\langle b^\infty, w_n \rangle_1 \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (since $\langle b^\infty, w_n \rangle_1 \geq n - \delta$, where δ is the hyperbolicity constant of Γ_G). Next, note that, as an element of H , $w_n \rightarrow \xi \in \partial F(d_1, d_2) \subset \partial H$. In particular, $\xi \neq b^\infty$. Observe that $b^\infty \in \partial G$ is necessarily a conical limit point of H . We can now apply the JKLO criterion Proposition 4.7 to conclude that (H, G) does not admit a Cannon-Thurston map. □

7. OTHER EXAMPLES AND CONSTRUCTIONS

7.1. On the Matsuda-Oguni construction. In [MO14], using the construction of Baker-Riley, Matsuda and Oguni showed that any non-elementary hyperbolic group G_1 can be embedded in a hyperbolic group G such that (G_1, G) is not a CT pair. We observe in this subsection, that their construction goes through verbatim for many of the examples in this paper.

Let $K_0 < G_0$ be hyperbolic groups such that

- (1) (K_0, G_0) is not a CT pair, and
- (2) K_0 is a finitely generated free group rank $n \geq 2$.

Let U be any non-elementary hyperbolic group. By Theorem 3.4, there is a free subgroup $F < U$ of rank n and a finite subgroup $A < U$ such that $\langle F, A \rangle = F \times A$ is weakly malnormal and quasiconvex in U . Let $W = U *_{\langle F \times A \simeq K_0 \times A \rangle} G_0 \times A$. Then, as a consequence of Theorem 3.5, we have the following.

Corollary 7.1. (Matsuda-Oguni) *Given U , let W be constructed as above. Then W is a hyperbolic group and (U, W) is not a CT pair.*

For the pair $K_0 < G_0$, we can choose any of the following:

- (1) Based on Theorem 5.2: In Theorem 5.2, let K be free of rank $(n - 1)$, so that the group G_1 occurring there is given as $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$, and is therefore a free group of rank n . Set $K_0 = G_1$. Set G_0 to be equal to the group G occurring in Theorem 5.2 when K is free of rank $(n - 1)$.
- (2) Based on Theorem 5.8: In Theorem 5.8 let the commensurated subgroup K of H be free of rank $(n - 1)$. The rest of the construction is as in the previous case.
- (3) Based on Theorem 6.3: Start with K free as in Theorem 6.3. Assume that K is free of rank $(n - 1)$. The rest of the construction is as in the previous two cases.

7.2. Pairs from highly distorted examples.

7.2.1. *Background on Distortion.* Let $H < G$ be finitely generated groups with finite generating sets S and T respectively. We say that H is *undistorted* in G if H is quasi-isometrically embedded in G . Else it is said to be a distorted subgroup of G [Gro93]. Distortion is measured by the *distortion function* $\text{Dist}_H^G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined as follows.

$$\text{Dist}_H^G(n) := \max\{d_H(1, g) \mid g \in H \text{ with } d_G(1, g) \leq n\}.$$

The function $\text{Dist}_H^G(n)$ a priori depends on the choice of the finite generating sets. However, upon change of the generating sets S and T the distortion functions obtained are equivalent in the following sense:

Two functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ are said to be equivalent, and we write $f \simeq g$, if there exists $C \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f(n) \leq Cg(Cn + C) + Cn + C$ and $g(n) \leq Cf(Cn + C) + Cn + C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We note that $H < G$ is undistorted if and only if the corresponding distortion functions are linear. Some of the most sophisticated collections of distorted hyperbolic subgroups of hyperbolic groups appear in [BDR13] and recent work of Pallavi Dani and Tim Riley [DR24]). The following result of theirs is philosophically related to Theorem 3.5.

Theorem 7.2. ([DR24, Theorem 16.2]) *Suppose $G = A *_C B$ is an amalgamation of finitely generated groups. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $n \leq f(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Further, suppose C is qi embedded in A and $\text{Dist}_C^B \simeq f$. Then $\text{Dist}_A^G \simeq f$.*

Theorem 7.2 and Corollary 7.1 give the following immediate application.

Proposition 7.3. *Suppose $F < H$ are non-elementary hyperbolic groups, and (F, H) is not a CT pair with $\text{Dist}_F^H \simeq f$ for some function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, suppose F is a free group of finite rank. Then given any non-elementary hyperbolic group G_1 there is a hyperbolic group $G_1 < G$ such that $\text{Dist}_{G_1}^G \simeq f$ and (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.*

In [Mit98b, pp. 159] examples of free subgroups of hyperbolic groups were constructed exhibiting an (at least) iterated exponential distortion function. See also [BBD07] where it was shown that the lower bound established in [Mit98b, pp. 159] is, in fact, the distortion function for many examples. We recall the construction quickly.

Example 7.4. [Mit98b, pp. 159] *Let H be a hyperbolic group of the form $P \rtimes F$ where P and F are free group of rank ≥ 3 . Such examples may be found in [BFH97]. Note that P is normal and F is malnormal in H (see Lemma 3.3).*

Consider n distinct copies of H , say H_1, H_2, \dots, H_n . Let $F_{i,1}$ and $F_{i,2}$ denote respectively the normal subgroup and malnormal subgroup in H_i . Suppose

$$A_n = H_1 *_{K_1} H_2 *_{K_2} H_3 * \dots *_{K_{n-1}} H_n$$

where K_i is identified with $F_{i,2}$ in H_i and with $F_{(i+1),1}$ in H_{i+1} .

By repeated application of the Bestvina-Feighn combination theorem [BF92], we conclude that $A_j < A_n$ are hyperbolic for all $j \leq n$. Then $F_{1,1}$ has distortion in A_n (at least) an iterated exponential of height n . (As remarked above, it was shown in [BBD07] that the lower bound established in [Mit98b, pp. 159] is, in fact, the distortion function for many examples.)

Based on these examples, we shall construct below in Section 7.2.2, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, examples of pairs of hyperbolic group $F < H$ such that (F, H) is not a CT pair and the distortion function Dist_F^H is an iterated exponential of height n . These examples are only a placeholder illustrating the fact that armed with the *techniques* of this paper (as opposed to its results), it is relatively easy to come up with interesting examples.

Therefore, as a consequence of Proposition 7.3, we have the following.

Theorem 7.5. *Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a non-elementary hyperbolic group G_1 , we can embed G_1 in another hyperbolic group G such that (G_1, G) is not a CT pair and distortion function $\text{Dist}_{G_1}^G$ is exponential of height n .*

7.2.2. Non-CT pairs with high distortion. First, we shall construct groups satisfying conditions (1) and (2) of Corollary 4.11, and show a limit condition (see Claim below) which ensures condition (4) of Corollary 4.11 under an appropriate HNN extension as required in Corollary 4.11.

We now start with the collection of groups A_n described in Example 7.4. We note that H_j is quasiconvex in A_j by Theorem 3.5 (1), and malnormal in A_j by Lemmas 3.3 and 3.2. Note that (K_j, H_j) is a CT pair by Theorem 2.14. So by Theorem 3.5 (2), (H_1, A_1) , $(A_1, A_2), \dots, (A_{j-1}, A_j)$ are CT pairs. Hence (H_1, A_j) is a CT pair since a composition of CT pairs is a CT pair. Since $(F_{1,1}, H_1)$ is a CT pair [Mit98a], it follows that $(F_{1,1}, A_j)$ is a CT pair.

Again H_n and $F_{n,2}$ are malnormal quasiconvex in A_n and H_n respectively. So, $F_{n,2}$ is also malnormal and quasiconvex in A_n . Finally, we need the following.

Claim 7.6. $\partial F_{n,2} \subseteq \partial i_{F_{1,1}, A_n}(\partial F_{1,1}) \subseteq \partial A_n$.

Proof. Suppose $\{x_l\} \subseteq F_{n,2}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} x_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{F_{n,2}} x_l \in \partial F_{n,2}$. Since $\partial i_{F_{n,1}, H_n} : \partial F_{n,1} \rightarrow \partial H_n$ is surjective (Theorem 2.11) and $F_{n,2}$ is quasiconvex in H_n , there exists a sequence $\{y_l\} \subseteq F_{n,1} = F_{(n-1),2}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{H_n} y_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{H_n} x_l \in \partial H_n$. Again, since H_n is quasiconvex in A_n , we have $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} y_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} x_l \in \partial A_n$.

Note that $F_{(n-1),2}$ and H_{n-1} are quasiconvex in A_{n-1} . Then by the same argument as above, we have a sequence $\{y'_l\} \subseteq F_{(n-2),2}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_{n-1}} y'_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_{n-1}} y_l \in \partial A_{n-1}$. Again, since (A_{n-1}, A_n) is a CT pair, $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} y'_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} y_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} x_l \in \partial A_n$. Then by repeated application of the above argument, we obtain a sequence $\{z_n\}$ in $F_{1,2}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} z_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} x_l \in \partial A_n$.

Observe that $F_{1,2}$ is quasiconvex in H_1 and the CT map $\partial i_{F_{1,1}, H_1} : \partial F_{1,1} \rightarrow H_1$ is surjective (Theorem 2.11). After passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we have $\{z'_l\} \subseteq F_{1,1}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{H_1} z'_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{H_1} z_l \in \partial H_1$. Again the CT map $\partial i_{H_1, A_n} : \partial H_1 \rightarrow \partial A_n$ ensures that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} z'_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} z_l \in \partial A_n$. Therefore, we have a sequence $\{z'_l\} \subseteq F_{1,1}$ such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{F_{1,1}} z'_l \in \partial F_{1,1}$ and $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} z'_l = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty}^{A_n} x_l \in \partial A_n$. This completes the proof of claim. \square

Finally, let $\phi : F_{n,2} \rightarrow F_{n,2}$ be a hyperbolic automorphism, so that the HNN extension $G = A_n *_{F_{n,2}, \phi}$ is hyperbolic (using the Bestvina-Feighn combination theorem [BF92]). Let G_1 be the subgroup of G generated by $F_{1,1}$ and $\{t\}$ where t is the stable letter of the HNN extension.

Theorem 7.7. *Let G, G_1 be as above. Then*

- (1) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.
- (2) (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

Proof. The first claim follows from Corollary 4.11 and the second from Corollary 4.20. \square

7.3. Graphs of groups. Our aim in this subsection is to extract out from Theorem 6.3 the minimal hypotheses necessary for the conclusion to go through. All hyperbolic groups in this subsection will be assumed to be torsion-free. Using Theorem 3.4, the main results can be generalized in a straightforward way to the case with torsion. However, all that torsion adds is an additional finite group (the group A in Theorem 3.4) to deal with in the proofs. We therefore omit this extra layer of complication for the ease of exposition. We shall assume the following in this section as per Remark 2.13.

Setup:

- (1) Here H is a finite graph of groups with underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} and the finite presentation as given in Remark 2.13.
- (2) Following Remark 2.13, we set the stable letters to be $\{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$. Let $Q = \langle s_1, \dots, s_m \rangle$ denote the natural group theoretic section of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ in H . We denote the set $\{s_1, \dots, s_m\}$ by S_Q .
- (3) Set $K = G_v$ to be the unique vertex group and let $\{G_{e_i} : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ be the set of edge groups. We assume that K is hyperbolic. Hence $\{G_{e_i} : i = 1, \dots, m\}$ are all hyperbolic by (4) below.
- (4) The simplicial inclusion maps $i_{e_i, v} : \Gamma_{e_i} \rightarrow \Gamma_v$ are qi-embeddings. *We do not necessarily assume that for each edge e_i , one of the inclusion maps is an isomorphism.*
- (5) Finally, we assume that $H = \langle S_H : R_H \rangle$ is the finite presentation mentioned in (1) above containing that of $K = \langle S_K : R_K \rangle$, that is, $S_K \subseteq S_H$ and $R_K \subseteq R_H$. Also, note that $S_Q \subseteq S_H$.

Remark 7.8. We first observe that in the statement of Theorem 6.3 the hypothesis that K is free is not really necessary. It suffices to assume that K is hyperbolic and admits a hyperbolic multiple ascending HNN extension. Note that this forces K to be a free

product of surface groups and a free group, essentially by Paulin's theorem and [RS94] as explained in the introduction to [Mit97] (the argument there works for endomorphisms as well as automorphisms). If some closed surface group appears, then any hyperbolic endomorphism must preserve it (up to taking powers and conjugacy), so that the conclusion of Lemma 6.4 continues to hold. If no closed surface group appears, then we are exactly in the situation of Theorem 6.3. Thus, the discussion in this section gains significance when, for at least one of the edges e_j , neither of the inclusion maps is an isomorphism.

Recall that for X a hyperbolic metric space and $Y \subseteq X$ any subset, the weak hull of Y in X is denoted as $\mathcal{CH}(Y)$.

Definition 7.9. *Suppose $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ is a tree of hyperbolic metric spaces satisfying the qi embedded condition. Assume further that X is hyperbolic. Let $u \in V(T)$ and β be a geodesic ray in T starting at u . We say that $X_u (= \pi^{-1}(u))$ is non-quasiconvex along the ray β if $\beta \subseteq \pi(\mathcal{CH}(X_u))$.*

For H the above graph of groups with the underlying graph \mathcal{R} , let $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ be the associated tree of spaces (see Subsection 2.3). Suppose Γ_Q is the Cayley graph of Q with respect to the symmetrization of the generating set $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_m\}$. Note that X is quasi-isometric to the Cayley graph of H , and the inclusion $\Gamma_Q \rightarrow X$ gives rise to an isometric embedding of $\pi(\Gamma_Q)$ in T . Thus for any geodesic ray α in Γ_Q starting at $1 \in Q$, the projection $\pi(\alpha)$ is a geodesic ray in T starting at a fixed root vertex $u \in V(T)$.

Definition 7.10. *Identify Γ_K with $X_u = \pi^{-1}(u)$ for a root vertex u of T . We say that K is non-quasiconvex along the ray α if the vertex space $\pi^{-1}(u)$ is non-quasiconvex along the ray $\pi(\alpha)$ in the sense of Definition 7.9.*

Background on ladders, hallways and annuli.

Suppose $e = [w, v]$ is an edge in T joining w and v . We denote the corresponding edge space as X_e , and vertex spaces as $X_w := \pi^{-1}(w)$, $X_v := \pi^{-1}(v)$. Suppose β is a geodesic ray in T starting at w . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the edge joining $\beta(n-1)$ and $\beta(n)$ by e_n . Then we denote the inclusion $X_{e_n} \rightarrow X_{\beta(n-1)}$ and $X_{e_n} \rightarrow X_{\beta(n)}$ by i_n and j_n respectively. Note that $\partial i_n : \partial X_{e_n} \rightarrow \partial X_{\beta(n-1)}$ and $\partial j_n : \partial X_{e_n} \rightarrow \partial X_{\beta(n)}$ are topological embeddings. With this notation, we have the following definition.

Definition 7.11. *[Mit97, pp. 392] [KS20, Definition 6.13] Let β be a geodesic ray in T .*

(1) **Semi-infinite ladders.** *Suppose Σ is a qi lift of β in X . Let $z_0 = z \in \partial i_1(\partial X_{e_1})$ such that $z_n = \partial j_n \circ (\partial i_n)^{-1}(z_{n-1})$ is defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (Note that $z_n \in \partial j_n(\partial X_{e_n}) \cap \partial i_{n+1}(\partial X_{e_{n+1}})$.) For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let l_n be a geodesic ray in $X_{\beta(n)}$ joining $\Sigma(\beta(n))$ to z_n . The union*

$$\mathcal{L}(\Sigma; z) = \cup_n l_n$$

is referred to as a semi-infinite ladder over β .

(2) **Bi-infinite ladders.** *Suppose $z_0 = z$, $z'_0 = z' \in \partial i_1(\partial X_{e_1})$ are distinct such that $z_n = \partial j_n \circ (\partial i_n)^{-1}(z_{n-1})$ and $z'_n = \partial j_n \circ (\partial i_n)^{-1}(z'_{n-1})$ are defined for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (Note that $z_n, z'_n \in \partial j_n(\partial X_{e_n}) \cap \partial i_{n+1}(\partial X_{e_{n+1}})$.) For $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let l_n be a bi-infinite geodesic in $X_{\beta(n)}$ joining z_n and z'_n . The union*

$$\mathcal{L}(z; z') := \cup_n l_n$$

is referred to as a bi-infinite ladder over β .

Definition 7.12. A bi-infinite or semi-infinite ladder \mathcal{L} over a geodesic ray $\beta \subseteq T$ is said to be contracting if any two qi lifts of β lying in \mathcal{L} are asymptotic.

Suppose $\pi : X \rightarrow T$ is the tree of metric spaces described above. Let $\kappa \geq 1$. Recall that a κ -qi lift of a geodesic $\gamma = [a, b]_T$ is a κ -qi embedding $\gamma' : [a, b]_T \rightarrow X$ such that $\gamma(v) = \pi \circ \gamma'(v)$ for all $v \in V([a, b]_T)$. For the next two notions, we refer to [BF92, pp. 87] (see also [Mit04, pp. 46]). Suppose Σ, Σ' are two κ -qi lifts of some geodesic $[a, b]_T$. Then we say that $\cup_{v \in V([a, b]_T)} [\Sigma(v), \Sigma'(v)]_{X_v}$ forms a κ -hallway bounded by Σ and Σ' . Suppose $v, v' \in V([a, b]_T)$ are adjacent such that $d_T(a, v') < d_T(a, v)$. Now define $\Delta(v) = \Sigma(v')^{-1}\Sigma(v)$ and $\Delta'(v) = \Sigma'(v')^{-1}\Sigma'(v)$. A κ -hallway as above is said to be a κ -annulus if $\Delta(v) = \Delta'(v)$ for all $v \in V([a, b]_T) \setminus \{a\}$.

We note the following straightforward fact about finite approximants of contracting ladders for future reference.

Lemma 7.13. Let $D \geq 0$. Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{H}_n is a κ -hallways over $[u, u_n]_T$ bounded by two κ -qi lifts $\Sigma_{1,n}$ and $\Sigma_{2,n}$. Suppose

- (1) $|\Sigma_{1,n}(u_n)^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u_n)|_K \leq D$, and
- (2) $|\Sigma_{1,n}(u)^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u)|_K \geq n$.

Then $d_T(u, u_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Fix $p \in K$. Then further,

$$\max\{d_X(p, \Sigma_{1,n}([u, u_n]_T)), d_X(p, \Sigma_{2,n}([u, u_n]_T))\} \rightarrow \infty$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 7.14. Suppose $\mathcal{L} \subseteq X$ is a bi-infinite (respectively, semi-infinite) contracting ladder over a geodesic ray $\beta \subseteq T$. Let α be a qi lift of β contained in \mathcal{L} . Let $L_0 = \mathcal{L} \cap X_{\beta(0)}$. Then $\partial i_{K,H}(L_0(\pm\infty)) = \alpha(\infty)$ (respectively, $\partial i_{K,H}(L_0(\infty)) = \alpha(\infty)$).

Proof. We will sketch a proof when \mathcal{L} is a semi-infinite ladder. The proof for the bi-infinite case is similar. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose Σ_n is a qi lift passing through $L_0(n)$ lying in \mathcal{L} (see [Mit98b, Lemma 3.5] for the existence of qi lifts). Then by the definition of contracting ladders, we have a subsequence $\{i_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\Sigma_n(i_n)^{-1}\alpha(i_n)|_K \leq D$ where $D \geq 0$ is a uniform constant. Let $\Sigma_n|_{[\beta(0), \beta(i_n)]_T}$ denote the restriction of Σ_n to $[\beta(0), \beta(i_n)]_T$. Since D is uniform, the path $\gamma_n := \Sigma_n|_{[\beta(0), \beta(i_n)]_T} \cup [\Sigma_n(i_n), \alpha(i_n)]_{X_{\beta(i_n)}}$ is a D' -quasigeodesic in X for some uniform constant $D' \geq 1$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(i_n) = \alpha(\infty)$. Again, from Lemma 7.13, $d_X(1, \gamma_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X L_0(n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X \Sigma_n(\beta(0)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty}^X \alpha(i_n) = \alpha(\infty)$. Since (K, H) is a CT pair ([Mit98b]), $\partial i_{K,H}(L_0(\infty)) = \alpha(\infty)$. \square

In the following theorem, we will assume that we have fixed a finite generating set for K . For $k \in K$, the length of k is denoted by $|k|_K$.

Theorem 7.15. ([Mit04, Corollary 4.3 and Theorem 4.5]) Let H be a graph of groups with the underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} . Let K denote the unique vertex group. We assume that H, K are hyperbolic and the graph of groups satisfies the qi embedded condition. Suppose K is not quasiconvex in H .

Then we have a geodesic ray β in T starting at root vertex u and a bi-infinite (hence, a semi-infinite) ladder \mathcal{L} over β such that the following hold.

- (1) For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $g_j \in \mathcal{L} \cap X_{\beta(j)}$ where $0 \leq j \leq m$ such that $\cap_{j=1}^m g_j K g_j^{-1}$ is infinite. In particular, K has infinite height.
- (2) Moreover, there is $\lambda > 1$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mu_m \in K \setminus \{1\}$ with $g_m \mu_m g_m^{-1} \in K$ and $\lambda^m |\mu_m|_K \leq |g_m \mu_m g_m^{-1}|_K$.

Note that the statements in [Mit04, Corollary 4.3 and Theorem 4.5] are for free products with amalgamation/HNN extension but the proofs go through for the statement of Theorem 7.15. We will sketch a proof of Theorem 7.15 using a slightly different argument, rather than following the original proof exactly. This approach is intended to highlight the interplay between a geometric and a group-theoretic consistency condition we will need (in Definition 7.17).

Sketch of proof of Theorem 7.15. The proof is sketched into two steps. In Step 1, we will find a bi-infinite ladder (hence, a semi-infinite ladder). Then in Step 2, in this ladder, we will construct annuli to find g_i .

Step 1: *Construction of bi-infinite ladder.* By [Mit04, Lemma 4.2], there exists $\kappa \geq 1$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a κ -hallway \mathcal{H}_n over $[u, u_n]_T$ bounded by two lifts $\Sigma_{1,n}$ and $\Sigma_{2,n}$ satisfying the following.

- (1) $|\Sigma_{1,n}(u_n)^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u_n)|_K \leq 1$, and
- (2) $|\Sigma_{1,n}(u)^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u)|_K \geq n$.

Let $\gamma_n = [\Sigma_{1,n}(u), \Sigma_{2,n}(u)]_K$ and $p_n \in \gamma_n$ be such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |p_n^{-1}\Sigma_{1,n}(u)|_K = \infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |p_n^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u)|_K.$$

Note that $p_n^{-1} \cdot \gamma_n$ passes through 1. After passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we assume that $\{p_n^{-1} \cdot \gamma_n\}$ converges to a bi-infinite geodesic γ in K . We note that $d_T(u, u_n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 7.13.

Given $R \geq 0$, there exists $D \geq 0$ such that the number of cosets of edge subgroups of K that intersects an R -radius ball in K is at most D .

Then passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we can assume that

- (1) $p_n^{-1} \cdot [u, u_n]_T$ converges to a geodesic ray $[u, \xi)$ in T for some $\xi \in \partial T$, and
- (2) $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ is a bi-infinite ladder over $[u, \xi)$.

We note that given any point in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ there is a qi lift of $[u, \xi)$ passing through the given point and lying in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ (for instance, see [Mit98b, Lemma 3.5]).

Recall that our initial collection of hallways \mathcal{H}_n over $[u, u_n]_T$ were chosen so that $|\Sigma_{1,n}(u_n)^{-1}\Sigma_{2,n}(u_n)|_K \leq 1$. It follows that for any other κ -qi section of $[u, u_n]_T$ lying in \mathcal{H}_n , the terminal vertices over u_n lie at a distance of at most 1 from each other. Since H is hyperbolic, the hallways \mathcal{H}_n are hyperbolic in the sense of [BF92]. This follows from the converse to the Bestvina-Feighn theorem that asserts the necessity of the flaring condition of [BF92]. We reprise briefly an argument from [MS12, Section 5.3]. Indeed, from [Mit98b, Theorem 3.8], it follows that each \mathcal{H}_n is hyperbolic, and so any two qi sections must satisfy the flaring condition. Since they end at distance one from each other in the forward direction on \mathcal{H}_n , they are allowed to flare only in the backward direction (towards $u \in T$). Passing to a subsequential limit, it follows that any two qi lifts of $[u, \xi)$ in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ are asymptotic in the forward direction.

Step 2: *Construction of annuli of length m .* Let $v \in V([u, \xi))$ such that $d_T(u, v) = m$. Fix an arc length parametrization of $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow K$. Let Σ be a fixed qi lift of $[u, \xi)$ passing through $\gamma(0)$ and lying in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$. Let Σ_i be a qi lift of $[u, \xi)$ passing through $\gamma(i)$ and lying in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$ where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. After passing to a subsequence, if necessary, we assume that $|\Sigma(v)^{-1}\Sigma_i(v)|_K \leq |\Sigma(v)^{-1}\Sigma_{i+1}(v)|_K$ if $i > 0$ and $|\Sigma(v)^{-1}\Sigma_{i+1}(v)|_K \leq |\Sigma(v)^{-1}\Sigma_i(v)|_K$ if $i < 0$. We will mainly focus on Σ_i for $i > 0$. This will be enough for us.

Let $u = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_m = v$ be the consecutive vertices on $[u, v]$. Define $\Delta_i(j) = \Sigma_i(v_{j-1})^{-1}\Sigma_i(v_j)$ where $j = 1, \dots, m$. By repeated application of the pigeonhole principle, we have a sequence $\{i_l\} \subseteq \{i\}$ such that for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we have $\Delta_{i_1}(j) = \Delta_{i_2}(j) = \dots$. Therefore, Σ_{i_l} and $\Sigma_{i_{l'}}$ forms a κ -annulus over $[u, v]_T$ where l, l' are distinct natural numbers.

Define $g_j = \Delta_{i_1}(1) \cdots \Delta_{i_1}(j)$ where $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then one can easily check that $\bigcap_{j=1}^m g_j K g_j^{-1}$ is infinite where $g_j K \neq g_{j'} K$ for all distinct $j, j' \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. In particular, K has infinite height in H . This completes a proof of (1).

Now we will sketch a proof of (2). Fix m , and choose $v \in V([u, \xi])$ such that $d_T(u, v) = m$ in Step 2. From the flaring condition, we will have a threshold constant, M say, depending on κ such that the following holds. Let $p \in \mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty)) \cap X_v$ such that $|\Sigma_{i_l}(v)^{-1}p|_K \geq M$. Let Σ_p be a qi lift of $[u, \xi]$ passing through p and lying in $\mathcal{L}(\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty))$.

Note that Σ_{i_l} and Σ_p are asymptotic (by Step 1). Since $|\Sigma_{i_l}(v)^{-1}\Sigma_p(v)|_K \geq M$, so Σ_{i_l} and Σ_p have to flare in the backward direction towards u , i.e. there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that $\lambda^m |\Sigma_{i_l}(v)^{-1}p|_K \leq |\Sigma_{i_l}(u)^{-1}\Sigma_p(u)|_K$. Choose $l, l' \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\Sigma_{i_l}(v)^{-1}\Sigma_{i_{l'}}(v)|_K \geq M$. Define $\mu_m = \Sigma_{i_l}(v)^{-1}\Sigma_{i_{l'}}(v)$. This completes (2). \square

Remark 7.16. In Step 1 above, if we had translated γ_n by one of its endpoints, then we would have ended up with a semi-infinite ladder instead of a bi-infinite ladder.

Note that non-quasiconvexity of K is a geometric condition. We want this to be consistent with the group-theoretic condition that the qi-sections lie in Q . This leads to the following definition.

Definition 7.17. Let H be a graph of groups as above with underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} . Let K denote the unique vertex group. Denote the natural group theoretic section of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ in H by Q . Let α be a geodesic ray in Q starting at 1. Then we say that K satisfies a group theoretically consistent non-quasiconvexity condition (or simply a consistent non-quasiconvexity condition) along the ray α if

- (1) the conclusions of Theorem 7.15 hold with $g_n = \alpha(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and
- (2) α lies in a contracting bi-infinite or semi-infinite ladder over $\pi(\alpha)$.

As an immediate consequence of Lemma 7.14, we have the following.

Proposition 7.18. Let H be a graph of groups with underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} . Let K denote the unique vertex group. Denote the natural group theoretic section of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ in H by Q . We assume that H, K are hyperbolic and the graph of groups satisfies the qi embedded condition. Let α be a geodesic ray in Q starting at 1. Suppose that K satisfies a consistent non-quasiconvexity condition along the ray α . Then $\alpha(\infty) \in \partial i_{K,H}(\partial K)$.

Theorem 7.19. Let $H = \langle S_H : R_H \rangle$ be a graph of groups with underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} . Let $K = \langle S_K : R_K \rangle$ denote the unique vertex group. Denote the natural group theoretic section of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ in H by $Q = \langle S_Q \rangle$. (Note that $S_K \sqcup S_Q \subseteq S_H$ and $R_H \subseteq R_K$.) Further, we assume one of the following.

- (1) $m \geq 3$ and ϕ is a hyperbolic automorphism of Q .
- (2) $m \geq 2$ and ϕ is a hyperbolic endomorphism of Q .

Let $G = \langle S_H, t : R_H, txt^{-1} = \phi(x), x \in S_Q \rangle$. Let L be the subgroup of G given by $L = \langle S_Q, t : txt^{-1} = \phi(x), x \in S_Q \rangle$. Let G_1 be the subgroup of G generated by $\{S_K, t\}$.

Then:

- (1) The group G is hyperbolic. G_1 is isomorphic to $K * \langle t \rangle$ and is hyperbolic.
- (2) The group L is quasiconvex in G .
- (3) The pair (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map.

If we further assume the following for some geodesic ray α in Q starting at 1,

- K satisfies a consistent non-quasiconvexity condition along α , and
- $\partial i_{Q,L}(\alpha(\infty)) = t^\infty$ in ∂L .

then (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

Proof. Since $Q \cap K = \{1\}$, then by Britton's lemma, $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$. So G_1 is hyperbolic. G can be described as a free product with amalgamation $G = H *_Q L$. Note that Q is malnormal and quasiconvex in H (see Lemma 3.3). By Theorem 3.5(1), G is hyperbolic and L is quasiconvex in G . This proves (1) and (2).

Now we will prove that the pair (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map. Note that L is quasiconvex in G (by (2)) and (K, H) is a CT pair (see Theorem 2.14). Hence by Corollary 4.20, (G_1, G) admits a ray CT map. This completes (3).

Now we will prove that (G_1, G) is not a CT pair. Since K satisfies a consistent non-quasiconvexity condition along the ray α and (K, H) is a CT pair (see Theorem 2.14), so by Proposition 7.18, we have a geodesic ray β in K starting at $1 \in K$ such that $\partial i_{r,K,H}(\beta(\infty)) = \alpha(\infty)$. Again (H, G) is a CT pair (by Theorem 2.14). Hence $\partial i_{K,G}(\beta(\infty)) = \partial i_{r,H,G}(\alpha(\infty))$. Since L is quasiconvex in G (by (2)), so by our assumption, we conclude that $\partial i_{K,G}(\beta(\infty)) = t^\infty$ in ∂G .

Hence we have $(\beta(\infty), t^\infty) \in \mathcal{L}_r(G_1, G)$ such that $\partial i_{r,G_1,G}(\beta(\infty)) = \partial i_{r,G_1,G}(t^\infty)$. Since t is an infinite order element, so $[1, t^\infty]_{G_1}$ is a quasigeodesic ray in the ambient group G . Therefore, by the strong JKLO criterion (see Corollary 4.3), the pair (G_1, G) does not admit a CT map. \square

Now we will see a sufficient condition under which we can ensure $\partial i_{Q,L}(\alpha(\infty)) = t^\infty$ in ∂L as in the above theorem.

Corollary 7.20. *Let $H = \langle S_H : R_H \rangle$ be a graph of groups with underlying graph the rose \mathcal{R} . Let $K = \langle S_K : R_K \rangle$ denote the unique vertex group. Denote the natural group theoretic section of $\pi_1(\mathcal{R})$ in H by $Q = \langle S_Q \rangle$. Further, we assume one of the following.*

- (1) $m \geq 3$ and ϕ is a positive, hyperbolic automorphism of Q .
- (2) $m \geq 2$ and ϕ is a positive, hyperbolic endomorphism of Q .

Let $G = \langle S_H, t : R_H, txt^{-1} = \phi(x), x \in S_Q \rangle$ and $L = \langle S_Q, t : txt^{-1} = \phi(x), x \in S_Q \rangle < G$. Let G_1 be the subgroup of G generated by $\{S_K, t\}$. Suppose that K satisfies a consistent non-quasiconvexity condition along **all** positive rays α in Q starting at 1.

Then:

- (1) G and $G_1 = K * \langle t \rangle$ are hyperbolic, and
- (2) (G_1, G) is not a CT pair.

Proof. The first conclusion is immediate from Theorem 7.19 (1). Recall that $L = \langle S_Q, t : txt^{-1} = \phi(x), x \in S_Q \rangle$. By Theorem 7.19, we only need to prove that $\partial i_{Q,L}(\alpha(\infty)) = t^\infty$ in ∂L for some positive ray α in Q . This is immediate from Lemma 6.2. \square

We end by sketching a potential construction for building examples beyond Section 6 to which Corollary 7.20 applies. We start with K a free group, and fix two isomorphic

subgroups H_1, H_2 . We then choose two isomorphisms $\phi, \psi : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ such that the ‘double HNN extension’ of K using ϕ, ψ is hyperbolic. One way to do this is to start with an example of an isomorphism $\phi : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ such that the HNN extension $K *_{H_1, H_2, \phi}$ is hyperbolic. See [Mut21, Section 7] for such constructions. We demand further that H_1 has infinite height. Finally, set $\psi = \theta \circ \phi$, where $\theta : H_2 \rightarrow H_2$ is a large power of a hyperbolic fully irreducible automorphism. Then, by arguments similar to [GM22], the double HNN extension H of K using ϕ, ψ should be hyperbolic. The construction of G from H is then straightforward and Corollary 7.20 should apply.

REFERENCES

- [Bas93] H. Bass. Covering theory for graphs of groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 89:3–47, 1993.
- [BBD07] Josh Barnard, Noel Brady, and Pallavi Dani. Super-exponential distortion of subgroups of $\text{CAT}(-1)$ groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 7:301–308, 2007.
- [BCG⁺22] Benjamin Beeker, Matthew Cordes, Giles Gardam, Radhika Gupta, and Emily Stark. Cannon-Thurston maps for $\text{CAT}(0)$ groups with isolated flats. *Math. Ann.*, pages 963–987, 2022.
- [BDR13] Noel Brady, Will Dison, and Timothy Riley. Hyperbolic hydra. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 7(4):961–976, 2013.
- [Bes00] Mladen Bestvina. Geometric group theory problem list. <https://www.math.utah.edu/~bestvina/eprints/questions.pdf>, 2000.
- [BF92] Mladen Bestvina and Mark Feighn. A combination theorem for negatively curved groups. *J. Differential Geom.*, 35(1):85–101, 1992.
- [BFH97] Mladen Bestvina, Mark E. Feighn, and Michael Handel. Laminations, trees, and irreducible automorphisms of free groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(2):215–244, 1997.
- [BH99] 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.
- [Bow12] Brian H. Bowditch. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 22(3):1250016, 66, 2012.
- [BR13] Owen Baker and Timothy Riley. Cannon-Thurston maps do not always exist. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 1:Paper No. e3, 11, 2013.
- [BR20] Owen Baker and Timothy Riley. Cannon-Thurston maps, subgroup distortion, and hyperbolic hydra. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 14:255–282, 2020.
- [CCG⁺25] Ruth Charney, Matthew Cordes, Antoine Goldsborough, Alessandro Sisto, and Stefanie Zbinden. (Non-)existence of Cannon–Thurston maps for Morse boundaries. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 57(2):463–471, 2025.
- [CHL07] Thierry Coulbois, Arnaud Hilion, and Martin Lustig. Non-unique ergodicity, observers’ topology and the dual algebraic lamination for \mathbb{R} -trees. *Illinois J. Math.*, 51(3):897–911, 2007.
- [CT85] James W. Cannon and William P. Thurston. Group Invariant Peano Curves. *preprint, Princeton*, 1985.
- [CT07] James W. Cannon and William P. Thurston. Group Invariant Peano Curves. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:1315–1355, 2007.
- [Dah03] François Dahmani. Combination of convergence groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 7:933–963, 2003.
- [DFWZ23] Sami Douba, Balthazar FlÀ©chelles, Theodore Weisman, and Feng Zhu. Cubulated hyperbolic groups admit anosov representations. *Geom. Topol. to appear, arXiv:2309.03695*, 2023.
- [DK84] Robert L. Devaney and MichałKrych. Dynamics of $\exp(z)$. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 4(1):35–52, 1984.
- [DKT16] Spencer Dowdall, Ilya Kapovich, and Samuel J. Taylor. Cannon-Thurston maps for hyperbolic free group extensions. *Israel J. Math.*, 216(2):753–797, 2016.
- [DM17] Francois Dahmani and Mahan Mj. Height, graded relative hyperbolicity and quasiconvexity. *J. Éc. polytech. Math.*, 4:515–556, 2017.
- [DR24] Pallavi Dani and Timothy Riley. Fractional distortion in hyperbolic groups. *arXiv preprint, 2403.08645 https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08645*, 2024.

- [DT86] Robert L. Devaney and Folkert Tangerman. Dynamics of entire functions near the essential singularity. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 6(4):489–503, 1986.
- [Far98] Benson Farb. Relatively hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 8(5):810–840, 1998.
- [GdlH90] Étienne Ghys and Pierre de la Harpe, editors. *Sur les groupes hyperboliques d'après Mikhael Gromov*, volume 83 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990. Papers from the Swiss Seminar on Hyperbolic Groups held in Bern, 1988.
- [GM22] Pritam Ghosh and Mahan Mj. Regluing graphs of free groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 22(4):1969–2006, 2022.
- [GMRS98] Rita Gitik, Mahan Mitra, Eliyahu Rips, and Michah Sageev. Widths of subgroups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 350(1):321–329, 1998.
- [Gro87] Mikhael Gromov. Hyperbolic Groups. *Essays in Group Theory, MSRI Publ., vol.8, (Stephen M. Gersten, ed.)*, Springer Verlag, pages 75–263, 1987.
- [Gro93] M. Gromov. Asymptotic Invariants of Infinite Groups. in *Geometric Group Theory, vol.2; Lond. Math. Soc. Lecture Notes 182*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [HS25] R. Halder and P. Sardar. On the existence of weakly malnormal quasiconvex subgroups of hyperbolic groups. *preprint, 2025*, 2025.
- [JKLO16] Woojin Jeon, Ilya Kapovich, Christopher Leininger, and Ken'ichi Ohshika. Conical limit points and the Cannon-Thurston map. *Conform. Geom. Dyn.*, 20:58–80, 2016.
- [Kap99] Ilya Kapovich. A non-quasiconvexity embedding theorem for hyperbolic groups. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 127(3):461–486, 1999.
- [KL10] Ilya Kapovich and Martin Lustig. Intersection form, laminations and currents on free groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 19(5):1426–1467, 2010.
- [KL15] Ilya Kapovich and Martin Lustig. Cannon-Thurston fibers for iwip automorphisms of F_N . *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 91(1):203–224, 2015.
- [KS20] Swathi Krishna and Pranab Sardar. Pullbacks of Metric Bundles and Cannon-Thurston Maps. *To appear in Algebr. Geom. Topol.* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.13109>, 2020.
- [KS24] Michael Kapovich and Pranab Sardar. *Trees of hyperbolic spaces*, volume 282 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2024] ©2024.
- [LMM24] Nir Lazarovich, Alex Margolis, and Mahan Mj. Commensurated hyperbolic subgroups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 377(10):7377–7402, 2024.
- [Mar22] Alex Margolis. Discretisable quasi-actions I: Topological completions and hyperbolicity. *arXiv preprint, 2207.04401* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.04401>, 2022.
- [Min11] Honglin Min. Hyperbolic graphs of surface groups. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 11(1):449–476, 2011.
- [Mit97] Mahan Mitra. Ending laminations for hyperbolic group extensions. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(2):379–402, 1997.
- [Mit98a] Mahan Mitra. Cannon-Thurston maps for hyperbolic group extensions. *Topology*, 37(3):527–538, 1998.
- [Mit98b] Mahan Mitra. Cannon-Thurston maps for trees of hyperbolic metric spaces. *J. Differential Geom.*, 48(1):135–164, 1998.
- [Mit98c] Mahan Mitra. Coarse extrinsic geometry: a survey. In *The Epstein birthday schrift*, volume 1 of *Geom. Topol. Monogr.*, pages 341–364. Geom. Topol. Publ., Coventry, 1998.
- [Mit99] Mahan Mitra. On a theorem of Scott and Swarup. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 127(6):1625–1631, 1999.
- [Mit04] Mahan Mitra. Height in splittings of hyperbolic groups. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 114(1):39–54, 2004.
- [Miy06] Hideki Miyachi. Moduli of continuity of Cannon-Thurston maps. In *Spaces of Kleinian groups*, volume 329 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 121–149. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [Mj14a] Mahan Mj. Cannon-Thurston maps for surface groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 179(1):1–80, 2014.
- [Mj14b] Mahan Mj. Ending laminations and Cannon-Thurston maps. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 24(1):297–321, 2014. With an appendix by Shubhabrata Das and Mahan Mj.
- [Mj17] Mahan Mj. Cannon-Thurston maps for Kleinian groups. *Forum Math. Pi*, 5:e1, 49, 2017.
- [Mj19] Mahan Mj. Cannon-Thurston maps. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (ICM 2018)*, ISBN 978-981-3272-87-3, pages pp 885–917, 2019.

- [MO14] Yoshifumi Matsuda and Shin-ichi Oguni. On Cannon-Thurston maps for relatively hyperbolic groups. *J. Group Theory*, 17(1):41–47, 2014.
- [Mos96] Lee Mosher. Hyperbolic extensions of groups. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 110(3):305–314, 1996.
- [Mos97] L. Mosher. A hyperbolic-by-hyperbolic hyperbolic group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 125, pages 3447–3455, 1997.
- [MR18] Mahan Mj and Kasra Rafi. Algebraic ending laminations and quasiconvexity. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 18(4):1883–1916, 2018.
- [MS12] Mahan Mj and Pranab Sardar. A combination theorem for metric bundles. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(6):1636–1707, 2012.
- [MS13] Mahan Mj and Caroline Series. Limits of limit sets I. *Geom. Dedicata*, 167:35–67, 2013.
- [MS17] Mahan Mj and Caroline Series. Limits of limit sets II: Geometrically infinite groups. *Geom. Topol.*, 21(2):647–692, 2017.
- [Mut20a] Jean Pierre Mutanguha. Hyperbolic immersions of free groups. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 14(4):1253–1275, 2020.
- [Mut20b] Jean Pierre Mutanguha. Irreducible nonsurjective endomorphisms of F_n are hyperbolic. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 52(5):960–976, 2020.
- [Mut21] Jean Pierre Mutanguha. The dynamics and geometry of free group endomorphisms. *Adv. Math.*, 384:Paper No. 107714, 60, 2021.
- [Osi06a] Denis V. Osin. Elementary subgroups of relatively hyperbolic groups and bounded generation. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 16:99–118, 2006.
- [Osi06b] Denis V. Osin. Relatively hyperbolic groups: intrinsic geometry, algebraic properties, and algorithmic problems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 179(843):vi+100, 2006.
- [Rey11] Patrick Reynolds. Dynamics of irreducible endomorphisms of F_n . *preprint, arXiv:1008.3659*, 2011.
- [Rip82] Eliyahu Rips. Subgroups of small cancellation groups. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 14(1):45–47, 1982.
- [RS94] E. Rips and Z. Sela. Structure and rigidity in hyperbolic groups. *GAF A v.4 no.3*, pages 337–371, 1994.
- [Ser03] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Trees*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Translated from the French original by John Stillwell, Corrected 2nd printing of the 1980 English translation.
- [Sho91] Hamish Short. Quasiconvexity and a theorem of Howson’s. In *Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint (Trieste, 1990)*, pages 168–176. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1991.
- [SW79] Peter Scott and Terry Wall. Topological methods in group theory. In *Homological group theory (Proc. Sympos., Durham, 1977)*, volume 36 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 137–203. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge-New York, 1979.
- [Wis04] D. T. Wise. Cubulating small cancellation groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 14(1):150–214, 2004.
- [Woe93] Wolfgang Woess. Fixed sets and free subgroups of groups acting on metric spaces. *Math. Z.*, 214:425–439, 1993.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH (TIFR) MUMBAI, INDIA

Email address: rhalder.math@gmail.com, rhalder@math.tifr.res.in

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH (TIFR) MUMBAI, INDIA

Email address: mahan@math.tifr.res.in

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH (IISER) MOHALI, KNOWLEDGE CITY, SECTOR 81, S.A.S. NAGAR 140306, PUNJAB, INDIA

Email address: psardar@iisermohali.ac.in