

# A LOCAL TREATMENT OF FINITE ALIGNMENT AND PATH GROUPOIDS OF NONFINITELY ALIGNED HIGHER-RANK GRAPHS

MALCOLM JONES

ABSTRACT. We give a local treatment of finite alignment by identifying the finitely aligned part of any (not necessarily finitely aligned) higher-rank graph. We show the finitely aligned part is itself a constellation and forms a finitely aligned relative category of paths together with the original higher-rank graph. We show that the elements of the finitely aligned part are precisely those whose cylinder sets are compact, which allows us to give novel definitions of locally compact path and boundary-path spaces for nonfinitely aligned higher-rank graphs. We extend a semigroup action and the associated semidirect product groupoid developed by Renault and Williams to define ample Hausdorff path and boundary-path groupoids. The groupoids are amenable for nonfinitely aligned  $k$ -graphs by a result of Renault and Williams. In the finitely aligned case, the path groupoids coincide with Spielberg’s groupoids, and the boundary-path groupoid has an inverse semigroup model via a result of Ortega and Pardo.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Higher-rank graphs are a generalisation of directed graphs introduced in [KP00] as  $k$ -graphs and further generalised in [BSV13] to  $P$ -graphs whereby relations can be imposed on edges. There is an extensive literature stemming from [KPRR97] that associates *path spaces* and *path groupoids* to  $P$ -graphs and even more general combinatorial data [Spi20]. This has been extremely beneficial in the study of  $C^*$ -algebras [KPRR97], Leavitt path algebras [AA05] and has implications for point-set topology [PW05] and higher-dimensional Thompson groups [Bri04; LSV24].

In the above settings, the path space needs to be locally compact, but not all higher-rank graphs have a locally compact path space (see Example 3.4 from [Yee07, Example 3.7]). However, the path space of any *finitely aligned* higher-rank graph is locally compact [FMY05, Proposition 5.7]. The finite alignment condition was first identified in [RS05] (in the context of product systems of graphs). When studying the  $C^*$ -algebras of  $k$ -graphs, finite alignment has been called the “natural boundary of the subject” [FMY05]. More recently, there is growing interest in nonfinitely aligned examples. Spielberg associated ample (not necessarily Hausdorff) groupoids to each (not necessarily finitely aligned) left cancellative small category in [Spi20], including all higher-rank graphs. In [NS23], Neshveyev and Schwartz gave an example of a nonfinitely aligned left cancellative monoid whose reduced  $C^*$ -algebra cannot be realised by Spielberg’s groupoids. Thus, there is more to understand about groupoids associated to nonfinitely aligned data, and this is the focus of this work.

*Path* groupoids are well-understood for finitely aligned higher-rank graphs, so we desire a path groupoid for general higher-rank graphs in order to see which results from the finitely aligned case can be generalised. Given a general higher-rank graph  $\Lambda$ , the unit space  $X(\Lambda)$  of Spielberg’s groupoid from [Spi20] is the spectrum of a certain commutative  $C^*$ -algebra associated to  $\Lambda$ . The elements of  $X(\Lambda)$  identify with paths if  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned [Spi20, Theorem 6.8], but not otherwise. In this sense, Spielberg’s groupoids are not *path* groupoids.

In this paper, we associate locally compact path spaces and ample Hausdorff path groupoids to any higher-rank graph that is finitely aligned *somewhere* in a certain sense. After establishing preliminaries in Section 2, our first contribution is a local treatment of finite alignment in Section 3. Specifically, given a higher-rank graph  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , we define what it means for  $\Lambda$  to be *finitely aligned at  $\lambda$*  (Definition 3.1). The set  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid \Lambda \text{ is finitely aligned at } \lambda\}$  enjoys a number of properties related to the category structure on the higher-rank graph  $\Lambda$  (Lemma 3.5). Though  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  can fail to be a higher-rank graph (Section 3.5),  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a constellation (Proposition 3.6) in the sense of [GH10], which is a sort of “one-sided category”. Also, by adjoining some units to  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , we attain a *finitely aligned* relative category of paths (Proposition 3.7) in the sense of [Spi14], even if  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned. In Section 6.2, we show that Spielberg’s groupoid of this relative category of paths does not coincide with the path groupoid we construct in Section 5. In Example 3.3, we show there are higher-rank graphs that are finitely aligned *nowhere* in the sense that  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$ . Our methods do not apply to such  $\Lambda$ , so we restrict our attention throughout the paper to higher-rank graphs that are finitely aligned *somewhere*, i.e.  $\Lambda$  such that  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . In Section 6.2, we consider the extreme case of higher-rank graphs that are finitely aligned *everywhere*, i.e.  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ , which is equivalent to saying  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned in the usual sense (for example, [Spi12, Page 729]).

In Section 4, we recall the space  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  of filters in  $\Lambda$  from [BSV13], which is a suitable locally compact path space when  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned, but can fail to be locally compact if  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned [Yee07, Example 3.7]. Our contribution in this section is a new definition of *locally compact* path and boundary-path spaces,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\partial\Lambda$ , whenever  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$  (Theorem 4.9). Our path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is an open subspace of  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Theorem 4.9 (among other results in this paper) depends on Lemma 4.8, which says  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  if and only if the cylinder set of  $\lambda$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is compact.

In Section 5, we construct a semigroup action on the path space like in [RW17] (Theorem 5.14), and we define the path and boundary-path groupoids to be the associated semidirect product groupoids from [RW17], which are ample Hausdorff groupoids (Theorem 5.18). By an amenability result from [RW17], the path and boundary-path groupoids are amenable for any  $k$ -graph (Corollary 5.20).

In Section 6, we show our path and boundary-path groupoids are topologically isomorphic to Spielberg’s groupoids from [Spi14] in the finitely aligned case (Theorem 6.6); consequently, our boundary-path groupoid is topologically isomorphic to Exel’s tight groupoid of a certain inverse semigroup from [OP20] (Corollary 6.8).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Topology on the power set of a set.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a countable set. We describe a topology on the power set  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  that is a special case of the pointwise topology on function spaces, where  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  identifies with functions from  $\Lambda$  to the discrete space  $\{0, 1\}$  (see for example [Wil70, Definition 42.1]). Consider the product topology on  $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{0, 1\}$ , where each  $\{0, 1\}$  is discrete. The set  $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{0, 1\}$

identifies with  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  such that each standard basic open set in  $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{0, 1\}$  identifies with a cylinder

$$\mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2) := \{x \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \mid K_1 \subseteq x \subseteq \Lambda \setminus K_2\},$$

for some finite (possibly empty)  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$ . For each  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and finite  $K \subseteq \Lambda$ , let

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mu \setminus K) := \mathcal{Z}(\{\mu\} \setminus K) \text{ and } \mathcal{Z}(\mu) := \mathcal{Z}(\mu \setminus \emptyset).$$

For each  $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ , the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_X(K_1 \setminus K_2) := \mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2) \cap X$ , where  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$  are finite is a basis for the subspace topology on  $X$ . We define  $\mathcal{Z}_X(\mu \setminus K)$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_X(\mu)$  similarly.

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a countable set. The collection of cylinders in  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is a basis for a second-countable compact Hausdorff topology on  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ . Moreover, each cylinder is compact.

*Proof.* The collection of cylinders is a basis as it identifies with a standard basis for the product topology on  $\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \{0, 1\}$ , which is a countable collection because  $\Lambda$  is countable, so  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is second-countable. Tychonoff's theorem implies  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is compact, and products of Hausdorff spaces are Hausdorff. For all  $\mu \in \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda) \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\mu) = \mathcal{Z}(\emptyset \setminus \{\mu\})$ , so  $\mathcal{Z}(\mu)$  is closed. Thus, for *finite*  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$  can be written as a finite intersection of closed sets, so  $\mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$  is closed and hence compact.  $\square$

Since  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is second-countable, closed sets and continuous functions are characterised as in [Wil70, Corollary 10.5(b)–(c)].

**Lemma 2.2.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a countable set. Suppose  $X$  and  $Y$  are subspaces of  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ . Then:

- (a)  $C \subseteq X$  is closed if and only if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $(x_n) \subseteq C$  implies  $x \in C$ ; and
- (b)  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if and only if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  in  $X$  implies  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$  in  $Y$ .

Since  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is second-countable, we also get from Urysohn's metrization theorem that any subspace of  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is metrizable, which is a sufficient condition for compactness to be equivalent to sequential compactness (i.e. every sequence has a convergent subsequence) as in [Mun00, Theorem 28.2]. Thus:

**Lemma 2.3.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a countable set. Every subspace of  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is compact if and only if it is sequentially compact.

If  $(x_n)$  is a sequence in  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  and  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , we say  $\lambda$  is eventually inside (resp. outside)  $(x_n)$  if there is  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\lambda \in x_n$  (resp.  $\lambda \notin x_n$ ) for all  $n \geq N$ .

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a countable set. A sequence  $(x_n)$  converges to  $x$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  if and only if, for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ :

- (in) if  $\lambda \in x$ ,  $\lambda$  is eventually inside  $(x_n)$ ; and
- (out) if  $\lambda \notin x$ ,  $\lambda$  is eventually outside  $(x_n)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $x_n \rightarrow x \in \mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  and fix  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . If  $\lambda \notin x$ , then  $x \in \mathcal{Z}(\emptyset \setminus \{\lambda\})$ , so eventually  $x_n \in \mathcal{Z}(\emptyset \setminus \{\lambda\})$ . Thus, (out) holds. A similar argument works for (in).

For the other direction, consider a basic open set  $\mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$  containing  $x$ , where  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$  are finite. Hence,  $K_1 \subseteq x \subseteq \Lambda \setminus K_2$ . Let  $N$  be the maximum of the indices given by applying (in) to each element of  $K_1$  and (out) to each element of  $K_2$ . Then, for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $x_n \in \mathcal{Z}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$ , so  $x_n \rightarrow x$ .  $\square$

**2.2. Higher-rank graphs.** Higher-rank graphs were introduced in [KP00] as  $k$ -graphs and generalised to  $P$ -graphs in [BSV13]. All the examples in this paper are  $k$ -graphs. That said, we prove our results for  $P$ -graphs, which generalise both  $k$ -graphs and the hybrid graphs of [Spi07]. The generalisation is worthwhile: Any purely infinite simple  $C^*$ -algebra is stably isomorphic to the  $C^*$ -algebra of a  $P$ -graph [Spi07; BSV13].

We follow [BSV13; aNSY21] for preliminaries on weakly quasi-lattice ordered groups and  $P$ -graphs. Let  $Q$  be a discrete group, and let  $P$  be a semigroup with unit  $e$  such that  $P \cap P^{-1} = \{e\}$ . For each  $p, r \in P$ , define  $p \leq r$  if  $pq = r$  for some  $q \in P$ . Following [aNSY21],  $(Q, P)$  is a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group if, whenever two elements of  $P$  have a common upper bound with respect to  $\leq$ , there is a least common upper bound. A (discrete)  $P$ -graph consists of a countable small category  $(\Lambda, \Lambda^{(2)}, \Lambda^{(0)}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})$  together with a functor  $\mathbf{d}: \Lambda \rightarrow P$  satisfying the unique factorisation property: for every  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $p, q \in P$  with  $\mathbf{d}(\lambda) = pq$ , there are unique elements  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$  such that  $\lambda = \mu\nu$ ,  $\mathbf{d}(\mu) = p$  and  $\mathbf{d}(\nu) = q$ .

We state some basic facts and notations about  $P$ -graphs. It follows from the unique factorisation property that  $\Lambda$  is left cancellative (i.e.  $\mu\nu = \mu\kappa$  implies  $\nu = \kappa$ ), right-cancellative (i.e.  $\mu\nu = \kappa\nu$  implies  $\mu = \kappa$ ), and has no inverses (i.e.  $\mu\nu = \mathbf{s}(\nu)$  implies  $\mu = \nu = \mathbf{s}(\nu)$ ). Hence, any  $P$ -graph is a category of paths (i.e. a left and right cancellative small category having no inverses) as in [Spi14, Example 2.2(6)]. For each  $p \in P$ , we write  $\Lambda^p := \mathbf{d}^{-1}(p)$ , and we have  $\Lambda^{(0)} = \Lambda^e$ . For each  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and  $E \subseteq \Lambda$ , we write  $\lambda E := \{\lambda\mu \mid \mu \in E \text{ and } \mathbf{s}(\lambda) = \mathbf{r}(\mu)\}$ . For each  $\mu, \lambda \in \Lambda$ , define  $\mu \preceq \lambda$  if  $\mu\nu = \lambda$  for some  $\nu \in \Lambda$ . The relation  $\preceq$  is the same as that of [Spi14, Definition 2.5] for categories of paths, so  $\preceq$  is a partial order. Moreover,  $\preceq$  is left invariant (i.e.  $\mu\nu \preceq \mu\kappa$  implies  $\nu \preceq \kappa$ ) because of left cancellation.

**Example 2.5.** The  $k$ -graphs of [KP00] are the  $P$ -graphs where  $(Q, P) = (\mathbb{Z}^k, \mathbb{N}^k)$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

We say  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned if, for all  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ , there is a finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$  as in [Spi12, Page 729]. Our first contribution is to give a local treatment of finite alignment in Section 3, during which we give examples of  $k$ -graphs.

**2.3. Groupoids.** We refer to [Wil19, Page 3–4] for preliminaries on groupoids. A groupoid consists of a set  $G$  and a subset  $G^{(2)} \subseteq G \times G$  together with a map  $(g, h) \mapsto gh$  from  $G^{(2)}$  to  $G$  (called composition) and a map  $g \mapsto g^{-1}$  from  $G$  to  $G$  (called inversion) such that:

- (a) if  $(f, g), (g, h) \in G^{(2)}$ , then  $(f, gh), (fg, h) \in G^{(2)}$  and  $f(gh) = (fg)h =: fgh$ ;
- (b) for all  $g \in G$ ,  $(g^{-1})^{-1} = g$ ; and
- (c) for all  $g \in G$ ,  $(g^{-1}, g) \in G^{(2)}$  and  $(g, h) \in G^{(2)}$  implies  $g^{-1}(gh) = h$  and  $(gh)h^{-1} = g$ .

The set  $G^{(0)} := \{x \in G \mid x = xx = x^{-1}\}$  is called the unit space of  $G$ . There are range and source maps from  $G$  to  $G^{(0)}$  given by  $\mathbf{r}(g) := gg^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{s}(g) := g^{-1}g \in G^{(0)}$ , for each  $g \in G$ , respectively. We have  $\mathbf{r}(G) = \mathbf{s}(G) = G^{(0)}$ , and  $(g, h) \in G^{(2)}$  if and only if  $\mathbf{s}(g) = \mathbf{r}(h)$ .

We define topological, locally compact, étale and ample groupoids as in [Ste10], though they were first studied by Renault [Ren80] and then Paterson [Pat99]. Let  $G$  be a groupoid endowed with a (*not necessarily Hausdorff*) topology. The set  $G^{(2)}$  is endowed with the subspace topology from the product topology on  $G \times G$ . We say  $G$  is topological if composition and inversion are continuous. A locally compact groupoid is a topological groupoid  $G$  such that  $G$  is locally compact and the unit space  $G^{(0)}$  is both locally compact *and Hausdorff* in the subspace topology. A locally compact groupoid  $G$  is étale if  $\mathbf{s}: G \rightarrow G^{(0)}$  is a local homeomorphism. An étale groupoid  $G$  is ample if  $G^{(0)}$  has a basis of compact open sets.

If  $G$  is a groupoid, we call  $H \subseteq G$  a subgroupoid if  $H$  is a groupoid under the inherited operations. Given  $U \subseteq G^{(0)}$ , the reduction of  $G$  to  $U$  is  $G|_U := \mathbf{s}^{-1}(U) \cap \mathbf{r}^{-1}(U)$ , which is a subgroupoid of  $G$  under the inherited operations. Following [SSW20], we say  $U \subseteq G^{(0)}$  is invariant if  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{s}^{-1}(U)) \subseteq U$ , in which case  $G|_U = \mathbf{s}^{-1}(U)$ . If  $G$  is étale and  $U \subseteq G^{(0)}$  is closed and invariant, then  $G|_U$  is an étale closed subgroupoid of  $G$  (see [SSW20, Page 96]).

**2.4. Semigroup actions.** The following definitions come from [RW17, §5]. Let  $X$  be a set, and let  $P$  be a subsemigroup of a group  $Q$  with unit  $e$ . Suppose  $X * P$  is a subset of  $X \times P$  and  $T: X * P \rightarrow X$  is a function sending each  $(x, m) \in X * P$  to  $T((x, m)) =: x \cdot m \in X$  and satisfying:

- (S1) for all  $x \in X$ ,  $(x, e) \in X * P$  and  $x \cdot e = x$ ; and
- (S2) for all  $(x, m, n) \in X * P \times P$ ,  $(x, mn) \in X * P$  if and only if  $(x, m) \in X * P$  and  $(x \cdot m, n) \in X * P$ , in which case  $(x \cdot m) \cdot n = x \cdot (mn)$ .

We call the triple  $(X, P, T)$  a semigroup action (of  $P$  on  $X$ ). For each  $m \in P$ , we write

$$\text{dom}(m) := \{x \in X \mid (x, m) \in X * P\} \text{ and } \text{im}(m) := \{x \cdot m \mid x \in \text{dom}(m)\},$$

and we define  $T_m: \text{dom}(m) \rightarrow \text{im}(m)$  by  $T_m(x) = x \cdot m$ , for each  $x \in \text{dom}(m)$ . We say  $(X, P, T)$  is directed if, for all  $m, n \in P$ , if  $\text{dom}(m) \cap \text{dom}(n) \neq \emptyset$ , then there is  $l \in P$  such that  $m, n \leq l$  and  $\text{dom}(m) \cap \text{dom}(n) \subseteq \text{dom}(l)$ , in which case  $\text{dom}(m) \cap \text{dom}(n) = \text{dom}(l)$  as per the note following [RW17, Definition 5.2]. Recall that a local homeomorphism from a space  $X$  to a space  $Y$  is a continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  such that every  $x \in X$  has an open neighbourhood  $U$  such that  $f(U)$  is open in  $Y$  and the restriction  $f|_U: U \rightarrow f(U)$  of  $f$  is a homeomorphism [Wil70, Page 68]. A semigroup action  $(X, P, T)$  is locally compact if  $X$  is a locally compact Hausdorff space and, for all  $m \in P$ ,  $\text{dom}(m)$  and  $\text{im}(m)$  are open in  $X$  and  $T_m: \text{dom}(m) \rightarrow \text{im}(m)$  is a local homeomorphism.

**2.5. Semidirect product groupoids.** Semidirect product groupoids are a generalisation of Deaconu–Renault groupoids [Dea95; Ren00]. In [RW17], Renault and Williams associate a semidirect product groupoid  $G(X, P, T)$  to each locally compact directed semigroup action  $(X, P, T)$  as follows. Let  $G(X, P, T)$  be the set of  $(x, q, y) \in X \times Q \times X$  for which there are  $m, n \in P$  satisfying  $q = mn^{-1}$ ,

$x \in \text{dom}(m)$ ,  $y \in \text{dom}(n)$  and  $x \cdot m = y \cdot n$ . Let  $G(X, P, T)^{(2)}$  be the set of pairs  $((x, q, y), (w, r, z)) \in G(X, P, T) \times G(X, P, T)$  with  $y = w$ . Then,  $G(X, P, T)$  is a groupoid with composition  $(x, q, y)(y, r, z) := (x, qr, z)$  and inversion  $(x, q, y)^{-1} := (y, q^{-1}, x)$ , called the semidirect product groupoid of  $(X, P, T)$ . The collection of  $Z(U, m, n, V) := \{(x, mn^{-1}, y) \in G(X, P, T) \mid x \in U, y \in V \text{ and } x \cdot m = y \cdot n\}$ , where  $m, n \in P$  and  $U, V \subseteq X$  are open, is a basis for a topology on  $G(X, P, T)$  such that  $G(X, P, T)$  is étale and Hausdorff, and  $x \mapsto (x, e, x)$  is a homeomorphism from  $X$  to  $G(X, P, T)^{(0)}$ . It follows from the definition of a basis that:


**Lemma 2.6.** If  $\mathcal{B}$  is a basis for the topology on  $X$ , then the collection of  $Z(B, m, n, C)$ , where  $m, n \in P$  and  $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$ , is a basis for the topology on  $G(X, P, T)$ .

### 3. A LOCAL TREATMENT OF FINITE ALIGNMENT

We give a local treatment of finite alignment. We find each  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  contains a subset  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  that is a *right constellation* in the sense of [GH10; GS17]—a sort of “one-sided category”. Moreover,  $\text{FA}_r(\Lambda) := \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cup \mathbf{r}(\text{FA}(\Lambda))$  is a subcategory of  $\Lambda$  such that  $(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda), \Lambda)$  is a *finitely aligned* relative category of paths in the sense of [Spi14]. We use  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  in Section 4 to define a locally compact path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  for each  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph. For each  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ , we say  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu, \nu)$  if there is a finite (possibly empty) subset  $J$  of  $\Lambda$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ . For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , we say  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $\lambda$  if  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu, \nu)$  for any  $\mu \in \lambda\Lambda$  and  $\nu \in \Lambda$ . Let  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  be the set of  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  such that  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $\lambda$ . We say  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned if  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ , which coincides with the definition of finite alignment from [Spi12, Page 729]. If  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned, we say  $\Lambda$  is nonfinitely aligned, as in [Spi14].


**Example 3.2.** We describe  $k$ -graphs in terms of their 1-skeletons as per [RSY03]. Consider the 2-graph  $\Lambda_0$  from [Spi20, Example 12.7], which is given by the following 1-skeleton with relations  $\mu\beta_n = \lambda\alpha_n$ , for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .



The only pair at which  $\Lambda_0$  is not finitely aligned is  $(\lambda, \mu)$ . Thus,  $\text{FA}(\Lambda_0) = \Lambda_0 \setminus \{v, \lambda, \mu\} \neq \emptyset$ , i.e.  $\Lambda_0$  is finitely aligned *somewhere*.

**3.1. Nowhere finitely aligned higher-rank graph.** By adjoining copies of  $\Lambda_0$  to itself, we construct a 2-graph  $\Lambda_\emptyset$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda_\emptyset) = \emptyset$ .

**Example 3.3.** Consider the 2-graph  $\Lambda_\emptyset$  given by the following 1-skeleton with relations  $\mu^m \beta_n^m = \lambda^m \alpha_n^m$ , for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ .




For any  $\lambda \in \Lambda_\emptyset$ , there are  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda' \in \Lambda_\emptyset$  such that  $\mathbf{s}(\lambda\lambda') = v^n$ . Then,  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned at  $(\lambda\lambda'\lambda^n, \lambda\lambda'\mu^n)$ . Hence,  $\text{FA}(\Lambda_\emptyset) = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $\Lambda_\emptyset$  is finitely aligned *nowhere*.

Our path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is empty if and only if  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$  (Remark 4.4), so we restrict our attention to  $\Lambda$  for which  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Note that Spielberg's techniques for the nonfinitely aligned setting [Spi20] apply to  $\Lambda_\emptyset$  even though  $\text{FA}(\Lambda_\emptyset) = \emptyset$ .

**3.2. Somewhere finitely aligned higher-rank graph.** We recall the 2-graph  $\Lambda^{\text{Yee}}$  from [Yee07], which satisfies  $\text{FA}(\Lambda^{\text{Yee}}) \neq \emptyset$  and motivates our definition of path space in Section 4.

**Example 3.4.** Consider the 2-graph  $\Lambda^{\text{Yee}}$  from [Yee07, Remark 3.7], which is given by the following 1-skeleton with relations  $\mu_i \beta_{i,j} = \lambda \alpha_{i,j}$ , for each  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ .



The importance of  $\Lambda^{\text{Yee}}$  is that the usual path space from the finitely aligned setting is not locally compact [Yee07, Remark 3.7], and hence does not give rise to the desired groupoids. In Section 4, we give a novel definition of a *locally compact* path space for any  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ .

**3.3. Properties of the finitely aligned part of a higher-rank graph.** We collect some basic properties of  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ .

- The set  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a right ideal in  $\Lambda$ .
- If  $\mu\delta \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , then  $\delta \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ .
- The set  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is closed under the source map  $\mathbf{s}$ .
- The set  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is not necessarily closed under the range map  $\mathbf{r}$ .
- If  $\mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , then  $\mathbf{s}(\mu)\Lambda \subseteq \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ .
- If  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , then there is a finite  $J \subseteq \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ .



*Proof.* (a) Suppose  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \lambda') \in \Lambda^{(2)}$ . We show  $\lambda\lambda' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . If  $(\lambda\lambda', \lambda'') \in \Lambda^{(2)}$  and  $\nu \in \Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\lambda\lambda'\lambda'', \nu)$  because  $\lambda\lambda'\lambda'' \in \lambda\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $\lambda$ .

(b) Suppose  $\mu' \in \delta\Lambda$  and  $\nu \in \Lambda$ . We show  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu', \nu)$ . If  $\mathbf{r}(\nu) \neq \mathbf{r}(\mu')$ , then  $\mu'\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \emptyset$ , so we are done. Otherwise,  $\mathbf{r}(\nu) = \mathbf{r}(\mu') = \mathbf{r}(\delta) = \mathbf{s}(\mu)$ , so  $(\mu, \nu) \in \Lambda^{(2)}$ . Because  $\mu\mu' \in \mu\delta\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu\mu', \mu\nu)$ . That is, there is a finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\mu'\Lambda \cap \mu\nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ . It follows  $J \subseteq \mu\Lambda$ , and so  $\mu'\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\kappa \text{ such that } \mu\kappa \in J} \kappa\Lambda$ , so  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu', \nu)$ .

(c) This is a special case of (b) because  $\lambda = \lambda\mathbf{s}(\lambda)$ , for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ .

(d) The 2-graph  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2 is a counter-example because  $v = \mathbf{r}(\lambda\alpha_1) \notin \text{FA}(\Lambda_0)$ .

(e) This follows from (a) and (b).

(f) Since  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\mu, \nu)$ , there is a finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ .

Each  $\lambda \in J$  is in  $\mu\Lambda$ , so (a) implies  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ .  $\square$

**3.4. The finitely aligned part as a constellation.** We highlight from Lemma 3.5 that  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is closed under composition (by Lemma 3.5(a)), closed under  $\mathbf{s}$  (by Lemma 3.5(c)), and not necessarily closed under  $\mathbf{r}$  (by Lemma 3.5(d)). Thus,  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a right constellation in the sense of [GS17, Page 280]—a sort of “one-sided category”. Constellations were introduced in [GH10].

**Proposition 3.6.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Then,  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a right constellation with respect to the restrictions of the composition and source maps in  $\Lambda$ .

**3.5. Lack of a factorisation property.** If  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a finitely aligned  $P$ -graph, we could simply apply techniques from the extensive literature on *finitely aligned*  $P$ -graphs to  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . The immediate issue is that  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  can fail to be closed under  $\mathbf{r}$  (Lemma 3.5(d)). However, even the union  $\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda) := \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cup \mathbf{r}(\text{FA}(\Lambda))$  may not be a  $P$ -graph: Recall the 2-graph  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2. Observe  $\lambda\alpha_1 \in \text{FA}(\Lambda_0)$  but  $\lambda \notin \text{FA}(\Lambda_0)$ , which means  $\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$  does not have a factorisation property. That is,  $\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda_0)$  is not a 2-graph.

**3.6. Finitely aligned relative category of paths.** Following [Spi14], a relative category of paths is a pair  $(\Lambda', \Lambda)$ , where  $\Lambda$  is a category of paths and  $\Lambda'$  is a subcategory. A relative category of paths  $(\Lambda', \Lambda)$  is finitely aligned if:

- (a) for every  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda'$ , there is a finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda'$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ ; and
- (b) for every  $\mu \in \Lambda'$ ,  $\mu\Lambda \cap \Lambda' = \mu\Lambda'$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The pair  $(\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda), \Lambda)$  is a finitely aligned relative category of paths, where

$$\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda) := \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cup \mathbf{r}(\text{FA}(\Lambda)).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.5,  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is closed under the composition and source maps in  $\Lambda$ , so  $\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$  is closed under the composition, source *and* range maps in  $\Lambda$ . That is,  $\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$  is a subcategory of  $\Lambda$ , and



$\Lambda$  is a category of paths. Let  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$ . If  $\mu$  or  $\nu$  is in  $\mathbf{r}(\text{FA}(\Lambda))$ , then  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \emptyset$ ,  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \nu\Lambda$  or  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \mu\Lambda$ . Otherwise,  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , so Lemma 3.5(f) implies there is a finite  $J \subseteq \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \nu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\lambda \in J} \lambda\Lambda$ . It remains to show  $\mu\Lambda \cap \text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda) = \mu\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$ . Suppose  $\mu\nu \in \mu\Lambda \cap \text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$ . Then,  $\nu \in \mathbf{s}(\mu)\Lambda \subseteq \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 3.5(e), so  $\mu\nu \in \mu\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$ . Conversely, if  $\mu\nu \in \mu\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda)$ , either  $\mu\nu = \mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , or both  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and so  $\mu\nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  because  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is closed under composition (Lemma 3.5(a)).  $\square$

Spielberg associated groupoids to relative categories of paths in [Spi14; Spi20]. We show in Section 6.5 that Spielberg's groupoid of  $(\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda), \Lambda)$  does not coincide with the path groupoid  $G_{\Lambda}$  we define in Section 5.

#### 4. PATH SPACES

In this section, given any  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ , we use  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  from Section 3 to give a novel definition of a path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  for  $\Lambda$ . We show in Lemma 4.8 that  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  if and only if  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  is compact, where  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is the set of filters of  $\Lambda$ , which implies  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is locally compact (Theorem 4.9).

**4.1. Filters.** A filter of a  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  is a nonempty subset  $x$  of  $\Lambda$  that is hereditary (i.e.  $\lambda \preceq \mu \in x$  implies  $\lambda \in x$ ) and directed (i.e.  $\mu, \nu \in x$  implies there is  $\lambda \in x$  such that  $\mu, \nu \preceq \lambda$ ). We denote the set of filters of  $\Lambda$  by  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Filters have been used to give combinatorial descriptions for spaces of path-like objects for some time. In [Nic92], Nica showed filters provide a path model for the spectrum of the diagonal subalgebra of the Wiener–Hopf  $C^*$ -algebra of a quasi-lattice ordered group. Paterson and Welch used filters to model paths in  $k$ -graphs in [PW05, Lemma 2.1]. Exel used filters to model paths in semigroupoids in [Exe08, §20]. Indeed, in the original paper [BSV13] on  $P$ -graphs, filters played the role of paths, and we will do the same.

We recall basics of filters from [BSV13]. The restriction  $\mathbf{d}|_x$  of  $\mathbf{d}$  to any  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is injective. For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , we write  $F(\lambda) := \{\mu \in \Lambda \mid \mu \preceq \lambda\} \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , there is a unique element of  $x \cap \Lambda^{(0)}$  denoted by  $\mathbf{r}(x)$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{r}(F(\lambda)) = \mathbf{r}(\lambda)$ . We say  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is an ultrafilter of  $\Lambda$  if, for all  $y \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ ,  $x \subseteq y$  implies  $x = y$ . We denote the set of ultrafilters of  $\Lambda$  by  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ . The following result is standard, but we prove it to emphasise there is no need for finite alignment.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ , where  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \Lambda$  is finite, is a basis for  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  consisting of clopen sets.

**Remark 4.2.** If  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned, we can assume  $K \subseteq \mu\Lambda$  (see Lemma 6.2).

*Proof of Lemma 4.1.* Since  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  has the subspace topology from  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ , the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$ , where  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$  are finite, is a basis for  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$  for some finite  $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \Lambda$ . Because filters are nonempty, we can assume without loss of generality that  $K_1$  is nonempty. Then, because filters are directed, there is  $\mu \in x$  such that  $\lambda \preceq \mu$  for all  $\lambda \in K_1$ . The

hereditary property of filters implies  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K_2) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(K_1 \setminus K_2)$ , as required. The intersection of a closed set with a subspace is closed in the subspace topology, so each  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K_2)$  is closed in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

**4.2. Path and boundary-path spaces.** If  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned, then  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is the appropriate path space (for example, see [Spi12], wherein  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is denoted by “ $\Lambda^*$ ”). However, Yeend showed in [Yee07, Remark 3.7] that  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda^{\text{Yee}})$  is not locally compact for the 2-graph  $\Lambda^{\text{Yee}}$  from Example 3.4. (Actually, Yeend constructs a path space using graph morphisms instead of filters, like in the original  $k$ -graph paper [KP00], but the author showed in [Jon24] that Yeend’s arguments apply to  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda^{\text{Yee}})$  as well.) We use  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  from Section 3 to identify an open subspace  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  of  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  that is locally compact even if  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned. The definition of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  also allows a locally compact and directed semigroup action of  $P$  on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  in Section 5.

**Definition 4.3** (Path space). Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The path space of  $\Lambda$  is the set  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  of  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  for which  $x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ .

**Remark 4.4.** Notice  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$  implies  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$  because, for each  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ ,  $F(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . On the other hand, if  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$  (as in Example 3.3), then  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) = \emptyset$ .

**Example 4.5.** Recall  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2. The set of filters is

$$\mathcal{F}(\Lambda_0) = \{\{t\}, \{u\}, \{v\}, \{w\}, F(\mu), F(\lambda)\} \cup \{F(\alpha_n), F(\beta_n), F(\mu\beta_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Since  $\text{FA}(\Lambda_0) = \Lambda_0 \setminus \{v, \lambda, \mu\}$ , we have  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda_0) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda_0) \setminus \{\{v\}, F(\lambda), F(\mu)\}$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , the following are equivalent:

- (a)  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ ;
- (b)  $x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cap \lambda\Lambda \neq \emptyset$  for all  $\lambda \in x$ .

*Proof.* We have that (b) implies (a) because filters are nonempty. Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ , and fix  $\lambda \in x$ . There is some  $\mu \in x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . Filters are directed, so there is  $\nu \in x$  with  $\lambda, \mu \preceq \nu$ . In particular,  $\nu \in \lambda\Lambda$ , and  $\nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  because  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a right ideal in  $\Lambda$  (Lemma 3.5(a)).  $\square$

**Definition 4.7** (Boundary-path space). Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  of  $\Lambda$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .

**4.3. Local compactness of the path spaces.** In the remainder of this section, we prove topological properties of  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $\partial\Lambda$ , which are summarised in Theorem 4.9. The main work is to show they are locally compact. This involves the following lemma that characterises the elements of  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  in terms of the topology on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . A consequence of the lemma is that the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  in this paper is equivalent to that of the author’s thesis [Jon24].

**Lemma 4.8.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , the following are equivalent:

- (a)  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ ;
- (b)  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  is compact.

*Proof.* We prove (b) implies (a) by contrapositive. If  $\lambda \notin \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , then there are  $\lambda' \in \lambda\Lambda$  and  $\mu \in \Lambda$  such that  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned at  $(\lambda', \mu)$ . We show  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  is not compact—equivalently, sequentially compact (Lemma 2.3). By definition,  $\Lambda$  not being finitely aligned at  $(\lambda', \mu)$  means, for all finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda$ ,  $\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda \neq \bigcup_{\nu \in J} \nu\Lambda$ . Thus,  $\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda$  is infinite. Since  $\Lambda$  is countable, we can write  $\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda = (\nu_n)$ . For all  $n$ , let  $J_n := \{\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n\}$ . Hence, for each  $n$ ,  $\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda \neq \bigcup_{\nu \in J_n} \nu\Lambda \subseteq \lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda$ . Thus, there is a sequence  $(\kappa_n)$  such that  $\kappa_n \in (\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda) \setminus \bigcup_{\nu \in J_n} \nu\Lambda$  for all  $n$ . In particular,  $(F(\kappa_n)) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  is compact. Because filters are hereditary,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda') \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ . Also,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$  is closed in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ , so  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$  is compact. That means there is a subsequence  $(F(\kappa_{n_k}))$  of  $(F(\kappa_n))$  and there is  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$  such that  $F(\kappa_{n_k}) \rightarrow x$ . Because  $\mu \in F(\kappa_n)$  for all  $n$ , Lemma 2.4 implies  $\mu \in x$ . Filters are directed, so  $x \cap \lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda \neq \emptyset$  and  $\lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda = (\nu_n)$ , so there is  $n'$  such that  $\nu_{n'} \in x \cap \lambda'\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda$ . Because  $\nu_{n'} \in x$  and  $F(\kappa_{n_k}) \rightarrow x$ ,  $\nu_{n'}$  is eventually inside  $(F(\kappa_{n_k}))$  by Lemma 2.4. That is, there is  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\nu_{n'} \in F(\kappa_{n_k})$  for all  $k \geq K$ . By definition of  $F(\kappa_{n_k})$ , we have  $\kappa_{n_k} \in \nu_{n'}\Lambda \subseteq \bigcup_{\nu \in J_{n'}} \nu\Lambda$  for all  $k \geq K$ . Recall, for each  $n$ ,  $\kappa_n$  was chosen so that  $\kappa_n \notin \bigcup_{\nu \in J_n} \nu\Lambda$ . Thus, we nearly have a contradiction. We just need to ‘wait’ for  $n_k$  to surpass  $n'$ . Formally, since  $n_k$  is unbounded, there is  $K'$  such that, for all  $k \geq K'$ , we have  $n' \leq n_k$ . Let  $N := \max\{K, K'\}$ . Then,  $N \geq K$  implies  $\kappa_{n_N} \in \bigcup_{\nu \in J_{n'}} \nu\Lambda$ . Also,  $N \geq K'$  implies  $n' \leq n_N$ , and so  $J_{n'} \subseteq J_{n_N}$ . Therefore,  $\kappa_{n_N} \in \bigcup_{\nu \in J_{n'}} \nu\Lambda \subseteq \bigcup_{\nu \in J_{n_N}} \nu\Lambda$ , which is a contradiction.

We prove (a) implies (b) directly by slightly modifying the proof of [Jon24, Lemma 5.2.1]. Suppose  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . If  $\lambda\Lambda$  is finite, then  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  is finite and therefore compact. Now suppose  $\lambda\Lambda$  is infinite and write  $\lambda\Lambda = (\mu_n)$  such that  $\mu_0 = \lambda$  and  $\mu_i \neq \mu_j$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . Let  $(x_j)$  be a sequence in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ . We construct a convergent subsequence of  $(x_j)$  via an infinite collection of nested subsequences  $(x_{f_n(j)})$ , each having the property that some extension of  $\mu_n$  is in  $x_{f_n(j)}$ , for all  $j$ . These extensions give rise to a particular  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  and the sequence  $(x_{f_i(i)})$  converges to  $x$ .

Let  $\lambda_0 := \mu_0 = \lambda$ , and let  $(x_{f_0(j)}) = (x_j)$ . Notice that  $\lambda_0 \in x_{f_0(j)}$ , for all  $j$ . Consider  $\mu_1$ . Suppose  $\mu_1$  is contained in infinitely many  $x_{f_0(j)}$ . That is, there is a subsequence  $(x_{f'_1(j)})$  of  $(x_{f_0(j)})$  such that  $\mu_1 \in x_{f'_1(j)}$  for all  $j$ . Since  $\lambda_0 = \lambda \in \lambda\Lambda$ ,  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned at  $(\lambda_0, \mu_1)$ , so there is a finite  $J_1 \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\lambda_0\Lambda \cap \mu_1\Lambda = \bigcup_{\gamma \in J_1} \gamma\Lambda$ . For every  $j$ ,  $\lambda_0$  and  $\mu_1$  are in  $x_{f'_1(j)}$ , which is directed, so  $\emptyset \neq \lambda_0\Lambda \cap \mu_1\Lambda \cap x_{f'_1(j)} \subseteq \bigcup_{\gamma \in J_1} \gamma\Lambda \cap x_{f'_1(j)}$ . For all  $j$ ,  $x_{f'_1(j)}$  is hereditary, so there is a  $\gamma_j \in J_1 \cap x_{f'_1(j)}$ . Since  $J_1$  is finite, the pigeonhole principle implies there is  $\gamma \in J_1$  such that, for infinitely many  $j$ ,  $\gamma \in x_{f'_1(j)}$ . Let  $(x_{f_1(j)})$  be the subsequence of  $(x_{f'_1(j)})$  given by those infinitely many  $j$ , and let  $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$  be such that  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 = \gamma$ . Thus,  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 \in x_{f_1(j)}$  for all  $j$ . Observe  $\mu_1 \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1$ . On the other hand, if  $\mu_1$  is contained in only finitely many  $x_{f_0(j)}$ , let  $(x_{f_1(j)}) := (x_{f_0(j)})$ , and let  $\lambda_1 := \mathbf{s}(\lambda_0)$ . In both cases,  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 \in x_{f_1(j)}$ , for all  $j$ .

Repeating the above argument with  $\lambda_0\lambda_1$  instead of  $\lambda_0$  and with the index of every other variable increased by 1 produces  $\lambda_2 \in \Lambda$  and a subsequence  $(x_{f_2(j)})$  of  $(x_{f_1(j)})$  such that  $\lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2 \in x_{f_2(j)}$  for all  $j$ . Moreover, if  $\mu_2$  is contained in infinitely many  $x_{f_1(j)}$ , then  $\mu_2 \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1\lambda_2$ . Indeed, this can be repeated again for each  $n \geq 3$ . Thus, for each  $n \geq 0$ , we have a subsequence  $(x_{f_n(j)})$  of  $(x_j)$ , where  $(x_{f_0(j)}) = (x_j)$ , and  $(x_{f_{n+1}(j)})$  is a subsequence of  $(x_{f_n(j)})$ , for all  $n \geq 0$ . Also, we have a subset  $\{\lambda_n \mid n \geq 0\} \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n \in x_{f_n(j)}$ , for all  $n, j \geq 0$ . In particular, for any  $i \geq 0$ ,  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_i \in x_{f_i(i)}$ . Since filters are hereditary,

$$(4.1) \quad 0 \leq n \leq i \implies \lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n \in x_{f_i(i)}.$$

Lastly, for each  $n \geq 1$ , if  $\mu_n$  is contained in infinitely many  $x_{f_{n-1}(j)}$ , then  $\mu_n \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n$ .

We claim that

$$x_{f_i(i)} \rightarrow x := \bigcup_n F(\lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n).$$

Because  $(F(\lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n))$  is totally ordered with respect to inclusion,  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  (see the proof of [BSV13, Lemma 3.2]). Moreover,  $\lambda_0 = \lambda \in x$ , so  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ . We show  $x_{f_i(i)} \rightarrow x$  using Lemma 2.4. Fix  $\mu \in x$ , so  $\mu \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n$  for some  $n$ . Then, Eq. (4.1) says  $\lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n$  is eventually inside  $(x_{f_i(i)})$  (for sufficiently large  $i$ ). Since each  $x_{f_i(i)}$  is hereditary,  $\mu$  is eventually inside  $(x_{f_i(i)})$ , so (in) holds. We show (out) by contrapositive. Suppose  $\mu \in \Lambda$  is not eventually outside  $(x_{f_i(i)})$ . That is, for all  $I$ , there is  $i_I \geq I$  such that  $\mu \in x_{f_{i_I}(i_I)}$ . Thus,  $\lambda, \mu \in x_{f_{i_I}(i_I)}$  for all  $I$ . Since  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , there is a finite  $J \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\lambda\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda = \bigcup_{\nu \in J} \nu\Lambda$ . Like earlier, because each  $x_{f_{i_I}(i_I)}$  is directed, the pigeonhole principle implies there is a subsequence  $(x_{f_{i_{I_k}}(i_{I_k})})$  and  $\nu \in J$  such that  $\nu \in x_{f_{i_{I_k}}(i_{I_k})} \cap \lambda\Lambda \cap \mu\Lambda$  for all  $k$ . In particular,  $\nu \in \lambda\Lambda$ , so  $\nu = \mu_{n'}$  for some  $n'$ . Notice the truncated sequence  $(x_{f_{i_{I_k}}(i_{I_k})})_{i_{I_k} \geq n'-1}$  is a subsequence of  $(x_{f_{n'-1}(j)})$  and  $\nu = \mu_{n'}$  is in every entry of  $(x_{f_{i_{I_k}}(i_{I_k})})_{i_{I_k} \geq n'-1}$ . Thus, according to the above construction,  $\mu_{n'} \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{n'}$ . Altogether we have  $\mu \preceq \mu_{n'} \preceq \lambda_0\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_{n'} \in x$ , so  $\mu \in x$ . That is, (out) holds, and so  $x_{f_i(i)} \rightarrow x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  by Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.9.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and the boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  are Hausdorff and have countable bases consisting of compact sets. Moreover,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is open in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* The space  $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$  is Hausdorff, and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is a subspace. By Lemma 4.1, the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus K)$ , where  $\mu' \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \Lambda$  is finite, is a basis for the topology on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus K)$ , there is  $\mu \in x \cap \mu'\Lambda \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 4.6. Then,  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus K)$ . Hence, the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ , where  $\mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $K \subseteq \Lambda$  is finite, is a basis for the topology on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . This basis is countable because  $\Lambda$  is countable. For each  $\mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and finite  $K \subseteq \Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu)$  is compact by Lemma 4.8 and  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu)$ , so  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$  is compact. The boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  also has the stated properties because  $\partial\Lambda$  is a closed subspace of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Also,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is open in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  because  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  equals the union of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu)$  for which  $\mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ .  $\square$

## 5. PATH GROUPOIDS

In [RW17, §6], Renault and Williams construct actions of semigroups  $P$  on  $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{d})$ -proper topological  $P$ -graphs. We only consider discrete  $P$ -graphs here, for which

$$(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{d})\text{-proper} \iff \text{row-finite} \implies \text{finitely aligned},$$

as per [Jon24, §5.1]. Thus, in the discrete setting, we generalise the semigroup action of [RW17] to any  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Then, we define the path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  to be the semidirect product groupoid associated to the action as in Section 2.5.

**5.1. Shift maps on the path space.** By [BSV13, Lemma 3.4], the maps

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mathbf{s}(\lambda)), \quad x \mapsto x \cdot \lambda := \{\mu \in \Lambda \mid \lambda\mu \in x\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mathbf{s}(\lambda)) \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda), \quad x \mapsto \lambda x := \{\zeta \in \Lambda \mid \zeta \preceq \lambda\mu \text{ for some } \mu \in x\}$$

are well-defined. We call them the left-shift map and right-shift map associated to  $\lambda$ , respectively. The notation “ $x \cdot \lambda$ ” mimics the operations defined in [RW17, Lemma 6.7(a)–(b)] and differs from [BSV13], where “ $x \cdot \lambda$ ” is denoted by “ $\lambda^* \cdot x$ ”.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda^{(2)}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ :

- (a) if  $\lambda\mu \in x$ , then  $(x \cdot \lambda) \cdot \mu = x \cdot (\lambda\mu)$ ; and
- (b) if  $\mathbf{s}(\mu) = \mathbf{r}(x)$ , then  $\lambda(\mu x) = (\lambda\mu)x$ .

*Proof.* (a) This follows from the associativity of composition in  $\Lambda$ .

(b) If  $\zeta \in \lambda(\mu x)$ , then there is  $\eta \in \mu x$  such that  $\zeta \preceq \lambda\eta$  and there is  $\xi \in x$  such that  $\eta \preceq \mu\xi$ . It follows from  $\eta \preceq \mu\xi$  that  $\lambda\eta \preceq \lambda\mu\xi$ , and so  $\zeta \preceq \lambda\mu\xi$  by the transitivity of  $\preceq$ . Hence,  $\zeta \in (\lambda\mu)x$ . The other inclusion is similar but uses the reflexivity of  $\preceq$ .  $\square$

Though finite alignment is assumed in the statement of the following result from [BSV13], it is not used in their proof, so we state the result in full generality here.

**Lemma 5.2** (Lemma 3.4 of [BSV13]). Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\mu \in x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $(\lambda, \mu) \in \Lambda^{(2)}$ , then:

- (a)  $\mu(x \cdot \mu) = x$  and  $(\lambda x) \cdot \lambda = x$ ; and
- (b) if  $x \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ , then  $x \cdot \mu, \lambda x \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ .

Left-shift maps are continuous bijections even when the  $P$ -graph is not finitely aligned:

**Lemma 5.3.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For each  $(\lambda, \lambda') \in \Lambda^{(2)}$ , the left-shift map associated to  $\lambda$  is a continuous bijection whose inverse is the right-shift map, and  $(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda\lambda')) \cdot \lambda = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$ .

*Proof.* For injectivity, suppose  $x, x' \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  satisfy  $x \cdot \lambda = x' \cdot \lambda$ . Lemma 5.2(a) implies  $x = \lambda(x \cdot \lambda) = \lambda(x' \cdot \lambda) = x'$ . For surjectivity, fix  $y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mathbf{s}(\lambda))$ . Notice  $\lambda y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ , and  $(\lambda y) \cdot \lambda = y$  by Lemma 5.2(a). Consequently, the right-shift map is the inverse of the left-shift map. Also, note that  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda\lambda')$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$  because filters are hereditary. For any  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda\lambda')$ ,  $\lambda\lambda' \in x$ , so  $\lambda' \in x \cdot \lambda$ . Hence,  $x \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$ . That is,  $(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda\lambda')) \cdot \lambda \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$ . The surjectivity argument can be modified to show  $(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda\lambda')) \cdot \lambda \supseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda')$ . To see the left-shift map is continuous, suppose  $(x_n)$  converges to  $x$  in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda)$ . To show  $(x_n \cdot \lambda)$  converges to  $x \cdot \lambda$ , we use Lemma 2.4. Suppose  $\mu \notin x \cdot \lambda$ , so  $\lambda\mu \notin x$ . Since (out) holds for  $(x_n)$  and  $x$ ,  $\lambda\mu$  is eventually outside  $(x_n)$ , and so  $\mu$  is eventually outside  $(x_n \cdot \lambda)$ , so (out) holds for  $(x_n \cdot \lambda)$  and  $x \cdot \lambda$ . A similar argument shows (in) holds.  $\square$

However, left-shift maps can fail to be open:

**Example 5.4.** Recall  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2. We write  $F(\kappa) = \{\nu \in \Lambda_0 \mid \nu \preceq \kappa\}$  for each  $\kappa \in \Lambda_0$ . Lemma 2.4 can be used to show  $F(\alpha_n) \rightarrow \{w\}$  (because  $w$  is the only element of  $\Lambda_0$  that is eventually inside  $(F(\alpha_n))$ ) but  $\lambda F(\alpha_n) = \{v, \mu, \lambda, \lambda\alpha_n\} \rightarrow \{v, \mu, \lambda\} \neq \{v, \lambda\} = \lambda\{w\}$ . Hence, the right-shift map associated to  $\lambda$  is not continuous, and the right-shift map is the inverse of the left-shift map by Lemma 5.3, so the left-shift map is not open.

The path space is closed under left-shift maps:

**Lemma 5.5.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $\lambda \in x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ , then  $x \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Recall from Lemma 4.6 that  $\lambda \in x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  implies there is some  $\lambda\lambda' \in x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cap \lambda\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ . Then, Lemma 3.5(b) implies  $\lambda' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda) \cap x \cdot \lambda$ , so  $x \cdot \lambda \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .  $\square$

However, the path space can fail to be closed under right-shift maps:

**Example 5.6.** In  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2,  $w \in \text{FA}(\Lambda_0)$ , so  $\{w\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda_0)$ . However,  $\lambda\{w\} = \{v, \lambda\} \subseteq \Lambda_0 \setminus \text{FA}(\Lambda_0)$ , so  $\lambda\{w\} \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda_0)$ .

**5.2. Semigroup action on the path space.** We use the above shift maps to define a locally compact and directed semigroup action  $T$  of  $P$  on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . The reader can recall preliminaries on semigroup actions from Section 2.4. We use one additional notation.

**Notation 5.7.** Recall that we write  $\Lambda^m = \mathbf{d}^{-1}(m)$ , for each  $m \in P$ . For each  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $m \in P$ , if  $x \cap \Lambda^m$  is nonempty, then there is precisely one element  $x(e, m)$  in  $x \cap \Lambda^m$  by the injectivity  $\mathbf{d}|_x$ . Then, the left-shift map associated to  $x(e, m)$  maps  $x$  to  $x \cdot x(e, m)$ .

**Definition 5.8.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P := \{(x, m) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \times P \mid x \cap \Lambda^m \neq \emptyset\}$ , and define  $T: \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  to map each  $(x, m) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$  to  $x \cdot m := x \cdot x(e, m)$ .



**Proposition 5.9.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  is a semigroup action.

*Proof.* The function  $T$  is well-defined with the codomain  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 5.5. We check (S1) and (S2) of the definition of a semigroup action. For each  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ ,  $\mathbf{r}(x) \in x \cap \Lambda^{(0)} = \Lambda^e$ . Thus,  $x \cdot e = x \cdot \mathbf{r}(x) = x$ , so (S1) holds.

Now suppose  $(x, mn) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Since  $\mathbf{d}(x(e, mn)) = mn$  and  $\Lambda$  has the unique factorisation property, there are unique  $\mu \in \Lambda^m$  and  $\nu \in \Lambda^n$  such that  $x(e, mn) = \mu\nu$ . Since  $x$  is hereditary,  $\mu \in x \cap \Lambda^m$ , so  $(x, m) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Notice  $x \cdot m = x \cdot \mu$ . Because  $\mu\nu \in x$ , we have  $\nu \in (x \cdot m) \cap \Lambda^n$ . Thus,  $(x \cdot m, n) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . That is,  $(x, mn) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$  implies both  $(x, m) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$  and  $(x \cdot m, n) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . For the other direction, suppose  $(x, m) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$  and  $(x \cdot m, n) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Say  $\mu \in x \cap \Lambda^m$  and  $\nu \in (x \cdot m) \cap \Lambda^n$ . It follows that  $\mu\nu \in x \cap \Lambda^{mn}$ , so  $(x, mn) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Using Lemma 5.1, we can compute  $(x \cdot m) \cdot n = (x \cdot \mu) \cdot \nu = x \cdot (\mu\nu) = x \cdot (mn)$ , so (S2) holds.  $\square$

The main result using the weak quasi-lattice order property of  $(Q, P)$  is Proposition 5.10.

**Proposition 5.10.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The semigroup action  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  is directed.

*Proof.* Fix  $(m, n) \in P \times P$  such that there is some  $x \in \text{dom}(m) \cap \text{dom}(n)$ . Remember this means  $(x, m), (x, n) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Say  $\mu \in x \cap \Lambda^m$  and  $\nu \in x \cap \Lambda^n$ . Because  $x$  is directed, there are  $\mu', \nu' \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\mu' = \nu\nu' \in x$ . Observe  $m, n \leq \mathbf{d}(\mu\mu') = \mathbf{d}(\nu\nu')$ . Since  $(Q, P)$  is a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, there is a least upper bound  $l$  of  $m$  and  $n$ , from which it follows that  $\text{dom}(m) \cap \text{dom}(n) \subseteq \text{dom}(l)$ .  $\square$

We embark on a series of lemmas proving  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  is locally compact (Theorem 5.14). This is one of the main technical difficulties of the work that led to the definition of our path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Recall from Theorem 4.9 that the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K) = \{x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \mid \mu \in x \subseteq \Lambda \setminus K\}$ , where  $\mu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $K \subseteq \Lambda$  is finite, is a basis of compact sets for the topology on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $m \in P$ ,  $\text{dom}(m)$  is open in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* We have  $\text{dom}(m) = \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda^m} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu)$ , which is a union of basic open sets.  $\square$

It would now be natural to try to prove  $\text{im}(m) = \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda^m} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mathbf{s}(\mu))$  so that  $\text{im}(m)$  is open too. We can prove  $\text{im}(m) \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu \in \Lambda^m} \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mathbf{s}(\mu))$ , but the reverse containment can fail because  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is not closed under right-shift maps (Example 5.6).

**Lemma 5.12.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $m \in P$ ,  $\text{im}(m)$  is open in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Fix  $x \cdot m \in \text{im}(m)$ , where  $x \in \text{dom}(m)$ . Write  $\mu := x(e, m) \in x \cap \Lambda^m$  so that  $x \cdot m = x \cdot \mu$ . By Lemma 4.6, there is some  $\mu' \in \Lambda$  with  $\mu\mu' \in x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . Notice  $x \cdot m = x \cdot \mu \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ .



Also,  $\mu\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  implies  $\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 3.5(b), so  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu') = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ , which is open in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Now fix  $y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ . Then,  $\mu y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu') = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu') \subseteq \text{dom}(m)$ , and so  $y = (\mu y) \cdot \mu = (\mu y) \cdot m \in \text{im}(m)$ .  $\square$

Recall from Example 5.4 that right-shift maps are not always continuous. Thus, in order to prove  $T$  acts by local homeomorphisms for Theorem 5.14 we need the following lemma, which says that right-shift maps are *continuous enough*.

**Lemma 5.13.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $(\mu, \mu') \in \Lambda^{(2)}$ ,  $\mu\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $w_n \rightarrow w$  in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ , then there is a subsequence  $(w_{n_k})$  such that  $\mu w_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu w$  in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$ .

*Proof.* Since  $(w_n) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ , we have  $(\mu w_n) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  by Lemma 5.2. Because  $\mu\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  is compact by Lemma 4.8. Thus, there is a subsequence  $(\mu w_{n_k})$  that converges to some  $z \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$ . The left-shift map associated to  $\mu$  is continuous (Lemma 5.3), so  $w_{n_k} = (\mu w_{n_k}) \cdot \mu \rightarrow z \cdot \mu$ . By assumption,  $w_{n_k} \rightarrow w$ , so  $z \cdot \mu = w$ . Therefore,  $z = \mu w$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.14.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The semigroup action  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  is locally compact and directed.

*Proof.* Recall from Proposition 5.10 that  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  is directed. By Theorem 4.9,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Now fix  $m \in P$ , and consider the map  $T_m$  from  $\text{dom}(m)$  to  $\text{im}(m)$ . We showed  $\text{dom}(m)$  and  $\text{im}(m)$  are open in Lemmas 5.11 and 5.12, respectively. It remains to show  $T_m$  is a local homeomorphism. Fix  $x \in \text{dom}(m)$ , and say  $\mu \in x \cap \Lambda^m$ . By Lemma 4.6, there is some  $\mu' \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\mu' \in x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , which means  $\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 3.5(b). Since  $\mu\mu', \mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , we have  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu') = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu') = \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ , which are both compact by Lemma 4.8. Because  $\mu \in y$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$ , the restriction of  $T_m$  to  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  coincides with the left-shift map associated to  $\mu$ . Then, Lemma 5.3 implies the image of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  under  $T_m$  is  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ . Since the left-shift map associated to  $\mu$  is a continuous bijection (Lemma 5.3), it remains to show the map is open. Let  $O$  be an open set in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$ . We show  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu') \setminus T_m(O)$  is closed. Suppose  $(w_n) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu') \setminus T_m(O)$  converges to some  $w \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ . By Lemma 5.13, there is a subsequence  $(w_{n_k})$  such that  $\mu w_{n_k} \rightarrow \mu w$  in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$ . Then,  $T_m(\mu w) = (\mu w) \cdot m = (\mu w) \cdot \mu = w$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $w \in T_m(O)$ . Then, the previous calculation implies  $\mu w \in O$  because  $T_m$  is a bijection. Thus,  $\mu w_{n_k}$  is eventually in  $O$ , so  $w_{n_k} = T_m(\mu w_{n_k})$  is eventually in  $T_m(O)$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

**5.3. Path and boundary-path groupoids.** Recall from Section 2.5 the semidirect product groupoid associated to a semigroup action as in [RW17]. Having constructed a locally compact and directed semigroup action  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  in Theorem 5.14, we can define an étale and Hausdorff groupoid as follows.

**Definition 5.15** (Path groupoid). Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  of  $\Lambda$  is the semidirect product groupoid  $G(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  of the semigroup action  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  from Theorem 5.14.

**Lemma 5.16.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  identifies with a closed invariant subset of  $G_\Lambda^{(0)}$ .

*Proof.* We have that  $\partial\Lambda$  is closed in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  by Definition 4.7. The homeomorphism  $z \mapsto (z, e, z)$  from  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  to  $G_\Lambda^{(0)}$  identifies the subset  $\partial\Lambda \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  with a subset of  $G_\Lambda^{(0)}$  that is invariant if, whenever  $m, n \in P$ ,  $x \in \text{dom}(m)$ ,  $y \in \text{dom}(n) \cap \partial\Lambda$  satisfy  $x \cdot m = y \cdot n$ , we have  $x \in \partial\Lambda$ . Fix  $m, n, x, y$  as above. Say  $\mu \in x \cap \Lambda^m$  and  $\nu \in y \cap \Lambda^n$ . By Lemma 4.6, there is some  $\mu' \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\mu' \in x \cap \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu\mu')$  is compact by Lemma 4.8. By definition,  $\partial\Lambda$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ , so there is a sequence  $(y_n) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  such that  $y_n \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Because  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  is a subspace of  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , we also have that  $y_n \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , so  $(y_n)$  is eventually in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\nu)$ , so we assume without loss of generality that  $\nu \in y_n$  for all  $n$ . We have  $(y_n \cdot \nu) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  because both  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  are closed under left-shift maps (Lemma 5.2(b) and Lemma 5.5). We also know  $(\mu(y_n \cdot \nu)) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$  by Lemma 5.2(b). Note that  $y_n \rightarrow y$  in  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\nu)$ . Also, the left-shift map associated to  $\nu$  is continuous (Lemma 5.3), so  $y_n \cdot \nu \rightarrow y \cdot \nu = x \cdot \mu \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu')$ . Thus, we assume without loss of generality that  $\mu' \in y_n \cdot \nu$  for all  $n$ . Therefore, every  $\mu(y_n \cdot \nu)$  contains  $\mu\mu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , so  $(\mu(y_n \cdot \nu)) \subseteq \mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Now Lemma 5.13 implies there is a subsequence  $(y_{n_k} \cdot \nu)$  such that  $\mu(y_{n_k} \cdot \nu) \rightarrow \mu(y \cdot \nu) = \mu(x \cdot \mu) = x$ .  $\square$

**Definition 5.17** (Boundary-path groupoid). Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The boundary-path groupoid  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  of  $\Lambda$  is the reduction  $G_\Lambda|_{\partial\Lambda}$  of  $G_\Lambda$  to  $\partial\Lambda$ .

**Theorem 5.18.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  and the boundary-path groupoid  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are ample, second-countable and Hausdorff.

*Proof.* The path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  is the semidirect product groupoid of the locally compact and directed semigroup action  $(\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda), P, T)$  from Theorem 5.14, so  $G_\Lambda$  is étale and Hausdorff. Reductions of étale groupoids to closed invariant subsets of their unit space are closed étale Hausdorff subgroupoids, so  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  is étale because of Lemma 5.16. The unit spaces  $G_\Lambda^{(0)}$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}^{(0)}$  are homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\partial\Lambda$ , respectively, which have bases of compact sets by Theorem 4.9. Hence,  $G_\Lambda$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are ample. The bases from Theorem 4.9 are also countable, so Lemma 2.6 yields countable bases for  $G_\Lambda$  and the subspace  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$ . Therefore,  $G_\Lambda$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are second-countable.  $\square$

In particular, Theorem 5.18 associates ample, second-countable and Hausdorff path and boundary-path groupoids to any  $k$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . This opens the door to studying the algebras and  $C^*$ -algebras of nonfinitely aligned  $k$ -graphs via *path* groupoids.

**5.4. Sufficient condition for amenability of the groupoids.** Our path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  is second-countable, Hausdorff and étale, so the three predominant notions of amenability (measurewise, topological and Borel) are all equivalent (see [AR00] and [Ren15, Corollary 2.15]). Also, the boundary-path groupoid  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  is a closed subgroupoid of  $G_\Lambda$ , so  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  is amenable whenever  $G_\Lambda$  is amenable [SSW20, Proposition 10.1.14]. Renault and Williams supply a sufficient condition for the amenability of semidirect product groupoids in [RW17, Theorem 5.13]. This allows us to generalise various amenability results for path groupoids in the setting of discrete  $P$ -graphs, including [Yee07, Proposition 6.2], [RW17, Corollary 6.19], and [RSWY18, Corollary 4.3].

**Proposition 5.19.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . If  $Q$  is countable and amenable, then  $G_\Lambda$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are amenable.

**Corollary 5.20.** For any  $k$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $G_\Lambda$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are amenable.

**5.5. Characterising the elements of the groupoids.** We characterise the elements of our path groupoids, which is more subtle than it may seem (Remark 5.22).

**Proposition 5.21.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \times Q \times \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ , the following are equivalent:

- (a)  $g \in G_\Lambda$ ;
- (b)  $g = (\mu x, \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, \nu x)$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$  with  $\mathbf{s}(\mu) = \mathbf{s}(\nu) = \mathbf{r}(x)$ .

**Remark 5.22.** The hypothesis that  $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \times Q \times \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  in the statement of Proposition 5.21 is crucial. Otherwise, (b) would not imply (a) because there are  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mu \in \Lambda$  with  $\mathbf{s}(\mu) = \mathbf{r}(x)$  such that  $\mu x \notin \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  (see Example 5.6).

*Proof of Proposition 5.21.* Fix  $g = (y, q, z) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) \times Q \times \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . If  $g \in G_\Lambda$ , then there are  $m, n \in P$  such that  $q = mn^{-1}$ ,  $y \in \text{dom}(m)$ ,  $z \in \text{dom}(n)$ , and  $y \cdot m = z \cdot n$ . Say  $\mu \in \Lambda^m \cap y$  and  $\nu \in \Lambda^n \cap z$ . Let  $x := y \cdot \mu = y \cdot m = z \cdot n = z \cdot \nu \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$ . Then, we have  $g = (\mu x, \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, \nu x)$ . Now suppose  $g = (\mu x, \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, \nu x)$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$  with  $\mathbf{s}(\mu) = \mathbf{s}(\nu) = \mathbf{r}(x)$ . We know  $\mu x = y \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  by assumption. Since  $\mu \in \Lambda^{\mathbf{d}(\mu)} \cap y$ , we have  $(y, \mathbf{d}(\mu)) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Similarly,  $(z, \mathbf{d}(\nu)) \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) * P$ . Therefore,  $y \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{d}(\mu))$ ,  $z \in \text{dom}(\mathbf{d}(\nu))$ , and

$$y \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mu) = y \cdot \mu = (\mu x) \cdot \mu = x = (\nu x) \cdot \nu = z \cdot \nu = z \cdot \mathbf{d}(\nu).$$

Hence,  $g \in G(\mathcal{F}(\Lambda), P, T)$ . □

**5.6. Basis for the topology on the groupoids.** Recall from Lemma 2.6 that, if  $\mathcal{B}$  is a basis for a space  $X$  and  $G(X, P, T)$  is the semidirect product groupoid of an action  $T$  of  $P$  on  $X$ , then the collection of  $Z(B, m, n, C)$ , where  $m, n \in P$  and  $B, C \in \mathcal{B}$ , is a basis for the topology on  $G(X, P, T)$ . Using the basis for the topology on  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)$  from Theorem 4.9, the collection of  $Z(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus J), m, n, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda)}(\nu' \setminus K))$ , where  $m, n \in P$ ,  $\mu', \nu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $J, K$  are finite subsets

of  $\Lambda$ , is a basis for the topology on  $G_\Lambda$ . However, we show in the following that the parameters  $m$  and  $n$  are redundant.

**Proposition 5.23.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . The collection of

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus J, \nu \setminus K) := Z(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus J), \mathbf{d}(\mu), \mathbf{d}(\nu), \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\nu \setminus K))$$

where  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  and  $J, K$  are finite subsets of  $\Lambda$ , is a basis for the topology on  $G_\Lambda$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $(x, mn^{-1}, y)$  is in  $Z(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus J), m, n, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\nu' \setminus K))$  for some  $m, n \in P$ ,  $\mu', \nu' \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ , and finite subsets  $J, K$  of  $\Lambda$ . Notice  $\mu' \in x$  and  $\nu' \in y$ . Also, since  $x \in \text{dom}(m)$  and  $y \in \text{dom}(n)$ , there are  $\mu_m \in x \cap \Lambda^m$  and  $\nu_n \in y \cap \Lambda^n$  with  $w := x \cdot \mu_m = x \cdot m = y \cdot n = y \cdot \nu_n$ . Because  $x$  and  $y$  are directed, there are  $\mu'_m \in \Lambda$  and  $\nu'_n \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mu', \mu_m \preceq \mu_m \mu'_m \in x$  and  $\nu', \nu_n \preceq \nu_n \nu'_n \in y$ . Then  $\mu'_m \in x \cdot \mu_m = w$  and  $\nu'_n \in y \cdot \nu_n = w$ . That is,  $\mu'_m, \nu'_n \in w$  and  $w$  is directed, so there are  $\mu''_m, \nu''_n \in \Lambda$  such that  $\mu'_m \mu''_m = \nu'_n \nu''_n \in w$ . Let  $\mu := \mu_m \mu'_m \mu''_m$ , and let  $\nu := \nu_n \nu'_n \nu''_n$ . Since  $\mu' \preceq \mu$  and  $\nu' \preceq \nu$ , we know  $\mu, \nu \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$  because  $\text{FA}(\Lambda)$  is a right ideal in  $\Lambda$  (Lemma 3.5(a)). Then,  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus J)$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\nu \setminus K)$ . Also, because  $\mu'_m \mu''_m = \nu'_n \nu''_n$  we have

$$\mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\mu_m)\mathbf{d}(\mu'_m \mu''_m)\mathbf{d}(\nu'_n \nu''_n)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\nu_n)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\mu_m)\mathbf{d}(\nu_n)^{-1} = mn^{-1}.$$

Lastly, we have  $x \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mu) = (x \cdot \mu_m) \cdot (\mu'_m \mu''_m) = (y \cdot \nu_n) \cdot (\nu'_m \nu''_m) = y \cdot \mathbf{d}(\nu)$ . Hence,  $(x, mn^{-1}, y) \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus J, \nu \setminus K)$ .

Now fix  $(x', \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, y') \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus J, \nu \setminus K)$ . Recall  $\mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1} = mn^{-1}$ . Because  $x'$  is hereditary and  $\mu' \preceq \mu$ , we have  $\mu' \in x'$ . Similarly,  $\nu' \in y'$ . Thus,  $x' \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus J)$  and  $y' \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\nu' \setminus K)$ . Also,  $\mu_m \in x'$  and  $\nu_n \in y'$ . Since  $\mathbf{d}(\mu_m) = m$  and  $\mathbf{d}(\nu_n) = n$ , we have  $x' \in \text{dom}(m)$  and  $y' \in \text{dom}(n)$ . By assumption  $x' \cdot \mathbf{d}(\mu) = y' \cdot \mathbf{d}(\nu)$ , so  $x' \cdot \mu = y' \cdot \nu$ . By definition of  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , we have  $x' \cdot (\mu_m \mu'_m \mu''_m) = y' \cdot (\nu_n \nu'_n \nu''_n)$ . Since  $\mu'_m \mu''_m = \nu'_n \nu''_n$ , the above implies

$$x' \cdot \mu_m = (\mu'_m \mu''_m)(x' \cdot (\mu_m \mu'_m \mu''_m)) = (\nu'_n \nu''_n)(y' \cdot (\nu_n \nu'_n \nu''_n)) = y' \cdot \nu_n.$$

Hence,  $(x', \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, y') \in Z(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\mu' \setminus J), m, n, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}\text{FA}(\Lambda)}(\nu' \setminus K))$ .  $\square$

## 6. COMPARISONS WITH SPIELBERG'S GROUPOIDS

The purpose of this section is to compare our path groupoids from Section 5 with relevant groupoids in the literature. The main theorem (Theorem 6.6) is that, if  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned (i.e.  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ ), then our path and boundary-path groupoids are topologically isomorphic to analogous groupoids developed by Spielberg for the finitely aligned setting in [Spi12; Spi14]. Spielberg has also developed a groupoid approach for nonfinitely aligned  $\Lambda$  in [Spi20]. The author showed in his thesis [Jon24] that the path groupoid  $G_{\Lambda_0}$  of the nonfinitely aligned 2-graph  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2 has a different structure of open invariant subsets of its unit space to that of Spielberg's groupoid of  $\Lambda_0$  (and hence their associated Steinberg algebras [Ste10] and C\*-algebras [Ren80] have different ideal structure). We

omit this result because we intend to give a more comprehensive comparison of our construction and Spielberg's in future work. Lastly, we show that Spielberg's groupoid of the finitely aligned relative category of paths  $(\text{FA}_{\mathbf{r}}(\Lambda), \Lambda)$  associated to each  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$  in Section 3.6 does not generally coincide with our path groupoid  $G_{\Lambda}$ .

**6.1. Path space in the finitely aligned case.** We begin by noting important simplifications to the path space when  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . Then,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $\partial\Lambda$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Because  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ , and filters are nonempty, every filter contains some  $\lambda \in \text{FA}(\Lambda)$ . That is,  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$ , so  $\partial\Lambda$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)$  in  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ .  $\square$

While discussing the finitely aligned case, we denote the path space by  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  because of Lemma 6.1. A crucial difference in the finitely aligned case is that the parameter  $K$  for the usual basis for the path space can be assumed to be a subset of  $\mu\Lambda$ , as follows. Among other things, this makes left-shift maps open (as well as being continuous bijections as in Lemma 5.3).

**Lemma 6.2.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . The collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ , where  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \mu\Lambda$  is finite, is a basis for  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K')$ , where  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and  $K' \subseteq \Lambda$  is finite. For each  $\zeta \in K'$ , since  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned, there is a finite (possibly empty)  $J_{\zeta} \subseteq \Lambda$  such that  $\mu\Lambda \cap \zeta\Lambda = \bigcup_{\gamma \in J_{\zeta}} \gamma\Lambda$ . Then,  $K := \bigcup_{\zeta \in K'} J_{\zeta}$  is a finite subset of  $\mu\Lambda$ , and the directed and hereditary properties of filters imply  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K')$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . The collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\kappa \setminus K, \lambda \setminus L)$ , where  $\kappa, \lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \kappa\Lambda$  and  $L \subseteq \lambda\Lambda$  are finite, is a basis for the topology on  $G_{\Lambda}$ .

*Proof.* The collection of  $Z(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\kappa \setminus K), m, n, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\lambda \setminus L))$ , where  $m, n \in P$ ,  $\kappa, \lambda \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \kappa\Lambda$  and  $L \subseteq \lambda\Lambda$  are finite, is a basis for the topology on  $G_{\Lambda}$  because of Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 6.2. Then, the claim follows from similar arguments to those in the proof of Proposition 5.23.  $\square$

**6.2. Spielberg's groupoid in the finitely aligned case.** We recall Spielberg's groupoid in the finitely aligned case from [Spi12, Page 729] and [MS22, §2]. For each  $\alpha \in \Lambda$  and  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \subseteq \alpha\Lambda \setminus \{\alpha\}$ , let  $E := \alpha\Lambda \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \beta_i\Lambda$ , and let  $\hat{E} := \{x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \mid E \supseteq x \cap \gamma\Lambda \text{ for some } \gamma \in x\}$ . The collection of  $\hat{E}$  is a basis of compact sets for a topology  $\tau^{\text{Spi}}$  on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . (Note that  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  is denoted by “ $\Lambda^*$ ” in [Spi12; MS22]). Let  $\Lambda * \Lambda * \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  be the set of  $(\alpha, \beta, x) \in \Lambda \times \Lambda \times \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  such that  $\mathbf{s}(\alpha) = \mathbf{s}(\beta) = \mathbf{r}(x)$ . Recall  $\alpha x := \{\mu \in \Lambda \mid \mu \preceq \alpha\gamma \text{ for some } \gamma \in x\}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  with  $\mathbf{r}(x) = \mathbf{s}(\alpha)$ . For any  $(\alpha, \beta, x), (\alpha', \beta', x') \in \Lambda * \Lambda * \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , let  $(\alpha, \beta, x) \sim (\alpha', \beta', x')$  if there are  $y \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Lambda$  such that  $x = \gamma y$ ,  $x' = \gamma' y$ ,  $\alpha\gamma = \alpha'\gamma'$ , and  $\beta\gamma = \beta'\gamma'$ . Then,  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation, and we write

$G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  for the set of equivalence classes of  $\Lambda * \Lambda * \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  with respect to  $\sim$ . Let  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}(2)}$  be the pairs  $([\alpha, \beta, x], [\gamma, \delta, y]) \in G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}} \times G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  that satisfy  $\beta x = \gamma y$ , in which case [Spi14, Lemma 4.12] implies there are  $z \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda$  such that  $x = \xi z$ ,  $y = \eta z$  and  $\beta \xi = \gamma \eta$ . Define composition and inversion maps by  $[\alpha, \beta, x][\gamma, \delta, y] := [\alpha \xi, \delta \eta, z]$  and  $[\alpha, \beta, x]^{-1} := [\beta, \alpha, x]$ , respectively. Given a basis  $\mathcal{B}$  for the topology  $\tau^{\text{Spi}}$  on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ , the collection of  $[\alpha, \beta, B] := \{[\alpha, \beta, x] \mid x \in B\}$ , where  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , is a basis under which  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  is a locally compact Hausdorff étale groupoid. If  $\Lambda$  is not finitely aligned, then  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  may not be Hausdorff [Spi14, Example 4.11].

**6.3. Isomorphism with Spielberg's groupoid in the finitely aligned case.** We show our path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  is topologically isomorphic to  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  when  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned (Theorem 6.6). Recall from Lemma 6.2 that the collection of  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ , where  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \mu\Lambda$  is finite, is a basis for  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  if  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned.

**Lemma 6.4.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a (not necessarily finitely aligned)  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $\mu \in \Lambda$  and finite  $K \subseteq \mu\Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K) = \hat{E}$  for  $E := \mu\Lambda \setminus \bigcup_{\nu \in K} \nu\Lambda$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $E \not\supseteq x \cap \mu\Lambda$ , so there is  $\lambda \in x \cap \mu\Lambda$  such that  $\lambda \notin E$ . Since  $E = \mu\Lambda \setminus \bigcup_{\nu \in K} \nu\Lambda$ , we must have  $\lambda \in \nu\Lambda$  for some  $\nu \in K$ . Since  $x$  is hereditary,  $\nu \in x$ , which contradicts  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ . Hence,  $E \supseteq x \cap \mu\Lambda$ , which implies  $x \in \hat{E}$ . Now let  $x \in \hat{E}$ , so there is  $\gamma \in x$  such that  $E \supseteq x \cap \gamma\Lambda$ . In particular,  $\gamma \in E \subseteq \mu\Lambda$ , so  $\mu \in x$ . Suppose for a contradiction that there is  $\nu \in K \cap x$ . Since  $x$  is directed, there is  $\lambda \in x$  such that  $\gamma, \nu \preceq \lambda$ . Thus,  $E \supseteq x \cap \gamma\Lambda \ni \lambda$ , so  $\lambda \in E$ . However,  $\lambda \in \nu\Lambda$ , contradicting the definition of  $E$ . Hence,  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ .  $\square$

The only difference to the parameterization of the  $\hat{E}$  in Section 6.2 when defining  $\tau^{\text{Spi}}$  and the parameterization of the  $\hat{E}$  appearing in Lemma 6.4 is that our  $K$  could contain  $\mu$ , in which case  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K) = \emptyset$ . That is, the basis for our topology on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  from Lemma 6.2 differs from the basis for the topology  $\tau^{\text{Spi}}$  on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  only by  $\emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Therefore:

**Lemma 6.5.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . Then,  $\tau^{\text{Spi}}$  equals the topology on  $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  given by the basis from Lemma 6.2.

**Theorem 6.6.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . The map

$$G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}} \rightarrow G_\Lambda, \quad [\alpha, \beta, x] \mapsto (\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x)$$

is a topological groupoid isomorphism. Moreover, the reductions  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}|_{\partial\Lambda}$  and  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  are topologically isomorphic.

*Proof.* Our first aim is to show the map is a well-defined bijection. Let  $[\alpha, \beta, x] \in G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$ . Since  $\alpha x \cdot \mathbf{d}(\alpha) = x = \beta x \cdot \mathbf{d}(\beta)$ ,  $(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x) \in G_\Lambda$ . If  $[\alpha, \beta, x] = [\alpha', \beta', x']$ , then there are  $y \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$



and  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Lambda$  such that  $x = \gamma y$ ,  $x' = \gamma' y$ ,  $\alpha\gamma = \alpha'\gamma'$ , and  $\beta\gamma = \beta'\gamma'$ . Then,  $\alpha x = \alpha(\gamma y) = (\alpha\gamma)y = (\alpha'\gamma')y = \alpha'(\gamma' y) = \alpha'x'$ . A similar argument shows  $\beta x = \beta'x'$ . Lastly,  $\mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\alpha')\mathbf{d}(\beta')^{-1}$  follows from the identities  $\alpha\gamma = \alpha'\gamma'$  and  $\beta\gamma = \beta'\gamma'$  and the fact that  $\mathbf{d}$  is a functor. Hence, the map is well-defined. The map is surjective because any  $(x, q, y) \in G_\Lambda$  is of the form  $(\mu x, \mathbf{d}(\mu)\mathbf{d}(\nu)^{-1}, \nu x)$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  by Proposition 5.21, which is the image of  $[\mu, \nu, x]$ . For injectivity, suppose  $[\alpha, \beta, x], [\alpha', \beta', x'] \in G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  are such that  $(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x) = (\alpha'x', \mathbf{d}(\alpha')\mathbf{d}(\beta')^{-1}, \beta'x')$ . Notice  $\alpha, \alpha' \in \alpha x = \alpha'x'$ , which is directed, so there are  $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Lambda$  such that  $\alpha\gamma = \alpha'\gamma' \in \alpha x = \alpha'x'$ . Notice  $\gamma \in x$ , so  $y := x \cdot \gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ . Then,  $x = \gamma(x \cdot \gamma) = \gamma y$ , and  $x' = \gamma'(x' \cdot \gamma') = \gamma' y$ . To show  $\beta\gamma = \beta'\gamma'$ , we show  $\beta\gamma, \beta'\gamma' \in \beta x$  and  $\mathbf{d}(\beta\gamma) = \mathbf{d}(\beta'\gamma')$ , and we apply the injectivity of  $\mathbf{d}|_{\beta x}$ . Since  $\gamma \in x$ , we have  $\beta\gamma \in \beta x$ . Also,  $\gamma' \in x'$ , so  $\beta'\gamma' \in \beta'x' = \beta x$ . The identity  $\alpha\gamma = \alpha'\gamma'$  implies  $\mathbf{d}(\alpha')^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\alpha) = \mathbf{d}(\gamma')\mathbf{d}(\gamma)^{-1}$ . If  $\mathbf{d}(\gamma')\mathbf{d}(\gamma)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\beta')^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\beta)$ , then  $\mathbf{d}(\beta\gamma) = \mathbf{d}(\beta'\gamma')$ , so it remains to show  $\mathbf{d}(\alpha')^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\alpha) = \mathbf{d}(\beta')^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\beta)$ , which follows from the assumption that  $\mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\alpha')\mathbf{d}(\beta')^{-1}$ . Therefore,  $\beta\gamma = \beta'\gamma'$  by the injectivity of  $\mathbf{d}|_{\beta x}$ . Thus,  $[\alpha, \beta, x] = [\alpha', \beta', x']$ , so the map is a bijection.

Next we aim to show the map is a homeomorphism. The image of an arbitrary basic open set  $[\alpha, \beta, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)]$ , where  $\alpha, \beta, \mu \in \Lambda$  and  $K \subseteq \mu\Lambda$  is finite, is the set of  $(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x)$  such that  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ . We claim this image equals

$$I := \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\alpha\mu \setminus \{\alpha\nu \mid \nu \in K\}, \beta\mu \setminus \{\beta\nu \mid \nu \in K\}).$$

Consider  $(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x)$  for some  $x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ . Observe  $\alpha\mu \in \alpha x$ . If there is a  $\nu \in K$  such that  $\alpha\nu \in \alpha x$ , then  $\nu \in x \cap K$ , which is a contradiction. A similar argument applies to  $\beta x$ , so we have  $\alpha x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\alpha\mu \setminus \{\alpha\nu \mid \nu \in K\})$  and  $\beta x \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\beta\mu \setminus \{\beta\nu \mid \nu \in K\})$ . Lastly, notice  $\mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1} = \mathbf{d}(\alpha\mu)\mathbf{d}(\beta\mu)^{-1}$ , and

$$(\alpha x) \cdot \mathbf{d}(\alpha\mu) = (\alpha x) \cdot (\alpha\mu) = x \cdot \mu = (\beta x) \cdot (\beta\mu) = (\beta x) \cdot \mathbf{d}(\beta\mu).$$

Hence,  $(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x) \in I$ . Now fix  $(x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha\mu)\mathbf{d}(\beta\mu)^{-1}, y) \in I$ , so  $x \cdot (\alpha\mu) = y \cdot (\beta\mu)$ , which implies  $z := x \cdot \alpha = y \cdot \beta$  and  $(x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha\mu)\mathbf{d}(\beta\mu)^{-1}, y) = (\alpha z, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta z)$ . Since  $\alpha\mu \in x$ ,  $\mu \in x \cdot \alpha = z$ . There cannot be  $\nu \in K \cap z$ , otherwise  $\alpha\nu \in x$ . Hence,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)$ , and so  $[\alpha, \beta, z] \in [\alpha, \beta, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)]$ . That is, the image of the basic open set  $[\alpha, \beta, \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\mu \setminus K)]$  equals  $I$ . An arbitrary basic open set  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)}(\kappa \setminus K, \lambda \setminus L)$  in  $G_\Lambda$  (see Lemma 6.3) is in the form of  $I$  with  $\alpha = \kappa$ ,  $\beta = \lambda$ ,  $\mu = \mathbf{s}(\alpha) = \mathbf{s}(\beta)$  and  $J = K \cdot \kappa \cup L \cdot \lambda$ . Hence, basic open sets in  $G_\Lambda$  identify with basic open sets in  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  via the map, so the map is a homeomorphism.

We now aim to show the groupoids are isomorphic. If  $([\alpha, \beta, x], [\gamma, \delta, y]) \in G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}(2)}$ , then  $\beta x = \gamma y$ , which implies  $((\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x), (\gamma y, \mathbf{d}(\gamma)\mathbf{d}(\delta)^{-1}, \delta y)) \in G_\Lambda^{(2)}$ . The converse holds in the same way, so the map identifies  $G_\Lambda^{(2)}$  with  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}(2)}$ . Recall that  $([\alpha, \beta, x], [\gamma, \delta, y]) \in G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}(2)}$  implies there are  $z \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$  and  $\xi, \eta \in \Lambda$  such that  $x = \xi z$ ,  $y = \eta z$  and  $\beta\xi = \gamma\eta$ . Then,

$$[\alpha, \beta, x][\gamma, \delta, y] = [\alpha\xi, \delta\eta, z] \mapsto ((\alpha\xi)z, \mathbf{d}(\alpha\xi)\mathbf{d}(\delta\eta)^{-1}, (\delta\eta)z).$$



Also,

$$(\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}, \beta x)(\gamma y, \mathbf{d}(\gamma)\mathbf{d}(\delta)^{-1}, \delta y) = (\alpha x, \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\gamma)\mathbf{d}(\delta)^{-1}, \delta y).$$

We have  $(\alpha\xi)z = \alpha x$  and  $(\delta\eta)z = \delta y$ . Lastly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\gamma)\mathbf{d}(\delta)^{-1} &= \mathbf{d}(\alpha)\mathbf{d}(\xi)\mathbf{d}(\xi)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\beta)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\gamma)\mathbf{d}(\eta)\mathbf{d}(\eta)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\delta)^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{d}(\alpha\xi)\mathbf{d}(\beta\xi)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\gamma\eta)\mathbf{d}(\delta\eta)^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{d}(\alpha\xi)\mathbf{d}(\beta\xi)^{-1}\mathbf{d}(\beta\xi)\mathbf{d}(\delta\eta)^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{d}(\alpha\xi)\mathbf{d}(\delta\eta)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the map preserves composition. It is immediate from the definitions of the inversions and the definition of the map that inversion is preserved too. Therefore, the map is a topological groupoid isomorphism. Our boundary-path space  $\partial\Lambda$  equals the boundary of  $\Lambda$  defined by Spielberg on [Spi12, Page 729], there too denoted by “ $\partial\Lambda$ ”. Our boundary-path groupoid  $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  is defined to be the reduction of  $G_\Lambda$  to  $\partial\Lambda$ , which therefore coincides with the reduction  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}|_{\partial\Lambda}$  of  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}$  to  $\partial\Lambda$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.7.** The author showed in [Jon24] that our path and boundary-path groupoids coincide also with those of Renault and Williams [RW17] and Yeend [Yee07] in the discrete row-finite case.

**6.4. Inverse semigroup model in the finitely aligned case.** In [OP20, Definition 2.2], Ortega and Pardo associate an inverse semigroup  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  to any left cancellative small category  $\Lambda$  (in particular, any  $P$ -graph). Exel’s tight groupoid of  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  from [Exe08] is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{tight}}(\mathcal{S}_\Lambda)$ . When  $\Lambda$  is finitely aligned,  $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}|_{\partial\Lambda}$  is topologically isomorphic to  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{tight}}(\mathcal{S}_\Lambda)$  by [OP20, Lemma 4.9 and Proposition 5.2], so we have the following corollary to Theorem 6.6.

**Corollary 6.8.** Let  $(Q, P)$  be a weakly quasi-lattice ordered group, and let  $\Lambda$  be a  $P$ -graph with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ . The following groupoids are topologically isomorphic:

- $G_{\partial\Lambda}$  from Definition 5.17,
- $G_\Lambda^{\text{Spi}}|_{\partial\Lambda}$  from [Spi20], and
- $\mathcal{G}_{\text{tight}}(\mathcal{S}_\Lambda)$  from [OP20].

**Remark 6.9.** Another relevant inverse semigroup model for groupoids associated to higher-rank graphs is the inverse semigroup of [FMY05, Definition 4.1], which we denote here by  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{\text{FMY}}$ . The author is unaware of a comparison between  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  from [OP20] and  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{\text{FMY}}$  beyond the observation in [LSV24] that certain elements of  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  are “closely related to the building blocks of”  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{\text{FMY}}$ . If  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}_\Lambda^{\text{FMY}}$ , then our boundary-path groupoid coincides also with that of [FMY05].

**6.5. Spielberg’s groupoid of a relative category of paths in general.** Recall from Section 3.6 that  $(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda), \Lambda)$  is a *finitely aligned* relative category of paths for any  $P$ -graph  $\Lambda$  with  $\text{FA}(\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Spielberg associates a groupoid  $G^{\Lambda'}(\Lambda)$  to each relative category of paths  $(\Lambda', \Lambda)$  in [Spi20, Definition 14.1] (see also [Spi14, §4]). In this section, we show  $G^{\text{FA}_r(\Lambda)}(\Lambda)$  is not topologically isomorphic to our path groupoid  $G_\Lambda$  in general. We first state [Spi14, Remark 3.7] explicitly:

**Proposition 6.10** (Remark 3.7 of [Spi14]). If  $(\Lambda', \Lambda)$  is a finitely aligned relative category of paths, then  $G^{\Lambda'}(\Lambda)$  is topologically isomorphic to the groupoid  $G_{\Lambda'}^{\text{Spi}}$  from Section 6.2 of the finitely aligned category of paths  $\Lambda'$ .

In particular,  $G^{\text{FA}_r(\Lambda)}(\Lambda)$  is topologically isomorphic to  $G_{\text{FA}_r(\Lambda)}^{\text{Spi}}$ . By Lemma 6.5, the unit space of  $G^{\text{FA}_r(\Lambda)}(\Lambda)$  is homeomorphic to  $\mathcal{F}(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda))$ , which has the basis from Lemma 6.2. Recall the 2-graph  $\Lambda_0$  from Example 3.2, for which  $\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0) = \text{FA}(\Lambda_0) \cup \{v\} = \Lambda_0 \setminus \{\lambda, \mu\}$ . The nondiscrete elements of  $\mathcal{F}(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0))$  are  $F(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\beta_n)$ ,  $F(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\alpha_n)$  and  $F(v) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\lambda\alpha_n)$ . This third nondiscrete element is due to the fact that  $\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0)$  does not contain  $\lambda$  or  $\mu$ , so the basic open sets containing  $F(v)$  are of the form  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{F}(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0))}(v \setminus \{\lambda\alpha_{n_1}, \dots, \lambda\alpha_{n_k}\})$ . On the other hand, the only nondiscrete elements of  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda_0)$  are  $F(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\beta_n)$  and  $F(w) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(\alpha_n)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}(\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0))$  is not homeomorphic to our path space  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{FA}}(\Lambda_0)$ , and so  $G^{\text{FA}_r(\Lambda_0)}(\Lambda_0)$  is not topologically isomorphic to our path groupoid  $G_{\Lambda_0}$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The theorems of Sections 4 and 5 were first proved in the author's thesis [Jon24] under the supervision of Lisa Orloff Clark and Astrid an Huef. Their support and ideas have been pivotal. The author is also grateful to thesis reviewers whose ideas led to the results in Sections 3 and 6. This research is supported by the Marsden Fund grant 21-VUW-156 from the Royal Society of New Zealand.

#### REFERENCES

- [AA05] G. Abrams and G. Aranda Pino. *The Leavitt path algebra of a graph*. J. Algebra, 293 (2005), 319–334. DOI: [10.1016/j.jalgebra.2005.07.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2005.07.028). MR: [2172342](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2172342).
- [aNSY21] A. an Huef, B. Nucinkis, C. F. Sehnen, and D. Yang. *Nuclearity of semigroup  $C^*$ -algebras*. J. Funct. Anal., 280 (2021), Paper No. 108793, 46. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfa.2020.108793](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfa.2020.108793). MR: [4159272](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=4159272).
- [AR00] C. Anantharaman-Delaroche and J. Renault. *Amenable groupoids*. Geneva: L'Enseignement Mathématique, 2000.
- [Bri04] M. G. Brin. *Higher dimensional Thompson groups*. Geom. Dedicata, 108 (2004), 163–192. DOI: [10.1007/s10711-004-8122-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10711-004-8122-9). MR: [2112673](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2112673).
- [BSV13] N. Brownlowe, A. Sims, and S. T. Vittadello. *Co-universal  $C^*$ -algebras associated to generalised graphs*. Israel J. Math., 193 (2013), 399–440. DOI: [10.1007/s11856-012-0106-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11856-012-0106-0). MR: [3038557](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=3038557).
- [Dea95] V. Deaconu. *Groupoids associated with endomorphisms*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 347 (1995), 1779–1786. DOI: [10.2307/2154972](https://doi.org/10.2307/2154972). MR: [1233967](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=1233967).
- [Exe08] R. Exel. *Inverse semigroups and combinatorial  $C^*$ -algebras*. Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.), 39 (2008), 191–313. DOI: [10.1007/s00574-008-0080-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00574-008-0080-7). MR: [2419901](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet-getitem?mr=2419901).

- [FMY05] C. Farthing, P. S. Muhly, and T. Yeend. *Higher-rank graph  $C^*$ -algebras: an inverse semigroup and groupoid approach*. Semigroup Forum, 71 (2005), 159–187. DOI: [10.1007/s00233-005-0512-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00233-005-0512-2). MR: [2184052](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=2184052).
- [GH10] V. Gould and C. Hollings. *Restriction semigroups and inductive constellations*. Comm. Algebra, 38 (2010), 261–287. DOI: [10.1080/00927870902887096](https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870902887096). MR: [2597495](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=2597495).
- [GS17] V. Gould and T. Stokes. *Constellations and their relationship with categories*. Algebra universalis, 77 (2017), 271–304. DOI: [10.1007/s00012-017-0432-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00012-017-0432-5).
- [Jon24] M. Jones. *Path and boundary-path groupoids of nonfinitely aligned higher-rank graphs over weakly quasi-lattice ordered groups* (2024). DOI: [10.26686/wgtn.27418512](https://doi.org/10.26686/wgtn.27418512).
- [KP00] A. Kumjian and D. Pask. *Higher rank graph  $C^*$ -algebras*. New York J. Math., 6 (2000), 1–20. MR: [1745529](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=1745529).
- [KPRR97] A. Kumjian, D. Pask, I. Raeburn, and J. Renault. *Graphs, groupoids, and Cuntz-Krieger algebras*. J. Funct. Anal., 144 (1997), 505–541. DOI: [10.1006/jfan.1996.3001](https://doi.org/10.1006/jfan.1996.3001). MR: [1432596](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=1432596).
- [LSV24] M. V. Lawson, A. Sims, and A. Vdovina. *Higher dimensional generalizations of the Thompson groups via higher rank graphs*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 228 (2024), Paper No. 107456, 40. DOI: [10.1016/j.jpaa.2023.107456](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpaa.2023.107456). MR: [4603005](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=4603005).
- [MS22] I. Mitscher and J. Spielberg.  *$AF$   $C^*$ -algebras from non- $AF$  groupoids*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 375 (2022), 7323–7371. DOI: [10.1090/tran/8723](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/8723). MR: [4491428](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=4491428).
- [Mun00] J. R. Munkres. *Topology (Second edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 2000.
- [Nic92] A. Nica.  *$C^*$ -algebras generated by isometries and Wiener–Hopf operators*. J. Operator Theory, 27 (1992), 17–52. MR: [1241114](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=1241114).
- [NS23] S. Neshveyev and G. Schwartz. *Non-Hausdorff étale groupoids and  $C^*$ -algebras of left cancellative monoids*. Münster J. Math., 16 (2023), 147–175. DOI: [10.17879/51009604279](https://doi.org/10.17879/51009604279). MR: [4563262](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=4563262).
- [OP20] E. Ortega and E. Pardo. *The tight groupoid of the inverse semigroups of left cancellative small categories*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 373 (2020), 5199–5234. DOI: [10.1090/tran/8100](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/8100). MR: [4127875](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=4127875).
- [Pat99] A. L. T. Paterson. *Groupoids, inverse semigroups, and their operator algebras*. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., 1999. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-1774-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1774-9).
- [PW05] A. L. T. Paterson and A. E. Welch. *Tychonoff’s theorem for locally compact spaces and an elementary approach to the topology of path spaces*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 133 (2005), 2761–2770. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9939-05-08030-5](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-05-08030-5). MR: [2146225](https://www.ams.org/mathscinet/item?id=2146225).
- [Ren00] J. Renault. *Cuntz-like algebras*. “Operator theoretical methods (Timișoara, 1998)”. Bucharest: Theta Found., 2000, 371–386.

- [Ren15] J. Renault. *Topological amenability is a Borel property*. Math. Scand., 117 (2015), 5–30. DOI: [10.7146/math.scand.a-22235](https://doi.org/10.7146/math.scand.a-22235). MR: [3403785](https://www.ams.org/mathscand/1995a-22235).
- [Ren80] J. Renault. *A groupoid approach to  $C^*$ -algebras*. Berlin: Springer, 1980.
- [RS05] I. Raeburn and A. Sims. *Product systems of graphs and the Toeplitz algebras of higher-rank graphs*. J. Operator Theory, 53 (2005), 399–429. MR: [2153156](https://www.ams.org/jot/2005-53-399).
- [RSWY18] J. Renault, A. Sims, D. P. Williams, and T. Yeend. *Uniqueness theorems for topological higher-rank graph  $C^*$ -algebras*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 146 (2018), 669–684. DOI: [10.1090/proc/13745](https://doi.org/10.1090/proc/13745). MR: [3731700](https://www.ams.org/proc/2018-146-669).
- [RSY03] I. Raeburn, A. Sims, and T. Yeend. *Higher-rank graphs and their  $C^*$ -algebras*. Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2), 46 (2003), 99–115. DOI: [10.1017/S0013091501000645](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0013091501000645). MR: [1961175](https://www.ams.org/proc/2003-46-99).
- [RW17] J. Renault and D. P. Williams. *Amenability of groupoids arising from partial semigroup actions and topological higher rank graphs*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 369 (2017), 2255–2283. DOI: [10.1090/tran/6736](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/6736). MR: [3592511](https://www.ams.org/tran/2017-369-2255).
- [Spi07] J. Spielberg. *Graph-based models for Kirchberg algebras*. Journal of Operator Theory, 57 (2007), 347–374. MR: [2329002](https://www.ams.org/jot/2007-57-347).
- [Spi12] J. Spielberg.  *$C^*$ -algebras for categories of paths associated to the Baumslag–Solitar groups*. J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2), 86 (2012), 728–754. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/jds025](https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/jds025). MR: [3000828](https://www.ams.org/jlms/2012-86-728).
- [Spi14] J. Spielberg. *Groupoids and  $C^*$ -algebras for categories of paths*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 366 (2014), 5771–5819. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9947-2014-06008-X](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-2014-06008-X). MR: [3256184](https://www.ams.org/proc/2014-366-5771).
- [Spi20] J. Spielberg. *Groupoids and  $C^*$ -algebras for left cancellative small categories*. Indiana Univ. Math. J., 69 (2020), 1579–1626. DOI: [10.1512/iumj.2020.69.7969](https://doi.org/10.1512/iumj.2020.69.7969). MR: [4151331](https://www.ams.org/proc/2020-69-1579).
- [SSW20] A. Sims, G. Szabó, and D. Williams. *Hausdorff Étale Groupoids and Their  $C^*$ -algebras*. “Operator algebras and dynamics: groupoids, crossed products, and Rokhlin dimension”. Ed. by F. Perera. Cham: Birkhäuser/Springer, 2020, x+163. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-39713-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39713-5).
- [Ste10] B. Steinberg. *A groupoid approach to discrete inverse semigroup algebras*. Adv. Math., 223 (2010), 689–727. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2009.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2009.09.001). MR: [2565546](https://www.ams.org/adv-math/2010-223-689).
- [Wil19] D. P. Williams. *A tool kit for groupoid  $C^*$ -algebras*. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 2019.
- [Wil70] S. Willard. *General topology*. Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- [Yee07] T. Yeend. *Groupoid models for the  $C^*$ -algebras of topological higher-rank graphs*. J. Operator Theory, 57 (2007), 95–120. MR: [2301938](https://www.ams.org/jot/2007-57-95).

(M. Jones) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON, PO BOX 600, WELLINGTON 6140, NEW ZEALAND

*Email address:* [malcolm.jones@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:malcolm.jones@vuw.ac.nz)