

Canonical decompositions for Poincaré duality pairs

Peter Scott*

Mathematics Department
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, USA.
email: pscott@umich.edu

Gadde A. Swarup
718 High Street Road
Glen Waverley
Victoria 3150, Australia.
email: anandaswarupg@gmail.com

April 14, 2020

Abstract

The authors previously described an algebraic analogue of the JSJ-decomposition of a 3-manifold. This analogue is defined for any finitely presented, one-ended group. We study this analogue in the special case of Poincaré duality pairs.

Contents

1 Preliminaries	6
2 Poincaré duality pairs and essential annuli and tori	20

*Partially supported by NSF grants DMS 9626537 and 0203883

3	The main theorem	41
4	Torus Decompositions for $PD(n + 2)$ groups and pairs	49
5	Further properties of Torus Decompositions	58
6	Enclosing properties of Annulus-Torus Decompositions	69
7	Proof of the Main Theorem	82
8	Comparing the decompositions of a $PD(n + 2)$ pair and its double	106
9	Concluding remarks and problems	122

Dedicated to Terry Wall

Introduction

In [22], as corrected in [23], we obtained canonical decompositions for almost finitely presented groups analogous to the JSJ -decomposition of a 3-manifold. In particular, for many almost finitely presented groups G , and any integer $n \geq 1$, we defined a decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, and we showed that when G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary, then $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ essentially yields the JSJ -decomposition of M . Further details are discussed in [24]. We recall that the JSJ -decomposition of M is given by a possibly disconnected compact submanifold $V(M)$ which is called the characteristic submanifold of M , such that the frontier of $V(M)$ consists of essential annuli and tori, and each component of $V(M)$ is an I -bundle or a Seifert fibre space. Further each component of the closure of $M - V(M)$ is simple. The frontier of $V(M)$ determines a graph of groups structure for $G = \pi_1(M)$, in which all edge groups are free abelian of rank 1 or 2, and this is essentially the same as $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$.

In this paper, we consider the structure of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, in the case of Poincaré duality pairs $(G, \partial G)$ of dimension $n + 2$, where $n \geq 1$. The results we obtain are very closely analogous to the above description for 3-manifolds. This greatly generalises work of Kropholler in [11] and of Castel in [4]. Kropholler described a canonical decomposition of such Poincaré duality pairs in any dimension at least three, and Castel described a canonical

decomposition of such Poincaré duality pairs in dimension three only, but their decompositions are analogous to the Torus Decomposition of an orientable Haken 3–manifold. See section 4 for a discussion.

A Poincaré duality pair is the algebraic analogue of an aspherical manifold with aspherical boundary components whose fundamental groups inject. It consists of a group G which corresponds to the fundamental group of the manifold, and a family ∂G of subgroups which correspond to the fundamental groups of the boundary components, and the whole setup satisfies an appropriate version of Poincaré duality. The main difficulty in establishing the results in this paper is that if one considers any of the decompositions of G described in [22], then a priori there is no connection between the decomposition and the boundary groups of the pair. In the topological case, if one considers the full characteristic submanifold $V(M)$ of an orientable Haken manifold M with incompressible boundary, one can double M along its boundary to obtain a closed Haken 3–manifold DM , and there is a natural submanifold DV of DM which is the double of $V(M)$. Further, in most cases, DV is the characteristic submanifold of DM . In the algebraic context, doubling a $(n + 2)$ –dimensional Poincaré duality pair $(G, \partial G)$ along its boundary yields a $(n + 2)$ –dimensional Poincaré duality group DG , but in general there is no natural way to double an algebraic decomposition of G to obtain a corresponding decomposition of DG . However, after establishing all the properties of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, when $(G, \partial G)$ is a Poincaré duality pair, we will show in section 8 that the algebraic situation is very similar to the topological one. In the topological setting, one can also reverse this process and construct the full characteristic submanifold of an orientable Haken manifold M with incompressible boundary by starting with the characteristic submanifold $V(DM)$ of DM and “undoubling” to obtain the required submanifold $V(M)$ of M . This greatly simplifies the construction of the characteristic submanifold of M . If we start with the Poincaré duality group DG , and the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$, then the natural algebraic analogue of “undoubling” is simply to restrict this decomposition to G using the Subgroup Theorem. This determines a graph of groups structure on G , and it follows from our results in section 8 that this decomposition of G is $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. However this does not simplify the proof that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ has the properties we require. In fact, the proof of this “undoubling” result in section 8 depends on first establishing all the properties of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. The difficulty is that we are unable to show directly that the decomposition of G obtained by restricting $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$ to G has any of

the enclosing properties required of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. This is partly because our idea of enclosing is much stronger than simply requiring certain subgroups of G to be conjugate into certain vertex groups of a given decomposition of G . For example if a splitting of G is enclosed by a vertex v of a graph of groups decomposition Γ of G , then we can split Γ at v to obtain a refined graph of groups structure for G which has an extra edge associated to the given splitting.

An important point about our ideas in [22] and in this paper is that we consider all almost invariant subsets of a group G rather than just those which correspond to splittings. In the topological setting, this corresponds to considering essential maps of codimension–1 manifolds rather than just essential embeddings. We do not know how to carry out the program in this paper using only splittings. The main goal in [22] was to enclose the algebraic analogues of immersed annuli and tori (the analogues were almost invariant sets over virtually polycyclic groups), which is the natural generalization of the approaches in [18] and [20]. It turns out that the analogy is stronger in the case of Poincaré duality pairs. The decomposition $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ which we obtained in [22] was constructed to enclose the analogues of immersions of annuli and tori whereas in *JSJ* theory [7, 8, 31], the aim was to enclose essential Seifert pairs. When G is the fundamental group of a 3–manifold, the difference turns out to be minor (consisting of small Seifert fibre spaces) and one can easily go from one decomposition to the other. In the case of groups it seems more natural to enclose almost invariant sets over virtually polycyclic subgroups, that is the analogues of immersions of annuli and tori, rather than Seifert pairs and to make the distinction clear, we will call the decompositions that we obtain Annulus–Torus decompositions. It should be pointed out that when doubling a manifold, the *JSJ*–decompositions behave better than the Annulus–Torus decompositions, and we will switch from one to the other when it is convenient. Similar comments apply to our algebraic decompositions of Poincaré duality pairs. This is made precise in Theorem 8.6 and Remark 8.7.

Our main result, Theorem 3.14, is a description of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, and its completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, for an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$, when $n \geq 1$. We leave the precise statement till later because it requires the introduction of a substantial amount of terminology. Some of the result is simply a restatement of our results from [22]. But an important part of the result is that all the edge splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are induced by essential annuli and tori in $(G, \partial G)$, in a sense which we define in section 2.

This means that, for each $n \geq 1$, the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of G is closely analogous to the *JSJ*-decomposition of an orientable 3-manifold.

In section 1, we recall the main definitions and results from our work in [22], as corrected in [23], and from our more recent paper with Guirardel [6]. In section 2, we discuss the definition of a Poincaré duality group and pair, and then we discuss essential annuli and tori (the terms ‘annulus’ and ‘torus’ are used in a generalised sense) in orientable Poincaré duality pairs. We show that each essential annulus and torus has a naturally associated almost invariant set, which we call its dual. We also show that all almost invariant sets over *VPC* n groups in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair are ‘generated’ by duals of essential annuli. In section 3, we give several more definitions which finally allow us to state our main theorem, Theorem 3.14. In section 4, we discuss the analogues of torus decompositions for orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups and pairs. These decompositions were already obtained by Kropholler [11] under the extra hypothesis that any *VPC* subgroup has finitely generated centraliser, a condition which he called Max-c. In [12] Kropholler showed that the Max-c condition holds in dimension three. However an example due to Mess [16] shows that the Max-c condition is not always satisfied. In dimension three, this decomposition was also obtained by Castel [4]. The comparison between our results and Kropholler’s results in the case of orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups is discussed briefly in [22], but we discuss this in more detail here. In section 5, we analyse further our torus decomposition of Poincaré duality pairs. In section 6, we continue studying orientable $PD(n+2)$ pairs, and consider the crossing of almost invariant subsets over *VPC* n groups with almost invariant subsets over *VPC* $(n+1)$ groups. This is a new feature of our arguments in this paper, which could not be handled in the more general setting of [22]. In section 7, we bring together the various pieces and prove our main result, Theorem 3.14. In section 8, we are able to prove Theorem 8.6 which shows that, for an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$, one can double the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ to obtain $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. Finally in section 9, we discuss some natural further questions.

This paper is a revised version of [25]. The main changes are that sections 2 and 3 of that paper have been removed, as the theory therein has now been developed more thoroughly and generally in [6], and a new section, numbered 8, has been added. In addition, there are several minor corrections and improvements in the exposition.

1 Preliminaries

In this section we recall the main definitions and results from [22], as corrected in [23], which we will use. But we will start by briefly discussing some 3-manifold theory which motivates and guides all our work. Let M be an orientable Haken 3-manifold with incompressible boundary. Jaco and Shalen [7] and Johannson [8] proved the existence and uniqueness of the characteristic submanifold of M . We will denote this submanifold by $JSJ(M)$. Its frontier consists of essential annuli and tori in M , and each component of $JSJ(M)$ is a Seifert fibre space or I -bundle. Further any essential map of a Seifert fibre space into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $JSJ(M)$, and this condition characterizes $JSJ(M)$. In order to compare this with algebraic generalisations, we note that, in particular, any essential map of the annulus or torus into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $JSJ(M)$. This weaker condition does not characterise $JSJ(M)$, but does characterise a submanifold of M which we denote by $AT(M)$. The letters AT stand for Annulus–Torus. This is discussed in detail in chapter 1 of [22], but the notation $AT(M)$ is not used. Any essential map of the annulus or torus into M can be properly homotoped to lie in $AT(M)$, and $AT(M)$ is minimal, up to isotopy, among all essential submanifolds of M with this property. (A compact submanifold of M is essential if its frontier consists of essential embedded surfaces.) We will say that the family of all essential annuli and tori in M *fills* $AT(M)$, and we regard $AT(M)$ as a kind of regular neighbourhood of this family. The connection between $AT(M)$ and $JSJ(M)$ can be described as follows. The submanifold $JSJ(M)$ has certain exceptional components. These are of two types. One type is a solid torus W whose frontier consists of three annuli each of degree 1 in W , or of one annulus of degree 2 in W , or of one annulus of degree 3 in W . The other type lies in the interior of M and is homeomorphic to the twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle. (Note that as M is orientable, only one such bundle can occur.) Then $AT(M)$ can be obtained from $JSJ(M)$ by discarding all these exceptional components, replacing each of them by a regular neighbourhood of its frontier, and finally discarding any redundant product components from the resulting submanifold.

Recall from the previous paragraph that the family of all essential annuli and tori in M fills $AT(M)$, and that we regard $AT(M)$ as a kind of regular neighbourhood of this family. However, $AT(M)$ is filled by a smaller family of essential annuli and tori in M , and this turns out to be crucial for the algebraic analogues we are discussing in this paper. Let $AT_{\partial}(M)$ denote

the union of those components of $AT(M)$ which meet ∂M , and let $AT_{int}(M)$ denote the union of the remaining components of $AT(M)$. Then any essential annulus in M can be properly homotoped to lie in $AT_{\partial}(M)$. Thus it is clear that any essential torus in M which is homotopic into $AT_{int}(M)$ cannot cross any such annulus, and that $AT_{int}(M)$ must be filled by tori which are homotopic into $AT_{int}(M)$. Further, it is easy to show that $AT_{\partial}(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M . We conclude that $AT(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M .

For future reference, we will also need to discuss the Torus Decomposition of M and its relationship with $AT(M)$. As above one can characterise a submanifold $T(M)$ of M by the property that any essential map of a torus into M can be homotoped into $T(M)$ and that $T(M)$ is minimal, up to isotopy, among all essential submanifolds of M with this property. Of course if M admits no essential annulus, then $AT(M)$ and $T(M)$ are equal. In general, $T(M)$ is obtained from $AT(M)$ as follows. Any component of $AT_{int}(M)$ is left unchanged. Now $AT_{\partial}(M)$ has three types of component. The first type is a Seifert fibre space which is not a solid torus and such that each boundary torus lies in the interior of M , or is contained in ∂M , or meets ∂M in vertical annuli. The second type is a solid torus which meets ∂M in annuli, and the third type is an I -bundle over a surface F which meets ∂M in the associated ∂I -bundle over F . As no essential torus in M can be homotopic into a component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ of the second or third type, all such components are omitted when we form $T(M)$. Finally let W denote a component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ which is of the first type. Thus W is a Seifert fibre space which is not a solid torus and $W \cap \partial M$ consists of tori and vertical annuli in ∂W . By pushing into the interior of W each torus component of ∂W which meets ∂M in annuli, we obtain a Seifert fibre space W' which is contained in and homeomorphic to W . Note that the components of the closure of $W - W'$ are homeomorphic to $T \times I$, and $W' \cap \partial M$ consists only of tori. Replacing W by W' for each such component of $AT_{\partial}(M)$ finally yields $T(M)$. Note that it is clear that $T(M) \subset AT(M)$ and that an essential torus in M is homotopic into $AT(M)$ if and only if it is homotopic into $T(M)$.

Next we recall the cohomological formulation of the theory of ends and of almost invariant subsets of a group. Let G be a group and let E be a set on which G acts on the right. Let PE denote the power set of E . Under Boolean addition ("symmetric difference") this is an additive group of exponent 2. Write FE for the additive subgroup of finite subsets. We refer

to two sets A and B whose symmetric difference lies in FE as *almost equal*, and write $A \stackrel{a}{=} B$. This amounts to equality in the quotient group PE/FE . Now define

$$QE = \{A \subset E : \forall g \in G, A \stackrel{a}{=} Ag\}.$$

The action of G on PE by right translation preserves the subgroups QE and FE , and QE/FE is the subgroup of elements of PE/FE fixed under the induced action. Elements of QE are said to be *almost invariant*. If we take E to be G with the action of G being right multiplication, then the number of ends of G is

$$e(G) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}_2} (QG/FG).$$

If G is finite, all subsets are finite and clearly $e(G) = 0$. Otherwise, G is an infinite set which is invariant (not merely “almost”), so $e(G) \geq 1$.

If H is a subgroup of G , and we take E to be the coset space $H \backslash G$ of all cosets Hg , still with the action of G being right multiplication, then the number of ends of the pair (G, H) is

$$e(G, H) = \dim_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \left(\frac{Q(H \backslash G)}{F(H \backslash G)} \right).$$

When H is trivial, so that $e(G, H) = e(G)$, this can be formulated in terms of group cohomology as follows. The abelian group PG is naturally a (right) \mathbb{Z}_2G -module, and the submodule FG can be identified with the group ring \mathbb{Z}_2G . Thus the invariant subgroup QG/FG equals $H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G)$. Now the short exact sequence of coefficients

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2G \rightarrow PG \rightarrow PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G \rightarrow 0$$

yields the following long exact cohomology sequence.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) \rightarrow H^0(G; PG) \rightarrow H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) \rightarrow H^1(G; PG) \rightarrow$$

For any group G , the group $H^n(G; PG)$ is zero if $n \neq 0$, and isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}_2 when $n = 0$. And if G is infinite, then $H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G) = 0$. Also when G is infinite, the non-zero element of $H^0(G; PG)$ maps to the element of $H^0(G; PG/\mathbb{Z}_2G)$ which corresponds to the equivalence class of G in QG/FG , under the identification of these two groups. It follows that when G is infinite, the group $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2G)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of G modulo almost equality and complementation.

If H is nontrivial, let E denote the coset space $H \backslash G$. The abelian group PE is naturally a (right) $\mathbb{Z}_2 G$ -module, and we denote the submodule FE by $\mathbb{Z}_2 E$. Thus the invariant subgroup QE/FE equals $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Now the short exact sequence of coefficients

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 E \rightarrow PE \rightarrow PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E \rightarrow 0$$

yields the following long exact cohomology sequence.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; PE) \rightarrow$$

For any group G and any subgroup H , the group $H^n(G; PE)$ is isomorphic to $H^n(H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and if the index of H in G is infinite, then $H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) = 0$. Thus, as above, when H has infinite index in G , the image of the coboundary map $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ modulo almost equality and complementation.

If G is finitely presented, this description connects very nicely with topology. Let X be an Eilenberg-MacLane space $K(G, 1)$ with finite 2-skeleton, let \tilde{X} denote its universal cover, and let X_H denote the cover of X with fundamental group H . Thus X_H is the quotient of \tilde{X} by the (left) action of H acting as a covering group. Because X has finite 2-skeleton, the part of the long exact cohomology sequence shown above is isomorphic to the corresponding part of the following long exact cohomology sequence for X_H ,

$$H_f^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow$$

where $H_f^i(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ denotes cellular cohomology with finite supports. Thus when H has infinite index in G , the image of the coboundary map $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ can be identified with the collection of all almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ modulo almost equality and complementation. If G is finitely generated but not finitely presented, we can take X to be a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1-skeleton but it is no longer correct to identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ with $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. In fact, cellular cohomology with finite supports for a cell complex which is not locally finite is an unreasonable idea, as the coboundary of a finite cochain need not be finite. However it is easy to define a modified version of this theory in our particular setting. For future reference we set this out as a remark.

Remark 1.1. *Let G be a group which is finitely generated but need not be finitely presented, and let X be a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1-skeleton. Let H be a subgroup of G , and let X_H denote the cover of X with fundamental group H . We replace the use of cochains on X_H with finite support by cochains whose support consists of only finitely many cells above each cell of X . Note that as X has only finitely many 1-cells, such 1-cochains are finite. In this paper, $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ will denote the appropriate cohomology group of this cochain complex. This enables us to identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ with $H_f^1(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$.*

This is the topological formulation of Lemma 7.4 in [3].

Recall that the invariant subgroup QE/FE equals $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Thus the elements of $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ are equivalence classes of almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ under the equivalence relation of almost equality. Also the elements of $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are equivalence classes of cellular 0-cochains on X_H which have finite coboundary. The support of such a cochain is a subset of the vertex set of X_H . Thus whether or not G is finitely presented, the isomorphism between $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ and $H_e^0(X_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ associates to an almost invariant subset Y of $H \backslash G$ a subset Z of the vertex set of X_H with finite coboundary, where Z is unique up to almost equality. This is a convenient fact which we will use on several occasions. Note that Y is trivial, i.e. finite or co-finite, if and only if Z is finite or co-finite. Also if Y and Y' are almost invariant subsets of $H \backslash G$ with corresponding subsets Z and Z' of the vertex set of X_H , then the intersections $Y \cap Y'$ and $Z \cap Z'$ also correspond.

Next we recall some more basic facts about almost invariant sets. If X and Y are subsets of G , the four sets $X \cap Y$, $X \cap Y^*$, $X^* \cap Y$ and $X^* \cap Y^*$ are called the *corners* of the pair (X, Y) . If X is H -almost invariant and Y is K -almost invariant, a corner of the pair (X, Y) is *small* if it is H -finite or K -finite. (These two conditions are equivalent so long as X and Y are both nontrivial and G is finitely generated.) We say that X *crosses* Y if all four corners of the pair (X, Y) are K -infinite. The preceding parenthetical comment shows that if X and Y are nontrivial and G is finitely generated, then X crosses Y if and only if Y crosses X . In [21] and [22], we defined a partial order \leq on certain families of almost invariant subsets of a finitely generated group G as follows. The idea of the definition is that $Y \leq X$ means that Y is “almost” contained in X . If E is a family of almost invariant subsets of G , we say that the elements of E are in *good position* if whenever U and V are elements of E such that two of the corners of the pair are small, then one corner is empty. If the elements of E are in good position, then we defined

$Y \leq X$ to mean that either $Y \cap X^*$ is empty or it is the only small corner of the pair (X, Y) . We showed that \leq is a partial order on E . Note that if $Y \subset X$, then automatically $Y \leq X$. Note also that the requirement of good position was needed to avoid the possibility of having distinct sets X and Y such that $Y \leq X$ and $X \leq Y$. In [19], we defined an even stronger condition. If E is a family of almost invariant subsets of G , we say that the elements of E are in *very good position* if whenever U and V are elements of E , either none of the four corners of the pair is small or one is empty. This is equivalent to the partial orders on E induced by inclusion and by \leq being the same. We also showed that one can often arrange that families of almost invariant sets are in very good position by replacing the given sets by equivalent ones.

Next we recall the theory of algebraic regular neighbourhoods. In [22], we defined an algebraic regular neighbourhood (Definition 6.1) and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood (Definition 6.18) of a family of almost invariant subsets of a finitely generated group G . See also Definition 9.1 in [6]. We discuss the difference between these objects immediately after Definition 1.4 below. Each is a bipartite graph of groups structure Γ for G with certain properties. The basic property of Γ is that the V_0 -vertices enclose the given almost invariant sets. See chapters 4 and 5 of [22], or section 3 of [6], for the definition and basic properties of enclosing. Algebraic regular neighbourhoods need not exist, but we showed that when they exist they are unique up to isomorphism of bipartite graphs of groups. We also showed that if one has a finite family of almost invariant sets each over a finitely generated subgroup of G , then it always has an algebraic regular neighbourhood and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood. The main results of [22] were existence results for algebraic regular neighbourhoods of infinite families in several special cases. In this paper, we will use the existence results for reduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods.

Before stating these existence results, we briefly discuss how the topological and algebraic situations are related. Groups which are virtually polycyclic (*VPC*) play an important role in this paper. The Hirsch length of such a group will simply be called the length for brevity. A group which is *VPC* of length n will be called *VPC* n . We will often need to refer to a group which is *VPC* of length at most n . Such a group will be called *VPC*($\leq n$). We will also use the notation *VPC*($< n$) in a similar way. Almost invariant sets which do not cross other almost invariant sets play a special role. We will need the following definition from [22].

Definition 1.2. *Let G be a one-ended finitely generated group and let X be a nontrivial almost invariant subset over a subgroup H of G .*

For $n \geq 1$, we will say that X is n -canonical if X crosses no nontrivial K -almost invariant subset of G , for which K is $VPC(\leq n)$.

Let G denote any one-ended almost finitely presented group. The natural algebraic analogue of an essential annulus in a 3-manifold M is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC1$ subgroup, and the natural analogue of an essential torus in M is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC2$ subgroup. As $AT(M)$ is a kind of regular neighbourhood of the family of all essential annuli and tori in M , it would seem natural to consider the algebraic regular neighbourhood in G of the family of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over VPC subgroups of length 1 or 2. However, we showed in Example 11.7 of [22] that, even when G is the fundamental group of a 3-manifold, such a family need not possess an algebraic regular neighbourhood with the right properties. But recall from our discussion on page 7 that $AT(M)$ is filled by the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M . The algebraic analogue of this family is the family $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC1$ subgroups and of equivalence classes of all 1-canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC2$ subgroups. In [22], as corrected in [23], we showed that $\mathcal{F}_{1,2}$ has an algebraic regular neighbourhood which is precisely analogous to the decomposition given by $AT(M)$. We also described analogous constructions for VPC subgroups of G of higher length. This is contained in Theorem 1.16 below.

Next we need to introduce some more definitions which we used in [22].

Definition 1.3. *If E is a G -invariant family of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of a group G , we will say that an element of E which crosses no element of E is isolated in E .*

When forming an algebraic regular neighbourhood of a family E of almost invariant sets, isolated elements yield special vertices which we also call isolated.

Definition 1.4. *A vertex of a graph of groups Γ is isolated if it has exactly two incident edges for each of which the inclusion of the associated edge group into the vertex group is an isomorphism.*

Remark 1.5. *If Γ consists of a single vertex v and a single edge, then v is not isolated, as only one edge is incident to v .*

Note that the two edges incident to an isolated vertex have the same associated edge splitting. Conversely if two distinct edges e and e' of a minimal graph Γ of groups have associated edge splittings which are conjugate, there is an edge path λ in Γ which starts with e and ends with e' such that all the interior vertices of λ are isolated, and all the edges in λ have associated edge splittings which are conjugate. When one forms the algebraic regular neighbourhood Γ of a family E of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of a group G , it may happen that Γ has such edge paths with more than two edges. One could reduce Γ by simply collapsing each maximal such edge path in Γ to a single edge. However Γ is bipartite and one wants to preserve this property, so one may instead need to collapse such a maximal edge path to two edges. The resulting bipartite graph of groups is the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of E . It never has three distinct edges such that the associated splittings of G are all conjugate. We formalise this in the following definition.

Definition 1.6. *A minimal bipartite graph of groups Γ is called reduced bipartite if it does not have three distinct edges such that the associated splittings of G are all conjugate.*

Some other special types of vertices may occur when one forms an algebraic regular neighbourhood.

Definition 1.7. *Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of a group G . A vertex v of Γ is of VPC-by-Fuchsian type if $G(v)$ is a VPC-by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is finitely generated and is not finite nor two-ended, and there is exactly one edge of Γ which is incident to v for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, and this edge carries K .*

If the length of the normal VPC subgroup of $G(v)$ is n , we will say that v is of VPC n -by-Fuchsian type.

Remark 1.8. *It is possible that a single edge of Γ can have both ends incident to v . In this case, the two inclusions of the associated edge group into $G(v)$ must have images which are distinct peripheral subgroups of $G(v)$ up to conjugacy.*

Note that if $G = G(v)$, then Γ must consist of v alone, and the Fuchsian quotient group of G corresponds to a closed orbifold. Conversely if the Fuchsian quotient group of $G(v)$ corresponds to a closed orbifold, then Γ must consist of v alone, and $G = G(v)$. Note also that if v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, then each peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$.

The assumption in Definition 1.7 that the Fuchsian quotient of $G(v)$ not be finite nor two-ended is made to ensure the uniqueness of the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient. This is immediate from the following result.

Lemma 1.9. *Let G be a group with a normal $VPCk$ subgroup L with Fuchsian quotient Φ . Suppose that Φ is not finite nor two-ended. If L' is a $VPCk$ normal subgroup of G with Fuchsian quotient, then L' must equal L .*

Proof. If L' is not contained in L , the image of L' in Φ is a nontrivial normal VPC subgroup, which we denote by N . As no Fuchsian group can be $VPC2$, it follows that N must be $VPC0$ or $VPC1$. If N is $VPC0$, i.e. finite, then Φ must also be finite. If N is $VPC1$, then it must be of finite index in Φ . As we are assuming that Φ is not finite nor two-ended, it follows that L' must be contained in L . Similarly L must be contained in L' , so that L and L' are equal, as required. \square

We note that in [22] we used the word Fuchsian to include discrete groups of isometries of the Euclidean plane, as well as the hyperbolic plane. The additional groups were all virtually $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$. The reason for this abuse of language was that we wanted to include the case of VPC groups in the statements of our results. However in all of the main results of this paper, it will be convenient to exclude the case of VPC groups.

Next we prove two simple results about VPC groups which will be needed on several occasions.

Lemma 1.10. *Let G be a $VPC(n + 1)$ group which splits over a subgroup L . Then L is $VPCn$, and is normal in G with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

Proof. The result is equivalent to asserting that, for a $VPC(n + 1)$ group G , any minimal G -tree must be a point or a line. We will prove this by induction on the length of G . The induction starts when G has length 1. Then G has two ends and the result is standard. Now suppose that G has length $n + 1 \geq 2$, and that the result is known for $VPC(\leq n)$ groups. Let

T be a minimal G -tree. There is a subgroup G' of finite index in G which normalises some $VPCn$ subgroup L' . By our induction assumption, the action of L' on T must fix a point or have a minimal subtree T' which is a line. In the second case, the minimal subtree of T left invariant by G' must also be T' . In the first case, we let T' denote the fixed subtree of L' , i.e. T' consists of all vertices and edges fixed by L' . The action of G' must preserve T' , so that the quotient group $L'\backslash G'$ acts on T' . As this quotient group has two ends, it follows that the minimal subtree of T' left invariant by G' is a point or a line. Thus in either case, the minimal subtree of T left invariant by G' is a point or a line. As G' has finite index in G , this minimal subtree must equal T , so that T itself is a point or a line as required. \square

Lemma 1.11. *Let G be a $VPC(n+1)$ group with a normal $VPCn$ subgroup L such that $L\backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let K be a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of G which is commensurable with L . Then the following hold:*

1. K is contained in L .
2. If $K\backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, then $K = L$.

Proof. 1) If K is not contained in L , then the image of K in the quotient $L\backslash G$ is a nontrivial finite normal subgroup. As neither \mathbb{Z} nor $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ possesses such a subgroup, it follows that K must be contained in L as required.

2) If $K\backslash G$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, we can apply the first part with the roles of K and L reversed. We deduce that L is contained in K , so that $K = L$ as required. \square

We also prove the following useful technical results about VPC -by-Fuchsian groups.

Lemma 1.12. *Let G be a group with a normal $VPCn$ subgroup L with Fuchsian quotient Φ , and let K be a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G .*

1. *Then $L \cap K$ is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.*
2. *If H is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, and if H is commensurable with L , then H equals $L \cap K$.*

Proof. 1) As L is $VPCn$ and normal in G , the intersection $L \cap K$ must be $VPC(\leq n)$, and normal in K . Hence the quotient of K by $L \cap K$ is a VPC subgroup of Φ of length at least 1. As a Fuchsian group can have no $VPC2$ subgroups, it follows that k must equal n and the quotient of K by $L \cap K$ must be $VPC1$. As the only $VPC1$ subgroups of a Fuchsian group are isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, the result follows. \square

2) This follows from Lemma 1.11. \square

Next we have a uniqueness result for a VPC -by-Fuchsian structure on a group.

Lemma 1.13. *Let G be a group with a normal $VPCn$ subgroup L with Fuchsian quotient Φ which is not virtually cyclic, and suppose G also has a normal $VPCm$ subgroup L' with Fuchsian quotient Φ' which is not virtually cyclic. Then $L = L'$.*

Proof. Suppose L' is not contained in L . Then the image of L' in Φ is a nontrivial normal VPC subgroup. But a Fuchsian group which is not virtually cyclic cannot contain such a subgroup. It follows that $L' \subset L$. Similarly, it follows that $L \subset L'$ so that $L = L'$, as required. \square

Now we can state the results from [22] which play a basic role in this paper. Recall that if H is a subgroup of a group G , the *commensuriser*, $Comm_G(H)$, of H in G is the subgroup of G consisting of all elements g such that the conjugate of H by g is commensurable with H . Trivially, $Comm_G(H)$ contains H . We will say that $Comm_G(H)$ is *large* if it contains H with infinite index, and is *small* otherwise.

The following existence result is essentially the statement of Theorem 12.3 of [22]. We have made one slight modification in the last sentence of part 3), where we refer to the number of coends of a subgroup in a group. See page 33 of [22] for a brief discussion of this concept. It was introduced independently by Bowditch [2] under the name of coends, by Geoghegan [5] under the name of filtered coends, and by Kropholler and Roller [13] under the name of relative ends.

Theorem 1.14. *Let $n \geq 1$, and let G be a one-ended, almost finitely presented group which is not VPC and does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPC(< n)$ subgroups, and let \mathcal{F}_n denote the collection of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups.*

Then \mathcal{F}_n has an unreduced and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G . Let $\Gamma_n = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_n : G)$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}_n in G .

Then Γ_n is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G . Each V_0 -vertex v of Γ_n satisfies one of the following conditions:

1. v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is $VPCn$.
2. v is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and elements of \mathcal{F}_n enclosed by v cross strongly if at all.
3. $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H , such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, and elements of \mathcal{F}_n enclosed by v cross weakly if at all.

Further, if H is a $VPCn$ subgroup of G such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, then Γ_n will have a non-isolated V_0 -vertex v such that $G(v) = Comm_G(H)$ if and only if H has at least 4 coends in G .

Γ_n consists of a single vertex if and only if \mathcal{F}_n is empty, or G itself satisfies condition 2) or 3). In the first case, Γ_n consists of a single V_1 -vertex. In the second case, Γ_n consists of a single V_0 -vertex.

Remark 1.15. The assumption that G is not VPC is made to simplify the statement of this result. If G is $VPC(n+1)$, then Γ_n consists of a single V_0 -vertex v with associated group G . In this case, v may not satisfy any of the conditions in the above theorem.

We will say that a V_0 -vertex in case 3) is of commensuriser type if v is not isolated, and is of large commensuriser type if, in addition, H has large commensuriser.

Note that we showed in Example 11.1 of [22] that, even if G is finitely presented, the group associated to a V_0 -vertex of commensuriser type need not be finitely generated.

The statement at the end of part 3) with the assumption that H has at least 4 coends in G comes from the proofs of Propositions 7.16, 7.17, 8.1 and 8.6 of [22]. Note that if H has large commensuriser in G , the proof of Proposition 8.1 of [22] shows that H has infinitely many coends in G . This uses the fact that we have excluded the case when G is VPC .

When $n = 2$, this result is the algebraic analogue of the torus decomposition $T(M)$ of a closed orientable Haken 3-manifold M . See the start of this section for a discussion of $T(M)$. As M is compact, its fundamental group G is finitely presented. As M is irreducible, it follows that G is also one-ended. As M is closed, our discussion in [24] implies that G does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPC1$ subgroups. Now the above result asserts that $\Gamma_2(G)$ exists, and we showed in [22] that it is the graph of groups structure for G determined by the frontier of $T(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_2(G)$ correspond to the components of $T(M)$. In this case, $\Gamma_2(G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type. An isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_2(G)$ corresponds to a component of $T(M)$ homeomorphic to $T \times I$. A V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_2(G)$ which is of $VPC1$ -by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $T(M)$ which is homeomorphic to a Seifert fibre space.

Next we come to the following more general result which is essentially the statement of Theorem 13.12 of [22]. Again we assume that G is not VPC in order to simplify the statement.

Theorem 1.16. *Let $n \geq 1$, and let G be a one-ended, almost finitely presented group which is not VPC and does not admit any nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPC(< n)$ subgroups, and let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the collection of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with the equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup.*

Then $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ has an unreduced and a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G . Let $\Gamma_{n,n+1} = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1} : G)$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G .

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G . Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

1. *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$.*
2. *v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n , and elements of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ enclosed by v cross strongly if at all.*
3. *$G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n+1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, and elements of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which are enclosed by v and are over groups commensurable with H cross weakly if at all.*

Further, if H is a VPC subgroup of G of length n or $n + 1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$, then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ will have a non-isolated V_0 -vertex v such that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ if and only if H has at least 4 coends in G .

$\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single vertex if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ is empty, or G itself satisfies condition 2) or 3). In the first case, $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single V_1 -vertex. In the second case, $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single V_0 -vertex.

When $n = 1$, this result is the algebraic analogue of the Annulus-Torus decomposition $AT(M)$ of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary. See the start of this section for a discussion of $AT(M)$. As M is compact, its fundamental group G is finitely presented. As M is irreducible and has incompressible boundary, it follows that G is also one-ended. Now the above result asserts that $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ exists, and we showed in [22] that it is the graph of groups structure for G determined by the frontier of $AT(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ correspond to the components of $AT(M)$. An isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ homeomorphic to $A \times I$ or $T \times I$. A V_0 -vertex of $VPC1$ -by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is a Seifert fibre space not meeting ∂M . A V_0 -vertex of $VPC0$ -by-Fuchsian type corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is an I -bundle and meets ∂M in the associated S^0 -bundle. A V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type, where $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some $VPC1$ subgroup H , corresponds to a component of $AT(M)$ which is a Seifert fibre space and meets ∂M . Finally, in this case, $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ has no V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type, where $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser of a $VPC2$ subgroup of G .

In the special case when M is closed or admits no essential annuli, then G has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over any $VPC1$ subgroup, so that $\Gamma_2(G)$ is defined and equals $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$.

Recall that $JSJ(M)$ can be obtained from $AT(M)$ by adding certain exceptional submanifolds of M . We will describe analogous algebraic constructions for any n and any group G for which $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ exist. The results of these constructions are graphs of groups structures $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ for G , which we call the completions of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ respectively.

Definition 1.17. *Let G be a group for which the decompositions $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ exist. The completions of these decompositions, denoted $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$*

and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ respectively are graphs of groups structures for G obtained as follows:

If $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ has a V_1 -vertex w such that $G(w)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, and if w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$, then we subdivide e into two edges. The new vertex is a V_1 -vertex and w becomes a V_0 -vertex. If the original V_0 -vertex of e is isolated, then in addition we collapse e to a point, which becomes a new V_0 -vertex.

If $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ has a V_1 -vertex w such that $G(w)$ is $VPCn$, and if w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, or if w has exactly three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$, then we subdivide each of the incident edges into two edges. The new vertices are V_1 -vertices and w becomes a V_0 -vertex. If the original V_0 -vertex of any of the edges incident to w is isolated, then in addition we collapse that edge.

Making all these changes for every such V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ yields $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ respectively.

Remark 1.18. If $n = 1$, and G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M with incompressible boundary, then the discussion in [22] shows that $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ is the graph of groups determined by the frontier of $JSJ(M)$ in M . The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ correspond to the components of $JSJ(M)$. Those V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ which are obtained from V_1 -vertices of $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ correspond to the exceptional components of $JSJ(M)$. If M is closed or admits no essential annuli, then $\Gamma_2^c(G)$ is defined and equals $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$. Also those V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_2^c(G)$ which are obtained from V_1 -vertices of $\Gamma_2(G)$ correspond to the exceptional components of $JSJ(M)$.

2 Poincaré duality pairs and essential annuli and tori

We refer to Brown [3], Bieri and Eckmann [1], Kapovich and Kleiner [9], and Wall [34] for various definitions of Poincaré duality groups and pairs. The definition of Bieri and Eckmann is that G is a Poincaré duality group of dimension $n + 2$ if $H^i(G; \mathbb{Z}G)$ is 0, when $i \neq n + 2$, and is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} when $i = n + 2$. Further G is orientable if the action of G on $H^{n+2}(G; \mathbb{Z}G)$ is trivial. In the following, we will be mostly concerned with orientable Poincaré duality groups and pairs. A Poincaré duality pair is a pair $(G, \partial G)$, where $\partial G = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ is a system of subgroups of G , such that the double of G

along ∂G is a Poincaré duality group. Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that each S_i must be a $PD(n+1)$ group. Note that the order of the S_i 's is irrelevant, and that repetitions are allowed. However, if any repetition occurs, or even if two distinct S_i 's are conjugate, there is a $PD(n+1)$ group H , such that the pair $(G, \partial G)$ equals $(H, \{H, H\})$, which is a trivial $PD(n+2)$ pair analogous to the product of a closed $(n+1)$ -manifold with the unit interval. We will usually assume that $n \geq 1$, so that our Poincaré duality groups and pairs are at least 3-dimensional. Bieri and Eckmann [1] show that their definition implies that G is almost finitely presented, which suffices for the accessibility results that we use. If G is finitely presented then the corresponding $K(G, 1)$ space is dominated by a finite complex (see Theorem 7.1 in Chapter 8 of [3]) and then G is a Poincaré duality group in the sense of Wall [34].

A Poincaré duality pair is a special case of what the authors of [6] call a group system, but it seems natural to use the language of pairs in the setting of this paper. In [6], many of our results require that the group system be of finite type, but this condition is automatic for Poincaré duality pairs. An important idea which we first introduced in [25], and is worked out in more detail in [6], is that of an almost invariant subset of a group G being adapted to a family of subgroups. As this idea will play an important role in this paper, we reproduce the definition from [6], and some of the following remarks. Lemma 2.5 summarises the properties of adapted almost invariant sets which we will need in this paper.

Definition 2.1. (*Definition 5.1 of [6]*) *Let G be a group and let H and S be subgroups. Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of subgroups of G , with repetitions allowed.*

A H -almost invariant subset X of G is strictly adapted to the subgroup S if, for all $g \in G$, the coset gS is contained in X or in X^ .*

A H -almost invariant subset X of G is adapted to S , or is S -adapted, if it is equivalent to a H' -almost invariant subset X' of G such that X' is strictly adapted to S .

A H -almost invariant subset X of G is adapted to the family \mathcal{S} , or is \mathcal{S} -adapted, if it is adapted to each S_i .

Remark 2.2. *If X is \mathcal{S} -adapted, then so is any almost invariant subset of G which is equivalent to X .*

If X is adapted to the family \mathcal{S} , and we replace each S_i by some conjugate, then X is also adapted to the new family. For if X is strictly adapted to a

subgroup S , and $k \in G$, then Xk is H -almost invariant and equivalent to X , and is strictly adapted to $k^{-1}Sk$.

Note that if X is adapted to the family \mathcal{S} , then, for each i , there is a K_i -almost invariant subset X_i of G which is equivalent to X and is strictly adapted to S_i , but the X_i 's may all be different. In general, it is difficult for an almost invariant set to be strictly adapted to more than one subgroup of G .

The following definition, due to Müller [17], is natural when one considers splittings of a group.

Definition 2.3. Let K be a group with a splitting σ over a subgroup H , and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . The splitting σ of K is adapted to \mathcal{S} , or is \mathcal{S} -adapted, if each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of σ .

There is also a natural generalisation of Definition 2.3 to graphs of groups.

Definition 2.4. Let K be a group with a graph of groups structure Γ , and let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_i\}$ be a family of subgroups of K . Then Γ is adapted to \mathcal{S} , or is \mathcal{S} -adapted, if each S_i is conjugate into a vertex group of Γ .

In [6], it is shown that these terminologies are all compatible.

In topological terms, this concept seems very natural when one considers manifolds with boundary, and this is how Muller's definition arose. Consider a manifold M , and a codimension-1 embedded submanifold F in the interior of M , such that F is two-sided, closed and π_1 -injective. Then clearly the splitting of $\pi_1(M)$ over $\pi_1(F)$ determined by F is adapted to the family \mathcal{S} of subgroups of M carried by the components of ∂M . On the other hand, if F has boundary and is properly embedded, then the corresponding splitting of $\pi_1(M)$ over $\pi_1(F)$ is likely not to be adapted to \mathcal{S} .

For the purposes of this paper we need to recall from [6] some properties of adapted almost invariant subsets of a group, which we summarize in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. Let \overline{G} be a group with subgroups H and G , such that $H \subset G$, and suppose that \overline{G} has a minimal graph of groups decomposition Γ with a vertex V whose associated group is G . Let \mathcal{S} denote the family of subgroups of G associated to the edges of Γ which are incident to V .

1. If \overline{X} is a H -almost invariant subset of \overline{G} which is enclosed by V , and if X denotes the H -almost invariant subset $\overline{X} \cap G$ of G , then X is adapted to the family \mathcal{S} .

2. Suppose that the group system (G, \mathcal{S}) is of finite type. If X is a nontrivial \mathcal{S} -adapted H -almost invariant subset of G , then X has an extension \overline{X} to \overline{G} , i.e. there is a H -almost invariant subset \overline{X} of \overline{G} which is enclosed by V , such that $\overline{X} \cap G = X$. Further if X is associated to a splitting of G over H , then \overline{X} is associated to a splitting of \overline{G} over H .

Remark 2.6. *As Poincaré duality pairs are automatically group systems of finite type, this condition in part 2) of the lemma can be ignored in this paper.*

We will collect here some useful basic results about Poincaré duality groups and pairs. The following result due to Kropholler and Roller is Lemma 2.2 of [14]. It will be needed at several points in this paper. Similar results are well known in the topology of 3-manifolds. In this setting, cases 1) and 2) of the lemma below occur when one has an I -bundle over a closed surface.

Lemma 2.7. *(Kropholler and Roller) Let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n+2)$ pair with ∂G non-empty. Then one of the following holds:*

1. G is a $PD(n+1)$ group and ∂G consists of a single group S which has index 2 in G .
2. G is a $PD(n+1)$ group and the pair $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$.
3. For each group S in ∂G , the index of S in G is infinite, and $\text{Comm}_G(S) = S$. Further if S and S' are distinct groups in ∂G , they are not conjugate commensurable.

It will also be convenient to state separately the following easy consequences.

Corollary 2.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Then*

1. If ∂G consists of a single group S which has index 2 in G , then G itself must be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group.
2. If S is a group in ∂G , and K is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G commensurable with S , then K is contained in S .
3. If $(G, \partial G)$ splits, adapted to ∂G , over a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H , and if H is commensurable with an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup K of G , then K is contained in H .

Proof. 1) As $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, S must be an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group. Thus G is also a $PD(n+1)$ group. If G were orientable, the fact that S has index 2 in G would imply that the induced map $\mathbb{Z} \cong H_{n+1}(S) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(G) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ would be multiplication by 2. But this map must be zero as $S = \partial G$. This contradiction shows that G must be non-orientable.

2) We apply Lemma 2.7. If case 3) of that lemma holds, the fact that K must commensurise S implies that K is contained in S . If case 2) of that lemma holds, the result is trivial. If case 1) of that lemma holds, then part 1) of this lemma tells us that G is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group. Hence S is the orientation subgroup of G , so that any orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G must be contained in S .

3) First suppose that ∂G is empty so that G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group. As G splits over H we have G equal to $A *_H B$ or to $A *_H$ for some subgroups A or B . In the first case, Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that each of the pairs (A, H) and (B, H) is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. In the second case, there are two inclusions of H into A whose images we denote by H_1 and H_2 , and Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(A, \{H_1, H_2\})$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. As K is commensurable with H , it must be conjugate into A or B . Now part 2) shows that K is contained in H , as required.

If ∂G is not empty, we recall that the given splitting of G over H is adapted to ∂G . Thus if we consider DG , the double of G over ∂G , and apply part 2) of Lemma 2.5, the given splitting of G over H induces a splitting of DG over H . Now we can apply the above argument to the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG to deduce that K is contained in H , as required. \square

The following observation will also be useful at several points in this paper. In the setting of 3-manifolds, the corresponding result is that if a Haken manifold M with non-empty incompressible boundary has VPC fundamental group, then M must be an I -bundle over the torus or Klein bottle.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n+2)$ pair, and suppose that G is VPC . Then one of the following holds:*

1. ∂G is empty and G is $VPC(n+2)$.
2. ∂G is non-empty, G is $VPC(n+1)$, and either $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$, or ∂G is a single group S , and G contains S with index 2.

Proof. If ∂G is empty, then G has cohomological dimension $n + 2$, and so G must be $VPC(n + 2)$. Thus we have case 1) of the corollary.

If ∂G is non-empty, each group in ∂G is $PD(n + 1)$, and is also VPC . Thus each group in ∂G is $VPC(n + 1)$. Now G must have cohomological dimension $n + 1$, and so G is also $VPC(n + 1)$. As this implies that any group in ∂G has finite index in G , Lemma 2.7 implies that we must have case 2) of the corollary. \square

Now we will begin our discussion of almost invariant sets in Poincaré duality groups and pairs. But first here are two important facts about such sets which follow immediately from Lemma 4.3 of Kropholler in [11].

Lemma 2.10. (*Kropholler and Roller*) *Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be a $PD(n + 2)$ pair. Then*

1. *G has no nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPC(< n)$ subgroup.*
2. *If ∂G is empty, so that G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, then G has no nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPC(\leq n)$ subgroup.*

Remark 2.11. *In the 3–manifold setting, so that $n = 1$, part 1) corresponds to the fact that a Haken manifold M with incompressible boundary must have a one-ended fundamental group, and part 2) corresponds to the additional fact that when M is closed it cannot admit essential annuli.*

The analogy between π_1 –injective maps of surfaces into 3–manifolds and almost invariant subsets of groups was one of the guiding principles in [21] and [22]. In particular, essential maps of annuli and tori into orientable 3–manifolds have corresponding nontrivial almost invariant sets.

We start by describing the analogous correspondence when one considers an orientable $PD(n + 1)$ subgroup H of an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ group G . As G and H are orientable, it follows that $e(G, H) = 2$. Thus G has a nontrivial H –almost invariant subset X_H which is unique up to equivalence and complementation. This is the almost invariant subset of G which we associate to H . We call it the *dual* of H . The restriction that H and G be orientable is not crucial to ensure that $e(G, H) = 2$, but it does simplify the statements somewhat. What is crucial is that when we consider the inclusion of H into G , it should commute with the orientation homomorphisms. For otherwise $e(G, H) = 1$, so that G has no nontrivial H –almost invariant

subsets. In topological terms, we want our codimension–1 manifolds to have trivial normal bundle or equivalently to be two-sided. Our higher dimensional algebraic analogue of a torus is an orientable $PD(n + 1)$ group H which is also $VPC(n + 1)$, and then a torus in an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ group G is an injective homomorphism $\Phi : H \rightarrow G$. Note that a $PD(n + 2)$ group G is torsion free, so that a $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup of G is always $PD(n + 1)$.

Next we consider $PD(n + 2)$ pairs. If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair with nonempty boundary, and if H is an orientable $PD(n + 1)$ subgroup of G , then $e(G, H)$ may not equal 2. Thus it is no longer clear how to naturally associate a H –almost invariant subset of G to H . However in the topological context, a map of a codimension–1 closed orientable manifold into an orientable manifold determines a corresponding almost invariant set in a natural way. For simplicity, consider the case when $n = 1$, and G is the fundamental group of an orientable 3–manifold M with incompressible boundary, and H is isomorphic to the fundamental group of a closed orientable surface F . Pick a map of F into the interior of M so that $\pi_1(F)$ maps to H by the given isomorphism, and consider its lift to the cover M_F of M with fundamental group H . Then M_F need not have two ends, so that the group H does not determine a unique H –almost invariant subset of G . But, as F is two-sided in M , the lift of F into M_F separates M_F into two pieces, and so F *does* determine a unique H –almost invariant subset Y of G . Note that Y will be trivial if and only if F is homotopic into a component of ∂M . Note also that as F does not meet ∂M , the associated almost invariant set Y is adapted to ∂G , the family of subgroups of $G = \pi_1(M)$ carried by the components of ∂M .

In the algebraic setting, where $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair with nonempty boundary and H is an orientable $PD(n + 1)$ subgroup of G , we will also associate to H a H –almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G . We do this by considering the double DG of G along ∂G . Since DG is orientable, H determines a nontrivial H –almost invariant subset X_H of DG . The H –almost invariant subset of G which we associate to H is the intersection $Y = X_H \cap G$. It is clear that Y is a trivial H –almost invariant subset of G if H is conjugate to a subgroup of one of the S_i ’s. The following result shows that, as in the topological situation, this is the only way in which Y can be trivial.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair with nonempty boundary, and let H be an orientable $PD(n + 1)$ subgroup of G . Let X_H*

denote the H -almost invariant subset of DG determined by H , and let Y denote the H -almost invariant subset $X_H \cap G$ of G .

Then Y is adapted to ∂G . Further, if Y is trivial, then H is conjugate to a subgroup of one of the S_i 's.

Proof. To prove this result, we need to use some techniques from [22]. Let Δ denote the graph of groups structure for DG corresponding to its construction by doubling. Thus Δ has two vertices w and \bar{w} , and edges corresponding to the groups in ∂G , each joining the two vertices. We identify G with the vertex group $G(w)$. As DG is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group, each S_i determines, up to complementation and equivalence, a unique S_i -almost invariant subset X_i of DG . Thus X_i is associated to the edge splitting of Δ which is over S_i . Since each of H and S_i has two coends in DG , Proposition 7.4 of [22] shows that the associated almost invariant sets X_H and X_i must cross strongly if they cross at all. As $H \subset G = G(w)$, it is clear that X_H cannot cross any X_i strongly, and so does not cross any X_i at all. Thus X_H must be enclosed by one of the vertices of Δ .

If X_H is enclosed by \bar{w} , then H must be a subgroup of $G(\bar{w})$. As H is also a subgroup of $G(w)$, this implies that H is conjugate into some S_i , as required. It also implies that Y is trivial, and so is automatically adapted to ∂G , completing the proof in this case.

For the rest of this proof, we will assume that X_H is enclosed by w . Thus Lemma 2.5 shows that $Y = X_H \cap G$ is adapted to ∂G , which proves the first part of the lemma.

Now suppose that Y is trivial, so that one of Y or Y^* is H -finite. We consider the action of DG on the universal covering DG -tree T of Δ . There is a vertex v of T with stabiliser $G = G(v)$ which lies above w such that X_H is enclosed by v . Corollary 4.16 of [22] tells us that X_H determines a nontrivial partition of the edges of T which are incident to v . Suppose that Y is H -finite and let e be an edge of T which is incident to v and on the X_H -side of v . Then X_H is equivalent to an almost invariant subset W of G which contains $G(e)$. The fact that $Y = X_H \cap G(v)$ is H -finite implies that $W \cap G(v)$ is also H -finite, and hence in particular that $G(e)$ itself is H -finite. Thus $H \cap G(e)$ has finite index in $G(e)$. Now $G(e)$ is a conjugate of some S_i . As H and S_i are both $PD(n+1)$, a subgroup of $G(e)$ of finite index is also $PD(n+1)$ and hence of finite index in H . It follows that H is commensurable with a conjugate of S_i . As H is orientable, part 2) of Corollary 2.8 shows that H is conjugate to a subgroup of S_i . This completes

the proof of the lemma. □

The conclusion of the above discussion is that if $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, and H is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , we can associate to H a H -almost invariant subset Y of G , and Y will be nontrivial so long as H is not conjugate into some S_i . Further Y is adapted to ∂G . We will say that Y is *dual* to H . When H is $VPC(n+1)$ and Y is nontrivial, we will say that H is an *essential* torus in $(G, \partial G)$. If G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group, then, as above, we associate X_H itself to H . In this case, we may also refer to H as an essential torus in G , though the word ‘essential’ is redundant in this case.

For later reference, we briefly consider the situation where $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, and H is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Unlike the case when ∂G is empty, G may possess nontrivial H -almost invariant subsets. However the following result says that no such subset of G can be adapted to ∂G .

Lemma 2.13. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with non-empty boundary, let H be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G , and let X be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G . Then X is not adapted to ∂G .*

Proof. As usual we let DG denote the double of G along ∂G , so that DG is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group. We recall that if K is a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of DG , then $e(DG, K)$ equals 2 if K is orientable and equals 1 otherwise. In particular, DG has no nontrivial H -almost invariant subset.

Suppose that X is adapted to ∂G . Then Lemma 2.5 tells us that there is a H -almost invariant subset \overline{X} of DG such that $\overline{X} \cap G$ equals X . As X is a nontrivial almost invariant set, so is \overline{X} . This contradiction shows that X cannot be adapted to ∂G , as required. □

For the rest of this section, we will discuss essential maps of higher dimensional ‘annuli’ into orientable $PD(n+2)$ pairs. It turns out that we need two types of higher dimensional analogue of an annulus. The first and most obvious type is a trivial orientable $PD(n+1)$ pair $A_H = (H; \{H, H\})$, where $n \geq 1$, and H is an orientable PDn group which is also $VPCn$. We call this an *untwisted annulus*. The second type is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ pair $\Lambda_H = (H, H_0)$, where H is a non-orientable PDn group which is also $VPCn$, and H_0 is the orientation subgroup of H . We call this a *twisted annulus*. When $n = 2$, an example of a 3-manifold of this type is the twisted

I -bundle over the Klein bottle with orientable total space. Note that there are no twisted annuli when $n = 1$, as any $PD1$ group is orientable. In particular, there are no twisted annuli in a 3-manifold. Algebraically, an annulus in a $PD(n + 2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ is an injective homomorphism of group pairs $\Theta : A_H \rightarrow (G, \partial G)$, or $\Theta : \Lambda_H \rightarrow (G, \partial G)$. This means that Θ maps H to G and also maps each group in $\partial\Lambda_H$ to a conjugate of some group in ∂G . Again the above orientation restrictions are not crucial, but they do simplify the statements. What is crucial is that Θ should commute with the orientation homomorphisms, so that, in topological terms, our annuli have trivial normal bundle or equivalently are two-sided. The reason for this is that we need to associate a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G to each essential annulus. We will do this in Definition 2.19.

It will be very helpful to consider a map θ of aspherical spaces such that the induced map on fundamental groups is Θ . For this we need to choose a $K(H, 1)$, and use a mapping cylinder construction to make a $K(G, 1)$ with the $K(S_i, 1)$'s as disjoint subcomplexes, for $i \geq 1$. To simplify the notation for an untwisted annulus, we write A for $K(H, 1) \times I$, and ∂A for $K(H, 1) \times \partial I$. The two components of ∂A will be denoted by $\partial_0 A$ and $\partial_1 A$. If $n = 1$, then A can be chosen to be the usual annulus $S^1 \times I$. For a twisted annulus, we write A for the twisted I -bundle over $K(H, 1)$ determined by the orientation homomorphism of H , and write ∂A for the induced S^0 -bundle. Finally we write M for $K(G, 1)$, and ∂M for the union of the $K(S_i, 1)$'s, for $i \geq 1$. Then Θ is induced by a map $\theta : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$. Note that in the untwisted case, such a map θ is determined up to homotopy by choosing a copy of H in two conjugates of groups in ∂G , such that the two copies of H are conjugate in G . And in the twisted case, θ is determined up to homotopy by choosing a copy of H in G and a conjugate of some group in ∂G such that the intersection of H with this conjugate contains H_0 . Thus an annulus can be thought of purely algebraically. We will say that Θ is *essential* if θ cannot be homotoped relative to ∂A into ∂M . It is clear that the essentiality of an annulus is also a purely algebraic property. An untwisted annulus is essential if and only if the images of the two boundary groups are not conjugate in a group in ∂G . And a twisted annulus is essential if and only if H_0 lies in a boundary group K in ∂G , and $H \cap K = H_0$. Note that as G is finitely generated, we can choose M to have finite 1-skeleton. If G is finitely presented, we can also choose M to have finite 2-skeleton, as each S_i is finitely generated.

Now suppose that θ is an essential map of an untwisted annulus A into M , where $\pi_1(A)$ is equal to H , and identify H with its image in G under θ_* . Let

M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H , and let \widetilde{M} denote the universal cover of M . Let $\theta_H : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_H, \partial M_H)$ be the lift of θ . The induced map on homology sends the fundamental class $[A] \in H_{n+1}(A, \partial A; \mathbb{Z})$ to an element α of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. Let Σ denote the component of ∂M_H which contains $\theta_H(\partial_0 A)$. We will assume that the base point of A lies in $\partial_0 A$. As M_H and Σ are aspherical and the inclusion of Σ in M_H induces an isomorphism of fundamental groups, Σ is a deformation retract of M_H . As θ is essential, it follows that $\theta_H(\partial_1 A)$ must lie in a different component Σ' of ∂M_H . This implies that α is a nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$.

If θ is an essential map into M of a twisted annulus A with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , we again identify H with its image in G under θ_* . Recall that $\pi_1(\partial A)$ equals the orientation subgroup H_0 of H . Let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H , and let $\theta_H : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_H, \partial M_H)$ be the lift of θ . Again we let α denote the image in $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ of the fundamental class $[A] \in H_{n+1}(A, \partial A; \mathbb{Z})$. Let Σ denote the component of ∂M_H which contains $\theta_H(\partial A)$, and consider the inclusions $H_0 = \pi_1(\partial A) \subset \pi_1(\Sigma) \subset \pi_1(M_H) = H$. If $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ equals H , then M_H deformation retracts to Σ , which contradicts the hypothesis that θ is essential. It follows that we must have $\pi_1(\Sigma) = H_0$. In turn this implies that α is a nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. We note that the double cover A_0 of A with $\pi_1(A_0)$ equal to H_0 is an untwisted annulus, and the induced map $\theta_0 : A_0 \rightarrow M_0$ is also essential, where M_0 is the cover of M with fundamental group H_0 .

Remark 2.14. *The above discussion shows that if A is an annulus, twisted or untwisted, and $\theta : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ is an essential map, then in either case the image of the fundamental cycle $[A]$ with \mathbb{Z}_2 -coefficients is also nontrivial in $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ and is the specialization of α .*

We also note that, whether or not A is twisted, the induced action of H on the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M preserves the union of two distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. If some element of H interchanges these two components, then A is twisted. Otherwise, A is untwisted.

Conversely, suppose that two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ are each stabilised by an orientable PDn subgroup H of G . Then there is an essential map θ of an untwisted annulus A to M with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , and a lift $\theta_H : A \rightarrow M_H$ which maps $\partial_0 A$ to $H \setminus \Sigma$ and maps $\partial_1 A$ to $H \setminus T$. We denote this essential untwisted annulus in $(M, \partial M)$ by $H_{\Sigma, T}$.

If the union of Σ and T is stabilised by a PDn subgroup H of G and if some element of H interchanges Σ and T , let H_0 denote the subgroup of H

of index 2 which stabilises both Σ and T . If H_0 is the orientation subgroup of H , there is an essential map θ of a twisted annulus A to M with $\pi_1(A)$ equal to H , and the induced essential map θ_0 of the double cover A_0 of A with $\pi_1(A_0)$ equal to H_0 has a lift to M_{H_0} which maps $\partial_0 A_0$ to $H \setminus \Sigma$ and maps $\partial_1 A_0$ to $H \setminus T$. We denote this essential twisted annulus in $(M, \partial M)$ by $H_{\Sigma, T}$.

In order to associate an almost invariant subset of G to an essential annulus, we will need the following result, which was proved by Swarup in [30]. See [15] for a purely algebraic proof. The statement we give here is equivalent to Theorem 2 of [30].

Lemma 2.15. *(Swarup) Let G be a finitely generated group, and let H be a subgroup of infinite index in G . If φ is a homomorphism from H to \mathbb{Z} , denote the kernel of φ by N . Suppose that whenever φ is non-zero, we have $e(G, N) = 1$. Then the restriction map $r : H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(H; \mathbb{Z})$ is trivial.*

Proof. As before, we let M denote a $K(G, 1)$ with the $K(S_i, 1)$'s as disjoint subcomplexes, for $i \geq 1$. Recall from Remark 1.1, that we can identify $H^1(G, \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ with $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. If G is finitely generated but not finitely presented, we need to modify the usual definition of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ as discussed there. In any case, M need not be locally finite, so any reference we make to the number of ends of a cover of M really refers to the number of ends of the 1-skeleton of the cover. We also let r denote the natural map $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$.

Let β denote an element of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, and let $\gamma \in H^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ denote $r(\beta)$. Thus γ can be represented by a map $g : M_H \rightarrow S^1$. Represent β by a finite cocycle $c : M_H^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ on the 1-skeleton $M_H^{(1)}$ of M_H , and let Σ denote the support of c . Thus Σ is a finite subcomplex of $M_H^{(1)}$, and c restricted to any simplex of $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$ is trivial. As c also represents γ , for any component L of $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$, the map $\pi_1(L) \rightarrow \pi_1(S^1)$ induced by g is trivial. Since Σ is finite, $M_H^{(1)} - \Sigma$ has at least one unbounded component L whose coboundary δL must be finite, as $\delta L \subset \delta \Sigma$.

Now suppose that γ is non-zero. We consider the induced map $g_* : H \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, let N denote the kernel of g_* , and consider the cover $q_N : M_N \rightarrow M_H$. As the map $\pi_1(L) \rightarrow \pi_1(S^1)$ induced by g is trivial, L lifts to M_N . As the infinite quotient group H/N acts on M_N , it follows that L has infinitely many disjoint lifts to M_N . This implies that M_N has infinitely many ends, which

contradicts the hypothesis that $e(G, N) = 1$. It follows that γ must be zero which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

We will want to apply this result to Poincaré duality pairs. The result we obtain is the following.

Lemma 2.16. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let H be a PDn subgroup of G . Then the restriction map $r : H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(H; \mathbb{Z})$ is trivial.*

Remark 2.17. *The PDn subgroup H need not be orientable.*

Proof. As before, we let M denote a $K(G, 1)$ with the $K(S_i, 1)$'s as disjoint subcomplexes, for $i \geq 1$. We need to check all the hypotheses of Lemma 2.15. Certainly G is finitely generated and H has infinite index in G . Now suppose that N is the kernel of a non-zero homomorphism from H to \mathbb{Z} . We need to show that $e(G, N) = 1$. As N has infinite index in the PDn group H , a theorem of Strebel [29] tells us that N has cohomological dimension $\leq n-1$. Hence $H_k(N; \mathbb{Z}) = 0$, for any $k \geq n$, and the same holds for any subgroup of N . In particular, $H_{n+1}(M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ and $H_n(\partial M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ are both zero. It follows from the exact sequence of the pair $(M_N, \partial M_N)$ that $H_{n+1}(M_N, \partial M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero. By Poincaré duality, this implies that $H_f^1(M_N; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero, so that M_N has only one end. Hence $e(G, N) = 1$ as required. \square

Our real interest lies in the corresponding restriction map with \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients in place of \mathbb{Z} . This map need not be trivial, but the fact that r is trivial yields enough information about the case of \mathbb{Z}_2 coefficients for our purposes.

Corollary 2.18. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let H be a PDn subgroup of G . Let ρ denote the map of cohomology groups given by reduction of the coefficients modulo 2. Then the image of $\rho : H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ is contained in the image of the coboundary map $\delta : H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$, given on page 9.*

Proof. As before, we let M denote a $K(G, 1)$ with finite 1-skeleton, and let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group H .

Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{r} & H^1(H; \mathbb{Z}) \\
& & \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \rho \\
H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G]) & \xrightarrow{\bar{r}} & H^1(H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \\
\cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \\
H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\bar{r}} & H^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)
\end{array}$$

where the bottom two rows come from the long exact cohomology sequences given before Remark 1.1. Lemma 2.16 tells us that the map r is zero. As the image of δ equals the kernel of the map \bar{r} , it follows immediately that the image of ρ is contained in the image of δ . \square

Now we can associate an almost invariant set to an essential annulus as promised.

Definition 2.19. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let θ be an essential annulus in $(M, \partial M)$ with fundamental group H .*

As discussed before Lemma 2.15, the essential annulus θ determines a non-zero element $\alpha \in H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$. The Poincaré dual of α , regarded as an element of this second group, is a nontrivial element β of $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$. Corollary 2.18 shows that $\rho(\beta)$ is contained in the image of δ , and so, as discussed on page 9, determines an almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ modulo almost equality and complementation. The pre-image in G of such a set is a H -almost invariant subset X_θ of G .

We will say that X_θ is dual to the essential annulus θ . On occasion, it will also be convenient to say that the almost invariant subset $H \setminus X$ of $H \setminus G$ is dual to θ .

If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and the almost invariant subset of G associated to a splitting is dual to an essential annulus or torus, we will say that the splitting itself is dual to an essential annulus or torus, as appropriate.

If $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair which admits an essential annulus, the dual almost invariant subset of G is nontrivial and is over a $VPCn$ subgroup. The converse is not true. In general G will have many nontrivial such subsets which are not dual to any essential annulus. In the following two results, we consider this in more detail. In particular, we show that if G has a nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPCn$ subgroup, then $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential annulus.

Proposition 2.20. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be a $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Let α be an element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, so that $\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is supported by some finite number k of components of ∂M_H . Then the following statements hold:*

1. *If α is non-zero, then k is non-zero.*
2. *If α is non-zero, then each of the k components of ∂M_H which support $\partial\alpha$ carries a subgroup of finite index in H . If H is orientable then $k \geq 2$.*
3. *If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, then $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential map of an annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in H .*

Proof. 1) Consider the exact sequence.

$$H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$$

Since H is a PDn group, it follows that $H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is zero. Thus the map ∂ in this sequence is injective. If α is non-zero, it follows that $\partial\alpha$ is non-zero, and hence that k is non-zero.

2) If Σ is one of the components of ∂M_H which supports $\partial\alpha$, then $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z})$ must be nontrivial. Note that the fundamental group of any component of ∂M_H is a subgroup of H . As H is PDn , Strebel's result in [29] implies that a subgroup of H of infinite index has cohomological dimension less than n . Hence $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ must have finite index d in H , so that $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z})$ is infinite cyclic. Now suppose that H is orientable. Then $H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ must also be infinite cyclic. Further the map $H_n(\Sigma; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is multiplication by d , and so is injective. We know that the map $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_n(M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ has nontrivial kernel as it contains $\partial\alpha$. It follows that ∂M_H has a second boundary component Σ' which carries $\partial\alpha$. Thus when H is orientable, we must have $k \geq 2$.

3) If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, Corollary 2.18 implies that $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$, and hence $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, is nontrivial. Suppose first that H is orientable. Then part 2) shows that there are two distinct components Σ and Σ' of ∂M_H such that each of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ and $\pi_1(\Sigma')$ is a subgroup of finite index in H . It follows that $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential map of an untwisted annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index

in H . If H is non-orientable, we consider the orientation subgroup H_0 of H which is of index 2. As H_0 is a subgroup of H of finite index, G has a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset. Now we apply the above discussion to H_0 in place of H and obtain an essential map of an untwisted annulus whose fundamental group is a subgroup of finite index in H_0 , and hence of finite index in H , as required. This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

In the next result, we prove more.

Proposition 2.21. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be a $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Then we have the following results.*

1. *No nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G can be adapted to ∂G .*
2. *If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X , there is an orientable subgroup H' of finite index in H , such that X is equivalent to a sum of H' -almost invariant subsets of G each dual to an untwisted annulus.*
3. *If ∂M_H has k components each of which carries a subgroup of finite index in H , then the number of coends of H in G is at least k .*
4. *If the number of coends of H in G is at least k , then H has a subgroup L of finite index such that ∂M_L has k components each of which carries L .*
5. *If G has a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X which crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over any finite index subgroup of H , then X is dual to an annulus.*

Proof. 1) Suppose there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset Y of G which is adapted to ∂G . We will consider the $PD(n+2)$ group DG obtained by doubling G along ∂G , and the corresponding graph of groups decomposition Δ of DG , which has a vertex w with associated group G . Lemma 2.5 tells us that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G which is enclosed by w such that $X \cap G$ equals Y . But part 2) of Lemma 2.10 tells us that DG has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups. This contradiction shows that no nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G can be adapted to ∂G , as required.

2) Let X be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G , and let Y denote the almost invariant subset $H \setminus X$ of $H \setminus G$. As discussed before Remark 1.1, the equivalence class of Y under almost equality is an element of $H^0(G; P[H \setminus G]/\mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$. We let $[Y]$ denote the image of this equivalence class in $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ under the coboundary map δ given on page 9. Thus $[Y]$ is represented by any almost invariant subset of $H \setminus G$ which is almost equal to Y or to Y^* . As H is $VPCn$, and torsion free, it is PDn . Thus Corollary 2.18 tells us that there is an element β of $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ such that $\rho(\beta) = [Y]$. Let α denote the element of $H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ which is Poincaré dual to β . Regard α as an element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$, and consider $\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. From Proposition 2.20, $\partial\alpha$ is non-zero, so there is at least one component of ∂M_H which lies in its support. Each component Σ of ∂M_H which supports $\partial\alpha$ carries a subgroup of H of finite index. Let H'' denote the intersection of all conjugates in H of these subgroups, let H_0 denote the maximal orientable subgroup of H of index at most 2, and let H' denote the intersection $H'' \cap H_0$. Thus H' is an orientable normal subgroup of H of finite index. By replacing H by H' , we can assume that H is orientable and that the finitely many components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ of ∂M_H which support $\partial\alpha$ all carry H . As H is orientable, we must have $k \geq 2$.

If i and j are distinct integers, there is an essential untwisted annulus A_{ij} in M_H with fundamental group H and whose boundary components lie in Σ_i and Σ_j . Let α_{ij} denote the image of the fundamental class of A_{ij} in $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$. Then $\partial\alpha_{ij} \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z})$ is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . Regard α_{ij} as an element of $H_{n+1}(G, \partial G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$, and let $\beta_{ij} \in H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}[H \setminus G])$ be Poincaré dual to α_{ij} . Recall that ρ denotes reduction of coefficients mod 2, and that Corollary 2.18 tells us that $\rho(\beta_{ij}) \in H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ equals $[Y_{ij}]$, for some almost invariant subset Y_{ij} of $H \setminus G$ which is said to be dual to A_{ij} .

Let \bar{Y} denote $\rho\partial\alpha \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and let \bar{Y}_{ij} denote $\rho\partial\alpha_{ij} \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Then \bar{Y}_{ij} is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . Let γ denote any nontrivial element of $H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ whose image in $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is supported by some subset of the Σ_i 's. As each Σ_i carries H , this image must be supported by at least two components of ∂M_H . Thus a simple induction argument on k shows that \bar{Y} must be equal to a sum of \bar{Y}_{ij} 's.

Now consider the following commutative diagram. The vertical maps are Poincaré duality isomorphisms, the top horizontal map is the boundary map in the long exact homology sequence of the pair $(M_H, \partial M_H)$, and the bottom

horizontal map is induced by the inclusion of ∂M_H into M_H .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{n+1}(M_H, \partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & H_f^1(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \end{array}$$

As H is PDn , it follows that $H_{n+1}(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is zero. Thus the map ∂ in this diagram must be injective, so that i^* is also injective.

Recall that $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2[H \setminus G])$ and $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ are naturally isomorphic, so that we can identify $[Y]$ and $[Y_{ij}]$ with elements of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Now, under Poincaré duality, $i^*[Y]$ corresponds to $\overline{Y} \in H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and $i^*[Y_{ij}]$ corresponds to $\overline{Y_{ij}}$. As \overline{Y} is equal to a sum of $\overline{Y_{ij}}$'s, and i^* is injective, it follows that $[Y]$ is equal to a sum of $[Y_{ij}]$'s. Thus Y is equivalent to a sum of Y_{ij} 's and their complements. Hence X is equivalent to a sum of H -almost invariant subsets of G each dual to an untwisted annulus in M_H , as required.

3) Suppose that ∂M_H has k components each of which carries a subgroup of finite index in H . In order to show that the number of coends of H in G is at least k , it suffices to show there is a subgroup H' of H of finite index such that $e(G, H')$ is at least k . As in part 2), by replacing H by a suitable subgroup of finite index, we can suppose that ∂M_H has components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ each carrying H . Consider the composite map

$$H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\delta} H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{i^*} H_f^1(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2).$$

If $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, the almost invariant subset Y_{ij} of $H \setminus G$ in part 2) determines an element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ whose image $\overline{Y_{ij}}$ in $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ under this composite map is supported by Σ_i and Σ_j . As the $\overline{Y_{ij}}$'s span a $(k-1)$ -dimensional subgroup of $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$, and the kernel of δ is nontrivial, it follows that $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ has dimension at least k , so that $e(G, H)$ is at least k , as required.

4) If the number of coends of H in G is at least k , then H has a subgroup H_1 of finite index such that $e(G, H_1) \geq k$. It follows from part 2) of this proposition that H_1 has a subgroup L of finite index such that the space of L -almost invariant subsets of G spanned by such sets which are dual to an untwisted annulus has dimension at least k . Pick a finite family of L -almost invariant subsets of G , each dual to an untwisted annulus, which together span a space with dimension at least k . The corresponding annuli in M_L have boundaries in a finite family of components of ∂M_L . As in part 2),

we can replace L by a subgroup of finite index so that all these boundary components carry L . It follows immediately that there must be at least k such components of ∂M_L , as required.

5) Let X be a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset of G which crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over any finite index subgroup of H . In part 2) of this lemma, we showed that, after replacing H by a suitable subgroup of finite index, the almost invariant subset $Y = H \setminus X$ of $H \setminus G$ is equivalent to a sum of almost invariant subsets Y_{ij} , $i \neq j$, of $H \setminus G$ where Y_{ij} is dual to an untwisted annulus in M_H with boundary in $\Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_j$. By re-labelling the Σ_i 's if needed, we can assume that $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and that each index between 1 and m occurs.

If $m = 2$, then Y is equivalent to Y_{12} , and we are done. We will show that no other case is possible.

If $m = 3$, then, after renumbering, Y must be equivalent to $Y_{12} + Y_{23}$. But this implies that \bar{Y} is supported on Σ_1 and Σ_3 which contradicts our assumption that $m = 3$.

Now suppose that $m \geq 4$. Recall that an almost invariant subset Y of $H \setminus G$ determines an element $[Y]$ of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ which can be represented by a 0-cochain with finite coboundary. The support Z of this cochain is an infinite subset of vertices in M_H , with infinite complement Z^* . Similarly each Y_{ij} yields a corresponding infinite subset of vertices Z_{ij} in M_H , with infinite complement Z_{ij}^* . It will be convenient to consider Z and the Z_{ij} 's rather than Y and the Y_{ij} 's. Lemma 2.22 below shows that there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that the vertex set of Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} , and the vertex set of Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* . This implies that the four corners of the pair (Z, Z_{ij}) are infinite, as Z and Z^* each meet both Σ_k and Σ_l in an infinite set of vertices. Hence the four corners of the pair (Y, Y_{ij}) are infinite, so that Y crosses Y_{ij} . This contradicts our hypothesis that X crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over any finite index subgroup of H , which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

In the next lemma we consider how two untwisted annuli can cross, by which we mean that the dual almost invariant sets cross. The corresponding picture in the 3-manifold setting is very simple. Start with a 2-disc D with four disjoint open intervals in its boundary. Then remove the rest of ∂D . The resulting surface has four boundary components, and it is trivial that of the six arcs which join pairs of distinct boundary components, there are two which cross. The product of this manifold with S^1 is a 3-manifold M with

four annulus boundary components, and there are two annuli in M which cross.

Lemma 2.22. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and let H be an orientable $VPCn$ subgroup of G . Suppose that $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_4$ are distinct components of ∂M_H each with fundamental group H . Let Y_{ij} denote the almost invariant subset of $H \backslash G$ dual to the annulus A_{ij} in M_H which has fundamental group H and has boundary in Σ_i and Σ_j . Then there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that Y_{ij} crosses Y_{kl} .*

Proof. As at the end of the previous lemma, it will be convenient to consider Z_{ij} rather than Y_{ij} , where Z_{ij} is the support of a 0-cochain on M_H with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by Y_{ij} .

For three distinct integers i, j and k , the vertex set of Σ_k must be almost contained in Z_{ij} or Z_{ij}^* . For simplicity we will say that Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} to mean that the vertex set of Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} . Note that Σ_i and Σ_j are not almost contained in Z_{ij} or in Z_{ij}^* .

Now let i, j, k and l be distinct integers. We will say that Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l if Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} , and Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* , or vice versa.

Claim: Y_{ij} crosses Y_{kl} if and only if Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l , and Z_{kl} separates Σ_i and Σ_j .

Suppose first that Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l . Then Y_{ij} must cross Y_{kl} , because all four corners of the pair (Z_{ij}, Z_{kl}) will be infinite as each has infinite intersection with Σ_k or Σ_l .

Next suppose that Z_{ij} does not separate Σ_k and Σ_l . Without loss of generality, we can assume that Σ_k and Σ_l are both almost contained in Z_{ij} . Thus each of the corners $Z_{ij}^* \cap Z_{kl}$ and $Z_{ij} \cap Z_{kl}^*$ intersects Σ_k and Σ_l in a finite set. As each of Σ_i and Σ_j is almost contained in one of Z_{kl} or Z_{kl}^* , it follows that one of these two corners intersects at most one of Σ_i and Σ_j in an infinite set. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that this corner is $Z_{ij}^* \cap Z_{kl}$, which we denote by V . Let W denote $Y_{ij}^* \cap Y_{kl}$. Thus W is an almost invariant subset of $H \backslash G$ and the corresponding element $[W]$ of $H_f^1(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is represented by a 1-cocycle equal to the coboundary δV . Our choice of V means that at most one component of ∂M_H is not almost contained in V^* . This implies that the element \overline{W} of $H_n(\partial M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is supported on at most one component of ∂M_H . As H is orientable, part 2) of Proposition

2.20 implies that W must be trivial. It follows that Y_{ij} and Y_{kl} do not cross, which completes the proof of the claim.

Now suppose that the lemma is false. Then the above claim shows that, for any four distinct integers i, j, k and l , the boundary components Σ_k and Σ_l must both be almost contained in Z_{ij} or both in Z_{ij}^* . By replacing each of Z_{12} and Z_{23} by its complement if needed, we can arrange that Z_{12} meets each of Σ_3 and Σ_4 in a finite set and that Z_{23} meets each of Σ_1 and Σ_4 in a finite set. Note that we cannot have $Y_{12} \leq Y_{23}$ as Z_{12} meets Σ_1 in an infinite set, and Z_{23} meets Σ_1 in a finite set. And we cannot have $Y_{23} \leq Y_{12}$ as Z_{23} meets Σ_3 in an infinite set and Z_{12} meets Σ_3 in a finite set. It follows that $Y_{12} \cup Y_{23}$ is equivalent to Y_{13} or its complement. Thus $Z_{12} \cup Z_{23}$ is almost equal to Z_{13} or Z_{13}^* . Now $Z_{12} \cup Z_{23}$ meets Σ_4 in a finite set, and has infinite intersection with Σ_2 . Hence it is not the case that Σ_2 and Σ_4 are both almost contained in Z_{13} or in Z_{13}^* , so that Z_{13} separates Σ_2 and Σ_4 . Now the above claim shows that Y_{13} and Y_{24} must cross. This contradicts our supposition, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair and, as usual, let M be an aspherical space with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let DM denote the space obtained by doubling M along ∂M , and let DG denote the fundamental group of DM . If M is a 3-manifold, an annulus in M can be doubled to yield a torus in DM . If the annulus is inessential, it can be homotoped to have image a loop in ∂M . Thus the torus can be homotoped to have the same image and so is not π_1 -injective. However, if the annulus is essential, then the torus will be π_1 -injective. The same construction works in the more general setting of this section. Doubling a topological annulus $f : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ yields a map $Df : DA \rightarrow DM$, where DA denotes the double of A along its boundary. Thus Df is a map of a torus into DM . Again, if f is inessential, Df will not be π_1 -injective, but if f is essential, then Df will be π_1 -injective. To see this, first suppose that A is untwisted, so that $(A, \partial A)$ is of the form $(C \times I, C \times \partial I)$, let $H = \pi_1(A)$, and consider the lift f_H of f to the cover M_H of M such that $\pi_1(M_H) = H$. As f is essential in $(M, \partial M)$, the images $f_H(C \times \{0\})$ and $f_H(C \times \{1\})$ must lie in distinct components of ∂M_H . It follows that a component of the pre-image of $Df(DA)$ in $(DM)_H$ is homeomorphic to $C \times \mathbb{R}$, so that Df must be π_1 -injective. If A is twisted, we simply apply the above argument to the untwisted double cover of A . Now part 3) of Proposition 2.20 implies that if G has any nontrivial almost

invariant subset over a $VPCn$ subgroup, then there is an essential torus in DG .

In terms of almost invariant sets, the preceding discussion shows that if Y is a nontrivial H -almost invariant set dual to an essential annulus in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$, then there is a natural way to double Y . One obtains a nontrivial almost invariant subset X of DG , such that $X \cap G$ equals Y , and X is over the double of H , i.e. an essential torus in DG . At first sight, this result sounds somewhat similar to that in Lemma 2.5, as both results are about constructing an almost invariant subset X of DG from an almost invariant subset Y of G . However they are completely different as Lemma 2.5 requires that Y be adapted to ∂G , whereas a nontrivial H -almost invariant set over a $VPCn$ subgroup of G is never adapted to ∂G , by part 1) of Proposition 2.21.

3 The main theorem

In the previous section, we discussed the analogues in an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair of annuli and tori in a 3-manifold. In this section we will finally state our main theorem, but first we need to discuss the analogues of the various types of component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold. Recall that if $(G, \partial G)$ is a Poincaré duality pair our aim is to produce a bipartite graph of groups structure for G in which V_0 -vertices are analogous to components of the characteristic submanifold. In particular if G is the fundamental group of a Haken 3-manifold M , this graph of groups structure is dual to the frontier of the characteristic submanifold of M . In our earlier discussion in section 1, we described only two types of such component, namely I -bundles and Seifert fibre spaces. But in order to describe the algebraic analogues correctly, we will need to subdivide into several cases. There are special cases when an I -bundle has infinite cyclic fundamental group, and we also need to distinguish between Seifert fibre spaces depending on how they meet ∂M .

We start by considering a component W of the characteristic submanifold of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M such that W is an I -bundle over a surface F , and F is not an annulus or Moebius band. Thus $\pi_1(W)$ equals $\pi_1(F)$, so is not finite nor two-ended, and the frontier of W in M consists of the restriction of the I -bundle to ∂F and so consists of essential annuli. In addition, if F is orientable, the I -bundle is trivial and W meets ∂M in

two copies of F , and if F is non-orientable, then the I -bundle is nontrivial and W meets ∂M in one copy of the orientable double cover of F . Let \widetilde{F} , \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{M} denote the universal covers of F , W and M respectively. Thus \widetilde{W} is homeomorphic to $\widetilde{F} \times I$. Further each component of the pre-image in \widetilde{M} of W consists of a copy of \widetilde{W} such that $\widetilde{W} \cap \partial \widetilde{M} = \widetilde{F} \times \{0, 1\}$, and $\widetilde{F} \times \{0\}$ and $\widetilde{F} \times \{1\}$ lie in distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. Thus the induced action of $\pi_1(W)$ on \widetilde{M} preserves the union of two distinct components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$. If some element of $\pi_1(W)$ interchanges these two components, then W is a twisted I -bundle. Otherwise, W is untwisted. This leads to the following definition.

Definition 3.1. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let M be an aspherical space with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G , and let v be a vertex of Γ which is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type. (See Definition 1.7. Note that each peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ is $VPCn$.)*

Then v is of I -bundle type if there are two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ such that

1. *the induced action of $G(v)$ on \widetilde{M} preserves the union of Σ and T , and*
2. *for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, if e_K denotes the edge of Γ which is incident to v and carries K , then the edge splitting associated to e_K is given by the essential annulus $K_{\Sigma, T}$. (See the discussion just before Lemma 2.15.)*

Next we consider a component W of the characteristic submanifold of M such that W is a Seifert fibre space, and the orbifold fundamental group of the base orbifold of W is not finite nor two-ended. Thus $\pi_1(W)$ is $VPC1$ -by-Fuchsian, the frontier of W in M consists of boundary torus components or of vertical annuli in its boundary, and W meets ∂M in boundary torus components or vertical annuli in its boundary. We distinguish three types of such components W .

We will say that W is an *interior* component if it lies in the interior of M . Otherwise W is a *peripheral* component. Our first definition is the algebraic analogue of an interior component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold.

Definition 3.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ which is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. (See Definition 1.7.)*

Then v is of interior Seifert type if each edge of Γ which is incident to v determines a splitting of G over an essential torus.

Recall that Lemma 1.9 shows that the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient is unique. Note that as G is torsion free, so is L , so that L is PDn . The following little result applied to any edge group K of v tells us that if v is of interior Seifert type, then L must be orientable. Note that L is normal in K with quotient which must be isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, as these are the only possible peripheral subgroups of a finitely generated Fuchsian group. Of course this question did not arise in the case of a 3-manifold as then L was the fundamental group of a closed 1-manifold, and the only such manifold is orientable.

Lemma 3.3. *Let K be an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and let L be a $VPCn$ normal subgroup of K with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Then L is an orientable PDn group.*

Proof. As K is torsion free, so is L , and hence L is PDn . As $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ has an infinite cyclic subgroup of index 2, there is a subgroup K_0 of K , of index at most 2, such that K_0 contains L , and L is normal in K_0 with infinite cyclic quotient. As K is orientable, so is K_0 . Now Theorem 7.3 of [1] shows that L is orientable. \square

We will say that a Seifert fibre space component W of the characteristic submanifold of M is *adapted to ∂M* if there are no annuli in its frontier. In this case each boundary torus of W is either a component of ∂M or lies in the interior of M and so is a component of the frontier of W in M . Our next definition is the algebraic analogue of such a component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold.

Definition 3.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is not finite nor two-ended.*

Then v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G if the following conditions hold:

1. *If K is a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$, then either K is a conjugate of a group in ∂G , or K is carried by an edge of Γ which is incident to v .*

2. For each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, there is at most one edge which is incident to v and carries K .
3. Each edge of Γ which is incident to v carries a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$ and determines a splitting of G over an essential torus in G .

Remark 3.5. *If v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the two possibilities in 1) for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$ are mutually exclusive. For an essential torus in G cannot be a conjugate of a group in ∂G .*

Note that if v is of interior Seifert type, it is automatically of Seifert type adapted to ∂G .

If W is not adapted to ∂M , we can push into the interior of W those components of ∂W which meet ∂M in annuli to obtain a Seifert fibre space W' which is homeomorphic to W and adapted to ∂M . Note that each component of the closure of $W - W'$ is homeomorphic to $T \times I$. Recall that the annuli in which W meets ∂M must be vertical in W . Our next definition is the algebraic analogue of such a component of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold M .

Definition 3.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the Fuchsian group is not finite nor two-ended. Let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient.*

Then v is of Seifert type if Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G with the following properties:

1. *There is a vertex v' of Γ' with $G(v') = G(v)$ such that v' is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Thus each edge of Γ' which is incident to v' carries a peripheral subgroup of $G(v')$ and determines a splitting of G over an essential torus in G .*
2. *The projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends v' to v and is an isomorphism apart from the fact that certain edges incident to v' are collapsed to v .*
3. *Let e denote an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and collapsed to v . Thus $G(e)$ is a peripheral subgroup K of $G(v')$. Let w denote the other vertex of e . Then $G(w) = K$, and there is at least one other edge incident to w . Further for each such edge the associated edge splitting*

is dual to an essential annulus, and the boundary of each such annulus carries L .

Remark 3.7. *When comparing this definition with the topological situation, think of Γ as being dual to the frontier of W , and the refinement Γ' as being dual to the union of the frontiers of W and of W' . Note that if v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then v is trivially of Seifert type. One simply takes Γ' equal to Γ in the above definition.*

Part 3) of the definition corresponds to the facts that each component of the closure of $W - W'$ is homeomorphic to $T \times I$, and that the frontier annuli of W must be vertical in W . The reason for the formulation involving the boundary of each annulus is that some of the annuli involved may be twisted, a phenomenon with no analogue in 3-manifold theory.

There are some special cases which are not covered by the above definitions. These occur when the Fuchsian quotient group of a vertex group is finite or two-ended. In the case of the characteristic submanifold of an orientable Haken 3-manifold, such a vertex corresponds to a component which is homeomorphic to one of $S^1 \times D^2$, $T \times I$, or a twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle.

Definition 3.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . Let v be a vertex of Γ such that $G(v)$ is a $VPCn$ group.*

Then v is of solid torus type if it is not isolated, and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus, and there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of finite index in $G(v)$ such that the boundary of each such annulus carries H .

A vertex of solid torus type is of special solid torus type if either v has valence 3 and $H = G(v)$, or if v has valence 1 and H has index 2 or 3 in $G(v)$.

Remark 3.9. *As mentioned after the previous definition, the annuli involved in this definition may be twisted. However, in the special case when v is of special solid torus type, the conditions imply that each of the annuli must be untwisted. This is proved during the proof of Theorem 3.14 in section 7.*

Definition 3.10. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G .*

A vertex v of Γ is of special Seifert type if v has only one incident edge e , the splitting of G associated to e is dual to an essential torus, and $G(e)$ is a subgroup of index 2 in $G(v)$.

Remark 3.11. As $G(v)$ is a finite, torsion free extension of $G(e)$, it follows that $G(v)$ is also $PD(n+1)$. Also part 3) of Corollary 2.8 implies that $G(v)$ must be non-orientable.

Our last definition is the algebraic analogue of a component W of the characteristic submanifold of a 3-manifold which is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to $K \tilde{\times} I$, but has some annuli in its frontier. There are subcases here, depending on whether or not W has a component of its frontier which is a torus, and whether or not W contains a torus component of ∂M . It is not possible to have both. Note that in all cases, there is a Seifert fibration of W for which all the annuli in its frontier are vertical. As W is $T \times I$ or $K \tilde{\times} I$, this is equivalent to the condition that all the frontier annuli carry the same subgroup of $\pi_1(W)$ and that $\pi_1(W)$ splits over this subgroup. This is what we generalise in the definition below. Recall that as G is torsion free, a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup is automatically $PD(n+1)$.

Definition 3.12. Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let Γ be a minimal graph of groups decomposition of G . A vertex v of Γ is of torus type if $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and one of the following cases hold:

1. $G(v)$ is orientable and is one of the groups in ∂G , and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that the boundary of each such annulus carries H , and $G(v)$ splits over H .
2. $G(v)$ is orientable, one of the edges of Γ incident to v carries $G(v)$, and the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential torus in G . For each of the remaining edges of Γ incident to v , the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that the boundary of each such annulus carries H , and $G(v)$ splits over H .
3. $G(v)$ is orientable, and for each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)$ such that the boundary of each such

annulus carries H , and $G(v)$ splits over H . In addition Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group $G(e)$ associated to e is equal to $G(v)$, and the edge splitting associated to e is dual to an essential torus in G .

4. $G(v)$ is non-orientable, and we denote the orientable subgroup of index 2 by $G(v)_0$. For each edge of Γ which is incident to v the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus. Further there is a $VPCn$ subgroup H of $G(v)_0$ such that the boundary of each such annulus carries H , and $G(v)$ splits over H . In addition Γ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group associated to e is equal to $G(v)_0$, and the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential torus in G . Finally one vertex of e has valence 1, and associated group $G(v)$.

Remark 3.13. In part 3) of this definition, the comparable 3-manifold situation occurs when W is $T \times I$, and the frontier of W consists of annuli. Think of Γ as being dual to the frontier of W , and the refinement Γ' as being dual to the union of the frontier of W with the torus $T \times \{\frac{1}{2}\}$.

In part 4) of this definition, the comparable 3-manifold situation occurs when W is $K \times I$, and the frontier of W consists of annuli. Think of Γ as being dual to the frontier of W , and the refinement Γ' as being dual to the union of the frontier of W with a torus in the interior of W which is parallel to ∂W .

In all cases, the reason for the formulation involving the boundary of each annulus is that some of the annuli involved may be twisted, a phenomenon with no analogue in 3-manifold theory.

Note that Lemma 1.10 tells us that if a $VPC(n+1)$ group G splits over a subgroup H , then H is $VPCn$, and is normal in G with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Now we are ready to state the main result of this paper. Lemma 2.10 implies that if $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, then the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of Theorem 1.16 exists. That theorem tells us that for any group G , the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are of four types, namely they are isolated, of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k is $n-1$ or n , or of commensuriser type.

Our main result is the following theorem which asserts that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ and its completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ (see Definition 1.17) have properties analogous to the topological picture in dimension 3. If $n = 1$, and G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M , then $\Gamma_{1,2}(G)$ is dual to the frontier of $AT(M)$, and $\Gamma_{1,2}^c(G)$ is dual to the frontier of $JSJ(M)$, where $AT(M)$ and $JSJ(M)$ are the submanifolds of M discussed at the start of section 1.

Theorem 3.14. *(Main Result) Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC. Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a VPC n subgroup, together with the equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a VPC $(n+1)$ subgroup. Finally let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ denote the completion of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ are bipartite graphs of groups structures for G , with vertices of V_0 -type and of V_1 -type.*

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ have the following properties:

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$, and the edge splittings associated to the two edges incident to v are dual to essential annuli or tori in G .*
 - (b) *v is of VPC $(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of I -bundle type. (See Definition 3.1.)*
 - (c) *v is of VPC n -by-Fuchsian type, and is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 3.2.)*
 - (d) *v is of commensuriser type. Further v is of Seifert type (see Definition 3.6), or of torus type (see Definition 3.12) or of solid torus type (see Definition 3.8).*
2. *The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type (see Definition 3.10) or of special solid torus type (see Definition 3.8).*
3. *Each edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is dual to an essential annulus or torus in G .*

4. Any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group and adapted to ∂G is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and also by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.
5. If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.

Remark 3.15. Part 3) follows immediately from parts 1) and 2), as the definitions of the various types of V_0 -vertex in the statements of parts 1) and 2) all contain the requirement that the edge splittings be dual to an essential annulus or torus.

Part 4) does not follow from the properties of an algebraic regular neighbourhood as an almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group which is adapted to ∂G need not be n -canonical, and so need not lie in the family $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Note that, from [24], we know that there may be almost invariant subsets of G over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups which are not adapted to ∂G .

Part 5) also does not follow from the properties of an algebraic regular neighbourhood as a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H of G may be non-orientable.

4 Torus Decompositions for $PD(n+2)$ groups and pairs

Before embarking on the proof of Theorem 3.14, we will consider a simpler graph of groups structure analogous to the torus decomposition $T(M)$ of a 3-manifold M , discussed in section 1.

We will start this section by considering an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group G , where $n \geq 1$, and the graph of groups structure $\Gamma_{n+1}(G) = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n+1} : G)$ of Theorem 1.14. Recall from Lemma 2.10 that such a group cannot admit any nontrivial almost invariant subset over a $VPC(\leq n)$ subgroup, so that $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ does exist. It is a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}_{n+1} in G , where \mathcal{F}_{n+1} is the collection of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Since G is orientable, the nontrivial almost invariant sets in \mathcal{F}_{n+1} are automatically over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ groups. Recall that if H is an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , we call H an essential torus in G , and G possesses a unique nontrivial H -almost invariant subset, up to equivalence and

complementation. Thus \mathcal{F}_{n+1} can be thought of as the collection of all essential tori in G . It will be convenient to denote $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ by $T_{n+1}(G)$, and we will call $T_{n+1}(G)$ the *torus decomposition* of G . We will also use $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ to denote the completion $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(G)$ of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$. See Definition 1.17.

In chapter 12 of [22], we briefly discussed the connection between $T_{n+1}(G)$ and Kropholler's decomposition in [11] in the case of orientable $PD(n+2)$ groups. Using the present notation, it follows from Theorem 4.1 below that $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ is the same as Kropholler's decomposition. We will show shortly that the analogous statement holds for the case of a $PD(n+2)$ pair. In dimension 3, it is clear that $T_2(G)$ is the same as Castel's decomposition in [4] as his decomposition is defined to be $\Gamma_2(G)$. As discussed in section 1, if M is a closed orientable Haken 3-manifold and G equals $\pi_1(M)$, then the topological torus decomposition $T(M)$ determines the decomposition $T_2^c(G)$ of G . As in the statement of Theorem 1.14, it will be convenient to state Theorem 4.1 excluding the case when G is VPC . For if G is a $VPC(n+2)$ group, then $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ consists of a single V_0 -vertex.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $n \geq 1$. If G is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ group which is not VPC , then $T_{n+1}(G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ have the following properties:*

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is a torus in G .*
 - (b) *v is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 3.2.)*
2. *The V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type. (See Definition 3.10.)*
3. *Each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G)$ and of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ is dual to an essential torus in G .*
4. *If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$.*

Remark 4.2. *If G has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups, then \mathcal{F}_{n+1} is empty and $T_{n+1}(G)$, and hence $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, consists of a single V_1 -vertex.*

Proof. 1) Theorem 1.14 tells us that $T_{n+1}(G)$ is a minimal, reduced bipartite, graph of groups decomposition of G , and that each V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is isolated, of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, or of commensuriser type. If v is a V_0 -vertex of commensuriser type, then v encloses an element X of \mathcal{F}_{n+1} which is over some $VPC(n+1)$ group H , and $G(v)$ is of the form $Comm_G(H)$. Further X crosses weakly some of its translates by $Comm_G(H)$. In the present situation, G is $PD(n+2)$ and H is $VPC(n+1)$, so that the number of coends of H in G is 2. Now Proposition 7.4 of [22] implies that no almost invariant set can cross X or any of its translates weakly, so that V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type cannot occur. It follows that each V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. As each edge splitting is over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , it follows that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G)$ is dual to an essential torus in G . Hence any V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G)$ which is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type must be of interior Seifert type. This completes the proof of part 1) of the theorem.

2) The construction of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$ from $T_{n+1}(G)$ described in section 1 can only introduce V_0 -vertices of special Seifert type, so part 2) of the theorem holds.

3) Part 3) of the theorem follows immediately from parts 1) and 2).

4) First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

If H is orientable, the pair (G, H) has two ends, so there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G . As X is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$, it follows that H is conjugate into $G(v)$. Hence H is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required.

If H is non-orientable, let H_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. As the pair (G, H_0) has two ends, there is a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset of G . As $T_{n+1}(G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, it follows from Theorem 1.14 and Remark 1.15 that H_0 must have small commensuriser, which we denote by K . This means that K contains H_0 with finite index, so that K is itself $VPC(n+1)$ and $PD(n+1)$. Note that K must contain H , so that K is non-orientable. We let K_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. Note that K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G . The preceding paragraph shows that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G)$ such that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. As K contains K_0 with finite index, it follows that there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$. If w is a V_0 -vertex, then K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required. So we now consider the case when w is a V_1 -vertex. In particular, v and w must be distinct. Thus there is an edge e of $T_{n+1}(G)$ which is incident to w

such that, after a conjugation, $G(e)$ contains K_0 . As all the edge groups of $T_{n+1}(G)$ are torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal K_0 . If $E(w)$ denotes the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w , then Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. The commensuriser in $G(w)$ of $G(e) = K_0$ contains a conjugate of K and so is not equal to K_0 . Thus Lemma 2.7 shows that K_0 is the only element of the family $E(w)$, and $G(w)$ contains K_0 with index 2. Thus w has valence 1, and $G(w)$ equals a conjugate of K . Now it follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required. \square

Next we discuss the torus decomposition of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ with non-empty boundary. Recall from section 2 the discussion of an essential torus in G . In particular, we let DG denote the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group obtained by doubling G along its boundary. Then given an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H of G , there is a H -almost invariant subset X_H of DG associated to H , and the intersection $Y_H = X_H \cap G$ is a H -almost invariant subset of G which is nontrivial unless H is conjugate into ∂G . Let \mathcal{T}_{n+1} denote the family of equivalence classes of all such nontrivial subsets Y_H of G , where H is $VPC(n+1)$. Then the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of $(G, \partial G)$ will be the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} . This is the natural definition, but it is not obvious that this algebraic regular neighbourhood exists. One immediate problem is that G may have nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups, so this decomposition is different from any of those proved to exist in [22]. In order to show that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ exists, we will use the fact that DG does not have nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPCn$ subgroups, so we can apply results from [22].

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that ∂G is non-empty, and let \mathcal{T}_{n+1} denote the family of equivalence classes of almost invariant subsets Y_H of G described above. Then \mathcal{T}_{n+1} has a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ in G . Further $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G .*

Proof. If G is VPC , part 2) of Corollary 2.9 tells us that either $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$, or that ∂G is a single group S , and G contains S with index 2. In either case, the pair $(G, \partial G)$ admits no essential tori, so that \mathcal{T}_{n+1} is empty. Thus \mathcal{T}_{n+1} has a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood

which consists of a single V_1 -vertex, and this is trivially adapted to ∂G . For the rest of this proof we will assume that G is not VPC .

Recall our discussion at the start of section 2. The natural graph of groups structure Δ for the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG has two vertices w and \bar{w} and edges joining them which correspond to the groups of ∂G . Given an orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup H of G , there is a H -almost invariant subset X_H of DG associated to H , and the intersection $Y_H = X_H \cap G$ is a H -almost invariant subset of G . An important point about X_H is that it is enclosed by the vertex w of Δ , where we identify G with $G(w)$, so that Y_H is adapted to ∂G .

Now consider $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$, which is the collection of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of DG which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Recall that as DG is $PD(n+2)$, it is torsion free so that a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup K of DG must be $PD(n+1)$. Further, as DG is orientable, if there is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of DG which is over K , then K must be orientable, and all such almost invariant subsets of DG are equivalent up to complementation. Also recall from Theorem 4.1 that the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ exists, and is denoted $T_{n+1}(DG)$, and its V_0 -vertices are either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. As we will need to use our construction of unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods in [22], as corrected in [23], we note that Theorem 1.14 tells us that the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ in DG also exists. We will use the notation $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ for this unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood. As in the case of the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood, its V_0 -vertices are either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ denote the subfamily of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ which consists of non-trivial almost invariant subsets of DG which are over subgroups of G which are non-peripheral in G . Note that $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ is G -invariant but is not DG -invariant. We claim that $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ possesses an unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ in DG , and hence a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. We recall from [22] that any finite subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ possesses an unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in DG . As $\bar{\Gamma}(\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, the same holds for an algebraic regular neighbourhood of any subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus the proof of Theorem 1.14 which we gave in chapter 12 of [22] shows that the V_0 -vertices of the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of a finite subset of $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}(DG)$ must be either isolated

or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. Now we consider the construction in the proof of Theorem 9.2 of [22]. This constructs $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ by expressing $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ as an ascending union of finite subsets \mathcal{E}_{n+1}^k . We obtain a sequence of bipartite graphs of groups decompositions $\overline{\Gamma}^k$ of DG for each of which, every V_0 -vertex must be either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. The accessibility results of section 13 of [6] imply that the sequence must stabilise so that $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ exists as required. Further each V_0 -vertex of $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ is either isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Let T_{DG} denote the universal covering DG -tree of $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$, and recall that the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} are the CCC's of all the translates by DG of elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$. Now we consider the construction of the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} described in chapter 6 of [22]. One starts by choosing one element of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} from each equivalence class, and then considers the CCC's of these elements. There is a natural map φ from the equivalence classes of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} to the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$, given by sending the class of Y_H to the class of X_H . Recall that $Y_H = X_H \cap G$. Clearly if two elements of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} cross, then the corresponding elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ also cross. Now recall that elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ which cross must do so strongly. It follows that if two elements of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ cross, then the corresponding elements of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} also cross. Hence φ induces a G -equivariant bijection between the collection P of all CCC's of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} and a subset Q of the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} . It also follows that the pretree structures on P and Q are the same. In particular, the pretree structure on the collection P of all CCC's of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} is discrete. Now the proof of Theorem 3.8 of [22] shows that there is a bipartite G -tree T_G whose quotient by G is the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G . Thus \mathcal{T}_{n+1} also has a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G , so the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of G exists.

Recall that each of the edge splittings of Δ crosses no element of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$, and so must be enclosed by some V_1 -vertex of the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. Thus we can refine $\overline{\Gamma}(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ by splitting at V_1 -vertices to obtain a graph of groups decomposition $\overline{\Gamma}\Delta$ of DG which also refines Δ . Recall that each element of $\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG)$ is enclosed by the vertex w of Δ . Thus if we remove the interiors of the edges of $\overline{\Gamma}\Delta$ which correspond to the edges of Δ , we will be left with a connected graph of groups $\overline{\Gamma}_w$, and the single vertex \overline{w} . The fundamental group of $\overline{\Gamma}_w$ is $G(w)$,

which we continue to identify with G .

Claim: $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G .

This claim immediately implies that the graph of groups Γ_w obtained by reducing $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. It also implies that each group in ∂G is conjugate into some vertex group of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, so that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G .

To prove our claim, recall from two paragraphs previously that the map φ induces a G -equivariant injection from the V_0 -vertices of T_G to the V_0 -vertices of T_{DG} . It follows that φ induces a G -equivariant injection from the V_0 -vertices of T_G to the V_0 -vertices of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}_\Delta}$. Let T denote the subtree of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}_\Delta}$ spanned by the V_0 -vertices in the image of φ . As T_G is a minimal G -tree, T must be the minimal G -invariant subtree of $T_{\bar{\Gamma}_\Delta}$. It follows that T is the universal covering G -tree of $\bar{\Gamma}_w$, proving that $\bar{\Gamma}_w$ is isomorphic to the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{T}_{n+1} in G , as claimed. Note that it also follows that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is the decomposition of G induced from $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$. \square

The properties of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ when ∂G is non-empty are similar to those in the case when ∂G is empty. The fact that $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is adapted to ∂G plays an important role. Before listing these properties, it will be convenient to introduce the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is defined in the same way as we defined the completions of $\Gamma_{n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ in Definition 1.17.

The following result lists the properties of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and its completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ when ∂G is non-empty. As usual, it will be convenient to exclude the case when G is VPC . For in that case $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ are equal and consist of a single V_1 -vertex.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that ∂G is non-empty. If G is not VPC , then $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ have the following properties:*

1. *Each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$.*
2. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- (a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is an essential torus in G .
 - (b) v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . (See Definition 3.4. Note that this includes the possibility that v is of interior Seifert type.)
3. The V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type. (See Definition 3.10.)
 4. If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$.

Remark 4.5. It follows from property 4) that $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ is the same as Kropholler's decomposition in [11]. In dimension 3, it is also easy to see that $T_2(G, \partial G)$ is the same as Castel's decomposition in [4]. Finally if M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold and $(G, \partial G)$ is the corresponding Poincaré duality pair, then the topological torus decomposition $T(M)$ determines the decomposition $T_2^c(G, \partial G)$ of G .

Proof. It follows from the proof of Theorem 4.3 that the reduced graphs of groups decompositions $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ and Δ have a common refinement $\Gamma\Delta$, obtained from $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ by splitting at V_1 -vertices, which consists of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and a single extra vertex \bar{w} which is joined to $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ by edges e_1, \dots, e_m whose associated splittings are those of Δ . Note that the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ and their incident edges are unaffected by the refinement process. Thus we will refer to the vertices of $\Gamma\Delta$ which are obtained from V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ as V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma\Delta$. As the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}_{n+1}(DG) : DG)$ are isolated or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, the same holds for the V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma\Delta$.

1) Each edge of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, regarded as an edge of $\Gamma\Delta$, determines a splitting of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup. It follows that this splitting is dual to an essential torus in DG . Hence each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, proving part 1) of the theorem.

2) Let v be an isolated V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma\Delta$. If one of the e_i 's is incident to v , then v has only one incident edge e in $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and the inclusion of $G(e)$ into $G(v)$ is an isomorphism. But this contradicts the minimality of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Thus no e_i is incident to v , and v must be an isolated V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$.

Now let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma\Delta$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If no e_i is incident to v , then v is a V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian

type. As each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, it follows that v is of interior Seifert type. If some e_i is incident to v , the associated edge group is a group in ∂G . It follows that v is a V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G .

Thus the V_0 -vertices of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ are isolated, or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , which completes the proof of part 2) of the theorem.

3) The construction of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ from $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ described in section 1 can only introduce V_0 -vertices of special Seifert type, so part 3) of the theorem holds.

4) First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

Suppose that H is orientable. The hypothesis that H is not conjugate into ∂G implies that H is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G dual to H . As X is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it follows that H is conjugate into $G(v)$. Hence H is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G)$, as required.

Now suppose that H is non-orientable, and let H_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. If H_0 is conjugate into a group S in ∂G , this conjugate of H_0 will be a $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of the $PD(n+1)$ group S and so will be of finite index. Thus S must itself be $VPC(n+1)$ and be conjugate commensurable with H_0 . As H is not conjugate into S , it follows that $Comm_G(S) \neq S$, so Lemma 2.7 implies that G contains S with index 2. But this implies that G is $VPC(n+1)$ which contradicts the hypothesis that G is not VPC . This contradiction shows that H_0 is not conjugate into ∂G .

It follows from the discussion in section 2 that H_0 is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H_0 -almost invariant subset of G which is dual to H_0 . As $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ has no V_0 -vertices of commensuriser type, it follows from Theorem 1.14 and Remark 1.15 that H_0 must have small commensuriser, which we denote by K . This means that K contains H_0 with finite index, so that K is itself $VPC(n+1)$ and $PD(n+1)$. Note that K must contain H , so that K is non-orientable. We let K_0 denote its orientable subgroup of index 2. Note that K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G , and is not conjugate into ∂G . Thus there is a nontrivial K_0 -almost invariant subset of G which must be enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. It follows that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. As K contains K_0 with finite index, it follows that there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$. If w is a V_0 -vertex, then K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, as required. So we now consider the case when w is a V_1 -vertex. In particular,

v and w must be distinct. Thus there is an edge e of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is incident to w such that $G(e)$ contains K_0 . As all the edge groups of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ are torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal K_0 . Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w .

Recall that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is over a $PD(n+1)$ group. If ∂G were empty so that G was a $PD(n+2)$ group, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] would tell us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. As ∂G is not empty this need not be the case, but instead we apply Theorem 8.1 of [1] to the graph of groups structure $\Gamma\Delta$ of DG . This shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . Let $\overline{E}(w)$ denote this augmented family of subgroups of $G(w)$, so that the pair $(G(w), \overline{E}(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. As the commensuriser in $G(w)$ of the group $G(e) = K_0$ is not equal to K_0 , Lemma 2.7 shows that K_0 is the only element of the family $\overline{E}(w)$, and $G(w)$ contains K_0 with index 2. Thus w has valence 1, and $G(w)$ equals a conjugate of K . Now it follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$, as required. \square

5 Further properties of Torus Decompositions

In the previous section, we showed that any $PD(n+2)$ pair has a torus decomposition, and established the basic properties of this decomposition. In this section, we will establish more detailed information about the vertices of this decomposition.

Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let w be a V_1 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w . Recall that each edge splitting of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is over a $PD(n+1)$ group. If ∂G is empty so that G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. In general, the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ need not be $PD(n+2)$, but instead we apply Theorem 8.1 of [1] to the graph of groups structure $\Gamma\Delta$ of DG described in the proof of Theorem 4.4. This shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . As any essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it follows that any orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of $G(w)$ is conjugate into one of the groups in $E(w)$. It will be

convenient to give a name to this property of a $PD(n + 2)$ pair.

Definition 5.1. *An orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal if any orientable $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup of G is conjugate into one of the groups in ∂G .*

Remark 5.2. *As G is torsion free, a $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup of G is also torsion free and hence is $PD(n + 1)$. Thus it makes sense to say that such a subgroup is orientable. Recall from the preceding paragraph that if w is a V_1 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, then the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ becomes $PD(n + 2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by suitable groups in ∂G . The resulting $PD(n + 2)$ pair is atoroidal.*

This is precisely analogous to the definition of atoroidal for a 3-manifold. In the case when an orientable atoroidal 3-manifold M has incompressible boundary, it is easy to show that M admits no essential annulus, unless M is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to a twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle. We will now prove the algebraic analogue of this fact.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable atoroidal $PD(n + 2)$ pair, where $n \geq 1$. Let A and B be $VPC(n + 1)$ groups in ∂G , possibly $A = B$. Let S and T be $VPCn$ subgroups of A and B respectively, and let g be an element of G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *A and B are the same element of ∂G , and $g \in A$.*
2. *A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , are the only groups in ∂G , and $A = G = B$. Thus $(G, \partial G)$ is the trivial pair $(G, \{G, G\})$.*
3. *A and B are the same element of ∂G . Further A is the only group in ∂G , and has index 2 in G .*

Remark 5.4. *The hypothesis that there is g in G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$ means that the pair $(G, \partial G)$ admits an annulus. The conclusion of the proposition is that either this annulus is inessential (case 1) or that we have the special cases in 2) or 3).*

Proof. As $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal, any orientable $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup of G is conjugate into one of the groups in ∂G . Suppose that G contains a non-orientable $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup K . Then K has a subgroup of index 2

which must be conjugate into a group H of ∂G . As H and K are orientable $PD(n+1)$ groups, it follows that H and K are conjugate commensurable. As H cannot contain a non-orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup, this implies that $Comm_G(H) \neq H$. Now Lemma 2.7 shows that ∂G consists of a single group H which has index 2 in G , so that we have case 3) of this proposition.

Thus in what follows we will assume that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable, and show that we have case 1) or case 2) of the proposition. We will consider separately the cases when A and B are the same or distinct.

Case: A and B are distinct elements of ∂G .

In this case, we will show that A and B are conjugate commensurable. Then Lemma 2.7 shows that we must have case 2) of the proposition.

We suppose that A and B are not conjugate commensurable, and will obtain a contradiction. After a suitable conjugation, we can arrange that $A \cap B$ is $VPCn$. Thus A , B and $A \cap B$ contain respectively finite index subgroups A' , B' and L such that L is normal in each of A' and B' , and $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$ are both infinite cyclic (see Lemma 13.2 of [22]). Thus A' and B' are orientable $PD(n+1)$ groups, and L is PDn . Now let K denote the amalgamated free product $A' *_L B'$, so that L is normal in K with quotient a free group F of rank 2. We identify F with the fundamental group of a surface M which is a disc with two holes, in such a way that two of the boundary components of M carry the groups $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$. Thus F together with the subgroups $L \setminus A'$ and $L \setminus B'$ and a third infinite cyclic subgroup forms a $PD2$ pair. The pre-images in K of the three boundary groups of this pair yield three $PD(n+1)$ subgroups of K . Theorem 7.3 of [1] implies that K together with these subgroups forms a $PD(n+2)$ pair. Two of these three boundary subgroups of K are equal to A' and B' . As A' and B' are orientable and together generate K , it follows that the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is orientable. The inclusions of A' and B' into G determine a homomorphism of K into G , and we consider the image H in G of the third boundary subgroup $\partial_3 K$ of K . As $\partial_3 K$ is an extension of L by an infinite cyclic group, H is an extension of the $VPCn$ group L by a cyclic group. Thus H is $VPC(n+1)$ or $VPCn$.

If H is $VPC(n+1)$, it must be orientable as we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable. As $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal, this implies that H is conjugate into a group in ∂G . Thus the map from K to G can be regarded as a map of $PD(n+2)$ pairs. Recall that the maps from the boundary subgroups A' and B' of K to the boundary subgroups A and B of G each have non-zero degree. As A and B are distinct, and K has only one

other boundary group, it follows that the map from K to G must also have non-zero degree. Hence the image of K in G is a subgroup G' of finite index. Further L must be normal in G' . Recall that we are considering the case where $(G, \partial G)$ admits an annulus with fundamental group L whose boundary lies in the groups A and B of ∂G . As we are also assuming that A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , this annulus is automatically essential. As in Definition 2.19, an essential annulus with fundamental group L determines a nontrivial L -almost invariant subset of G . In particular, it follows that $e(G, L) > 1$, so that $e(G', L) > 1$. As L is normal in G' , it follows that $e(L \backslash G') > 1$. Now we apply Stallings' structure theorem [27][28] for groups with more than one end. If $e(L \backslash G') = 2$, then $L \backslash G'$ is virtually infinite cyclic, so that G' , and hence G , must be $VPC(n+1)$. But then Corollary 2.9 implies that G , A and B are all equal, which contradicts our assumption that A and B are not commensurable. If $e(L \backslash G') = \infty$, then either $L \backslash G'$ is of the form $P *_R Q$, where R is finite, $P \neq R \neq Q$ and one of P and Q contains R with index at least 3, or $L \backslash G'$ is of the form $P *_R$, where R is finite and at least one of the inclusions of R into P is not an isomorphism. In either case, it is easy to see that $L \backslash G'$ contains infinitely many conjugacy classes of maximal infinite cyclic subgroups. It follows that $L \backslash G'$ contains infinitely many conjugacy classes of maximal two-ended subgroups. As a group is two-ended if and only if it is $VPC1$, the pre-images of these subgroups in G' form an infinite collection of conjugacy classes of maximal $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of G' . Recall that we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable. As G' is of finite index in G , there is a finite family $\partial G'$ of $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of G' such that $(G', \partial G')$ is an orientable atoroidal $PD(n+2)$ pair. Thus any maximal $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G' must be conjugate to one of the groups in $\partial G'$. As $\partial G'$ is a finite family, this is a contradiction, which completes the proof that H cannot be $VPC(n+1)$.

Now consider the case when H is $VPCn$. Recall that L is normal in $\partial_3 K$ with infinite cyclic quotient. Thus L is normal in H with finite cyclic quotient of some order d . There is a d -fold regular cover M_d of the surface M in which the pre-image of the third boundary component of M is a single circle C . Now M_d determines a subgroup K_d of K of index d , and L is normal in K_d with quotient $\pi_1(M_d)$. The boundary component C of M_d determines a boundary subgroup ∂_C of K_d . By construction the image of ∂_C in G is equal to L . We let \overline{M} be obtained from M_d by gluing a disc onto C , and let \overline{K} denote the corresponding quotient of K_d . Thus L is normal in \overline{K} with quotient $\pi_1(\overline{M})$, and \overline{K} yields an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair with one

less boundary subgroup than K_d . Further the homomorphism from K_d to G factors through \overline{K} . Each boundary subgroup of \overline{K} maps to a conjugate of A or B , so that the map from \overline{K} to G is a map of $PD(n+2)$ pairs. Again we have a map of non-zero degree, as it is of non-zero degree on the boundary. Now we argue exactly as in the preceding paragraph to obtain a contradiction. This completes the proof that if A and B are not conjugate commensurable, we have a contradiction, thus completing the proof that if A and B are distinct elements of ∂G , then we have case 2) of the proposition.

Case: A and B are the same element of ∂G .

Recall that we are assuming that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable. Thus case 3) cannot occur. Also recall that, as $A = B$, there are $VPCn$ subgroups S and T of A , and an element g of G such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. If g lies in A , we have case 1) of the proposition. Thus for the rest of this proof, we will suppose that g does not lie in A , and will obtain a contradiction.

As g does not lie in A , it follows that $(G, \partial G)$ admits an essential annulus with both ends in A . Let K denote the double of G along A . As $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and A is one of the groups in the family ∂G , there is a natural structure of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair on K . As discussed at the end of section 2, we can double this essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ to obtain an essential torus in $(K, \partial K)$ which clearly crosses the torus in K represented by the subgroup A . Now we consider the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair $(K, \partial K)$. As K admits an essential torus, either this decomposition consists of a single V_0 -vertex or it has at least one edge.

If $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ has at least one edge, then the associated splitting σ of K along an essential torus cannot cross any torus in K . In particular, it cannot cross the torus A , nor can it equal this torus. It follows that σ determines an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$. But this contradicts the fact that $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal. It follows that $T_{n+1}(K, \partial K)$ must consist of a single V_0 -vertex, so that either K is VPC or the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian.

If K is VPC , then G must also be VPC , so Corollary 2.9 tells us that either G has two boundary groups each equal to G , or G has one boundary group which is a subgroup of G of index 2. The first case is not possible as we assumed g does not lie in A , and the second case is not possible, as part 1) of Corollary 2.8 shows that G would be $VPC(n+1)$ and non-orientable which contradicts our assumption that every $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G is orientable.

If the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian, we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup and let Φ denote the quotient Fuchsian group. We can assume that K is not VPC , so Lemma 1.9 tells us that L is unique. Also part 1) of Lemma 1.12 tells us that as A is $VPC(n+1)$ the intersection $A \cap L$ must be $VPCn$ and hence of finite index in L . As K is the double of G along A , it follows that L must be conjugate into a vertex group of this splitting. As L is normal in K , it now follows that A must contain L . Thus G is itself isomorphic to a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the normal $VPCn$ subgroup is L . We denote the quotient group by Θ . As A is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , the group Θ must be infinite. If Θ is two-ended, then G is $VPC(n+1)$, and we have a contradiction by the preceding paragraph. Thus we can assume that Θ is not two-ended. This implies that there are elements δ and ε in Θ of infinite order such that δ and ε have non-zero geometric intersection number. The pre-images in G of the infinite cyclic subgroups of Θ generated by δ and ε are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups D and E of G . Note that $D \cap E = L$. By replacing δ and ε by their squares if needed, we can ensure that they are orientable elements of Φ , so that D and E will be orientable. As δ and ε have non-zero geometric intersection number, it follows that D and E are tori in K which cross. As D and E are subgroups of G , it follows that D and E are tori in $(G, \partial G)$ which cross. But this contradicts the hypothesis that $(G, \partial G)$ is atoroidal. This contradiction completes the proof of the proposition. \square

We now apply Proposition 5.3 to get information about the V_1 -vertices of the torus decomposition of a Poincaré duality pair.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let w be a V_1 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let s and t be edges of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which are incident to w , where possibly $s = t$. Let S and T be $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(s)$ and $G(t)$ respectively, and let g be an element of $G(w)$ such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. $s = t$, and $g \in G(s)$.
2. s and t are distinct and w is isolated, so that s and t are the only edges incident to w , and $G(s) = G(w) = G(t)$.
3. $s = t$, the vertex w has valence 1, and $G(s)$ has index 2 in $G(w)$.

Remark 5.6. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, and a component W of $M - T(M)$ admits a π_1 -injective annulus with boundary in $\text{fr}(W)$, then either this annulus can be homotoped into $\text{fr}(W)$, or W is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to a twisted I -bundle over the Klein bottle.*

Proof. Let $E(w)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(w)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to w . If ∂G is empty, then Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair $(G(w), E(w))$ is $PD(n+2)$. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.1, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(w)$ is augmented by some groups in ∂G , and the $PD(n+2)$ pair obtained this way is atoroidal. Applying Proposition 5.3 to this pair yields three cases, which yield the three cases of this proposition. \square

Remark 5.7. *If we consider the completed torus decomposition $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$ of the $PD(n+2)$ pair, then the third case in Proposition 5.5 cannot occur. For such V_1 -vertices of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ become V_0 -vertices when $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is completed to $T_{n+1}^c(G, \partial G)$.*

We will also need information about the V_0 -vertices of the torus decomposition of a Poincaré duality pair. Part 1) of Theorem 4.4 states that a V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ must be isolated or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . In the next result, we consider the second type of V_0 -vertex.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let v be a V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . (See Definition 3.4.) Let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient Φ . Let s and t be edges of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which are incident to v , where possibly $s = t$. Let S and T be $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(s)$ and $G(t)$ respectively, and let g be an element of $G(v)$ such that $gSg^{-1} = T$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. $s = t$, and $g \in G(s)$.
2. S is commensurable with L .

Remark 5.9. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, then any component of $T(M)$ is a Seifert fibre space. The corresponding result is a standard result about Seifert fibre spaces. Namely that if W is a Seifert fibre space with incompressible boundary which admits a π_1 -injective annulus with boundary in ∂W , then either this annulus can be homotoped into ∂W , or this annulus is vertical in W .*

Proof. Let $E(v)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(v)$ which are edge groups for the edges incident to v . If ∂G is empty, then as discussed just before Definition 5.1, the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is orientable $PD(n+2)$. In general, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when $E(v)$ is augmented by some groups in ∂G . Let $\overline{E}(v)$ denote this augmented family of groups. As v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the normal subgroup L of $G(v)$ is contained in each group in $\overline{E}(v)$. Let $\partial\Phi$ denote the family of subgroups of Φ obtained by taking the quotient by L of each group in $\overline{E}(v)$. Thus the pair $(\Phi, \partial\Phi)$ is the orbifold fundamental group of a compact 2-dimensional orbifold $(F, \partial F)$. Note that as v is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , the group Φ is not finite nor two-ended.

Let S', T' and g' denote the images of S, T and g in Φ , so that we have the equation $g'S'g'^{-1} = T'$ in Φ . If S' is finite, then $S \cap L$ has finite index in S , so that S is commensurable with L , and we have case 2) of the lemma. Otherwise S' is an infinite subgroup of a group H in $\partial\Phi$. Let A denote an infinite cyclic subgroup of S' , and let F_A denote the orbifold cover of F with fundamental group A . Thus F_A has a boundary component which carries A . Also, as A is torsion free, F_A is a surface. If g' does not lie in H , then this surface admits an essential annulus, and so must be an annulus. In particular, F_A is compact and hence a finite cover of F . As Φ is not two-ended, this is impossible so that g' must lie in H , and hence so does T' . Thus S', T' and g' all lie in the same group H in $\partial\Phi$, which means that we have case 1) of the lemma. \square

An important consequence of Proposition 5.5 is the following.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, let V be a non-isolated V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , and let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Then*

$$G(V) = N_G(L) = \text{Comm}_G(L),$$

where $N_G(L)$ denotes the normalizer of L in G .

Remark 5.11. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, then any component of $T(M)$ is a Seifert fibre space, and so its fundamental group has an infinite cyclic normal subgroup. Let W be a component of $T(M)$, and L this normal subgroup. Then the corresponding result is that $\pi_1(W)$ is equal to the commensuriser of L in $\pi_1(M)$.*

Proof. The inclusions $G(V) \subset N_G(L) \subset \text{Comm}_G(L)$ are all clear. Thus it remains to prove that $\text{Comm}_G(L) \subset G(V)$.

Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ and let v denote a vertex of T above V with stabiliser $G(v)$ equal to $G(V)$. Suppose that $\text{Comm}_G(L)$ does not equal $G(V)$. Then there is an element g of $\text{Comm}_G(L)$ which does not fix v , and we let L' denote the intersection $L \cap gLg^{-1}$. Thus L' is a $VPCn$ subgroup of G which fixes both v and gv , and hence fixes every edge on the path λ joining v to gv .

If w is a V_1 -vertex of λ , then L' fixes w and two distinct incident edges. Now Proposition 5.5 shows that w has valence 2 in T and that the two incident edges each have the same stabiliser. It also implies that $G(w)$ contains this stabiliser with index 1 or 2, but we will not need to distinguish these cases. Recall that any V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is isolated or of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . If v_0 is an interior V_0 -vertex of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then Lemma 5.8 shows that L' must be commensurable with the $VPCn$ subgroup L_0 of $G(v_0)$ which is normal in $G(v_0)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

Now let μ denote the subinterval of λ between v and the first V_0 -vertex w of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Possibly μ equals λ . The preceding discussion shows that any pair of adjacent edges of μ have the same stabiliser. Thus the stabiliser of μ equals an edge group H of $G(v)$, which is also an edge group of $G(w)$. Hence the subgroup K of G generated by $G(v)$ and $G(w)$ equals $G(v) *_H G(w)$, and K has the natural structure of an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. The splitting of K over H is over an essential torus in K . Recall that L is the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient, and let L'' denote the corresponding $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(w)$. If w equals gv , then $L'' = gLg^{-1}$, so that L' is a subgroup of L'' . If w is not equal to gv , then the discussion in the preceding paragraph shows that L' is commensurable with L'' . As L' is contained in L , it follows that in either case L and L'' are commensurable. As each is a normal subgroup of H with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, part 2) of Lemma 1.11 shows that L and L'' must be equal. Thus the pair $(K, \partial K)$ is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian. It follows that there is an essential torus in K which crosses the essential torus determined by H , and hence an essential torus in G which crosses the torus determined by H . But this contradicts the fact that the edge splittings of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ do not cross any essential torus in G .

We conclude that every element of $\text{Comm}_G(L)$ lies in $G(V)$. Thus $G(V) = N_G(L) = \text{Comm}_G(L)$ as required. \square

There is another more technical consequence of Proposition 5.5 which will only be needed in the case when G is a $PD(n+2)$ group, i.e. when ∂G is empty, but the general result is no more difficult. Before stating this result it will be convenient to have the following definition.

Definition 5.12. *Let Γ be a minimal graph of groups structure for a group G , let v be a vertex of Γ , and let X be a H -almost invariant subset of G which is enclosed by v .*

Then X is peripheral in v if X is equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to some edge of Γ which is incident to v .

The word peripheral here is very natural, but the reader should note that when $(G, \partial G)$ is a Poincaré duality pair, this idea may have nothing to do with ∂G .

Lemma 5.13. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let H and H' be essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$ whose dual almost invariant sets X and X' are enclosed by V_0 -vertices V and V' of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Suppose that $H \cap H'$ is a $VPCn$ subgroup K of G . Suppose further that X is not peripheral in V . Then V must be of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , each of X and X' is enclosed by V , and K is commensurable with the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient.*

Proof. As X is not peripheral in V , the vertex V of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ cannot be isolated. Thus Theorem 4.4 implies it must be of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Now part 1) of Lemma 1.12 tells us that the intersection $H \cap L$ must be $VPCn$, and hence of finite index in L .

Suppose that V equals V' . Then part 1) of Lemma 1.12 tells us that the intersection $H' \cap L$ must also be $VPCn$, and hence of finite index in L . Thus the intersection $H \cap H' \cap L$ is of finite index in L , and so is also $VPCn$. As $K = H \cap H'$ is assumed to be $VPCn$, it follows that K and L must be commensurable, as required.

In what follows, we will suppose that V and V' are distinct. Let T denote the universal covering G -tree of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Let v be a vertex above V which is fixed by H , and let v' be a vertex above V' which is fixed by H' . Then K fixes the path λ joining v to v' . Now we are in much the same situation as in the proof of Lemma 5.10, with v' in place of gv . Thus if w is a V_1 -vertex of λ , then w has valence 2 in T and the two incident edges each have the same stabiliser, and if v_0 is an interior V_0 -vertex of λ which

is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , then K must be commensurable with the $VPCn$ normal subgroup L_0 of $G(v_0)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

Now we consider the edge e of λ which is incident to v . As K fixes e , it is a subgroup of the torus group $G(e)$. Our hypothesis that X is not peripheral in V implies that $H \cap G(e)$ is commensurable with the normal $VPCn$ subgroup L of $G(v)$. As K is a $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(e)$ and of H , it follows that K must be commensurable with L . It remains to prove that X' must be enclosed by V .

As in the proof of Lemma 5.10, we let μ denote the subinterval of λ between v and the first V_0 -vertex v'' of λ which is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . As before any pair of adjacent edges of μ have the same stabiliser. Thus the edge group $G(e)$ is equal to an edge subgroup of $G(v'')$.

If v'' is not equal to v' , so that μ is properly contained in λ , the above discussion shows that K must be commensurable with the normal $VPCn$ subgroup L'' of $G(v'')$. As K is commensurable with L and L'' , it follows that L and L'' are commensurable. As each is a normal subgroup of $G(e)$ with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, Lemma 1.11 shows that L and L'' must be equal. Now Lemma 5.10 yields a contradiction. We deduce that μ must equal λ .

Let e' denote the edge of λ which is incident to v' . As all consecutive edges of λ have the same stabiliser, it follows that $G(e) = G(e')$. If X' is not peripheral in v' , the preceding argument with the roles of X and X' reversed shows that K must be commensurable with the normal subgroup L' of $G(v')$. If X' is peripheral in v' but is not equivalent to the almost invariant set associated to the edge e' , then Lemma 5.8 shows that K must be commensurable with L' . Thus either K is commensurable with L' , or X' is equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to e' . In the first case, we derive a contradiction as before. In the second case, we recall that each interior vertex of λ is isolated or of special Seifert type. Thus consecutive edges of λ not only have the same stabilisers but they have equivalent associated almost invariant subsets of G . Hence X' must be equivalent to the almost invariant subset of G associated to e , so that X' is enclosed by v , and hence by V , as required. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

6 Enclosing properties of Annulus-Torus Decompositions

Let G denote any almost finitely presented group which has no nontrivial almost invariant subsets over $VPC(< n)$ subgroups. Recall that $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denotes the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups and of equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. The decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of G is the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, and its V_0 -vertices correspond to the cross connected components of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Some of its properties are described in Theorem 1.16. For brevity, we will denote $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ by \mathcal{F} in the rest of this section. In the case when $(G, \partial G)$ is a $PD(n+2)$ pair, we will also consider the family \mathcal{F}' of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups together with equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G . Note that, by Lemma 2.13, nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G are dual to essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$. Thus from the topological point of view, it seems very natural to consider the family \mathcal{F}' . However, one obvious reason why our theory in [22] discusses algebraic regular neighbourhoods of $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ rather than \mathcal{F}' is that, for general groups, there is no analogue of \mathcal{F}' . Another reason is that elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ need not be n -canonical and our methods in [22] cannot handle this situation. In this section, we will show that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' (Corollary 6.4) and that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same reduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods (Theorem 6.17). This technical result will be used in section 7 of this paper in a crucial way. It is the algebraic analogue of the situation discussed in the second paragraph of section 1, with $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ being the algebraic analogue of $AT(M)$, the family \mathcal{F}' being the algebraic analogue of the family of all essential annuli and tori in M , and the family \mathcal{F} being the algebraic analogue of the family of all essential annuli in M together with those essential tori in M which do not cross any essential annulus in M .

First we will show that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' . To do this we need to consider almost invariant subsets of G which are not adapted to ∂G . We start with the following simple result.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Suppose that X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+$*

1) group H and that X is not adapted to ∂G . Then there is a subgroup S_i of G with a conjugate in ∂G such that $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$.

Proof. As X is not adapted to ∂G , there is S_i in ∂G , and $g \in G$, such that both $X \cap gS_i$ and $X^* \cap gS_i$ are not H -finite. By replacing S_i by a conjugate, we can arrange that both $X \cap S_i$ and $X^* \cap S_i$ are not H -finite. Thus both of them are not $(H \cap S_i)$ -finite. Let K denote $H \cap S_i$. Then $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of S_i which is over K , so that $e(S_i, K) > 1$. As K is a subgroup of the $VPC(n+1)$ group H , it must be $VPC(\leq n+1)$. As K must have infinite index in the $PD(n+1)$ group S_i , Strebel's result [29] shows that K has cohomological dimension $\leq n$. Thus K is $VPC(\leq n)$.

Recall the following long exact cohomology sequence from page 9.

$$H^0(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE) \rightarrow H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E) \rightarrow H^1(G; PE) \rightarrow$$

Here H is a subgroup of a group G , and E denotes $H \backslash G$. Also $H^0(G; PE) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $e(G, H)$ equals the dimension over \mathbb{Z}_2 of $H^0(G; PE/\mathbb{Z}_2 E)$. Thus if $e(G, H) > 1$, then $H^1(G; \mathbb{Z}_2 E)$ is non-zero. In the setting of the present lemma, as $e(S_i, K) > 1$ we see that $H^1(S_i; \mathbb{Z}_2(K \backslash S_i))$ must be non-zero. As S_i is $PD(n+1)$, this last group is isomorphic to $H_n(S_i; \mathbb{Z}_2(K \backslash S_i))$ which is in turn isomorphic to $H_n(K, \mathbb{Z}_2)$. Thus $H_n(K, \mathbb{Z}_2)$ is non-zero. As K is torsion free and $VPC(\leq n)$, it follows that K must be $VPCn$, so that $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$ as required. \square

Now we can prove the following.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Suppose that X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H and is not adapted to ∂G . Then X crosses some nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over some $VPCn$ subgroup of G and is dual to an essential annulus.*

Remark 6.3. *In particular, if such X exists, then there are essential annuli in the pair $(G, \partial G)$ which are over $VPCn$ subgroups of H .*

Proof. The proof of this result is suggested by our arguments in [21]. Since X is not adapted to ∂G , the proof of Lemma 6.1 shows that, after conjugation, there is a group S_i in ∂G such that $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of S_i over $H \cap S_i$, and $H \cap S_i$ is $VPCn$. We denote $H \cap S_i$ by K . By replacing H by a subgroup of finite index if necessary, we can arrange that

H is orientable, that K has a finite index subgroup L which is normal in H , and that the quotient $L \backslash H$ is infinite cyclic. Theorem 7.3 of [1] now implies that L is orientable.

As in section 2, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . We denote the cover of M corresponding to L by M_L . As S_i contains L , there is a component Σ of ∂M_L with fundamental group L . Since L is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient, the quotient $L \backslash H$ acts naturally on M_L , and we obtain infinitely many components of ∂M_L which are translates of Σ and have fundamental group L . Let Z denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_H with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by $H \backslash X$. Let $p : M_L \rightarrow M_H$ denote the covering projection. As $X \cap S_i$ is a nontrivial L -almost invariant subset of S_i , the vertices of $p(\Sigma)$ in M_H meet both Z and Z^* in infinite sets. As X is H -invariant, the vertices of the image of each translate of Σ also meet both Z and Z^* in infinite sets.

As the number of these translates of Σ is infinite, we can apply Lemma 2.22. As in that lemma, let $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \Sigma_3$ and Σ_4 denote four distinct translates of Σ by elements of $L \backslash H$, and let A_{ij} denote the annulus in M_L with fundamental group L and joining Σ_i and Σ_j . Let Y_{ij} denote the L -almost invariant subset of G dual to A_{ij} . Let Z_{ij} denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_L with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_L; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by $L \backslash Y_{ij}$. The proof of Lemma 2.22 shows that there are distinct integers i, j, k and l such that Z_{ij} separates Σ_k and Σ_l , i.e. Σ_k is almost contained in Z_{ij} and Σ_l is almost contained in Z_{ij}^* , or vice versa. It follows that X must cross Y_{ij} because each of the four corners of the pair (Z, pZ_{ij}) is infinite, as it has infinite intersection with $p\Sigma_k$ or $p\Sigma_l$. As Y_{ij} is dual to an essential annulus, this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The point of this proposition is the following corollary.

Corollary 6.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. If X is a n -canonical almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H , then X is automatically adapted to ∂G . Thus \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' .*

Remark 6.5. *As X is adapted to G , it follows from Lemma 2.13 that H must be orientable.*

Proof. If X is not adapted to ∂G , then Proposition 6.2 tells us that X crosses some nontrivial almost invariant set over some $VPCn$ subgroup of G , which

contradicts the hypothesis that X is n -canonical. Hence the definitions of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' show that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' , as claimed. \square

Next we give several results about how elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ can cross elements of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 6.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group K . Then the following hold:*

1. *If Y is dual to an essential annulus, then X crosses Y strongly.*
2. *There is an almost invariant set Y' over a group K' commensurable with K such that Y' is dual to an essential annulus and X crosses Y' strongly.*

Remark 6.7. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, the corresponding result holds. For X corresponds to a torus which must be homotopic into a component W of $T(M)$ which meets ∂M . Such W is a Seifert fibre space whose intersection with ∂M consists of tori and vertical annuli. Thus W is filled by vertical annuli, so X must cross one of them.*

Note that in this topological situation, an annulus can never cross a torus strongly, for the intersection of their fundamental groups must be of finite index in the fundamental group of the annulus.

Proof. As X lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G .

1) Suppose that Y is dual to an essential annulus A . As discussed immediately after the proof of Lemma 2.22, the double DG of G along ∂G contains a torus which is the double of the annulus A . We let DY denote the DK -almost invariant subset of DG associated to this torus. As X is adapted to ∂G , Lemma 2.5 yields a H -almost invariant subset \overline{X} of DG such that $\overline{X} \cap G$ equals X . As X and Y cross, it follows that \overline{X} and DY must also cross. As H and DK are both orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups of the orientable $PD(n+2)$ group DG , each has two coends in DG . Now Proposition 7.4 of [22] shows that \overline{X} and DY must cross each other strongly. This implies that X crosses Y strongly, thus completing the proof of part 1).

2) As in section 2, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is

denoted ∂M . Consider the cover M_K , the element of $H_f^1(M_K; \mathbb{Z})$ corresponding to $K \setminus Y$ and its dual class α in $H_{n+1}(M_K, \partial M_K; \mathbb{Z})$. The boundary of α has support in only finitely many components $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ of ∂M_K . Note that Proposition 2.20 tells us that there must be at least one such component of ∂M_K , and each such component must carry a subgroup of finite index in K . By replacing K by a suitable subgroup of finite index, we can arrange that K is orientable and that each of $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_k$ carries K itself. As K is orientable, we know that $k \geq 2$. For each pair of distinct integers i and j between 1 and k , there is an essential untwisted annulus A_{ij} in M_K whose boundary lies in $\Sigma_i \cup \Sigma_j$. Let Y_{ij} denote the dual K -almost invariant subset of G . Let Z_{ij} denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_K with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_K; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by $K \setminus Y_{ij}$. We will show that X must cross one of these Y_{ij} 's. This will be the required Y' . Now part 1) will imply that X crosses Y' strongly.

Let Z denote the support of a 0-cochain on M_H with finite coboundary which represents the element of $H_e^0(M_H; \mathbb{Z}_2)$ determined by $H \setminus X$. As X is adapted to ∂G , we know that for each component Σ of ∂M_H the vertices of Σ are almost all in Z or almost all in Z^* . Further the vertices of Σ are H -infinite, as X is nontrivial, so that the vertices of Σ cannot be almost all in Z and almost all in Z^* . Thus if X crosses none of the Y_{ij} 's, it follows that, after replacing X by X^* if needed, the vertices of the images in M_H of each Σ_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, almost all lie in Z . As X and Y_{ij} do not cross, it now follows that $Y_{ij} \leq X$ or $Y_{ij}^* \leq X$. By replacing Y_{ij} by its complement if needed, we can arrange that $Y_{ij} \leq X$, for all i and j . Part 2) of Proposition 2.21 tells us that Y is equivalent to a sum of some of the Y_{ij} 's and their complements. If there are no complements in the sum, then we have $Y \leq X$, which contradicts the assumption that X crosses Y . The same inequality holds if the number of complements in the sum is even. If the number of complements in the sum is odd, then we have $X^* \leq Y$, which again contradicts the assumption that X crosses Y . This contradiction shows that X must cross some Y_{ij} and so completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Two easy consequences are the following results.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses nontrivial almost invariant sets Y and Y' over $VPCn$ groups L and L' respectively. Then L and L' are commensurable.*

Remark 6.9. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, the corresponding result holds. For X corresponds to a torus which crosses an annulus in M , and so must be homotopic into a component W of $T(M)$ which meets ∂M . Such W is a Seifert fibre space whose intersection with ∂M consists of tori and vertical annuli. If W has a unique Seifert fibration, up to isotopy, it follows that all essential annuli in M which are homotopic into W carry commensurable groups as this group must be commensurable with the fibre group of W . Otherwise, W is homeomorphic to $T \times I$ or to $K \tilde{\times} I$, and in either case $W \cap \partial M$ must consist of annuli alone. In this case, all essential annuli in M which are homotopic into W carry commensurable groups as their boundaries lie in $W \cap \partial M$.*

Proof. As X lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G . By part 2) of Lemma 6.6, we may assume that X crosses Y and Y' strongly. As X crosses Y strongly, it follows that $e(H, H \cap L) \geq 2$. As H is $VPC(n+1)$, it follows that $H \cap L$ is $VPCn$ and hence of finite index in L . Thus by replacing L by a subgroup of finite index, we can assume that it is a subgroup of H . Similarly we can assume that L' is also a subgroup of H . If L and L' are not commensurable, it follows that some element of L' is hyperbolic with respect to Y which implies that Y' crosses Y strongly. Now Corollary 7.10 of [22] implies that L has small commensuriser which contradicts the fact that H commensurises L . This contradiction shows that L and L' must be commensurable as required. \square

Lemma 6.10. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, and let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ and let X' be an element of \mathcal{F}' dual to a torus in $(G, \partial G)$. Suppose that X crosses X' , and also crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group L . Then X' crosses a nontrivial almost invariant set Y' over a $VPCn$ group L' commensurable with L . In particular, X' lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$.*

Remark 6.11. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, the corresponding result is clear. For X corresponds to a torus which crosses an annulus in M , and so must be homotopic into a component W of $T(M)$ which meets ∂M . As X crosses X' , the corresponding tori cross, so both must be homotopic into W . In addition, each of these tori cannot be homotopic to a boundary component of W . Now any such torus in W must cross an annulus in W , so that X' lies in $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. The hypotheses imply that X and X' are nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups H and H' respectively, and are adapted to ∂G . As they are adapted to ∂G , they can be extended to almost invariant sets in DG over the same groups H and H' . As DG is $PD(n+2)$, and H and H' are each $PD(n+1)$, it follows that H and H' each has two coends in DG , so that these extended almost invariant sets must cross strongly if at all. As X and X' cross, it follows that they must cross each other strongly. Let L' denote the intersection $H \cap H'$, which is $VPCn$. By part 2) of Lemma 6.6, we may assume that X crosses Y strongly, and the proof of Lemma 6.8 shows that we can assume that L is a subgroup of H .

If L and L' are not commensurable subgroups of H , then some element of L' is hyperbolic with respect to Y . This implies that X' crosses Y strongly, thus proving the lemma in this case.

Now suppose that L and L' are commensurable. Lemma 13.1 of [22] implies that there are finite index subgroups H_1 of H and L_1 of L such that L_1 is normal in H_1 with infinite cyclic quotient. We let Γ denote the Cayley graph of G with respect to some finite generating set, and consider the action of $L_1 \backslash H_1$ on the graph $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$. Let h be an element of $H_1 - L_1$. As $L_1 \backslash \delta Y$ is finite, there is a finite connected subcomplex C of $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$ which contains $L_1 \backslash \delta Y$. Thus for all but finitely many elements g of $L_1 \backslash H_1$, we have $gC \cap C$ empty, so that $g(L_1 \backslash Y)$ and $L_1 \backslash Y$ are nested. As X crosses Y strongly, the intersection $Y \cap H_1$ is a nontrivial L_1 -almost invariant subset of H_1 . As $L_1 \backslash H_1$ is infinite cyclic, there is a power h^m of h such that $Y \cap H_1 \subset h^m(Y \cap H_1)$. Thus by replacing h by a suitable power if needed, we can arrange that $Y \subset hY$. Also Y cannot be equivalent to hY . For if this happens, then L_1 has infinite index in $\{g \in H_1 : gY \text{ is equivalent to } Y\}$, and we can apply Theorem 5.8 from [26] to the action of $L_1 \backslash H_1$ on $L_1 \backslash \Gamma$. The proof of this result implies that H_1 must have finite index in G , which is impossible as X is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over H .

As h normalises L_1 , each translate $h^n Y$ of Y is also L_1 -almost invariant. If X' crosses Y or any translate $h^n Y$, we will have proved the lemma. Thus we can suppose that X' does not cross $h^n Y$, for any integer n . By replacing X' and Y by their complements if needed, we can arrange that $X' \leq Y$. (If we replace Y by its complement, we simultaneously replace h by its inverse, in order to preserve the inclusion $Y \subset hY$.) Now this implies that $X' \leq h^k Y$ for all $k \geq 0$. We claim that the inequality $X' \leq h^k Y$ cannot hold for every integer k . To see this pick a finite generating set for G and let C denote the

corresponding Cayley graph for G . Now recall that given a pair of nontrivial almost invariant subsets U and W of G , each over a finitely generated subgroup of G , there is an integer d such that if $U \leq gW$ then U is contained in the d -neighbourhood of gW , where distances are measured in C . As the intersection of all the $h^k Y$ is empty, the inequalities $X' \leq h^k Y$, for every k , would imply that X' is empty, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof of the claim. (Alternatively the claim follows immediately using the fact, proved in [19], that X' and Y are equivalent to almost invariant sets in very good position, which implies that the partial orders on E induced by inclusion and by \leq are the same.) Thus there must be a least integer k such that $X' \not\leq h^k Y$. Now by replacing Y by $h^k Y$ if needed, we can suppose that $k = 0$. Thus we have $X' \leq Y$ and $X' \not\leq h^{-1} Y$.

Recall that L and $L' = H \cap H'$ are commensurable. This implies that h and its powers do not lie in L' . Let h_+ denote $\{h^k : k \geq 0\}$, let h_- denote $\{h^k : k \leq 0\}$, and let h_\pm denote $h_+ \cup h_-$. As X and X' cross strongly, it follows that $h_\pm \cap X'$ and $h_\pm \cap X'^*$ each contain points which are arbitrarily far from $\delta X'$. In particular, both sets are infinite. The fact that $X' \leq Y \subset hY \subset h^2 Y \subset \dots$ implies that $h_+ \cap X'$ is finite, so that $h_- \cap X'$ must be infinite.

As we are assuming that X' does not cross $h^n Y$, for any integer n , we know that X' does not cross $h^{-1} Y$. Also recall that $X' \not\leq h^{-1} Y$, so that we must have one of the inequalities $X' \leq h^{-1} Y^*$, $h^{-1} Y^* \leq X'$ or $h^{-1} Y \leq X'$. If $X' \leq h^{-1} Y^*$, then $X' \leq h^{-k} Y^*$, for every $k \geq 0$, so that $h_- \cap X'$ is finite, which is a contradiction. If $h^{-1} Y^* \leq X'$, the inequality $X' \leq Y$ implies that $h^{-1} Y^* \leq Y$, which is impossible as $h^{-1} Y \subset Y$. Thus we must have $h^{-1} Y \leq X'$. As $X' \leq Y$, we know $Y^* \leq X'^*$. Hence X' crosses the nontrivial L_1 -almost invariant set $Y' = Y^* \cup h^{-1} Y$, completing the proof of the lemma. \square

Remark 6.12. *Example 2.13 of [24] shows that Lemmas 6.8 and 6.10 are not valid if X is not adapted to ∂G . In that example, G is the fundamental group of an orientable Haken 3-manifold M constructed by gluing two Seifert fibre spaces M_1 and M_2 along a boundary torus T , so that the Seifert fibrations do not match. Thus the given decomposition of M is essentially its JSJ decomposition. Denote $\pi_1(T)$ by H , and let σ' denote the splitting of G over H determined by T . Note that σ' is adapted to ∂G . Let X' denote a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to σ' .*

In this example, each M_i has at least one boundary component other than

T , and so admits essential annuli disjoint from T . In particular M itself admits essential annuli, so that G does possess nontrivial almost invariant subsets over VPC1 subgroups. We described a splitting σ of G over H which crosses σ' , and is not adapted to ∂G . Let X denote a H -almost invariant subset of G associated to this splitting. Thus X crosses X' . We also showed that X crosses annuli in M_1 and in M_2 . As annuli in M_1 and M_2 carry incommensurable subgroups of G , Lemma 6.8 fails. It follows from results we proved in [24] that X' is 1-canonical, i.e. X' does not cross any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a VPC1 subgroup. Thus Lemma 6.10 also fails.

Now we can start on the proof that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same algebraic regular neighbourhoods. We want to show that the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}')$ of \mathcal{F}' is isomorphic to the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} , which is $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$. It seems natural to approach this by proving that each element of \mathcal{F}' is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, but this seems hard to do directly. Instead we will consider our construction of unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods from [22]. We will show that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' have the same unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods which will immediately imply that they also have the same reduced algebraic regular neighbourhoods. Briefly our construction in [22] goes as follows. Let E denote a G -invariant family of nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G , and assume that the elements of E are in good position. Thus we have a G -invariant partial order \leq on E , essentially given by almost inclusion. A cross-connected component (CCC) of E is an equivalence class of the equivalence relation generated by crossing. We let P denote the collection of CCC's of E . We showed that there is a natural idea of betweenness on the elements of P which gives it a pretree structure. If this pretree is discrete, we can construct a bipartite G -tree T with P as its V_0 -vertices, and the graph of groups $\Gamma = G \setminus T$ is the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of the family E .

Remark 6.13. *As G is finitely generated, it may be that we could simplify this approach using pretrees by one which uses cubings and very good position, as discussed in section 9 of [6], but we have not attempted to do this.*

Let $P(\mathcal{F})$ denote the collection of all CCC's of elements of \mathcal{F} , and let $P(\mathcal{F}')$ denote the collection of all CCC's of elements of \mathcal{F}' . Thus $P(\mathcal{F})$ and $P(\mathcal{F}')$ have natural pretree structures. As we know that \mathcal{F} has an unreduced

algebraic regular neighbourhood, we know that $P(\mathcal{F})$ is a discrete pretree. Recall that Corollary 6.4 shows that \mathcal{F} is contained in \mathcal{F}' . This inclusion yields a natural map $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$, which is clearly G -equivariant. We will show that φ is a G -equivariant bijection such that φ and φ^{-1} preserve the pretree idea of betweenness. Thus φ induces a G -equivariant isomorphism of the pretrees. This implies that the pretree determined by \mathcal{F}' is discrete, so that \mathcal{F}' has an unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G which is isomorphic to the unreduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} . Thus the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}' in G is isomorphic to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ as required.

Recall that $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ consists of all those nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G , but are not n -canonical. In particular every element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ crosses some element of \mathcal{F} . It follows immediately that $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$ is surjective. We will show in the proof of Theorem 6.17 that it is injective. Note also that φ clearly preserves betweenness in the sense that if three CCC's A , B and C of $P(\mathcal{F})$ satisfy ABC , i.e. B is between A and C , and if the image vertices A' , B' and C' of $P(\mathcal{F}')$ are distinct, then $A'B'C'$. But it is not automatic that φ^{-1} preserves betweenness, and this needs proof in the special case under consideration. We give here a simple example which makes clear that this is a real and subtle problem.

Example 6.14. *Let M denote the compact surface obtained from the 2-disc by removing the interiors of two subdiscs. Thus $G = \pi_1(M)$ is free of rank 2. Let λ and μ denote two simple essential arcs properly embedded in M and intersecting transversely in a single point which cannot be removed by an isotopy of λ and μ . Let $N(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda \cup \mu)$ denote regular neighbourhoods of λ and $\lambda \cup \mu$ respectively, and let $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ denote the bipartite graphs of groups decompositions of G which are determined by the frontiers in M of $N(\lambda)$ and $N(\lambda \cup \mu)$ respectively. Then $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ will be non-isomorphic graphs of groups. Now λ and μ determine almost invariant subsets $X(\lambda)$ and $X(\mu)$ of G obtained by lifting them to arcs $\bar{\lambda}$ and $\bar{\mu}$ in the universal cover of M and choosing one side of the lift. We can regard $\Gamma(\lambda)$ as the algebraic regular neighbourhood of $X(\lambda)$ and can regard $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ as the algebraic regular neighbourhood of the family $\{X(\lambda), X(\mu)\}$. As λ is a simple arc on M , the translates of $\bar{\lambda}$ are disjoint, so that the family $E(\lambda)$ of translates of $X(\lambda)$ and its complement is nested. Thus each CCC of $E(\lambda)$ consists of a single translate of $X(\lambda)$. If we let $E(\lambda, \mu)$ denote the family*

of translates of $X(\lambda)$ and $X(\mu)$ and their complements, then each CCC of $E(\lambda, \mu)$ will consist of a single translate of $X(\lambda)$ and a single translate of $X(\mu)$. In each case, the stabiliser of each CCC is trivial. Thus if $P(\lambda)$ and $P(\lambda, \mu)$ denote the families of CCC's of $E(\lambda)$ and $E(\lambda, \mu)$, the natural equivariant map φ from $P(\lambda)$ to $P(\lambda, \mu)$ is a bijection. Further it is clear that φ preserves betweenness. But this cannot be true for the inverse map φ^{-1} . For the fact that $\Gamma(\lambda)$ and $\Gamma(\lambda \cup \mu)$ are not isomorphic implies that the pretree structures on $P(\lambda)$ and $P(\lambda, \mu)$ must be different.

The following technical result is the key to handling this difficulty.

Lemma 6.15. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' be defined as above, and let $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$ be the natural map. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ which crosses an almost invariant set Y over a $VPCn$ group K , and let B denote the CCC of $P(\mathcal{F})$ which contains Y so that the CCC $\varphi(B)$ of $P(\mathcal{F}')$ contains X and Y . Then*

1. Y cannot be isolated in \mathcal{F} .
2. If U and V belong to CCC's A and C of $P(\mathcal{F})$ such that $A \neq B \neq C$, and if $U \leq X \leq V$, then there is an element Z of B such that $U \leq Z \leq V$.

Remark 6.16. *In the 3-manifold setting, so that $n = 1$, part 1) is easy to see. For let M be a Haken manifold with incompressible boundary, and suppose that an essential torus T in M crosses an essential annulus A . Then both must be homotopic into a component W of $JSJ(M)$ which is a Seifert fibre space which meets ∂M . As such a component W is filled by essential annuli, either A crosses some essential annulus or it is homotopic into a frontier component of W . The second case would imply that A crosses no essential torus of M , which is a contradiction, so that A must cross some essential annulus in M , as required.*

Proof. As X lies in \mathcal{F}' , it is a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G which is over an orientable $VPC(n+1)$ group H and is adapted to ∂G .

1) If Y is isolated in \mathcal{F} , then part 4) of Proposition 2.21 implies that Y is dual to an annulus. Now part 1) of Lemma 6.6 implies that X crosses Y strongly. Thus $e(H, H \cap K) \geq 2$, so that $H \cap K$ must be $VPCn$, and so of finite index in K . Now Lemma 13.1 of [22] shows that, by replacing H and K by subgroups of finite index, we can suppose that K is a subgroup

of H and is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient. Let h be an element of $H - K$. As K is normal in H , the translate hY of Y is also K -almost invariant. As Y is assumed to be isolated in \mathcal{F} , no translate $h^n Y$ of Y can cross Y . As in the proof of Lemma 6.10, by replacing h by a suitable power if needed, we can suppose that $Y \subset hY$. Also as in that proof, Y cannot be equivalent to hY . Now it follows that Y crosses the nontrivial K -almost invariant set $hY^* \cup h^{-1}Y$, so that Y cannot be isolated. This contradiction completes the proof of part 1).

2) If X crosses Y weakly, part 2) of Lemma 6.6 shows that there is a K' -almost invariant set Y' such that K' is commensurable with K , and Y' is dual to an annulus. It also shows that X crosses Y' strongly and hence that H commensurises K' . In particular K' , and hence K , has large commensuriser. Now Proposition 8.6 of [22] shows that all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G over subgroups commensurable with K belong to a single CCC apart from a finite number which are isolated. (Note that this proposition as stated only applies to the case when K is $VPC1$, but essentially the same proof works in general. This is discussed in section 14 of [6].) As X crosses Y and Y' , part 1) tells us that Y and Y' cannot be isolated, so it follows that Y and Y' belong to the same CCC B .

It follows from the preceding paragraph that, by replacing Y by Y' if needed, we can assume that Y is dual to an annulus, so that X crosses Y strongly.

As in part 1), we can further assume that K is a subgroup of H and is normal in H with infinite cyclic quotient. In particular, as H commensurises K , it follows that H must preserve the CCC B , so that for every $g \in H$, we have gY belongs to B . As no element of the CCC A can cross any element of B , it follows that, for every $g \in H$, we have $U \leq gY$ or $U \leq gY^*$. We will write $U \leq gY^{(*)}$ to indicate that one of these two inequalities holds. Similarly, for every $g \in H$, we have $gY^{(*)} \leq V$. By replacing Y by its complement if needed, we can suppose that $U \leq Y$.

Now we consider the action of $K \backslash H$ on $K \backslash \Gamma$, and let h be an element of $H - K$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.10, by replacing h by a suitable power, we can suppose that $Y \subset hY$. Also as in that proof, Y cannot be equivalent to $h^n Y$, for any non-zero value of n . As $U \leq Y$, the inclusion $Y \subset hY$ implies that $U \leq h^k Y$ for all $k \geq 0$. As in the proof of Lemma 6.10, the inequality $U \leq h^k Y$ cannot hold for every integer k , and by replacing Y by a suitable translate $h^k Y$ if needed, we can suppose that $U \leq Y$ and $U \not\leq h^{-1}Y$. Thus we must have $U \leq h^{-1}Y^* \subset h^{-2}Y^*$, and hence $U \leq Y \cap h^{-2}Y^*$. Let R denote

the intersection $Y \cap h^{-2}Y^*$. As $h^{-2}Y^*$ is K -almost invariant, it follows that R is also K -almost invariant. Now let Z denote the intersection $R \cap X$. We claim that Z is a K -almost invariant subset of G . Certainly $KZ = Z$ as each of R and X is invariant under the left action of K . The coboundary δZ of Z is the union of subsets of δR and δX . As δR is K -finite, it remains to show that $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ is K -finite. Now δX is H -finite, and contains the union of the translates $h^n(\delta Z \cap \delta X)$, for every integer n . As the translates of R by powers of h^2 are all disjoint, it follows that the translates of $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ by powers of h^2 are all disjoint. Now it follows that $\delta Z \cap \delta X$ must be K -finite, so that δZ itself is K -finite as required. Recall that we have the inequalities $U \leq R$ and $U \leq X$, so that we also have $U \leq Z$. Finally we claim that as $Z = Y \cap h^{-2}Y^* \cap X$, it crosses $hZ = hY \cap h^{-1}Y^* \cap X$. This is because none of the four corners of the pair (Z, hZ) is small, which follows from the inclusions $U \subset Z \cap hZ$, $hU \subset Z^* \cap hZ$, $h^{-1}U \subset Z \cap hZ^*$ and $X^* \subset Z^* \cap hZ^*$. Thus Z is a nontrivial and non-isolated almost invariant subset of G over K and hence must belong to the CCC B . Now the inequalities $U \leq Z \leq X \leq V$ complete the proof of part 2) of the lemma. \square

Theorem 6.17. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair. Let \mathcal{F} denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups and of equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups. Thus the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} exists and is $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Let \mathcal{F}' denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPCn$ subgroups together with all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups and are adapted to ∂G . Then \mathcal{F}' has a reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood in G , and this is naturally isomorphic to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$.*

Proof. Recall our discussion immediately before Example 6.14. There is a natural G -equivariant surjection $\varphi : P(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow P(\mathcal{F}')$. We need to show that φ is an injection and that $P(\mathcal{F})$ and $P(\mathcal{F}')$ have the same pretree idea of betweenness.

Suppose that φ is not injective. Then there must be elements Y_0 and Y_1 of \mathcal{F} , belonging to distinct CCC's v_0 and v_1 of $P(\mathcal{F})$, and a sequence X_1, \dots, X_n of elements of $\mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$ such that X_1 crosses Y_0 , and X_n crosses Y_1 , and X_i crosses both X_{i-1} and X_{i+1} , for each i such that $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. As $Y_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, and $X_1 \in \mathcal{F}' - \mathcal{F}$, Lemma 6.10 shows that Y_0 cannot be dual

to a torus. Similarly Y_1 cannot be dual to a torus. Thus Y_0 and Y_1 are over $VPCn$ subgroups of G .

Let X_i be almost invariant over H_i , and Y_j over K_j , and note that each H_i is orientable. We claim that $H_1 \cap K_0$ has finite index in K_0 . If X_1 crosses Y_0 strongly, then $e(H_1, H_1 \cap K_0) \geq 2$. As H_1 is $VPC(n+1)$, it follows that $H_1 \cap K_0$ must be $VPCn$ and so the claim follows in this case. If X_1 crosses Y_0 weakly, then part 2) of Lemma 6.6 tells us that there is a nontrivial almost invariant set Y' over a group K' commensurable with K_0 such that X_1 crosses Y' strongly. As before this implies that $H_1 \cap K'$ must be $VPCn$, so it follows that $H_1 \cap K_0$ must also be $VPCn$, and the claim follows in this case also.

Now Lemma 13.1 of [22] implies that a subgroup of finite index in H_1 commensurises $H_1 \cap K_0$ and hence commensurises K_0 itself, so that K_0 has large commensuriser in G . Proposition 8.6 of [22] shows that the collection of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 form a single CCC apart from finitely many isolated elements. Part 1) of Lemma 6.15 shows that Y_0 cannot be isolated. Thus the CCC v_0 of $P(\mathcal{F})$ which contains Y_0 contains all the nontrivial and non-isolated almost invariant subsets of G which are over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 . As X_1 crosses an element of v_0 , and also crosses X_2 , Lemma 6.10 shows that X_2 must cross some nontrivial almost invariant subset Y_2 of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with K_0 . Again part 1) of Lemma 6.15 shows that Y_2 cannot be isolated. It follows that Y_2 lies in the CCC v_0 . Now, by induction, it follows that each X_i must cross some element of v_0 . Thus X_n crosses an element Z_0 of v_0 and the element Y_1 of v_1 . Lemma 6.8 shows that Z_0 and Y_1 must have commensurable stabilisers, and Lemma 6.15 shows that Y_1 cannot be isolated. But this implies that Y_1 also lies in the CCC v_0 , which contradicts our assumption. This completes the proof that φ is injective and hence is a bijection.

Finally Lemma 6.15 shows that the betweenness relations on the two pretrees $P(\mathcal{F})$ and $P(\mathcal{F}')$ are the same, which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

7 Proof of the Main Theorem

In this section we use our work from previous sections to show how our main result, Theorem 3.14, follows from Theorem 1.16. One of the things we need to prove when $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair is that all the edge

splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are dual to essential annuli and tori. If an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ is incident to a V_0 -vertex v which is isolated or of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, with k equal to $n - 1$ or n , it is trivial that the edge group is $VPCn$ or $VPC(n + 1)$. But if v is of commensuriser type, then we do not even know that the edge group is finitely generated. However we will show in this section that when $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair the edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are all $VPCn$ or $VPC(n + 1)$. Assuming this, the following result shows that the edge splittings of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ are all dual to essential annuli and tori.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n + 2)$ pair such that G is not VPC . Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n + 1)$ subgroup. Let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . (See Theorem 1.16.) Finally let e be an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with associated edge splitting σ .*

1. *If $G(e)$ is $VPCn$, then σ is dual to an essential annulus in G .*
2. *If $G(e)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$, then σ is dual to an essential torus in G .*

Proof. Let X denote the $G(e)$ -almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge splitting σ . As σ is an edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, it follows that X crosses no element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$.

1) If $G(e)$ is $VPCn$, then X is automatically an element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, and hence is an isolated element. Now part 5) of Proposition 2.21 implies that X is dual to an essential annulus in G , as required.

2) If $G(e)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$, the fact that X crosses no nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPCn$ subgroup implies that X is n -canonical and so is again an element of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Now Corollary 6.4 and Remark 6.5 show that X is adapted to ∂G and that $G(e)$ is orientable, so that X is dual to an essential torus in G , as required. \square

Recall that Theorem 1.16 states that each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

- 1) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n + 1$.
- 2) v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n - 1$ or n .

3) v is of commensuriser type, so that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n + 1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

We will consider cases 2) and 3) in the lemmas which follow. We start with case 2), where v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n - 1$ or n .*

1. *If $k = n$, then v is of interior Seifert type (see Definition 3.2).*
2. *If $k = n - 1$, then v is of I -bundle type (see Definition 3.1).*

Proof. 1) As v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, the groups associated to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v are all $VPC(n + 1)$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splittings of G associated to these edges are dual to essential tori. It follows that v is of interior Seifert type, as claimed.

2) In this case $G(v)$ is $VPC(n - 1)$ -by-Fuchsian where the Fuchsian quotient group Θ is not finite nor two-ended, and there is exactly one edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$ and this edge carries K . Let $E(v)$ denote the collection of these edge groups. Note that each group in $E(v)$ is $VPCn$. Thus Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splittings of G associated to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v are dual to essential annuli. Note also that it is possible that the family $E(v)$ is empty. In this case, $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ consists of a single V_0 -vertex v , and $G = G(v)$ is $VPC(n - 1)$ -by-Fuchsian.

As in section 2, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Recall that in order to prove that v is of I -bundle type, we need to show that there are two distinct components Σ and T of $\partial \widetilde{M}$ such that the induced action of $G(v)$ on \widetilde{M} preserves the union of Σ and T , and for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, if e_K denotes the edge of Γ which is incident to v and carries K , then the edge splitting associated to e_K is given by the essential annulus $K_{\Sigma, T}$.

Finding Σ and T

We claim that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n + 1)$. Let L denote the $VPC(n - 1)$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient Θ . Let $\partial \Theta$

denote the family of subgroups of Θ which are the images of the groups in $E(v)$, so that the pair $(\Theta, \partial\Theta)$ is a Fuchsian pair. If Θ is torsion free, then the pair $(\Theta, \partial\Theta)$ is $PD2$. In this case, as L is $PD(n-1)$, Theorem 7.3 of [1] implies that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$. In general Θ has a torsion free subgroup of finite index, and the pre-image in $G(v)$ of this subgroup yields a $PD(n+1)$ pair of finite index in $G(v)$. As $G(v)$ is torsion free, it follows that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ itself is $PD(n+1)$, as claimed. Note that this pair need not be orientable.

Consider any orientation preserving non-peripheral element α in Θ of infinite order. As Θ is not finite nor two-ended, there is another orientation preserving non-peripheral element β in Θ of infinite order such that α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number. Thus α and β determine nontrivial almost invariant subsets of Θ such that each is over an infinite cyclic subgroup, each is adapted to $\partial\Theta$, and they cross strongly. The pre-images in $G(v)$ of these subsets of Θ are almost invariant subsets of $G(v)$ such that each is over a $VPCn$ subgroup, each is adapted to $E(v)$, and they cross strongly. We denote these $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(v)$ by C and D . Now Lemma 2.5 shows us that we can extend these sets to almost invariant subsets P and Q of G over C and D respectively such that P and Q are enclosed by v . As the almost invariant subsets of $G(v)$ cross strongly, P and Q must also cross strongly. Now Proposition 7.2 of [22] shows that C and D must each have two coends in G . Note that $C \cap D$ equals the $VPC(n-1)$ normal subgroup L of $G(v)$. Now we consider the covers M_L , M_C and M_D of M with fundamental groups L , C and D respectively.

Case: *C and D are orientable.*

As G possesses a nontrivial C -almost invariant subset, Proposition 2.20 tells us that M_C must have at least two boundary components which carry a subgroup of C of finite index. As C has two coends in G , part 3) of Proposition 2.21 shows that the number of such boundary components of M_C and of each finite cover of M_C is exactly 2. Hence each of these two boundary components of M_C must carry C itself. We denote these two boundary components by $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 M_C$. Note that it follows that C preserves precisely two boundary components of the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M , and that all other C -orbits of boundary components of \widetilde{M} are infinite. Now as in section 2, there is an untwisted annulus A and a map $\theta : (A, \partial A) \rightarrow (M_C, \partial M_C)$ which is an isomorphism on fundamental groups and sends $\partial_1 A$ into $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 A$ into $\partial_2 M_C$. Similarly D preserves precisely two boundary components of the

universal cover \widetilde{M} of M , and all other D -orbits of boundary components of \widetilde{M} are infinite. We denote by $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 M_D$ the images in M_D of the two boundary components of \widetilde{M} which are preserved by D . Also there is an untwisted annulus B and a map $\phi : (B, \partial B) \rightarrow (M_D, \partial M_D)$ which is an isomorphism on fundamental groups and sends $\partial_1 B$ into $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 B$ into $\partial_2 M_D$.

Now we consider the pre-images of these annuli in the common cover M_L of M_C and M_D . Above θ we have a map θ_L into M_L of a two-ended cover A_L of A , and θ_L maps ∂A_L into the two components of ∂M_L which lie above $\partial_1 M_C$ and $\partial_2 M_C$. Similarly above ϕ we have a map ϕ_L into M_L of a two-ended cover B_L of B , and ϕ_L maps ∂B_L into the two components of ∂M_L which lie above $\partial_1 M_D$ and $\partial_2 M_D$. The fact that P crosses Q strongly implies that $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ must cross the image of ϕ_L strongly, in the natural sense that $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ contains points arbitrarily far from the image of ϕ_L and on each side. In particular $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ must meet the image of ϕ_L , and hence must meet $\phi_L(\partial_1 B_L)$ or $\phi_L(\partial_2 B_L)$. As the same argument applies to $\theta_L(\partial_2 A_L)$, it follows that the two components of ∂M_L which contain $\theta_L(\partial_1 A_L)$ and $\theta_L(\partial_2 A_L)$ are the same as the two components of ∂M_L which contain $\phi_L(\partial_1 B_L)$ and $\phi_L(\partial_2 B_L)$. Hence C and D preserve the same two boundary components Σ and T of the universal cover \widetilde{M} of M .

Case: *one or both of C and D is not orientable.*

We apply the above arguments to their orientable subgroups of index 2. We will see that the action of the group generated by C and D on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} has one orbit with the two elements Σ and T , and all other orbits are infinite.

Let Θ_0 denote the subgroup of Θ generated by all orientation preserving non-peripheral elements, and let $G(v)_0$ denote the pre-image of Θ_0 in $G(v)$. Thus Θ_0 has index at most 2 in Θ , so that $G(v)_0$ has index at most 2 in $G(v)$. Consider the action of $G(v)_0$ on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} . As any two orientation preserving non-peripheral elements of Θ of infinite order belong to a finite sequence of such elements each crossing the next, and as such elements generate Θ_0 , it follows that Σ and T form one or two orbits under the action of $G(v)_0$ and that all other orbits are infinite. It follows that the same statement holds for the action of $G(v)$ on the boundary components of \widetilde{M} . Thus Σ and T are the required components of $\partial \widetilde{M}$.

If the family $E(v)$ of edge splittings associated to edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident

to v is empty, we have shown that v is of I -bundle type. In this case, either ∂G consists of two copies of G , or ∂G consists of a single group which has index 2 in G . It remains to deal with the case when $E(v)$ is non-empty.

The edge splittings of v

Let K denote a peripheral subgroup of $G(v)$, let e_K denote the edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v and carries K , and let $\theta_K : (A_K, \partial A_K) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ be an essential annulus which is dual to the edge splitting associated to e_K . We need to show that the annulus θ_K equals $K_{\Sigma, T}$ which was defined prior to Lemma 2.15. In general there can be many distinct annuli all carrying the same group, so there is something to be proved.

Let S denote the stabiliser of Σ , so that S is one of the groups in ∂G . We first consider the case when no element of $G(v)$ interchanges Σ and T , so that $G(v)$ is contained in S . As v is a vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with associated group $G(v)$, there is a natural induced decomposition of S as the fundamental group of a graph of groups $\Gamma(S)$, with a vertex V with associated group $S \cap G(v) = G(v)$. Further the stars of v in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of V in $\Gamma(S)$ are isomorphic, i.e. there is a bijection between the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v and the edges of $\Gamma(S)$ incident to V , and corresponding edges have the same associated groups. Note that $\Gamma(S)$ is probably not minimal, and may well be infinite. However, as S is finitely generated, there is a finite minimal subgraph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ of $\Gamma(S)$ which carries S .

Recall from the start of this proof that the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$. In particular, as we are now assuming that $E(v)$ is non-empty, $G(v)$ itself is not $PD(n+1)$. Also each group in $E(v)$ is $VPCn$. As S is $PD(n+1)$, and $G(v)$ is not $PD(n+1)$ nor $VPCn$, it follows that the minimal graph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ must contain V , and at least one edge incident to V . As S is $PD(n+1)$, Theorem 8.1 of [1] tells us that the pair $(G(V), E_\mu(V))$ is $PD(n+1)$, where $E_\mu(V)$ denotes the family of subgroups of $G(V)$ associated to edges of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ incident to V . As the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$, and $G(V) = G(v)$ and $E_\mu(V)$ is a subfamily of $E(v)$, it follows that the families $E_\mu(V)$ and $E(v)$ must be equal. In particular every edge of $\Gamma(S)$ which is incident to V must also be an edge of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$. Recall that K is a group in $E(v)$, that e_K denotes the edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v and carries K , and that $\theta_K : (A_K, \partial A_K) \rightarrow (M, \partial M)$ denotes an essential annulus which is dual to the edge splitting associated to e_K . Let φ_K denote the lift of θ_K into $M_{G(v)}$. As the edge of $\Gamma(S)$ corresponding to e_K is an edge of $\Gamma_\mu(S)$, it follows that the splitting of G over K associated to e_K induces a splitting of S over K .

This implies that φ_K must have a boundary component on the image of Σ in $M_{G(v)}$. The same argument applied to the stabiliser of T shows that φ_K must also have a boundary component on the image of T in $M_{G(v)}$. Hence the annulus θ_K must be $K_{\Sigma,T}$, which completes the proof of the lemma, on the assumption that no element of $G(v)$ interchanges Σ and T .

If there are elements of $G(v)$ which interchange Σ and T , we let S denote the stabiliser of Σ , and let $G(v)_0$ denote $S \cap G(v)$. Note that in this case the images of Σ and T in $M_{G(v)}$ are the same. Then we make essentially the same argument as in the preceding paragraph. This time the vertex V of $\Gamma(S)$ has associated group $G(v)_0$. Given the edge e_K of the star of v in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which has associated group K , the star of V in $\Gamma(S)$ has either one corresponding edge with associated group K or it has two corresponding edges each with associated group K_0 , where $K_0 = K \cap G(v)_0$. As the pair $(G(v), E(v))$ is $PD(n+1)$, it follows that the pair $(G(V), E(V))$ is also $PD(n+1)$. Hence as above, the minimal subgraph $\Gamma_\mu(S)$ of $\Gamma(S)$ which carries S must contain V and each edge of $\Gamma(S)$ which is incident to V . Thus, as before, the lift φ_K of the annulus θ_K into $M_{G(v)}$ must have all of its boundary on the image of Σ . Note that there are two cases here, depending on whether the annulus A_K is twisted or untwisted. In either case it follows that the annulus θ_K must be $K_{\Sigma,T}$, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Now we consider the case when v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type. This is the most difficult case, and we will need most of our previous work in this paper. Note that in Theorem 1.16, the vertex group $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ need not even be finitely generated. Before we start, here is a preliminary result.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of commensuriser type such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

Then v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over a subgroup of H of finite index, and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross.

Proof. As $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , any V_0 -vertex arises from a cross-connected component (CCC) of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. As v is of commensuriser type, all the crossings in this CCC must be weak

and all the almost invariant sets in this CCC are over groups commensurable with H . As in section 2, we consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . As v is of commensuriser type, the number of coends of H in G must be at least 4. Now part 4) of Proposition 2.21 tells us H has a subgroup K of finite index such that ∂M_K has 4 (or more) components each of which carries K . Now Lemma 2.22 shows that we can find almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over K , and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. When $n = 1$, Proposition 8.6 of [22] shows that X and X' must be enclosed by the V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and essentially the same argument applies for all values of n . \square

Recall that we want to consider a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, and that we do not even know that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ is finitely generated. We first deal with two special cases when $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ is certainly finitely generated.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $\text{Comm}_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If H has finite index in $G(v)$, then v is of solid torus type (see Definition 3.8).

Proof. Let e_1, \dots, e_m denote the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v , and denote the associated subgroups of $G(v)$ by H_1, \dots, H_m . The hypothesis implies that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(H)$ is itself $VPCn$. Hence each H_i is also $VPC(\leq n)$. Now Lemma 2.10 implies that G cannot split over a $VPC(< n)$ subgroup. It follows that each H_i is $VPCn$, and now Lemma 7.1 tells us that the edge splitting of G associated to e_i is dual to an essential annulus A_i . It remains to show that the boundaries of these annuli all carry the same subgroup of $G(v)$. We write ∂H_i for the group carried by the boundary of A_i . Note that as each H_i is a $VPCn$ subgroup of the $VPCn$ group $G(v)$, it must be of finite index in $G(v)$. Thus each H_i is commensurable with H .

Lemma 7.3 shows that v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each over a subgroup of H of finite index, and each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. By replacing H by a subgroup of finite index, we can assume that X and X' are both H -almost invariant. As discussed in

section 2, the doubles of these annuli are tori T and T' in DG . These tori must cross and are therefore enclosed by the same V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Hence V is not an isolated vertex, so that V must be of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. We let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. As T and T' are non-peripheral tori enclosed by V , Lemma 5.13 shows that the intersection group $T \cap T'$ must be commensurable with L . As $T \cap T'$ contains the $VPCn$ group H , it follows that H is commensurable with L , and hence that each H_i is also commensurable with L . Let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i . The tori T_i and T have the $VPCn$ subgroup $H \cap H_i$ in common. As T is non-peripheral in V , Lemma 5.13 shows that T_i must also be enclosed by V . Now Lemma 7.5 below shows that ∂H_i must equal L . As this holds for all i , it shows that the groups ∂H_i are all equal, as required. This completes the proof that v is of solid torus type. \square

Lemma 7.5. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and suppose that G has a splitting over a $VPCn$ subgroup H_i which is dual to an essential annulus A_i in $(G, \partial G)$. Let ∂H_i denote the group carried by the boundary of A_i , and let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling A_i . Let V denote a vertex of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, and let L denote the normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Suppose that T_i is enclosed by V , and that H_i is commensurable with L . Then ∂H_i equals L .*

Proof. Observe that ∂H_i is a normal subgroup of T_i with quotient Q isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, depending on whether the annulus A_i is untwisted or twisted. As ∂H_i is assumed to be commensurable with L , part 2) of Lemma 1.12 implies that ∂H_i equals $L \cap T_i$, so that ∂H_i must be contained in L .

As in section 2, it will again be convenient to consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces which correspond to ∂G whose union is denoted by ∂M . Let Σ be a component of ∂M such that one end of A_i is in Σ . The splitting of G over H_i determined by A_i induces a splitting of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ over ∂H_i . Thus part 3) of Corollary 2.8 shows that ∂H_i is a maximal orientable $VPCn$ subgroup of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. Now DG splits over $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ and this induces the splitting of T_i over ∂H_i . As ∂H_i equals $L \cap T_i$, we can identify the quotient $Q = T_i / \partial H_i$ with a subgroup of the Fuchsian quotient group of $G(V)$ by L . Now we consider the full pre-image \overline{T}_i of Q in $G(V)$. Thus L is normal in \overline{T}_i with quotient Q . In particular \overline{T}_i is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of $G(V)$ which contains T_i with finite index. As the

splitting of DG over $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ induces a splitting of T_i over ∂H_i , it follows that it induces a splitting of $\overline{T_i}$ over some subgroup L' of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ which contains ∂H_i with finite index. Thus L and L' must be commensurable. As $\overline{T_i}$ splits over L' , Lemma 1.10 shows that L' must be a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $\overline{T_i}$ with quotient which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. Now part 2) of Lemma 1.11 shows that L' must equal L . In particular, it follows that $\partial H_i \subset L \subset \pi_1(\Sigma)$. Recall from Lemma 3.3 that L must be orientable. Now the maximality of ∂H_i among orientable $VPCn$ subgroups of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ implies that ∂H_i must equal L , as required. \square

Next we consider a case where $Comm_G(H)$ contains H with infinite index, but still must be finitely generated.

Lemma 7.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, then v is of torus type (see Definition 3.12).

Proof. As $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, and G cannot split over a $VPC(< n)$ subgroup, it follows that the group associated to each edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to v must be $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splittings of G associated to these edges are dual to essential annuli or tori. Let $\Sigma(v)$ denote the collection of all these splittings. Recall that Definition 3.12 includes four cases, but in each case, at most one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ can be dual to an essential torus.

We start by showing that this condition holds.

The splittings in $\Sigma(v)$

Note that any splitting of G dual to an essential torus must be over a maximal orientable $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G , by part 3) of Corollary 2.8. Thus if $G(v)$ is orientable, any such edge splitting must be over $G(v)$. If $G(v)$ is non-orientable, then any such edge splitting must be over $G(v)_0$, the orientable subgroup of $G(v)$ of index 2. Let $T_{n,n+1}$ denote the universal covering G -tree of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and let w denote a vertex of $T_{n,n+1}$ above v and with stabiliser $G(v)$. If $G(v)$ is orientable, suppose that two of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ are dual to an essential torus, and if $G(v)$ is non-orientable, suppose that one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ is dual to an essential torus. In either case,

there are two distinct edges of $T_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to w and have the same stabiliser, which is $G(v)$ or $G(v)_0$. Let X and Y denote the almost invariant subsets of G associated to these edges. As each is dual to the same essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ they must be equivalent. Now Corollary 4.16 of [22] implies that w must have valence 2, and hence is isolated. This implies that either v is isolated, or that v has valence 1 with edge group of index 2 in $G(v)$. Either case contradicts our assumption that v is of commensuriser type. We conclude that if $G(v)$ is orientable, then at most one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ can be dual to a torus, and if $G(v)$ is non-orientable, then none of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ can be dual to a torus. Further if $G(v)$ is orientable and one of the splittings in $\Sigma(v)$ is dual to a torus, the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ shows that there must also be a splitting in $\Sigma(v)$ which is dual to an essential annulus. Thus in all cases, $\Sigma(v)$ must contain at least one splitting which is dual to an essential annulus.

Notation

Let e_1, \dots, e_m denote all those edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which are incident to v and have associated edge splitting dual to an essential annulus. Denote the associated $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(v)$ by H_1, \dots, H_m . Let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i associated to the edge splitting of G over H_i .

Lemma 7.3 implies that v encloses two almost invariant subsets X and X' of G , each dual to an annulus, such that X and X' cross. Further we can assume that X and X' are both H -almost invariant. The doubles of these annuli are tori in DG which must cross, and are therefore both enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus neither torus is peripheral in V , and V is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient, then H is commensurable with L . Now Lemma 5.10 shows that $G(V) = Comm_{DG}(L)$ which equals $Comm_{DG}(H)$. As $G(v) = Comm_G(H)$, it follows that $G(v)$ is a subgroup of $G(V)$.

Case 1: $G(v)$ is orientable.

Thus $G(v)$ is an essential torus in DG , and we let W denote the almost invariant subset of DG which is over $G(v)$. As $G(v)$ is a subgroup of $G(V)$, it follows that W is enclosed by V .

We will suppose that W is not peripheral in V . We will not need to consider here the case when W is peripheral in V , although this can occur.

As H_i is a subgroup of $G(v)$, the tori T_i and $G(v)$ have the $VPCn$ sub-

group H_i in common. Then Lemma 5.13 shows that the almost invariant subset of DG associated to the torus T_i must be enclosed by V , and that H_i is commensurable with L . Now Lemma 7.5 shows that ∂H_i must equal L . As ∂H_i is a subgroup of $G(v)$ which in turn is a subgroup of $G(V)$, and as L is normal in $G(V)$, it follows that ∂H_i is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(v)$ with quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, so that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . This proves part of cases 1), 2) and 3) of the definition of torus type (Definition 3.12).

We next consider how the $VPC(n+1)$ group $G(v)$ sits in G . There are three subcases.

Case 1a): $G(v)$ is conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G .

Note that this implies that no edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v has associated splitting dual to an essential torus. As in section 2, it will again be convenient to consider an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces which correspond to ∂G whose union is denoted by ∂M . Let Σ be a component of ∂M such that $G(v)$ is a subgroup of $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. As $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ must contain $G(v)$ with finite index, it is conjugate into some vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus either $\pi_1(\Sigma)$ equals $G(v)$, or some edge incident to v has associated group equal to $G(v)$. As the second case is impossible, $G(v)$ must equal $\pi_1(\Sigma)$. Consider the cover M_H of M with fundamental group equal to H . There will be a component of ∂M_H which covers Σ and has fundamental group H . As we already know that M_H admits essential annuli which carry H , it follows that there is an essential annulus in M which carries H and has one end on Σ . Doubling such an annulus yields a torus in DG which crosses the torus Σ . It follows that the $G(v)$ -almost invariant subset W of DG associated to $G(v)$ is not peripheral in the V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ which encloses W , so the argument in the preceding paragraph applies and shows that each ∂H_i equals L . As above, it also follows that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . Thus we have case 1) of Definition 3.12.

Case 1b): $G(v)$ is not conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G .

In this case, there is a nontrivial $G(v)$ -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G , and we denote this set by Y . The $G(v)$ -almost invariant subset W of DG is enclosed by G , and Y is equal to $W \cap G$, and is adapted to ∂G . Now Theorem 6.17 tells us that Y must be enclosed by some V_0 -vertex w of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. If w is not equal to v , then there must be an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$

which is incident to v , and carries $G(v)$. Thus in any case, Y is enclosed by v . Now we have two subcases depending on whether or not Y is peripheral in v .

If Y is not peripheral in v , then Y must cross some almost invariant subset Z of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and belongs to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . Lemma 6.6 shows that Y must cross some almost invariant subset Z' of G also over a subgroup commensurable with H and dual to an annulus in $(G, \partial G)$. Now part 1) of Lemma 6.15 shows that Z' cannot be isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ and so must also belong to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . We conclude that Y crosses some annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ enclosed by v . It follows that W crosses the torus in DG which is the double of this annulus. As above this implies that W is not peripheral in V , and hence that each ∂H_i equals L , and that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . As v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and Y is enclosed by v and is over $G(v)$, it follows that Y crosses no torus in G so that Y determines a splitting of G over $G(v)$. As Y is enclosed by v and is not peripheral in v , this shows that we have case 3) of Definition 3.12.

If Y is peripheral in v , we let e be the edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ to which Y is associated. We also let X_i denote the H_i -almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge e_i . Now the definition of betweenness in our construction of an algebraic regular neighbourhood in [22] implies that there is an element Z of the CCC which gives rise to v such that Z lies between X_i and Y . More precisely, there is a nontrivial almost invariant subset Z of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and which is enclosed by v such that $Y^{(*)} \leq Z \leq X_i^{(*)}$, where $Y^{(*)}$ denotes one of Y or Y^* . As H_i stabilises both X_i and Y , it follows that H_i lies within some bounded neighbourhood of δZ . In turn this implies that a subgroup of finite index in H_i must stabilise Z . Thus H_i and H must be commensurable. As H is commensurable with L , it follows that H_i is commensurable with L , and now Lemma 7.5 shows that ∂H_i must equal L . As above, it also follows that $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i . Thus we have case 2) of Definition 3.12.

This completes the proof that v is of torus type, in the case when $G(v)$ is orientable.

Case 2: $G(v)$ is non-orientable.

Let W denote the almost invariant subset of DG which is over $G(v)_0$. As before W is enclosed by V . Recall that V is the V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ with $G(V) = \text{Comm}_{DG}(L) = \text{Comm}_{DG}(H)$, and that $G(v)$ is a subgroup of

$G(V)$.

If $G(v)_0$ is conjugate to a subgroup of some group in ∂G , then the non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group $G(v)$ is commensurable with that group in ∂G . Now part 1) of Corollary 2.8 shows that G itself must be a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and that G must contain $G(v)_0$ with finite index. In particular it would imply that G is $VPC(n+1)$, which is excluded in our hypotheses. Thus $G(v)_0$ cannot be conjugate to a subgroup of any group in ∂G , so we let $Y = W \cap G$, a nontrivial $G(v)_0$ -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G . As before Y must be enclosed by v . As we showed earlier that no edge incident to v can have associated splitting dual to an essential torus, it follows that Y cannot be peripheral in v . As in the case when $G(v)$ is orientable, this implies that W is not peripheral in V , and hence that each ∂H_i equals L , the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Thus L is also a normal subgroup of $G(v)$, and the quotient $G(v)/L$ is a $VPC1$ subgroup of the Fuchsian quotient $G(V)/L$. Hence $G(v)/L$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, so that $G(v)$ splits over L . Thus $G(v)$ splits over ∂H_i , for each i , as required by part 4) of Definition 3.12.

As v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and Y is enclosed by v and is over a subgroup of index 2 in $G(v)$, it follows that Y determines a splitting σ of G over $G(v)_0$. As $G(v)$ contains $G(v)_0$ with finite index, it must be conjugate into one of the vertex groups K of this splitting. Note that the splitting σ is dual to an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$. Thus, if ∂G is empty, Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair formed by K and one or two copies of $G(v)_0$ is $PD(n+2)$, where there will be two copies of $G(v)_0$ if σ is a HNN extension and only one copy otherwise. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.1, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when some family of groups in ∂G is added to the copies of $G(v)_0$. As K contains a conjugate of $G(v)$, one of the copies of $G(v)_0$ in ∂K is not equal to its own commensuriser in K . Thus Lemma 2.7 implies that K contains this copy of $G(v)_0$ with index 2, so that K must be a conjugate of $G(v)$, and ∂K consists only of $G(v)_0$. In particular it follows that σ must be an amalgamated free product and not a HNN extension.

As Y is enclosed by v , we can refine $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ by splitting at v to obtain a graph of groups structure Γ' of G such that the projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma_{n,n+1}$ sends an edge e to v and otherwise induces a bijection of edges and vertices. The group associated to e is equal to $G(v)_0$, and the associated edge splitting is σ . As $G(v)$ contains $G(v)_0$ with finite index, one vertex of e must carry $G(v)$ and the other must carry $G(v)_0$. Let w denote the vertex of e with

$G(w) = G(v)$. Recall from the preceding paragraph that σ is an amalgamated free product and that one vertex group of σ is conjugate to $G(v)$. It follows that the edge e of Γ' is separating, and that if we remove the interior of e from Γ' then the component of the resulting subgraph which contains w must carry the group $G(v)$. As $G(w)$ equals $G(v)$, the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that this subgraph must consist solely of w , so that w has valence 1 in Γ' . This shows that we have case 4) of Definition 3.12, and so completes the proof that v is of torus type in all cases. \square

Now we consider the general situation of a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type. Note that a priori, the group $G(v)$ need not be finitely generated, but we show not only that $G(v)$ is finitely generated, but also describe its structure.

Lemma 7.7. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G . Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, such that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some $VPCn$ subgroup H of G with $e(G, H) \geq 2$.*

If H has infinite index in $G(v)$, and $G(v)$ is not $VPC(n+1)$, then v is of Seifert type (see Definition 3.6).

Proof. Lemma 7.3 implies that v must enclose two almost invariant subsets of G , each dual to an annulus and crossing each other. Further we can assume that each is over H . The doubles of these annuli are tori in DG which must cross, and are therefore both enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$. Thus neither torus is peripheral in V , and V is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. If we let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient Φ , then H is commensurable with L . Now Lemma 5.10 tells us that $G(V) = Comm_{DG}(L)$. It follows that $G(V)$ is also equal to $Comm_{DG}(H)$, and so $G(V)$ contains $Comm_G(H) = G(v)$. Thus $G(v)$ is itself a $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian group, where the normal $VPCn$ subgroup H' is commensurable with H . (But note that at this stage it is still possible that $G(v)$ is not finitely generated!) As we are assuming H has large commensuriser, it follows that the Fuchsian quotient group $\Theta = G(v)/H'$ must be infinite. Further as $G(v)$ is not $VPC(n+1)$, this quotient cannot be two-ended. This implies that there are elements α and β in Θ of infinite order such that α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number. The pre-images in $G(v)$ of the infi-

nite cyclic subgroups of Θ generated by α and β are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups A' and B' of $G(v)$. Note that $A' \cap B' = H'$.

If we regard α and β as elements of Φ , the pre-images in $G(V)$ of the same infinite cyclic subgroups are $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups A and B of $G(V)$. By replacing α and β by their squares if needed, we can ensure that they are orientable elements of Φ , so that A and B will be orientable. As α and β have non-zero geometric intersection number, it follows that A and B are tori in DG which cross. As A' and B' are subgroups of finite index in A and B respectively, they also are tori in DG which cross. As A' and B' are subgroups of $G(v)$ which is a subgroup of G , it follows that A' and B' are tori in $(G, \partial G)$ which are enclosed by v and which cross.

Now we consider the torus decomposition $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. Each of A' and B' must be enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$. As A' and B' cross, they must both be enclosed by a single V_0 -vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, and neither is peripheral in u . Thus u is not isolated, and so Theorem 4.4 shows that u must be of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . Let L' denote the normal subgroup of $G(u)$ with Fuchsian quotient. Recall that A' and B' are tori in $(G, \partial G)$ which cross and that $A' \cap B' = H'$. Lemma 5.13 implies that H' is commensurable with L' . Now Lemma 5.10 implies that $G(u)$ equals $Comm_G(L')$. It follows that $G(u) = Comm_G(L') = Comm_G(H') = Comm_G(H) = G(v)$. Note that as $G(u)$ is finitely generated, it follows that $G(v)$ must also be finitely generated. As each of H' and L' is a normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient, Lemma 1.9 shows that H' and L' must be equal.

Now Theorem 6.17 shows that each essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$ which is enclosed by the vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is also enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. As the tori which are enclosed by u and are not peripheral in u form a single CCC, they must all be enclosed by v . It follows that the vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by the vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus there is a refinement Γ' of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and a vertex v' of Γ' , such that the projection map $p : \Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma_{n,n+1}$ sends v' to v and is an isomorphism apart from the fact that certain edges incident to v' are mapped to v . Further the vertex v' , like u , is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , and $G(v') = G(u)$ maps isomorphically to $G(v)$. This last fact implies that if e is an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and mapped to v , then the other vertex w of e has associated group equal to $G(e)$. As Γ' is minimal there is at least one other edge incident to w , and each such edge must carry a subgroup of the $VPC(n+1)$ group $G(w) = G(e)$. Thus each such edge carries a $VPC(\leq n+1)$ subgroup of G . As usual, Lemma 7.1 tells us that the associated splitting of G must

be dual to an essential annulus or torus in $(G, \partial G)$. If one of these other edges incident to w has associated splitting dual to an essential torus, the edge group must equal $G(e)$, so that the vertex w of Γ' has two incident edges with associated splittings over the same essential torus. In this case, as in the proof of Lemma 7.6, Corollary 4.16 of [22] implies that w must have valence 2, and we modify Γ' by collapsing the edge e . By repeating this process we will arrange that if e is an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and mapped to v , with the other vertex of e being w , then each edge e_i , other than e , which is incident to w must carry a $VPCn$ subgroup H_i of $G(w) = G(e)$, so that the associated edge splitting is dual to an annulus A_i in $(G, \partial G)$. As usual we write ∂H_i for the group carried by ∂A_i . At this point we have proved that most of Definition 3.6 holds. It remains to show that ∂H_i equals L' , for each i , where L' is the normal subgroup of $G(u) = G(v)$ with Fuchsian quotient.

The image of e_i in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is an edge incident to v , so its associated edge splitting is enclosed by v . The edge splitting of G associated to the edge e of Γ' is dual to a torus T which is also enclosed by v . We claim that the torus T cannot be peripheral in v . To see this we need to consider the universal covering G -trees T' and $T_{n,n+1}$ of Γ' and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ respectively. Let V' be a vertex of T' above v' with stabiliser equal to $G(v')$. Let E be an edge of T' above e which is incident to V' and has stabiliser equal to $G(e)$, let W denote the other vertex of E , and let E_i denote an edge of T' above e_i which is incident to W and has stabiliser equal to H_i . Orient E and E_i towards V' , and let Z_E and Z_i denote the associated almost invariant subsets of G . The orientations imply that $Z_i^* \leq Z_E^*$. If T were peripheral in v , the fact that Z_i is enclosed by v would imply that $Z_E^* \leq Z_i$ or $Z_E^* \leq Z_i^*$. The first inequality would imply that $Z_i^* \leq Z_i$, which is obviously impossible. The second inequality would imply that Z_i and Z_E were equivalent. This is impossible as their stabilisers are not commensurable, as H_i is $VPCn$ and $G(e)$ is $VPC(n+1)$. This contradiction shows that the torus T cannot be peripheral in v , as claimed.

Now let T_i denote the torus in DG obtained by doubling the annulus A_i with fundamental group H_i . As T is not peripheral in v , it must cross some almost invariant subset of G which is over a subgroup commensurable with H and belongs to the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . As in the proof of Lemma 7.6, Lemmas 6.6 and 6.15 imply that T crosses some annulus enclosed by v , and so crosses the torus obtained by doubling this annulus. Lemma 5.13 then implies that T and this torus are enclosed by the vertex V of $T_{n+1}(DG)$ and are not peripheral in V . As H_i is contained in $G(e)$, Lemma

5.13 now shows that T_i is enclosed by V , and that H_i is commensurable with L . (Recall that L is the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient Φ .) Lemma 7.5 then shows that ∂H_i must equal L . In particular, $G(e)$ contains L . As $G(e)$ is an edge torus of the V_0 -vertex u of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$, it must contain L' . As L and L' are commensurable normal $VPCn$ subgroups of $G(e)$ each of which has quotient isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, Lemma 1.11 implies that L' equals L . We conclude that ∂H_i equals L' , for each i . We have now established all the requirements in Definition 3.6, so that v must be of Seifert type in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, as required. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.7. \square

We are finally ready to prove our main result. For the convenience of the reader we restate it.

Theorem 3.14. *(Main Result) Let $n \geq 1$, and let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC . Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPCn$ subgroup, together with the equivalence classes of all n -canonical almost invariant subsets of G which are over a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup. Finally let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ denote the reduced algebraic regular neighbourhood of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ in G , and let $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ denote the completion of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. Thus $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ are bipartite graphs of groups structures for G , with vertices of V_0 -type and of V_1 -type.*

Then $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ have the following properties:

1. *Each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:*
 - (a) *v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$, and the edge splittings associated to the two edges incident to v are dual to essential annuli or tori in G .*
 - (b) *v is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of I -bundle type. (See Definition 3.1.)*
 - (c) *v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, and is of interior Seifert type. (See Definition 3.2.)*
 - (d) *v is of commensuriser type. Further v is of Seifert type (see Definition 3.6), or of torus type (see Definition 3.12) or of solid torus type (see Definition 3.8).*

2. The V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ obtained by the completion process are of special Seifert type (see Definition 3.10) or of special solid torus type (see Definition 3.8).
3. Each edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is dual to an essential annulus or torus in G .
4. Any nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group and adapted to ∂G is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and also by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.
5. If H is a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G , then H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.

Remark 7.8. Part 3) follows immediately from parts 1) and 2), as the definitions of the various types of V_0 -vertex in the statements of parts 1) and 2) all contain the requirement that the edge splittings be dual to an essential annulus or torus.

Part 4) does not follow from the properties of an algebraic regular neighbourhood as an almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$ group which is adapted to ∂G need not be n -canonical, and so need not lie in the family $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Note that, from [24], we know that there may be almost invariant subsets of G over $VPC(n+1)$ subgroups which are not adapted to ∂G .

Part 5) also does not follow from the properties of an algebraic regular neighbourhood as a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup H of G may be non-orientable.

Proof. 1) Recall that Theorem 1.16 states that each V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies one of the following conditions:

- a) v is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$.
- b) v is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n .
- c) v is of commensuriser type, and $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n+1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

We will consider each type of V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ in turn.

a) Suppose that a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is isolated, and $G(v)$ is VPC of length n or $n+1$. Let e denote either of the two edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ incident to v . Then $G(e)$ equals $G(v)$ and so is VPC of length n or $n+1$. Now Lemma 7.1 implies that the edge splitting of G associated to e is dual to an essential annulus or torus. It follows that we have case 1a) of Theorem 3.14.

b) Suppose that a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is of $VPCk$ -by-Fuchsian type, where k equals $n-1$ or n . If $k = n$, part 1) of Lemma 7.2 shows that v is of

interior Seifert type, so that we have case 1c) of Theorem 3.14. If $k = n - 1$, part 2) of Lemma 7.2 shows that v is of I -bundle type, so that we have case 1b) of Theorem 3.14.

c) Suppose that v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is of commensuriser type, and that $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser $Comm_G(H)$ for some VPC subgroup H of length n or $n + 1$, such that $e(G, H) \geq 2$.

If H has length $n + 1$, we recall from Theorem 1.16 and Remark 1.15 that v encloses elements X and Y of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which are over a subgroup H' of finite index in H , and which cross weakly. Now Corollary 6.4 and Remark 6.5 imply that as X and Y are n -canonical, they must be adapted to ∂G , and H' must be orientable. Thus X and Y are dual to essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$. Now Lemma 2.5 tells us that there are H' -almost invariant subsets \bar{X} and \bar{Y} of DG such that $\bar{X} \cap G$ equals X and $\bar{Y} \cap G$ equals Y . As X and Y cross weakly, it follows that \bar{X} and \bar{Y} also cross weakly. But Proposition 7.4 of [22] implies that no almost invariant subset of DG can cross \bar{X} weakly, as H' has only 2 coends in DG . This contradiction shows that v cannot be of commensuriser type.

If H has length n , there are three cases depending on the index of H in $Comm_G(H)$. In all three cases, we have case 1d) of Theorem 3.14.

If this index is finite, Lemma 7.4 shows that v is of solid torus type.

If this index is infinite and $Comm_G(H)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$, Lemma 7.6 shows that v is of torus type.

In the remaining case, Lemma 7.7 shows that v is of Seifert type.

We have now shown that each V_0 -vertex of the uncompleted graph of groups $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ satisfies part 1) of the theorem.

2) A V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ which is obtained by the completion process arises from a V_1 -vertex w of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. It suffices to show that w is of special Seifert type or of special solid torus type. Recall that either $G(w)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$, or $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, or $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$. We consider each case separately.

Case: $G(w)$ is $VPC(n + 1)$, and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 in $G(w)$.

Lemma 7.1 shows that the edge splitting associated to e is dual to an essential torus. It follows that w is of special Seifert type.

In the remaining cases, each edge incident to w carries a $VPCn$ group,

so that Lemma 7.1 shows that the associated edge splitting is dual to an essential annulus.

Case: $G(w)$ is $VPCn$, and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$.

Let H denote $G(e)$, let A denote the annulus associated to e , and let ∂H denote the subgroup of H carried by ∂A . We claim that A is untwisted. Assuming this claim, it follows that ∂H equals H and so has index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$, which implies that w is of special solid torus type. It remains to prove the claim.

As usual we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M_H denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to H . If A is twisted, then its lift into M_H has boundary in a single component Σ of ∂M_H whose fundamental group must equal ∂H . First suppose that H is normal in $G(w)$, so that the quotient $G(w)/H$ acts on M_H . Thus ∂M_H has two or three distinct components whose fundamental group equals ∂H , and each of these components contains the boundary of an essential twisted annulus. The double cover $M_{\partial H}$ must have two boundary components above each such component of ∂M_H , each with fundamental group equal to ∂H , giving a total of four or six such boundary components of $M_{\partial H}$. Part 3) of Proposition 2.21 now shows that H has at least 4 coends in G . This implies that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type with $G(v) = Comm_G(H)$. But w is a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ and $G(w)$ commensurises H , so that $G(w) \subset G(v)$. As w has a single incident edge e and $G(e) \neq G(w)$, this is impossible. This contradiction shows that if H is normal in $G(w)$, then the annulus A must be untwisted, as claimed. Now suppose that H is not normal in $G(w)$, so that H has index 3 in $G(w)$. Let H_1 denote the intersection of the conjugates of H in $G(w)$. Thus H_1 is a normal subgroup of $G(w)$ of index some power of 3. If A_1 denotes the cover of A with fundamental group H_1 , the fact that this cover has odd degree implies that A_1 is itself a twisted annulus in M_1 . Now the preceding argument yields a contradiction, showing that the annulus A must be untwisted as claimed. This completes the proof that w must be of special solid torus type when $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has a single incident edge e with $G(e)$ of index 2 or 3 in $G(w)$.

Case: $G(w)$ is $VPCn$, and w has three incident edges e_1, e_2 and e_3 , each carrying $G(w)$.

Let K denote $G(w)$, and let A_i denote the annulus associated to the edge e_i . As in the preceding case, we claim that each A_i is untwisted. Assuming this claim, it follows that the boundary of each A_i carries K , which implies that w is of special solid torus type. It remains to prove the claim.

As K is a torsion free $VPCn$ group it is also PDn . Thus an annulus with fundamental group K is untwisted if and only if K is orientable.

Now suppose that K is non-orientable, so that each A_i is twisted. As usual we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M_K denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to K , and let M_0 denote the cover of M with fundamental group equal to K_0 , the orientable subgroup of K of index 2. The lift of each annulus A_i into M_K has boundary in a single component Σ_i of ∂M_K whose fundamental group must equal K_0 . As the A_i 's determine non-conjugate splittings of G , the Σ_i 's must be distinct. As above, the double cover M_0 of M_K has two boundary components above each Σ_i each with fundamental group equal to K_0 . It follows that K has at least 6 coends in G , which implies that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex v of commensuriser type with $G(v) = Comm_G(K)$. Further any almost invariant subset of G over a subgroup commensurable with K must be enclosed by v . In particular, for each i , the K -almost invariant subset of G associated to e_i is enclosed by v . This implies that there is a path λ_i in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ with v at one end and with the edge e_i at the other end, and each interior vertex of λ_i is isolated. As $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is reduced bipartite, each λ_i contains at most two edges. As v is a V_0 -vertex and w is a V_1 -vertex, it follows that each λ_i consists of the single edge e_i . Thus each e_i has v and w as its endpoints. Let Γ_K denote the subgraph of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which consists of the union of the e_i 's. As each e_i and w has associated group K , and $G(v)$ commensurises K , it follows that the group carried by Γ_K also commensurises K . But as $G(v)$ is the full commensuriser of K , this is impossible. This contradiction shows that K must be orientable, so that each A_i is untwisted, as claimed. This completes the proof that w must be of special solid torus type when $G(w)$ is $VPCn$ and w has three incident edges each carrying $G(w)$, and so completes the proof of part 2) of the theorem.

3) This follows immediately from parts 1) and 2), as the definitions of the various types of V_0 -vertex in the statements of parts 1) and 2) all contain the requirement that the edge splittings be dual to an essential annulus or torus.

4) Consider a nontrivial almost invariant subset of G over a $VPC(n+1)$

group and adapted to ∂G . We need to show that this set is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. By definition, any such set lies in the family \mathcal{F}' . Now Theorem 6.17 shows that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ equals the algebraic regular neighbourhood of the family \mathcal{F}' . Thus any element of \mathcal{F}' is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. The construction of the completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ shows that any element of \mathcal{F}' is also enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. This completes the proof of part 4).

5) Let H be a $VPC(n+1)$ subgroup of G which is not conjugate into ∂G . We need to show that H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. First note that as G is torsion free, so is H . Thus H must be $PD(n+1)$.

Suppose that H is orientable. The hypothesis that H is not conjugate into ∂G implies that H is an essential torus in $(G, \partial G)$, so that there is a nontrivial H -almost invariant subset X of G dual to H . Now Theorem 6.17 shows that X is enclosed by a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, so that H is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, and hence is also conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ as required.

Now we will suppose that H is non-orientable and is not conjugate into any V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. The proof of part 4) of Theorem 4.4 shows that the commensuriser K of H in G is itself a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ subgroup of G . Let K_0 denote the orientation subgroup of K . Then K_0 is a maximal torus subgroup of G , and the proof of part 4) of Theorem 4.4 shows that it is not conjugate into ∂G . As in the preceding paragraph, it follows that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, so that K_0 is conjugate into $G(v)$. Our assumption that H is not conjugate into any V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that the same is true for K . As K contains K_0 with finite index, there is a vertex w of $T_{n+1}(G, \partial G)$ such that K is conjugate into $G(w)$, and w must be a V_1 -vertex. Hence there is an edge e of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ which is incident to w such that $G(e)$ contains a conjugate of K_0 . As all the edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ are annulus or torus groups, the group $G(e)$ must equal this conjugate of K_0 . Let σ denote the splitting of G over K_0 determined by the edge e , so that σ is dual to an essential torus in G , and let L denote the vertex group of σ which contains $G(w)$. If ∂G is empty, Theorem 8.1 of [1] shows that the pair formed by L and one or two copies of K_0 is $PD(n+2)$, where there will be two copies of K_0 if σ is a HNN extension and only one copy otherwise. In general, as discussed just before Definition 5.1, the pair becomes $PD(n+2)$ when some family of groups in ∂G is added to the copies of K_0 . As L contains a conjugate of K , one of the copies of K_0 in ∂L is not equal to its own commensuriser in L . Thus Lemma 2.7 implies that L contains this copy

of K_0 with index 2, and ∂L consists only of K_0 . In particular it follows that σ must be an amalgamated free product and not a HNN extension. As L contains a conjugate of K , and both K and L contain K_0 with index 2, it follows that $G(w)$ is equal to L and must be a conjugate of K . Hence the edge e of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ is separating, and if we remove the interior of e from $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$, then the component Γ_w of the resulting subgraph which contains w must carry the group $G(w)$. Now the minimality of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ implies that Γ_w consists solely of w , so that w has valence 1 in $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. It follows that w becomes a V_0 -vertex in the completion $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, so that K , and hence H , is conjugate into a V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required. \square

We observe the following result which again shows the similarity between the algebra in this paper and the topology of 3-manifolds.

Lemma 7.9. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair such that G is not VPC. Suppose that X is a n -canonical almost invariant subset of G which is over a $VPC(n+1)$ group H , and that H intersects some group in ∂G in a $VPCn$ group L . Then X is isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$.*

Remark 7.10. *If $n = 1$ and M is an orientable Haken 3-manifold, the corresponding result holds. For X corresponds to an essential torus T in M which crosses no essential annulus in M , such that $\pi_1(T)$ intersects the fundamental group of some boundary component of M in an infinite cyclic subgroup. This second condition implies that T must be homotopic into a component W of $T(M)$ which meets ∂M , and the fact that T crosses no essential annulus in M now implies that T must be homotopic into a torus component of the frontier of W in M . In particular, T crosses no essential annulus or torus in M .*

Proof. As usual, Lemma 13.1 of [22] tells us that H has a subgroup H' of finite index which normalises a subgroup L' of finite index in L . Also as usual, we choose an aspherical space M with fundamental group G and with aspherical subspaces corresponding to ∂G whose union is denoted ∂M . Let M' denote the covering space of M with fundamental group L' . The hypothesis that H intersects some group in ∂G in the group L implies that there is a component of $\partial M'$ with fundamental group L' . The action of H'/L' on M' yields an infinite family of distinct such boundary components. Now the proof of part 3) of Lemma 2.21 shows that $e(G, L')$ is infinite.

As H' normalises L' , it also follows that L' has large commensuriser. Thus there is a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of commensuriser type such that $G(v) =$

$Comm_G(L')$, so that $G(v)$ must contain H' . Also $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ has a V_0 -vertex w which encloses X .

First we suppose that v and w are distinct. It follows that there is a path joining v and w such that H' lies in the edge group of each edge on the path. Let e be an edge on this path. Recall that all edge groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ are $VPCn$ or $VPC(n+1)$. Thus $G(e)$ must be $VPC(n+1)$ and must contain H' with finite index. Let Y denote the almost invariant subset of G associated to the edge splitting of G given by e . Lemma 7.1 tells us that Y is adapted to ∂G . Now Corollary 6.4 tells us that X is also adapted to ∂G . But a H' -almost invariant subset of G which is adapted to ∂G is unique up to equivalence and complementation, so it follows that X must be equivalent to Y or Y^* . As Y is isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$, it follows that X is also isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$.

Now suppose that $v = w$. Recall from Theorem 3.14 that any V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of commensuriser type must be of Seifert type, of torus type, or of solid torus type. The last case cannot occur here, as $G(v)$ contains the $VPC(n+1)$ group H' . Thus v is of Seifert type, or of torus type. In the second case, $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and so must contain H' with finite index. Thus any almost invariant set enclosed by v and corresponding to a torus must be equivalent to X or to X^* . Now the hypothesis that X crosses no essential annulus in M implies that X crosses no element of the CCC of $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$ which gives rise to v . As X is enclosed by v , it must be associated to an edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ associated to an edge incident to v , and so X must be isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. Finally if v is of Seifert type, we use the facts that v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, and that tori enclosed by v correspond to loops in the base orbifold X_v , and annuli enclosed by v correspond to arcs in X_v . Now a loop in X_v which crosses no arc must be peripheral in X_v . It follows again that X must be associated to an edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ associated to an edge incident to v , and so X must be isolated in $\mathcal{F}_{n,n+1}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

8 Comparing the decompositions of a $PD(n+2)$ pair and its double

In this section, we will apply Theorem 3.14 to understand the effect of doubling on our decompositions $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of a $PD(n+2)$ pair

$(G, \partial G)$.

First we need to improve our description of these decompositions. The same description suffices for both decompositions, so we will only work with $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. In section 2, we used aspherical spaces to clarify the concept of an essential annulus in a $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G, \partial G)$. Now we need to greatly refine those ideas in order to clarify "how vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ meet ∂G ". Let $\partial G = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$, and recall that in section 2, we used a mapping cylinder construction to make a $K(G, 1)$ with $K(S_i, 1)$'s as disjoint subspaces.

Given any group G and a graph of groups decomposition $\Gamma(G)$ of G , there is a general construction of an aspherical space X with $\pi_1(X) = G$ whose structure mimics the graph of groups $\Gamma(G)$. This is called a graph of spaces. For each vertex group $G(v)$ of $\Gamma(G)$, we choose a corresponding aspherical space $K(G(v), 1)$, and for each edge group $G(e)$ we choose a $K(G(e), 1)$ and then take its product with the unit interval I . We construct X from the disjoint union of all the $K(G(v), 1)$ and $K(G(e), 1) \times I$ by gluing each end of each $K(G(e), 1) \times I$ to the appropriate $K(G(v), 1)$, by a map inducing the appropriate inclusion of fundamental groups. Thus there is a natural map from X to $\Gamma(G)$ defined by collapsing each $K(G(v), 1)$ and each $K(G(e), 1)$ to a point. We will apply this construction to the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Further, for each edge e of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ whose associated splitting is dual to an annulus Λ with fundamental group H , we will choose our $K(G(e), 1)$ to be Λ , which is an I -bundle over a $K(H, 1)$, as discussed in section 2. Thus $\partial\Lambda$, the boundary of the annulus Λ , is the corresponding ∂I -bundle over $K(H, 1)$.

Next we will carry out a similar construction of an aspherical space Y which represents ∂G . Each boundary component of each annulus associated to an edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ induces a splitting of one of the S_i 's. Thus each S_i can be decomposed as a graph of groups structure with edges corresponding to boundary components of these annuli. For each S_i , we make a corresponding graph of spaces construction of a space Y_i , with $\pi_1(Y_i) = S_i$. Further, if an edge e of this graph of groups decomposition of S_i has associated splitting over a boundary component of the annulus Λ , we will choose the corresponding $K(G(e), 1)$ to be homeomorphic to that component of $\partial\Lambda$. Let Y denote the disjoint union of the Y_i 's. Note that as S_i is a $PD(n+1)$ group and these splittings are over PDn groups, it follows from [1] that each vertex space of Y is naturally a $PD(n+1)$ pair.

Finally we combine the above constructions using a mapping cylinder construction as follows. We take the disjoint union of the space X constructed above from $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ with the product $Y \times I$, and glue $Y \times \{0\}$ to X so that

each edge space glues by a homeomorphism to a boundary component of the appropriate annulus Λ , and each vertex space is glued to the appropriate vertex space of X . Denote the resulting space by M , and denote $Y \times \{1\}$ by ∂M . We now have a picture which mimics the topology of the *JSJ* decomposition of a 3-manifold, as each edge splitting of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ which is dual to an annulus Λ is represented by an embedding of Λ in M with $\partial\Lambda$ embedded in ∂M . Note that M has a natural projection p to $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ obtained by collapsing the constituent edge and vertex spaces to a point.

In order to complete the analogy with 3-manifold topology, we proceed as follows. We subdivide $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ by adding a new vertex at the middle of each edge e , and then for each vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, we let M_v denote the pre-image under p of the star of v in this subdivision. Let $\partial_1 M_v$ denote the intersection of M_v with the pre-image under p of the new vertices, let $\partial_0 M_v$ denote $M_v \cap \partial M$, and let ∂M_v denote the union $\partial_0 M_v \cup \partial_1 M_v$. Each component of $\partial_1 M_v$ is an annulus or torus in M . Each component of $\partial_0 M_v$ is either a component of ∂M , or is naturally a $PD(n+1)$ pair with boundary equal to the boundary of some annuli in M . Thus we have finally assigned meaning to the "intersection with ∂G of a vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ ".

If v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of interior Seifert type, of special Seifert type, or is isolated with torus group, then $\partial_1 M_v$ consists entirely of essential tori in $(G, \partial G)$, and $\partial_0 M_v$ is empty. Thus the "intersection of v with ∂G " is empty.

If v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of I -bundle type, then $\partial_1 M_v$ consists entirely of essential annuli in $(G, \partial G)$, and $\partial_0 M_v$ consists of one or two $PD(n+1)$ pairs the union of whose boundary components is equal to the boundary of the annuli forming $\partial_1 M_v$. If $\partial_0 M_v$ consists of two $PD(n+1)$ pairs, each includes into M_v by an isomorphism of fundamental groups, so that the I -bundle is trivial. Otherwise, $\partial_0 M_v$ consists of a single $PD(n+1)$ pair such that the image of $\pi_1(\partial_0 M_v)$ in $\pi_1(M_v)$ has index 2, so that the I -bundle is twisted. Thus the "intersection of v with ∂G " is the ∂I -bundle associated to the I -bundle.

We note that if Σ is a torus in ∂G , then it must be conjugate into some vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ or of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Otherwise there is an essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ with a boundary component in Σ , but then the V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ which encloses that annulus must be of commensuriser type so that $G(v)$ contains Σ .

Now we can describe exactly what we mean by doubling $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ or $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Again the same description suffices for both. Let DM denote

the space obtained by doubling M along ∂M , so that DM is a $K(DG, 1)$. We denote the two copies of M in DM by M and \overline{M} , and let τ denote the involution of DM which interchanges M and \overline{M} . We will describe a family of disjoint tori in DM which determines the decomposition of DG which we want. The annuli and tori in M which correspond to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ determine tori in DM , as follows. A torus T in M yields two tori T and τT in DM , and an annulus Λ in M yields a torus $D\Lambda = \Lambda \cup \tau\Lambda$ in DM . In addition, for each torus Σ in ∂G which is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, we add two parallel copies of the corresponding component of ∂M , one copy in M and the other in \overline{M} . Clearly the tori in this family are all disjoint. Now this family of disjoint tori in DM determines a graph of groups structure of DG , which we denote by $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. Thus all the edges of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ have associated splittings dual to tori in DG .

There is a natural map from DM to $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, and it is easy to describe the vertex spaces of DM . If Σ is a torus in ∂G which is conjugate into a V_1 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, the two parallel copies of Σ in DM together bound a copy of $\Sigma \times I$, which corresponds to an isolated vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. We label such a vertex as a V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. The other vertex spaces of DM arise from vertex spaces of M . If M_v is disjoint from ∂M , so that $\partial_0 M_v$ is empty, there are two corresponding vertex spaces M_v and τM_v of DM each homeomorphic to M_v . If v is a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ such that $\partial_0 M_v$ consists only of torus components of ∂M , there are again two corresponding vertex spaces, each homeomorphic to M_v . If v is a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ such that $\partial_0 M_v$ is not empty and does not consist only of torus components of ∂M , there is one corresponding vertex space obtained by doubling M_v along the non-torus components of $\partial_0 M_v$. Finally, if v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ such that $\partial_0 M_v$ is non-empty, there is one corresponding vertex space obtained by doubling M_v along $\partial_0 M_v$. We define each of the corresponding vertices of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ to be of type V_0 or V_1 so as to be of the same type as v . With this labelling, $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is bipartite. Note that an isolated vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ either arises from a torus in ∂G which is conjugate into a V_1 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, or it arises from an isolated annulus or torus vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. As $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ is reduced, it follows that $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is also reduced.

Next we need to consider more detail about the structure of the V_0 -vertex groups of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Recall that if v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of interior Seifert type, then v is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. Let L denote the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$. Then the quotient group $G(v)/L$ is not virtually cyclic and is the orbifold fundamental group of a compact 2-orbifold X_v .

Further there is exactly one edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ which is incident to v for each peripheral subgroup K of $G(v)$, and this edge carries K . Thus there is a natural projection of M_v to X_v , in which $\partial M_v = \partial_1 M_v$ maps onto ∂X_v . This precisely mirrors the picture in a 3-manifold of an interior Seifert fibre space component of the characteristic submanifold. We will show that a similar picture occurs for any V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of commensuriser type, again mirroring the situation for 3-manifolds. Thus, in all these cases, there is a compact 2-orbifold X_v and a natural projection of M_v to X_v in which ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v . Note that any V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of commensuriser type is of peripheral type, so that $\partial_0 M_v$ is non-empty, which introduces some new aspects to the discussion. Note also that if v is of peripheral Seifert type, then $G(v)$ is *VPCn*-by-Fuchsian and so v has a natural base orbifold X_v , but even this is not clear if v is of torus type or of solid torus type.

Consider a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of commensuriser type. For a given such vertex v , there is a *VPCn* subgroup L of $G(v)$ such that for each edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ which is incident to v and associated to a splitting over an annulus Λ , the group carried by each component of $\partial\Lambda$ is L . It follows that $\partial_0 M_v$ consists of a disjoint union of torus components of ∂M and of annuli whose boundary components carry L . Thus each component of ∂M_v is either a torus component of $\partial_0 M_v$ or of $\partial_1 M_v$, or is a union of annuli in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$.

Let T be a component of ∂M_v which is a union of annuli in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$. Either all the annuli in T are untwisted and glued in a circular pattern, or there are precisely two twisted annuli in T separated by a chain of untwisted annuli. Note that all these annuli carry subgroups of G , and so have torsion free *VPCn* fundamental group. It follows that $\pi_1(T)$ is a torsion free *VPC*($n+1$) group and so is *PD*($n+1$). We claim that $\pi_1(T)$ is an orientable *PD*($n+1$) group. By our construction of M , we know that T has a neighbourhood homeomorphic to an I -bundle over T . Further this I -bundle must be trivial as T is a boundary component of M_v . Now it follows that there is an excision isomorphism between $H_{n+2}(T \times I, T \times \partial I)$ and $H_{n+2}(M, \partial M) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. As $H_{n+2}(T \times I) = 0$, and $H_{n+1}(T \times \partial I) \cong H_{n+1}(T) \oplus H_{n+1}(T)$, it follows that $H_{n+1}(T)$ is non-zero, which implies that $\pi_1(T)$ is an orientable *PD*($n+1$) group, as required. We will abuse terminology and say that T is a torus.

Note that an untwisted annulus has a natural projection to the unit interval I , and a twisted annulus has a natural projection to the 1-orbifold Q which is the quotient of I by a reflection involution. Hence if the torus T is a union of untwisted annuli, it has a natural map to the circle S^1 such

that the restriction to each annulus is projection to a unit interval. And if T contains two twisted annuli, it has a natural map to the 1-orbifold C which is the quotient of S^1 by a reflection involution such that the restriction to each untwisted annulus is projection to a unit interval, and the restriction to each twisted annulus is projection to a copy of Q . Now recall that our aim is to show that if v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of commensuriser type, then there is a compact 2-orbifold X_v and a natural projection of M_v to X_v in which ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v . We will show further that this projection can be chosen so that its restriction to each annulus component of $\partial_0 M_v$ and of $\partial_1 M_v$ is the natural projection to a 1-suborbifold of ∂X_v which is isomorphic to I or Q , as appropriate. π

We start by considering the case when v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of torus type, so that $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and hence $PD(n+1)$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of torus type. Then the following hold:*

1. *If $G(v)$ is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, then ∂M_v consists of two tori such that each includes into M_v inducing an isomorphism of fundamental groups.*
2. *If $G(v)$ is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and if $G(v)_0$ denote its orientation subgroup, then ∂M_v consists of a single torus whose inclusion into M_v induces an injection of fundamental groups with image $G(v)_0$.*
3. *In either case, there is a compact 2-orbifold X_v such that $G(v)$ is L -by- $\pi_1^{orb}(X_v)$, and a natural map from M_v to X_v such that ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v . Further, each annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$ maps to a 1-suborbifold of ∂X_v by the natural map. If the annulus is untwisted, its image in ∂X_v is isomorphic to the unit interval I , and if the annulus is twisted, its image in ∂X_v is isomorphic to Q , the quotient of I by a reflection involution.*

Proof. 1) The above discussion shows that ∂M_v consists of tori. There is an excision isomorphism between $H_{n+2}(M_v, \partial M_v)$ and $H_{n+2}(M, \partial M) \cong \mathbb{Z}$, and the fundamental class of ∂M_v maps to zero in $H_{n+1}(M_v)$. Now consider the long exact homology sequence of the pair $(M_v, \partial M_v)$. As $G(v)$ is $VPC(n+1)$ and orientable, we know that $H_{n+2}(M_v) = 0$, and $H_{n+1}(M_v) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. As

$H_{n+1}(T) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for any torus T , it follows that ∂M_v consists of at most two tori.

In case 1) of Definition 3.12, there is a torus Σ in $\partial_0 M_v$ whose inclusion into M_v induces an isomorphism of fundamental groups.

In case 2) of Definition 3.12, there is a torus Σ in $\partial_1 M_v$ whose inclusion into M_v induces an isomorphism of fundamental groups.

It follows that in either of these cases, ∂M_v consists of two tori and that the inclusion into M_v of the second torus T induces an isomorphism $H_{n+1}(T) \rightarrow H_{n+1}(M_v)$. Thus the map from $\pi_1(T)$ to $\pi_1(M_v)$ is onto. As $\pi_1(T)$ is $VPC(n+1)$, the kernel of this map must be finite. Now the fact that $\pi_1(T)$ is torsion free implies that this map is an isomorphism, as required.

In case 3) of Definition 3.12, there is a torus contained in M_v whose fundamental group equals $G(v)$. We could further refine our above construction of $(M, \partial M)$ to arrange that M_v contains such a torus Σ . This must separate M_v into two pieces each with fundamental group $G(v)$. By considering each of these pieces separately as in the preceding paragraph, we can again conclude that each component of ∂M_v includes into M_v by an isomorphism of fundamental groups.

2) If $G(v)$ is a non-orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, then $H_{n+1}(M_v) = 0$. Now the long exact homology sequence of the pair $(M_v, \partial M_v)$ shows that ∂M_v consists of a single torus T . As T is orientable, the image of $\pi_1(T)$ in $G(v)$ is contained in $G(v)_0$. Thus there is an index 2 subgroup G' of G whose intersection with $G(v)$ is $G(v)_0$, and which is naturally a $PD(n+2)$ pair $(G', \partial G')$. Let M' denote the corresponding model space for this pair, and apply part 1) of the lemma to the appropriate vertex space of M' . This will imply that the inclusion of $T = \partial M_v$ into M_v induces an injection of fundamental groups with image $G(v)_0$, as required.

3) If $G(v)$ is orientable and T denotes a torus in ∂M_v , then the pair $(M_v, \partial M_v)$ is homotopy equivalent to $(T \times I, T \times \partial I)$. If T consists of a circular chain of untwisted annuli, then the quotient $\pi_1(T)/L$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , and we take the orbifold X_v to be the annulus. If T contains two twisted annuli, then the quotient $\pi_1(T)/L$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, and we take the orbifold X_v to be the product $C \times I$, where C is the quotient of S^1 by a reflection involution.

If $G(v)$ is non-orientable, then ∂M_v consists of a single torus T whose inclusion into M_v induces an injection of fundamental groups with image $G(v)_0$. If T consists of a circular chain of untwisted annuli, then the quotient $\pi_1(T)/L$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z} , and we take the orbifold X_v to be the Moebius

band. If T contains two twisted annuli, then the quotient $\pi_1(T)/L$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$, and we take the orbifold X_v to be "a twisted I -bundle" over C , which we describe as follows. Recall that the Moebius band is a twisted I -bundle over the circle S^1 . Let σ denote the reflection involution of S^1 with quotient C . Then σ extends to an involution $\bar{\sigma}$ of this I -bundle over S^1 , and X_v is the quotient of this action. Note that $\bar{\sigma}$ preserves each fibre over the fixed points of σ , and fixes one of these fibres pointwise, while reflecting the other one. Thus the fixed set of $\bar{\sigma}$ consists of an interval, where the local picture of $\bar{\sigma}$ is a reflection, and of an isolated point, where the local picture is of a rotation through π . Thus X_v has underlying surface a disc D , the boundary of D contains a single mirror interval whose complement is thus a copy of C , and X_v also has an order 2 cone point in the interior of D . \square

Now we understand how " v meets ∂G " when v is of torus type, we can apply this to the case where v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of peripheral Seifert type to obtain the following result.

Corollary 8.2. *Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of peripheral Seifert type, and let X_v denote the base orbifold of v . Then there is a natural map from M_v to X_v such that ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v . Further, each annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$ maps to a 1-suborbifold of ∂X_v with non-empty boundary, by the natural map.*

Proof. Recall from Definition 3.6 that $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ can be refined by splitting at v to a graph of groups structure Γ' of G with a vertex v' of Γ' such that $G(v') = G(v)$ and v' is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G . The projection map $\Gamma' \rightarrow \Gamma$ sends v' to v and is an isomorphism apart from the fact that certain edges incident to v' are collapsed to v . Further if e is an edge of Γ' which is incident to v' and collapsed to v , then the other vertex w of e is of torus type. As $G(e)$ is a torus, w is of torus type 2) in Definition 3.12. We can correspondingly refine M to obtain the vertex space $M_{v'}$. As v' is of Seifert type adapted to ∂G , there is a natural projection of $M_{v'}$ to $X_{v'}$ with all the required properties. It also follows from Lemma 8.1 that the base orbifold of w is an annulus or $C \times I$. In turn this implies that X_v and $X_{v'}$ are isomorphic. Now it follows that there is a natural projection of M_v to X_v in which ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v , and each annulus component of $\partial_0 M_v$ and of $\partial_1 M_v$ maps in the natural way to a 1-suborbifold of ∂X_v with non-empty boundary, as required. \square

We have shown that for any V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of commensuriser type, but not of solid torus type, there is a base orbifold X_v such that ∂X_v is divided into the image of $\partial_0 M_v$, which we denote by $\partial_0 X_v$, and the image of $\partial_1 M_v$, which we denote by $\partial_1 X_v$. This precisely mirrors the picture in a 3-manifold of a peripheral Seifert type or torus type component of the characteristic submanifold. Now we can continue our discussion of the double $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. As discussed above, this gives rise to a single vertex space DM_v of DM obtained by doubling M_v along $\partial_0 M_v$. It is clear that DM_v has a natural map to the 2-orbifold DX_v obtained by doubling X_v along $\partial_0 X_v$. It is easy to see that $\pi_1^{orb}(DX_v)$ is not virtually cyclic, so the corresponding V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type.

If v is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of I -bundle type, it is of $VPC(n-1)$ -by-Fuchsian type. Let K denote the $VPC(n-1)$ normal subgroup of $G(v)$. As before, we let X_v denote the compact 2-orbifold whose orbifold fundamental group is $G(v)/K$, and whose boundary corresponds to the edges of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ which are incident to v . Thus doubling M_v along $\partial_0 M_v$ yields a V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type with the same base 2-orbifold X_v .

The case of V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of solid torus type seems to be different, and we will need a separate and more subtle argument. Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of solid torus type. Thus $G(v)$ is $VPCn$ and has a $VPCn$ subgroup L such that all the annuli in $\partial_0 M_v$ and in $\partial_1 M_v$ have boundary with fundamental group L .

Lemma 8.3. *Let v be a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of solid torus type, and let L be as above. Then there is a compact 2-orbifold X_v , equal to a cone or the quotient of a cone by a reflection, such that $G(v)$ is L -by- $\pi_1^{orb}(X_v)$, and a natural map from M_v to X_v such that ∂M_v maps onto ∂X_v . Further, each annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$ maps to a 1-suborbifold of ∂X_v with non-empty boundary, by the natural map.*

Remark 8.4. *The orbifold fundamental group of X_v must be finite in this case, as L has finite index in $G(v)$. Note also that the definition of solid torus type, Definition 3.8, did not include the statement that L is normal in $G(v)$. This seems to be quite nontrivial.*

Proof. As before there is an excision isomorphism between $H_{n+2}(M_v, \partial M_v)$ and $H_{n+2}(M, \partial M) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. As $G(v)$ is $VPCn$, we know that $H_{n+1}(M_v)$ is zero. Now the long exact sequence of the pair $(M_v, \partial M_v)$ shows that ∂M_v consists of a single torus T . This torus is a union of annuli in $\partial_0 M_v$ and $\partial_1 M_v$, and all

these annuli have boundary with fundamental group L . Thus L is a normal subgroup of $\pi_1(T)$ with quotient \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$. However the inclusion of T into M_v cannot induce an injective map of fundamental groups, as $G(v)$ is $VPCn$, but $\pi_1(T)$ is $VPC(n+1)$. In this case, we need a more complicated argument to find the base orbifold for v .

Let M_V denote the double of M_v along $\partial_0 M_v$. The double of each annulus in $\partial_1 M_v$ is a torus component of ∂M_V . Recall that any torus in DG is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. As pairs of these tori in ∂M_V are joined by an annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$, it follows from the proof of Lemma 5.13 that all components of ∂M_V are enclosed by a single V_0 -vertex W of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. Now let A be an annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$. As A is an annulus with ends in W , which is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, it follows that A cannot cross any component of ∂M_W . Thus either V itself is enclosed by W , or some component T of ∂M_W is enclosed by V and is not peripheral in V . Suppose there is such a component T of ∂M_W . As T cannot cross any annulus in $\partial_0 M_v$, it follows that T is enclosed by v or τv , which is impossible, as $G(v)$ is $VPCn$. We conclude that V must be enclosed by W . If W is isolated, it follows that V is also isolated and hence that v must be isolated, contradicting the assumption that v is of solid torus type. If W is of special Seifert type, it follows that V must be isolated or also of special Seifert type. We have just shown that V cannot be isolated, so it must be of special Seifert type. As v is of solid torus type, the only possibility is that it is of special solid torus type, with a single incident edge carrying a subgroup of index 2 in $G(v)$. In this case, we can take X_v to be a cone with cone point labeled 2, and with $\partial_0 X_v$ and $\partial_1 X_v$ each consisting of a single arc in ∂X_v . If W is $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian, it follows that L is the normal $VPCn$ subgroup of $G(W)$, and that $G(V)$ is the pre-image in $G(W)$ of a suborbifold X of the base orbifold X_W of W . Now we can choose a projection map $p : M_V \rightarrow X$, so that ∂M_V maps to ∂X , and each annulus in $\partial_1 M_v$, and its translate by τ , projects in the natural way to a 1-orbifold contained in ∂X . The involution τ of DM induces an involution of $G(V)$ which is the identity on L , and so induces a proper homotopy equivalence of X of order 2. The Nielsen Realization Theorem [10] implies that there is an involution of X in the given homotopy class, which we again denote by τ . Recall that each component of ∂M_V is the double of an annulus in $\partial_1 M_v$. It follows that τ induces an involution on each component of ∂M_V which interchanges the two annuli. Hence the involution τ on X acts by a reflection on each component of ∂X , and so fixes one or two points of each such component. We now need to consider how $p : M_V \rightarrow X$ maps each

annulus Λ of $\partial_0 M_v$ into X . We already know that each component of $\partial\Lambda$ is also a component of the boundary of an annulus in $\partial_1 M_v$, and so is mapped to a point of ∂X fixed by τ .

If Λ is untwisted, it follows that we can homotop p restricted to Λ to factor through the natural projection of Λ to the unit interval. This yields a path λ in X joining two points of ∂X fixed by τ . We now give X a hyperbolic metric such that ∂X consists of geodesics and τ is an isometry, and then homotop λ rel $\partial\lambda$ to the unique geodesic in its homotopy class. As $\tau\Lambda = \Lambda$, it follows that $\tau\lambda$ is homotopic rel $\partial\lambda$ to λ . Now the uniqueness of hyperbolic geodesics in a homotopy class implies that $\tau\lambda = \lambda$. It follows that λ is contained in the fixed set of τ , and that λ must be a simple geodesic.

If Λ is twisted, then p maps $\partial\Lambda$ to a point a of ∂X fixed by τ . As $\pi_1(\Lambda)$ contains $\pi_1(\partial\Lambda) = L$ with index 2, it follows that $p_*\pi_1(\Lambda)$ is a subgroup of $\pi_1^{orb}(X)$ of order 2. Such a subgroup of $\pi_1^{orb}(X)$ must be carried by a mirror m of X or by a cone point w of X with even number attached. In the first case, we can homotope the map from Λ to X to have image a path λ joining a to m , and then further homotop λ to be the shortest geodesic in its homotopy class. As τ fixes Λ , it follows that τ must preserve m , and that $\tau\lambda$ is homotopic to λ fixing a and keeping the other end of λ in m . Now the uniqueness of hyperbolic geodesics in a homotopy class implies that $\tau\lambda = \lambda$. It follows that λ is contained in the fixed set of τ , and that λ must be a simple geodesic. In the second case, we can homotope the map from Λ to X to have image a path λ joining a to w , and then further homotop λ to be the shortest geodesic in its homotopy class. As τ fixes Λ , it follows that τ must fix w , and that $\tau\lambda$ is homotopic to λ rel $\partial\lambda$. Now the uniqueness of hyperbolic geodesics in a homotopy class implies again that $\tau\lambda = \lambda$, so that λ must be contained in the fixed set of τ , and λ must be a simple geodesic. In both cases, the image of λ is a 1-suborbifold of X , isomorphic to Q , the quotient of the unit interval by a reflection.

At this point, we have arranged that each annulus of $\partial_0 M_v$ maps to a "simple arc" in X which is contained in the fixed set of τ , so that distinct such arcs cannot cross. It is conceivable that two of these arcs coming from twisted annuli could share an endpoint at a cone point of X , but that would imply the two twisted annuli in question carried the same subgroup of DG , which is not possible. It follows that the image of ∂M_v in X is a connected 1-orbifold C , without boundary, embedded in X . Thus C is a circle or the quotient of a circle by reflection. The image of $\pi_1^{orb}(C)$ in $\pi_1^{orb}(X)$ must be finite, as it is contained in $\pi_1(M_v)/L$, which is the image of $\pi_1(M_v)$. It follows

that C bounds a suborbifold Z of X with finite orbifold fundamental group, which can only be a cone or the quotient of a cone by a reflection. This is the required base orbifold X_v for v . \square

Now we come to an important result about the V_1 -vertices of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that G is not VPC . Let V be a V_1 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, denote $G(V)$ by K , and let ∂K denote the family of subgroups of K associated to the edges of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ incident to V . Then $(K, \partial K)$ is an orientable atoroidal $PD(n+2)$ pair.*

Proof. The fact that $(K, \partial K)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair follows from [1]. Now suppose that T is a torus in $(K, \partial K)$. We need to show that T is conjugate into a group in ∂K . Recall from the above discussion of DM and $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, that V must be obtained from a V_1 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. If V is isolated, the required result is immediate. If V is equal to a V_1 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, then T is a torus in G . Now any torus in G is conjugate into a group in ∂G or is essential and so enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. In either case, it must be conjugate into a group in ∂K . If V is obtained by doubling from some V_1 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, there are three possible cases up to conjugacy, that T is an essential torus in G or \overline{G} , that T is contained in a group in ∂G , or that T is decomposed into essential annuli lying in $(G, \partial G)$ or $(\overline{G}, \partial \overline{G})$ and enclosed by v or by τv . The first case is again not possible. In the second case, T would be peripheral in V , as required. Now we consider the third case in which T is decomposed into essential annuli lying in $(G, \partial G)$ or $(\overline{G}, \partial \overline{G})$ and enclosed by v or by τv . We note that any essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Thus if an essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by a V_1 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, it must be a cover of an annulus associated to an edge of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ incident to v . Thus the annuli into which T is decomposed are all covers of edge annuli in v or τv . If v is a non-isolated V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, it is not possible to have two distinct edge annuli whose boundaries carry the same group L . It follows that T is a subgroup of the double of a single edge annulus of v , so that T is a subgroup of an edge torus of V , as required. \square

Next we discuss more carefully the V_0 -vertices of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}$. These are all obtained from V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ except for those isolated vertices obtained from torus groups in ∂G enclosed by a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$.

If V is obtained from a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of interior type, then V is equal to v or τv , so is isolated, of special Seifert type or of interior Seifert type. In the last case, if L denotes the $VPCn$ normal subgroup of $G(V)$ with Fuchsian quotient, then L is contained in G or \overline{G} , but is not contained in any group in ∂G .

If V is obtained from a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of peripheral type, then M_V is the double of M_v along $\partial_0 M_v$. If v is isolated, then V is also isolated. If v is of commensuriser type, there is a $VPCn$ subgroup L of G such that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(L)$ and all edge annuli of v have boundary which carries L . Thus L is contained in G and also contained in groups in ∂G . Further Lemma 8.1, Corollary 8.2 and Lemma 8.3 together show that $G(v)$ is L -by- $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(X_v)$, where X_v is the base orbifold of v . Hence $G(V)$ is L -by- $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(DX_v)$, where DX_v is the double of X_v along $\partial_0 X_v$. In almost all cases $\pi_1^{\text{orb}}(DX_v)$ is not virtually cyclic, and V is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type, where the normal $VPCn$ subgroup is again L . The only exception occurs when v is of special solid torus type, with a single incident edge carrying a subgroup of $G(v)$ of index 2. In this case, V is of special Seifert type.

Finally if V is obtained from a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ of I -bundle type, then V is of Seifert type, but this time the normal $VPCn$ subgroup L of $G(V)$ is not conjugate into G or \overline{G} .

Now we can state our doubling result which is precisely analogous to the situation in 3-manifold theory.

Theorem 8.6. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that G is not VPC . Then the double $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ is equal to the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$ of DG .*

Remark 8.7. *The double $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}$ of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$ need not be equal to the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$ of DG . For example, consider the case when G is the fundamental group of a 3-manifold M , and $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ has a V_0 -vertex v of special solid torus type, with three incident edges each carrying $G(v)$. Thus the characteristic submanifold of M has a component X which is a solid torus which meets ∂M in three annuli all of degree 1 in X . Doubling M yields a component DX of the characteristic submanifold of DM , which is the double of X along $X \cap \partial M$. Thus DX is the product of a pair of pants with the circle. Now X corresponds to a V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}(G)$, but DX corresponds to a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}(DG)$.*

Proof. The outline of our proof is to show that each V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, and that each V_0 -vertex of

$\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. Assuming these two facts, we can deduce the theorem as follows. Let V be a V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ enclosed by the V_0 -vertex W of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. As W is enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V' of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, it follows that V is enclosed by V' . As $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is reduced, it follows that $V = V'$, and hence that $G(V) = G(W)$. Let $\partial G(V)$ denote the family of subgroups of $G(V)$ associated to the edges of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ incident to V , and similarly for W . The facts that V is enclosed by W , and $G(V) = G(W)$ implies that the $PD(n+2)$ pairs $(G(V), \partial G(V))$ and $(G(W), \partial G(W))$ are isomorphic. Similarly if W is a V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$ enclosed by a V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, it follows that the $PD(n+2)$ pairs $(G(V), \partial G(V))$ and $(G(W), \partial G(W))$ are isomorphic. Together these facts imply that $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is equal to $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, as required.

First we will show that each V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$.

Our discussion immediately before this theorem shows that if V is a V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, it is isolated, of special Seifert type, or of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type. Now any torus in DG is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, and crossing tori must be enclosed by the same V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. Thus if V is not of special Seifert type, it follows that V is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. If V is of special Seifert type, we know that $G(V)$ is conjugate into some V_0 -vertex group of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, so that again V is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$. Thus each V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, as required.

It remains to show that each V_0 -vertex W of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$.

If W is isolated, let T denote an edge torus of W . As T is an edge torus of $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$, it crosses no torus in DG , and so is enclosed by some vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. Lemma 8.5 tells us that V_1 -vertices of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ are atoroidal, so it follows that T , and hence W , is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required.

If W is of special Seifert type, we let T denote the edge torus of W . Again T is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. As $G(W)$ contains T with index 2, it follows that W is enclosed by some vertex V' of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$. If V' is a V_1 -vertex, it follows that T is peripheral in both V and in V' . Now Lemma 2.7 shows that V' must be of special Seifert type. As no V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ can be of special Seifert type, V' must be obtained by doubling from a V_1 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. This implies that v must be of special solid torus type. As no V_1 -vertex of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ can be of special solid torus type,

it follows that V' is a V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ which encloses W , as required.

For the rest of this proof, we will assume that W is of $VPCn$ -by-Fuchsian type with normal $VPCn$ subgroup L . Thus Lemma 5.10 tells us that $G(W) = N_{DG}(L)$.

Let T denote the universal covering DG -tree of the graph of groups Δ determined by the doubling of G along ∂G . Thus Δ has two vertices with associated groups G and \overline{G} , and has edges corresponding to the groups in ∂G . We consider the actions of L and $G(W) = N_{DG}(L)$ on T , and the various cases which arise.

Case 1: L fixes a vertex z of T .

By a conjugation and possibly interchanging G and \overline{G} , we can assume that $G(z) = G$. In particular, $L \subset G$. Let T' denote the subtree of T consisting of all edges and vertices of T fixed by L . The action of $N_{DG}(L)$ on T must preserve T' .

Case 1a): $T' = \{z\}$.

Thus $N_{DG}(L)$ fixes z . This implies that $N_{DG}(L) \subset G$. In particular, any torus enclosed by W is also enclosed by the vertex U of Δ with associated group G . As W is filled by crossing tori, it follows that W itself is enclosed by U , and hence that W is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex Z of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$. Let \overline{Z} denote the corresponding V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, so that \overline{Z} is either equal to Z or obtained by doubling Z . In either case, W is enclosed by \overline{Z} , as required.

Case 1b): z has valence 1 in T' .

This implies that there are no essential annuli in $(G, \partial G)$ which carry L , and the same holds for \overline{G} . Thus every vertex of T' has valence 1 in T' , which implies that T' is equal to a single edge e of T . As $N_{DG}(L)$ preserves T' and cannot interchange the ends of e , we deduce that $N_{DG}(L)$ fixes e . Now the stabilizer of e is a group K in ∂G and so is an orientable $PD(n+1)$ group, and $N_{DG}(L)$ contains a torus subgroup Σ which is also $PD(n+1)$. It follows that Σ has finite index in K , so that K is $VPC(n+1)$, and hence also a torus. Hence W must be isolated, contradicting our assumption.

Case 1c): z has valence 2 in T' .

This implies that all vertices of T' have valence 2 in T' , so that T' is a line. As $N_{DG}(L)$ preserves this line, it follows that there is a map from $N_{DG}(L)$ to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ whose kernel K fixes every point of T' . Note that $N_{DG}(L) \cap G = N_G(L)$. In the first case, $N_G(L)$ equals K , and in the second case, $N_G(L)$ contains K with index 2. As L fixes only two edges of T incident to z , there is a unique essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ which carries L . It follows

that there is a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$, such that $G(v) = N_G(L)$, and that v is isolated or of special solid torus type, with a single incident edge carrying a subgroup of index 2. Let V denote the V_0 -vertex of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ obtained by doubling v . Then $G(V)$ contains $N_G(L)$, and contains an element which acts on T' by a translation of length 2. Hence $G(V)$ is equal to $G(W)$. In particular, W is enclosed by the V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required.

Case 1d): z has valence at least 3 in T' .

As L fixes three distinct edges of T incident to z , it follows that there are three distinct annuli in $(G, \partial G)$ whose boundaries carry L . Hence there is a V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of special solid torus type or of commensuriser type, such that $G(v) = \text{Comm}_G(L) = N_G(L) = N_{DG}(L) \cap G$. Hence for each edge e of T' incident to v , with stabilizer S , we have $N_{DG}(L) \cap S = G(v) \cap S$. Let V denote the double of v , so that $G(V) \subset N_{DG}(L) = G(W)$. The quotient of T' by $G(V)$ has two vertices, so the same holds for the quotient of T' by $G(W)$. As both groups act on T' with the same edge and vertex stabilizers, it follows that $G(V) = G(W)$. In particular, W is enclosed by the V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required.

Case 2: L fixes no vertex of T .

In this case, there is a unique minimal L -subtree Λ of T . As L is VPC , Lemma 1.10 tells us that Λ is a line. The uniqueness of Λ implies that $N_{DG}(L)$ preserves Λ . As in Case 1c), there is a map from $N_{DG}(L)$ to \mathbb{Z} or to $\mathbb{Z}_2 * \mathbb{Z}_2$ whose kernel K fixes every point of Λ . And $N_{DG}(L) \cap G$ is either equal to K or contains K with index 2. As $G(W) = N_{DG}(L)$, we know that any torus Σ enclosed by W must intersect L in a subgroup of finite index in L . Hence the $VPC(n+1)$ group Σ acts on Λ , and $\Sigma \cap K$ is a $VPCn$ subgroup of Σ which fixes the vertex z and preserves the two edges of Λ incident to z . This determines an essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ which carries $\Sigma \cap K$. Every torus enclosed by W determines an essential annulus in $(G, \partial G)$ preserving the same two edges of Λ incident to z . As W is not isolated or of special Seifert type, there are infinitely many distinct such annuli, so that $N_{DG}(L) \cap G = G(v)$, for some V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ of I -bundle type. Let V be obtained by doubling v . As $G(V)$ contains $N_{DG}(L) \cap G$ and acts on Λ by a translation of length 2, it follows that $G(V) = G(W)$. In particular, W is enclosed by the V_0 -vertex V of $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$, as required. \square

The machinery which we have just developed can be used to give simple proofs of some other results. For example, we have the following result.

Theorem 8.8. *Let $(G, \partial G)$ be an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that G is*

not *VPC*. Let \mathcal{F} denote the family of all essential annuli in $(G, \partial G)$, and let \mathcal{F}_n denote the family of equivalence classes of all nontrivial almost invariant subsets of G which are over a *VPC* $_n$ subgroup. Then $\Gamma(\mathcal{F} : G)$, the algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F} in G , is equal to $\Gamma_n(G)$, the algebraic regular neighbourhood of \mathcal{F}_n in G .

Proof. An essential annulus A in $(G, \partial G)$ is enclosed by some V_0 -vertex v of $\Gamma_n(G)$. The discussion in this section shows that if v is of I -bundle type, then A determines a loop in the base orbifold of v , and if v is of commensuriser type, then A determines an arc in the base orbifold of v . Further this yields a bijection between equivalence classes of annuli in $(G, \partial G)$ and loops and arcs in base orbifolds of V_0 -vertices of $\Gamma_n(G)$. As any compact 2-orbifold is filled by essential (possibly singular) loops, and is also filled by essential (possibly singular) arcs, it follows that $\Gamma(\mathcal{F} : G)$ is equal to $\Gamma_n(G)$, as required. \square

9 Concluding remarks and problems

In this section, we briefly discuss some problems which arise from our work in this paper.

In the previous section, we showed, in Theorem 8.6, that if $(G, \partial G)$ is an orientable $PD(n+2)$ pair, such that G is not *VPC*, then the double $D\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c$ of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ is equal to the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$ of DG . This precisely mirrors the situation in 3-manifold theory. But in that theory, one can deduce the JSJ decomposition theorem for 3-manifolds with boundary from the corresponding result for closed manifolds by "undoubling". This is a great simplification of the direct proofs. Our first problem is to decide whether an analogous argument is possible in the setting of $PD(n+2)$ pairs.

Problem 9.1. *Can the main result of this paper, Theorem 3.14, be deduced from the properties of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n+1}^c(DG)$ of DG , by some "undoubling" argument?*

Our main result in this paper, Theorem 3.14, shows that the situation for $PD(n+2)$ pairs is very similar to that for 3-manifolds with boundary. Now in 3-manifold theory, the characteristic submanifold of a Haken 3-manifold has the enclosing property for Seifert pairs. Thus it is reasonable to ask the following.

Problem 9.2. *Do our results in this paper imply a result for $PD3$ pairs analogous to the enclosing property for Seifert pairs in 3-manifolds.*

This is Conjecture 10.4 of Wall's survey article [34]. However we are unable to answer this question. Even a precise formulation of the statement requires a theory of Poincaré duality triads, and/or of Poincaré duality pairs with compressible boundary, neither of which has been developed so far.

Since one of the main results in the JSJ theory of 3-manifolds is Johannson's Deformation Theorem [8], it is natural to ask the following.

Problem 9.3. *Is there a result for Poincaré duality pairs which is analogous to Johannson's Deformation Theorem?*

Some of our discussion and definitions have been rather topological in order to suit the setting of group pairs and duality. A more algebraic description of the decomposition $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ should involve Poincaré duality triads rather than pairs, since a vertex group of $\Gamma_{n,n+1}^c(G)$ has two distinct important types of subgroups, namely the edge groups and the intersection groups with ∂G . We feel that a reformulation in these terms and a strengthening of the statements would be necessary in order to formulate the analogue of Johannson's Deformation Theorem. In [33], Wall studied the notion of triads of Poincaré complexes. It is natural to ask whether our algebraic decompositions can be realised using finite aspherical Poincaré complexes. Suppose that G is the fundamental group of such a complex X of dimension $n + 2$ and that G splits over a $VPCn$ group H . A basic question is whether X splits over a subcomplex Y with $\pi_1(Y) = H$. One expects to have to change the complex X to achieve this, so it seems better to ask whether there is a finite complex X' of the same simple homotopy type as X , such that X' splits over a suitable subcomplex Y . This involves the study of some obstruction groups most studied by Waldhausen [32]. For a general torsion free $VPCn$ group H , these obstruction groups are not well understood, so the problem seems difficult. But if we assume that H is torsion free and polycyclic, then Waldhausen's work shows that the obstruction groups are zero, so that we can find such a complex X' as desired. However, even if we try to restrict our attention to almost invariant subsets of G over torsion free polycyclic subgroups, it seems possible that the edge groups of the decompositions we obtain may be VPC . If the edge groups are polycyclic, as happens in the 3-dimensional case, then the analogue of Johannson's Deformation Theorem can be formulated. We expect this analogue to be correct for 3-dimensional Poincaré duality pairs, and finite aspherical Poincaré 3-complexes. In general it may be true only when the peripheral groups are polycyclic.

References

- [1] R. Bieri and B. Eckmann, Relative homology and Poincaré duality for group pairs, *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 13 (1978), 277–319.
- [2] B. H. Bowditch, Splittings of finitely generated groups over two-ended subgroups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 354 (2002), no. 3, 1049–1078.
- [3] K. S. Brown, *Cohomology of groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 87, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.
- [4] F. Castel, Centralisateurs dans les groupes à dualité de Poincaré de dimension 3, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 338 (2004), no. 12, 935–940.
- [5] R. Geoghegan, *Topological methods in group theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 243 (Springer, New York, 2008).
- [6] V. Guirardel, P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Adapted almost invariant sets and splittings of groups, preprint.
- [7] W. Jaco and P. B. Shalen, Seifert fibered spaces in 3–manifolds, *Memoirs of Amer. Math. Soc.* vol. 21, Number 220 (1979).
- [8] K. Johannson, *Homotopy equivalences of 3–manifolds with boundary*, Lecture notes in Mathematics 761 (Springer-Verlag, 1979).
- [9] M. Kapovich and B. Kleiner, Coarse Alexander duality and duality groups, *J. Differential Geom.* 69 (2005), no. 2, 279–352.
- [10] S. P. Kerckhoff, The Nielsen realization problem, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 117 (1983), no. 2, 235–265.
- [11] P. H. Kropholler, An analogue of the torus decomposition theorem for certain Poincaré duality groups, *Proc. London. Math. Soc.* (3) 60 (1990), 503–529.
- [12] P. H. Kropholler, A note on centrality in 3–manifold groups, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* 107 (1990), no. 2, 261–266.
- [13] P. H. Kropholler and M. A. Roller, Relative ends and duality groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 61 (1989), 197–210.

- [14] P. H. Kropholler and M. A. Roller, Splittings of Poincaré duality groups II, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) 38 (1988), no. 3, 410–420.
- [15] P. H. Kropholler and M. A. Roller, Remarks on a theorem of Swarup on ends of pairs of groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 109 (1996), no. 1, 107–110.
- [16] G. Mess, Examples of Poincaré duality groups, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 110 (1990), no. 4, 1145–1146.
- [17] H. Müller, Decomposition theorems for group pairs, *Math. Z.* 176 (1981), 223–246.
- [18] W. D. Neumann and G. A. Swarup, Canonical decompositions of 3-manifolds, *Geom. Topol.* 1 (1997), 21–40.
- [19] G. A. Niblo, M. Sageev, P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Minimal cubings, *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 15 (2005), no. 2, 343–366.
- [20] P. Scott, Strong annulus and torus theorems and the enclosing property of characteristic submanifolds of 3-manifolds, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* (2) 35 (1984), 485–506.
- [21] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Splittings of groups and intersection numbers, *Geometry and Topology* 4 (2000), 179–218.
- [22] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Regular neighbourhoods and canonical decompositions for groups, *Astérisque* 289 (2003). vi+233 pages.
- [23] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, appendix to V. Guirardel, P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Adapted almost invariant sets and splittings of groups, preprint.
- [24] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Canonical splittings of groups and 3-manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 353 (2001), 4973–5001.
- [25] P. Scott and G. A. Swarup, Annulus-Torus decompositions for Poincaré duality pairs, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0703890>.
- [26] P. Scott and C. T. C. Wall, Topological methods in group theory, *Homological Group Theory*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series 36 (1979), 137–214.

- [27] J. R. Stallings, On torsion-free groups with infinitely many ends, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 88 (1968), 312–334.
- [28] J. R. Stallings, *Group theory and three-dimensional manifolds*, Yale Mathematical Monographs 4, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1971.
- [29] R. Strebel, A remark on subgroups of infinite index in Poincaré duality groups, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 52 (1977), no. 3, 317–324.
- [30] G. A. Swarup, On the ends of pairs of groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 87 (1993), no. 1, 93–96.
- [31] F. Waldhausen, On the determination of some bounded 3-manifolds by their fundamental groups alone, *Proc. of the International symposium on Topology and its applications*, Here's-Novi, Yugoslavia, Beograd, 1969, 331–332.
- [32] F. Waldhausen, Whitehead groups of generalized free products, *Algebraic K-theory, II: "Classical" algebraic K-theory and connections with arithmetic* (Proc. Conf., Battelle Memorial Inst., Seattle, Wash., 1972), pp. 155–179, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Vol. 342, Springer, Berlin, (1973).
- [33] C. T. C. Wall, Poincaré complexes I, *Ann. of Math. (2)* 86 (1967), 213–245.
- [34] C. T. C. Wall, The geometry of abstract groups and their splittings, *Rev. Mat. Complut.* 16 (2003), no. 1, 5–101.