

# HOROCYCLIC PRODUCTS OF TREES

LAURENT BARTHOLDI, MARKUS NEUHAUSER AND WOLFGANG WOESS

ABSTRACT. Let  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  be homogeneous trees with degrees  $q_1 + 1, \dots, q_d + 1 \geq 3$ , respectively. For each tree, let  $\mathfrak{h} : T_j \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the Busemann function with respect to a fixed boundary point (end). Its level sets are the horocycles. The horocyclic product of  $T_1, \dots, T_d$  is the graph  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  consisting of all  $d$ -tuples  $x_1 \cdots x_d \in T_1 \times \cdots \times T_d$  with  $\mathfrak{h}(x_1) + \cdots + \mathfrak{h}(x_d) = 0$ , equipped with a natural neighbourhood relation. In the present paper, we explore the geometric, algebraic, analytic and probabilistic properties of these graphs and their isometry groups. If  $d = 2$  and  $q_1 = q_2 = q$  then we obtain a Cayley graph of the lamplighter group (wreath product)  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $d = 3$  and  $q_1 = q_2 = q_3 = q$  then DL is the Cayley graph of a finitely presented group into which the lamplighter group embeds naturally. Also when  $d \geq 4$  and  $q_1 = \cdots = q_d = q$  is such that each prime power in the decomposition of  $q$  is larger than  $d - 1$ , we show that DL is a Cayley graph of a finitely presented group. This group is of type  $F_{d-1}$ , but not  $F_d$ . It is not automatic, but it is an automata group in most cases. On the other hand, when the  $q_j$  do not all coincide,  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is a vertex-transitive graph, but is not the Cayley graph of a finitely generated group. Indeed, it does not even admit a group action with finitely many orbits and finite point stabilizers. The  $\ell^2$ -spectrum of the “simple random walk” operator on DL is always pure point. When  $d = 2$ , it is known explicitly from previous work, while for  $d = 3$  we compute it explicitly. Finally, we determine the Poisson boundary of a large class of group-invariant random walks on DL. It coincides with a part of the geometric boundary of DL.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Isometry groups	5
3. Cayley graphs	11
4. The DL complex	17
5. The spectrum of simple random walk	24
6. The Poisson boundary of random walk	35
7. Outlook	40
References	41

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X$  be a locally finite, infinite, connected graph. We write  $x \sim y$  if  $x, y$  are neighbours (connected by an edge), and  $\deg(x)$  for the number of neighbours of  $x$ . We assume that  $X$  has no loops, that is,  $x \not\sim x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Suppose that  $X$  is written as a disjoint union of non-empty sets  $H_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  (the *horocycles*), where each element in  $H_k$  has neighbours both in  $H_{k-1}$  and in  $H_{k+1}$ , but none in any other  $H_l$ . (This condition is tailored to our purposes and can be generalized.) The associated surjection  $\mathfrak{h} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathfrak{h}(x) = k$  if  $x \in H_k$ , is a graph homomorphism of  $X$  onto the two-way-infinite path  $\mathbb{Z}$ . We call it

---

*Date:* 23 January 2007.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C50, 20E22, 47A10, 60B15.

*Key words and phrases.* restricted wreath product, trees, horocycles, Diestel-Leader graph, growth function, normal form, Markov operator, spectrum.

Supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund) project P15577.

a *Busemann function*, although this terminology is justified completely only in specific cases (see below), and we say that  $(X, \mathfrak{h})$  is a *Busemann pair*. Now let  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  be a family of such graphs with associated Busemann functions  $\mathfrak{h} : X_j \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  (we use the same symbol  $\mathfrak{h}$  for each of them). Then their *horocyclic product* is

$$(1.1) \quad \prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} X_j = \{x_1 \cdots x_d \in X_1 \times \cdots \times X_d : \mathfrak{h}(x_1) + \cdots + \mathfrak{h}(x_d) = 0\}$$

with neighbourhood

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & x_1 \cdots x_d \sim y_1 \cdots y_d \iff \\ & \text{there are } i \neq j \text{ such that } x_i \sim y_i, x_j \sim y_j \text{ and } x_k = y_k \text{ for all } k \neq i, j. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, one must have  $\mathfrak{h}(x_i) - \mathfrak{h}(y_i) = \mathfrak{h}(y_j) - \mathfrak{h}(x_j) = \pm 1$ . Thus,  $x = x_1 \cdots x_d \mapsto \mathfrak{H}(x) = (\mathfrak{h}(x_1), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(x_d))$  is a graph homomorphism of  $\prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} X_j$  onto the simplicial lattice  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1} = \{\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : k_1 + \cdots + k_d = 0\}$ . In the latter lattice, two points are neighbours if they differ by a vector  $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$ , where  $i \neq j$  and  $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  is the unit vector with a 1 in its  $i$ -th coordinate.

There is an analogous construction for groups, compare with KAIMANOVICH AND WOESS [32, p. 356]. Let  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_d$  be topological (e.g. in particular, discrete) groups, each one equipped with a continuous homomorphism  $\mathfrak{h} : \Gamma_j \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  (or  $\rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ; we again use the same symbol  $\mathfrak{h}$  for each of them). Then their horocyclic product is

$$(1.3) \quad \prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} \Gamma_j = \{g_1 \cdots g_d \in \Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_d : \mathfrak{h}(g_1) + \cdots + \mathfrak{h}(g_d) = 0\},$$

which is a closed subgroup of the direct product of the  $\Gamma_j$ . For finitely generated groups  $\Gamma_j$ , this kind of construction was used for example by BESTVINA AND BRADY [6]. However, our approach has a different “history”, and below, the groups will be non-discrete isometry groups of homogeneous trees. Here, horocyclic products of groups will arise as isometry (automorphism) groups of horocyclic products of graphs.

If  $(X_1, \mathfrak{h})$  and  $(X_2, \mathfrak{h})$  are two Busemann pairs, then a *Busemann isometry*  $g$  from the former to the latter is a graph isomorphism  $g : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  such that  $x_1 \mapsto \mathfrak{h}(gx_1) - \mathfrak{h}(x_1)$  is constant. We write  $\mathfrak{h}(g)$  for this constant. The group  $\text{Aut}(X, \mathfrak{h})$  of a given Busemann pair  $(X, \mathfrak{h})$  consists of all Busemann isometries  $X \rightarrow X$ . Given  $(X_j, \mathfrak{h})$  as above ( $j = 1, \dots, d$ ), the group  $\prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} \text{Aut}(X_j, \mathfrak{h})$  acts on  $\prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} X_j$  by graph isometries via

$$(1.4) \quad gx = (g_1 x_1) \cdots (g_d x_d), \quad \text{where } g = g_1 \cdots g_d \quad \text{and} \quad x = x_1 \cdots x_d.$$

There are many examples of Busemann pairs, as well as generalizations of the definition. Some of them will be outlined in the final §7.

The basic example of a Busemann pair arises when the underlying graph is a *tree*  $T$ , that is, a connected graph without cycles, where  $2 \leq \deg(x) < \infty$  for every vertex  $x$ . There are several choices (one for each element in the boundary of the tree, see below) to equip the edge set of  $T$  with an orientation such that each vertex  $x$  has a unique *predecessor*  $x^-$  and  $\deg(x) - 1$  successors  $y \in T$  such that  $y^- = x$ . Then it is easily understood that in the induced half-order, the *ancestor relation*  $\preceq$ , any two vertices  $x, y \in T$  have a

greatest common ancestor  $x \wedge y$ . If  $o \in T$  is a reference vertex (origin), then we define  $\mathfrak{h}(x) = d(x, o \wedge x) - d(o, o \wedge x)$ , where  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the usual graph metric; compare, e.g., with the seminal paper of CARTIER [17]. Then  $(T, \mathfrak{h})$  is *the* typical example of a Busemann pair.

In the present paper, we shall deal with *homogeneous* trees  $T = \mathbb{T}_q$ , where each vertex has degree  $q + 1$  ( $q \geq 2$ ). In this case, the horocyclic structure (i.e., the ancestor relation) is unique up to isomorphism. We write  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  for the horocyclic product of the trees  $T_1 = \mathbb{T}_{q_1}, \dots, T_d = \mathbb{T}_{q_d}$ . The “DL” stands for DIESTEL AND LEADER, who were the first [23] to introduce the graph  $\text{DL}(2, 3)$  in attempt to answer a question raised by WOESS [44, 41]: “is there a locally finite vertex-transitive graph which is not quasi-isometric with a Cayley graph of some finitely generated group?” A very recent paper by ESKIN, FISHER AND WHYTE [25] confirms that the graphs  $\text{DL}(q_1, q_2)$  for  $q_1 \neq q_2$  are such examples. (Recall that a graph is called vertex-transitive if its isometry group acts transitively on the vertex set. Recall also that being quasi-isometric — see §3.B for the definition — is far more general than being isometric.)

The purpose of this paper is to present a picture of many interesting features of the graphs  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ .

In §2, we first recall in more detail the horocyclic structure of the homogeneous tree  $\mathbb{T}_q$  and the group  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q) = \text{Aut}(\mathbb{T}_q, \mathfrak{h})$  of all its Busemann self-isometries. This group has been called the *affine group* of the tree by analogy with the affine group over  $\mathbb{R}$  acting on the hyperbolic upper half plane. We determine the full isometry group  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})$  of  $\text{DL} = \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ . We prove that it is a finite extension of the group  $\mathcal{A} = \prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} \text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_j})$ . The group  $\mathcal{A}$  acts transitively on  $\text{DL}$  and is *amenable* as a locally compact, totally disconnected group with the topology of pointwise convergence.

If the  $q_j$  do not all coincide, we show that the group  $\mathcal{A}$  is also *non-unimodular* (i.e., the left Haar measure is not right-invariant). Consequently, by a theorem of SOARDI AND WOESS [41], the graph  $\text{DL}$  is *non-amenable*, i.e., it satisfies a strong isoperimetric inequality (the Cheeger inequality). We also conclude that  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})$  cannot have a cocompact lattice, that is, there is no discrete (closed) subgroup that acts on  $\text{DL}$  with finitely many orbits. In particular, if the  $q_j$  do not all coincide, then  $\text{DL}$  is vertex-transitive, but is not the Cayley graph of a finitely generated group.

In §3, we study  $\text{DL}_d(q) = \text{DL}(q, \dots, q)$ , the horocyclic product of  $d$  copies of  $\mathbb{T}_q$ . We use an approach that is reminiscent of the method for constructing lattices in Lie groups over local fields, as outlined on the first page of the book by MARGULIS [35]. When  $q = p_1 \cdots p_r$  is the factorization of  $q$  as a product of prime powers, and  $p_\iota \geq d - 1$  for all  $\iota \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , the graph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is the Cayley graph of a group of affine matrices over a ring of Laurent polynomials whose coefficients come from a suitable finite ring. There is some degree of freedom in the choice of the ring of coefficients. When  $d = 2$  or  $d = 3$ , we can take the ring  $\mathfrak{Z}_q = \mathbb{Z}/(q\mathbb{Z})$  of integers modulo  $q$ , and for  $d = 2$  this is a way to describe the lamplighter group  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$ , while for  $d = 3$  we obtain a finitely presented group into which the lamplighter group embeds. This group has appeared in previous work by BAUMSLAG [5] and others. The graph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is *quasi-isometric* with  $\text{DL}_d(q^s)$

for every  $s \geq 1$ , so  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is always quasi-isometric with the Cayley graph of a finitely generated group. On the other hand, [23] and [25] suggest that the vertex-transitive graph  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is not quasi-isometric with any Cayley graph when the  $q_j$  do not all coincide.

In §4, we consider  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  as a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional cell complex and explore its homotopy type, which is that of a union of countably many  $(d-1)$ -spheres glued together at a single point. This should be compared with a deep theorem of BESTVINA AND BRADY [6]. Thus, when DL is the Cayley graph of a group, then this group is of type  $F_{d-1}$ , but not of type  $F_d$ , and in particular it is finitely presented when  $d \geq 3$ . We deduce that, for each  $d$ , the lamplighter group can be embedded in a metabelian group of type  $F_d$ . In general, it is known [10] that every metabelian group embeds in a metabelian group of type  $F_3$ , while embeddability in  $F_d$  for larger  $d$  is conjectured.

In §5, we turn our attention to a more analytic-probabilistic object. The *simple random walk* on any locally finite, connected graph  $X$  is the Markov chain whose transition matrix  $P = (p(x, y))_{x, y \in X}$  is given by

$$(1.5) \quad p(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1/\deg(x), & \text{if } y \sim x, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$P$  acts on functions  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(1.6) \quad Pf(x) = \sum_y p(x, y)f(y).$$

In our case,  $\deg(\cdot) = (d-1)(q_1 + \dots + q_d)$  is constant, and we are interested in the *spectrum* of  $P$  on the space  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$  of all square-summable complex functions on DL. The spectral radius  $\rho(P)$  is equal to 1 if and only if  $q_1 = \dots = q_d$ . As a set,  $\text{spec}(P)$  is an interval contained in  $[-\rho(P)/(d-1), \rho(P)]$  and, with the exception of a “degenerate” case, it coincides with it. In particular, for  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  the spectrum of  $P$  is the same as the spectrum of  $P$ 's projection to the lattice  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$ . This last spectrum is absolutely continuous. On the other hand, for arbitrary  $q_1, \dots, q_d$ , the spectrum of  $P$  on  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is *pure point*: there is an orthonormal basis of  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$  that consists of finitely supported eigenfunctions of  $P$ . This extends previous results regarding the lamplighter group and the basic Diestel-Leader graphs  $\text{DL}(q_1, q_2)$ , see GRIGORCHUK AND ŽUK [29], DICKS AND SCHICK [22] and BARTHOLDI AND WOESS [3]. For the case  $d = 2$ , the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions were computed explicitly in those references. Here, we present explicit computations for  $d = 3$  and  $\text{DL}_3(q)$ , while the general case seems intractable (except numerically).

Finally, in §6, we study the general class of random walk on DL whose transition matrix is irreducible, invariant under the group  $\mathcal{A}$ , and has finite first moment. Using results of CARTWRIGHT, KAIMANOVICH AND WOESS [19] and BROFFERIO [12] concerning random walks on  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$ , we show that those random walks on DL converge almost surely to the geometric boundary of DL. This boundary is the ideal boundary added to DL when considering the closure of DL in  $\prod_i \widehat{T}_i$ , where  $\widehat{T}_i$  is the well-known *end compactification* of  $T_i$ . We then use the *ray criterion* of KAIMANOVICH, see [32], to prove that the active part of the boundary (i.e., the support of the limit distribution of the random walk) is

the “largest possible” model for distinguishing limit points of the random walk: it is the *Poisson boundary*.

## 2. ISOMETRY GROUPS

We start with a picture of the homogeneous tree  $\mathbb{T}_2$  in horocyclic layers, since it will be useful throughout the paper to keep this description in mind. Note that the negative direction is “upwards” in the picture.




Figure 1

Along with that picture comes a more detailed description of the geometry of  $T = \mathbb{T}_q$ .

Any pair of vertices  $x$  and  $y$  is connected by a unique *geodesic path*  $\overline{xy}$  whose length (number of edges) is the distance  $d(x, y)$ . A *geodesic ray* is a one-sided infinite geodesic path (isometric embedding of a half-line graph). Two rays are called equivalent, if their symmetric difference (as sets of vertices) is finite. An *end* of  $T$  is an equivalence class of rays. The boundary  $\partial T$  of  $T$  is the set of ends of  $T$ . For each  $\xi \in \partial T$  and each  $x \in T$  there is a unique geodesic ray  $\overline{x\xi}$  that represents  $\xi$  and starts with  $x$ . We choose an origin (root)  $o \in T$  and write  $|x| = d(x, o)$ . If  $w, z \in \widehat{T} = T \cup \partial T$  then their *confluent*  $c(w, z)$  is the last common element on  $\overline{ow}$  and  $\overline{oz}$ , a vertex of  $T$  unless  $w = z \in \partial T$ . With the ultrametric

$$\theta(w, z) = \begin{cases} q^{-|c(w, z)|}, & \text{if } w \neq z \\ 0, & \text{if } w = z, \end{cases}$$

$\widehat{T}$  becomes a compact space.

We now select an end  $\omega \in \partial T$  and write  $\partial^* T = \partial T \setminus \{\omega\}$ . Given  $\omega$ , we can define the predecessor  $x^-$  of  $x \in T$  as the neighbour of  $T$  that lies on  $\overline{x\omega}$ . Thus, the ancestor

relation is

$$(2.1) \quad x \preceq y \iff x \in \overline{y\omega},$$

and for  $x, y$  in general position,  $x \wedge y$  is the greatest common ancestor. We write  $\mathbf{u}(x, y) = d(x, x \wedge y)$ . Then the horocycle index of  $x$  (the Busemann function with respect to  $\omega$ ) is

$$\mathfrak{h}(x) = \mathbf{u}(x, o) - \mathbf{u}(o, x),$$

and the  $k$ -th horocycle is  $H_k = \{x \in T : \mathfrak{h}(x) = k\}$ . In particular,

$$(2.2) \quad d(x, y) = \mathbf{u}(x, y) + \mathbf{u}(y, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathfrak{h}(y) = \mathbf{u}(x, y) - \mathbf{u}(y, x).$$

As in Figure 1, we can *label* the edges of  $T$  with the elements of  $\mathfrak{Z}_q$ , such that the edges between a vertex and its  $q$  successors carry distinct labels, and such that on the geodesic from any vertex to  $\omega$ , only finitely many labels are non-zero. This labelling will be used several times in the sequel.

For  $T = \mathbb{T}_q$ , its *affine group*  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$  is the stabilizer of  $\omega$  in  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{T}_q)$ . It is an amenable and non-unimodular closed subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{T}_q)$  that acts transitively on  $\mathbb{T}_q$ , and all its elements are Busemann isometries. We have  $\mathfrak{h}(g) = \mathfrak{h}(go)$  for  $g \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$ . See CARTWRIGHT, KAIMANOVICH AND WOESS [19] for more details about the structure of  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$ .

We shall need some basic facts about the modular function of an isometry group of a locally finite graph  $X$  which is closed with respect to pointwise convergence. For more details, see TROFIMOV [43] and WOESS [44]. If  $\Gamma \leq \text{Aut}(X)$  is such a group, and  $x \in X$ , then  $\Gamma_x$  denotes the stabilizer of  $x$  in  $\Gamma$ , while  $\Gamma x$  is the orbit of  $x$  under  $\Gamma$ . Since  $\Gamma$  is locally compact, it carries a left Haar measure  $dg$ . The modular function  $\Delta$  on  $\Gamma$  is the unique multiplicative homomorphism  $\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  which satisfies

$$\Delta(g_0) \int_{\Gamma} f(gg_0) dg = \int_{\Gamma} f(g) dg$$

for every  $g_0 \in \Gamma$  and every continuous, compactly supported function  $f$  on  $\Gamma$ . Inserting for  $f$  the indicator function of  $\Gamma_x$  (which is an open, compact subgroup of  $\Gamma$ ), one finds the formula

$$(2.3) \quad \Delta(g) = |\Gamma_x(gx)| / |\Gamma_{gx}x|$$

for  $g \in \Gamma$  and for arbitrary  $x \in X$ , where  $|\Gamma_x y|$  is the (finite) number of elements in the  $\Gamma_x$ -orbit of  $y$ ; see e.g. [43, 44]. In particular, one has the following.

**(2.4) Lemma.** *If  $\Gamma$  acts transitively on  $X$  then  $\Gamma$  is unimodular if and only if  $|\Gamma_x y| = |\Gamma_y x|$  for some ( $\iff$  every)  $x \in X$  and all its neighbours  $y$ .*

In the sequel, we fix integers  $q_1, \dots, q_d \geq 2$ , and write  $o_j$  for the origin of  $T_j = \mathbb{T}_{q_j}$ , while the symbol  $o$  will be used for the origin  $o = o_1 \cdots o_d$  of  $\text{DL} = \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ . If  $x, y \in \text{DL}$ , then we say that a neighbour  $y$  of  $x$  has *type*  $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$ , if  $y_i^- = x_i$  and  $y_j = x_j^-$ . In this case,  $x$  is a neighbour with type  $\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i$  of  $y$ . We write  $N_{i,j}(x)$  for the set of neighbours with type  $\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i$  of  $x$ .

**(2.5) Proposition.** *The group*

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(q_1, \dots, q_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h} \operatorname{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_j})$$

*acts transitively on  $\operatorname{DL} = \operatorname{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  by (1.4). It is amenable. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{A}$  is unimodular if and only if  $q_1 = \dots = q_d$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x = x_1 \cdots x_d$  be in  $\operatorname{DL}$ . Then there are  $g_j \in \operatorname{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_j})$  such that  $g_j o_j = x_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Setting  $g = g_1 \cdots g_d$  as in (1.4), we get  $g \in \mathcal{A}$ , since  $\sum_j \mathfrak{h}(g_j) = \sum_j \mathfrak{h}(x_j) = 0$ . Thus,  $go = x$ , and the action is transitive. Amenability of  $\mathcal{A}$  follows from the fact that it is a closed subgroup of the direct product of the locally compact amenable groups  $\operatorname{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_j})$ .

Regarding unimodularity, let  $x$  be in  $\operatorname{DL}$ . By construction,  $\mathcal{A}_x$  must map every neighbour  $y$  of  $x$  of type  $\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i$  to a neighbour of  $x$  of the same type, and every permutation of this type can be achieved. Now  $x$  has exactly  $q_j$  neighbours of type  $\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i$ . Therefore,  $|\mathcal{A}_x y| = q_j$ , and (by exchanging  $x \leftrightarrow y$  and  $i \leftrightarrow j$ )  $|\mathcal{A}_y x| = q_i$ . If we vary  $i, j$  ( $i \neq j$ ) and apply Lemma 2.4, then we see that our group is unimodular if and only if all  $q_j$  coincide.  $\square$

Besides the elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ , there may be further isometries of  $\operatorname{DL}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  be the group of all permutations  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $q_{\sigma(j)} = q_j$  for all  $j$ . Then  $\mathfrak{S}$  acts on  $\operatorname{DL}$  by

$$(2.6) \quad \sigma x = x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)} \cdots x_{\sigma^{-1}(d)},$$

that is,  $\sigma$  permutes identical trees in the horocyclic product. Thus,  $\mathfrak{S}$  also acts on  $\mathcal{A}$  by group automorphisms  $(\sigma, g) \mapsto g^\sigma = \sigma g \sigma^{-1}$ . If all  $q_j$  are distinct, then  $\mathfrak{S}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is of course trivial. We shall prove the following.

**(2.7) Theorem.** *The full isometry group of  $\operatorname{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is the semidirect product of  $\mathfrak{S}$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to the action  $(\sigma, g) \mapsto g^\sigma$ ,*

$$\operatorname{Aut}(\operatorname{DL}) = \mathfrak{S} \ltimes \mathcal{A}.$$

*Thus,  $\operatorname{Aut}(\operatorname{DL})$  is amenable, and it is unimodular if and only if all  $q_i$  coincide.*

For the proof, we need a description of the (graph-theoretical) *link*  $N(x)$  of a vertex  $x \in \operatorname{DL}$ , that is, the subgraph of  $\operatorname{DL}$  spanned by the neighbours of  $x$ . Under the graph homomorphism  $\mathfrak{H} : \operatorname{DL} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{d-1}$ , where  $\mathfrak{H}(x) = \mathbf{k} = (\mathfrak{h}(x_1), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(x_d))$ , the link  $N(x)$  maps onto the link  $N(\mathbf{k})$  in the lattice  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$ . This last link has  $(d-1)$ -cliques (complete graphs on  $d-1$  vertices) as its building blocks. Namely, for  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , write

$$S_i^+(\mathbf{k}) = \{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j : j \neq i\} \quad \text{and} \quad S_i^-(\mathbf{k}) = \{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i : j \neq i\}.$$

Each of those spans a complete subgraph of  $N(\mathbf{k})$ . We have  $N(\mathbf{k}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^d S_i^+(\mathbf{k}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^d S_i^-(\mathbf{k})$ ,

$$S_i^+(\mathbf{k}) \cap S_j^+(\mathbf{k}) = S_i^-(\mathbf{k}) \cap S_j^-(\mathbf{k}) = \emptyset, \quad \text{and} \quad S_i^+(\mathbf{k}) \cap S_j^-(\mathbf{k}) = \{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j\} \quad (i \neq j).$$

We write  $S_i^\pm(x)$  for the set of all points in  $N(x)$  which are mapped to  $S_i^\pm(\mathbf{k})$  by  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Note that  $S_i^+(x) \cap S_j^-(x) = N_{i,j}(x)$ . The edges in  $N(x)$  are as follows.

(1) If  $y, z \in S_i^+(x)$  then there are  $j, k \neq i$  such that  $\mathfrak{H}(y) = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$  and  $\mathfrak{H}(z) = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_k$ . In this case, there is an edge between  $y$  and  $z$  if and only if  $j \neq k$  and  $y_i = z_i$ , in which case  $z$  is a neighbour of type  $\mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_k$  of  $y$  (i.e.,  $z_j^- = y_j$  and  $y_k^- = z_k$ ). Thus, the subgraph of  $N(x)$  that is mapped onto an edge in  $S_i^+(\mathbf{k})$  is the graph  $D(q_i, q_i)$  consisting of  $q_i$  independent edges with their endpoints; see Figure 2a.

(2) If  $y, z \in S_i^-(x)$  then there are  $j, k \neq i$  such that  $\mathfrak{H}(y) = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i$  and  $\mathfrak{H}(z) = \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_i$ . In this situation, there is an edge between  $y$  and  $z$  if and only if  $j \neq k$ ; furthermore,  $z$  is a neighbour of type  $\mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_j$  of  $y$  (i.e.,  $z_k^- = y_k$  and  $y_j^- = z_j$ ). Thus, the subgraph of  $N(x)$  that is mapped onto the edge  $[\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_j - \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_i]$  in  $S_i^+(\mathbf{k})$  is the complete bipartite graph  $K(q_j, q_k)$ ; see Figure 2b.




Figure 2a:  $D(3, 3)$ Figure 2b:  $K(2, 3)$ 

Figure 3a shows the link of a vertex of  $\text{DL}(2, 2, 3)$ . When  $d \geq 3$ , the link is connected. When  $d = 2$ , it consists of  $q_1 + q_2$  isolated points, and in this case, it will be more useful to consider the 2-link  $N_2(x)$  spanned by all points at distance 1 and 2 from  $x$ . Each of the  $q_1$  neighbours  $v$  of type  $\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2$  of  $x = x_1x_2$  is connected by an edge to each of the  $q_2 - 1$  points  $x_1y_2$ , where  $y_2 \neq x_2$  is a sibling of  $x_2$  in  $T_2$ , that is,  $y_2^- = x_2^-$ . In turn, there is an edge between each of those neighbours  $v$  of  $x$  and its  $q_1$  neighbours of the same type  $\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2$ . Exchanging the role of  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and  $\mathbf{e}_2$ , one finds the other part of  $N_2(x)$ . See Figure 3b, where we have also drawn the edges from  $x$  to its neighbours in dotted lines.

Figure 3a:  $N(x)$  in  $\text{DL}(2, 2, 3)$ Figure 3b:  $N_2(x)$  in  $\text{DL}(3, 2)$ 

**(2.8) Lemma.** *For every  $x \in \text{DL}$  and every  $g$  in the stabilizer  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})_x$  of  $x$ , there is  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$  such that for all  $i, j$  ( $i \neq j$ ), we have  $gN_{i,j}(x) = N_{\sigma^{-1}(i), \sigma^{-1}(j)}(x)$ .*

*Proof.* Our  $g$  acts as a graph isometry on  $N(x)$ , and also on  $N_2(x)$ . If  $d = 2$  (see Figure 3b) then  $g$  must permute the two connected components of  $N_2(x)$ . This permutation must be trivial unless  $q_1 = q_2$ . Thus, the statement follows when  $d = 2$ .

If  $d \geq 3$ , then by the above, each  $S_i^-(x)$  is a complete  $(d - 1)$ -partite subgraph of  $N(x)$ . That is, its vertex set is partitioned into the sets  $N_{j,i}(x)$  having cardinality  $q_j$ ,



$j \neq i$ , such that every pair of vertices in  $N_{j,i}(x) \times N_{k,i}(x)$ ,  $k \neq j$ , is connected by an edge, while there are no edges between different vertices within each  $N_{j,i}(x)$ . Also,  $S_i^-(x)$  is a *maximal* complete  $(d-1)$ -partite subgraph of  $N(x)$  (i.e., it is not contained in any bigger complete  $(d-1)$ -partite subgraph). This property must be preserved by isometries of  $N(x)$ , and  $gS_i^-(x)$  must again be a maximal complete  $(d-1)$ -partite subgraph of  $N(x)$ , whose  $d-1$  classes must have the same cardinalities  $q_j$  as the sets  $N_{i,j}(x)$ ,  $j \neq i$ . Thus, there is a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $gS_i^-(x) = S_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}^-(x)$ , and from  $|\{j \neq i : q_j = q_i\}| = |\{k \neq \sigma^{-1}(i) : q_k = q_i\}|$  we deduce  $q_i = q_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}$  for each  $i$ . Therefore,  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ .

For each  $j \neq i$ , we must have  $gN_{j,i}(x) = N_{k,\sigma^{-1}(i)}(x)$  and  $gN_{i,j}(x) = N_{l,\sigma^{-1}(j)}(x)$  for some  $k \neq \sigma^{-1}(i)$ ,  $l \neq \sigma^{-1}(j)$ . We still have to show that  $k = \sigma^{-1}(j)$ , and consequently  $l = \sigma^{-1}(i)$ . Now note that with respect to its (“inner”) graph metric,  $N(x)$  has diameter 3, and that the only points at distance 3 from all  $y \in N_{i,j}(x)$  are precisely those in  $N_{j,i}(x)$ . Therefore

$$N_{l,\sigma^{-1}(j)}(x) = gN_{i,j}(x) = N_{\sigma^{-1}(i),k}(x)$$

as sets, and thus  $(l, \sigma^{-1}(j)) = (\sigma^{-1}(i), k)$ . This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

We shall also need the following preparatory lemma.

**(2.9) Lemma.** *If  $g \in \text{Aut}(\text{DL})_x$  satisfies  $gN_{i,j}(x) = N_{i,j}(x)$  for all  $i, j$  ( $i \neq j$ ), then there is  $h \in \mathcal{A}_x$  such that  $g|_{N(x)} \equiv h|_{N(x)}$ .*

(As a matter of fact, it will turn out below that  $g$  itself must belong to  $\mathcal{A}$ .)

*Proof.* For each pair  $(i, j)$ , the isometry  $g$  permutes the  $q_i$  elements of  $N_{i,j}(x)$ . By the structure of  $S_i^+(x)$ , this permutation must be independent of  $j$  ( $j \neq i$ ). That is, there is a permutation  $h_i$  among the successors of  $x_i$  in  $T_i$  such that  $(gy)_i = h_i y_i$  for all  $y \in N_{i,j}(x)$  and all  $j \neq i$ . This permutation can be extended to an isometry of  $T_i$ , again denoted  $h_i$ , that fixes  $x_i$  and permutes the branches of  $T_i$  “below”  $x_i$ . Setting  $h = h_1 \cdots h_d$  according to (1.4), we obtain the required element of  $\mathcal{A}_x$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.7.* Consider an arbitrary  $g \in \text{Aut}(\text{DL})$ . Set  $x = g^{-1}o$ , where  $o$  is the root of DL. Then there is  $g_x \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $x = g_x^{-1}o$ , whence  $gg_x^{-1}o = o$ . By Lemma 2.8, there is  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ , acting on DL by (2.6), such that  $g' = \sigma^{-1}gg_x^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(\text{DL})_o$  satisfies  $g'N_{i,j}(o) = N_{i,j}(o)$  for all  $i, j$ . We claim that  $g'$  is *type-preserving*, that is, for all  $x \in \text{DL}$ ,

$$(2.10) \quad g'N_{i,j}(x) = N_{i,j}(g'x) \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\} \ (i \neq j).$$

(Note that this does hold for every  $g' \in \mathcal{A}$ .) Since DL is connected and (2.10) is true for  $x = o$ , it is sufficient to show the following.

$$(2.11) \quad \text{If (2.10) holds for } x \in \text{DL} \text{ then it holds for every } y \in N(x).$$

So suppose that (2.10) holds for  $x$ . Let  $h \in \mathcal{A}_x$  be as in Lemma 2.9, associated with  $g'$ , and set  $g'' = h^{-1}g'$ . Then  $g''v = v$  for every  $v \in \{x\} \cup N(x)$ . Let  $y \in N(x)$ , so that  $y \in N_{i,j}(x)$  for some  $i, j$ . Since  $g''y = y$ , Lemma 2.8 implies that there is  $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}$  such that  $g''N_{i,j}(y) = N_{\tau^{-1}(i),\tau^{-1}(j)}(y)$ .

Since  $x \in N_{j,i}(y)$  and  $g''x = x$ , we find that  $\tau(i) = i$  and  $\tau(j) = j$ . Also, if  $k \neq i, j$ , then  $N_{k,i}(y) = N_{k,j}(x)$  is stabilized by  $g''$ . Thus,  $\tau(k) = k$ . We see that  $\tau$  is the identity, and as  $h \in \mathcal{A}$ ,

$$g'N_{i,j}(y) = hg''N_{i,j}(y) = hN_{i,j}(y) = N_{i,j}(hy) = N_{i,j}(g'y),$$

as claimed. This proves (2.11) and consequently (2.10).

We now use (2.10) to show that  $g' \in \mathcal{A}$ . Our claim is the following.

$$(2.12) \quad \text{If } x, y \in \text{DL} \text{ satisfy } x_i = y_i \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \text{ then } (g'x)_i = (g'y)_i.$$

Indeed, if this holds, then define  $g_i \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_i})$  as follows. Given  $x_i \in T_i$ , choose  $x \in \text{DL}$  with  $i$ -th coordinate  $x_i$ , and set  $g_ix_i = (g'x)_i$ . This is independent of the specific choice of  $x$  by (2.12). We therefore get  $g' = g_1 \cdots g_d \in \mathcal{A}$ .

For any  $d$  and  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  with  $i \neq j$ , we can define recursively  $N_{i,j}^{(0)}(x) = \{x\}$  and  $N_{i,j}^{(k)}(x) = \bigcup \{N_{i,j}(y) : y \in N_{i,j}^{(k-1)}(x)\}$ , where  $x \in \text{DL}$ . We observe that

$$v_j = w_j \quad \text{for all } v, w \in N_{i,j}^{(k)}(x).$$

The proof of (2.12) is different in the cases  $d = 2$  and  $d \geq 3$ . In both cases, we may assume without loss of generality that  $i = 1$  in (2.12). Suppose therefore that  $x, y \in \text{DL}$  satisfy  $x_1 = y_1$ .

Case 1:  $d = 2$ . Consider  $x_2, y_2$  and their common ancestor  $u_2 = x_2 \wedge y_2$  in  $T_2$ . Since  $x_1 = y_1$ , we have  $\mathfrak{h}(x_2) = \mathfrak{h}(y_2)$ , whence  $d(x_2, u_2) = d(y_2, u_2) = \mathfrak{h}(x_2) - \mathfrak{h}(u_2) =: k \geq 0$ . We can find  $u_1 \in T_1$  such that  $x_1 \preccurlyeq u_1$  and  $\mathfrak{h}(x_1) - \mathfrak{h}(u_1) = -k$ , so that  $u = u_1 u_2 \in \text{DL}$  and  $x, y \in N_{2,1}^{(k)}(u)$ . Since  $g'$  is type-preserving, we have

$$g'N_{2,1}^{(k)}(u) = N_{2,1}^{(k)}(g'u) \ni g'x, g'y.$$

Using the above observation, we get  $(g'x)_1 = (g'y)_1$ , which proves (2.12).

Case 2:  $d \geq 3$ . The subgraph of  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  spanned by  $\{v = v_1 \cdots v_d \in \text{DL} : v_1 = x_1\}$  is *connected*; indeed, it is isomorphic to  $\text{DL}(q_2, \dots, q_d)$ . Thus, there is a path from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $\text{DL}$  all whose vertices have the same first coordinate  $x_1$ : if  $v, w$  are successive vertices on this path then  $w \in N_{i,j}(v)$  where  $i, j \neq 1$ , and  $v_1 = w_1 = x_1$ . But then (2.10) implies  $g'w \in N_{i,j}(g'v)$ , so that  $g'v$  and  $g'w$  differ only in the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th coordinates. In particular,  $(g'w)_1 = (g'v)_1$ , whence inductively  $(g'y)_1 = (g'x)_1$ .

We conclude that  $g = \sigma g'$ , where  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$  and  $g' \in \mathcal{A}$ , so that we have completed the description of  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})$ .

If  $h \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $g = \sigma g' \in \text{Aut}(\text{DL})$  with  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$  and  $g' \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $ghg^{-1} = \sigma(g'hg'^{-1})\sigma^{-1}$  is type-preserving, so that (2.12) implies  $ghg^{-1} \in \mathcal{A}$ . It is now obvious that the factor group  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})/\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mathfrak{S}$ .  $\square$

We briefly remind the reader of the concept of *amenability* of a locally compact group ( $\equiv$  existence of a finitely additive, left invariant probability measure on the group): see PATERSON [37]. Recall that a locally finite graph  $X$  is called *amenable*, if its *isoperimetric constant* is 0, that is, the number

$$\kappa = \inf\{|\partial F|/\text{Vol}(F) : F \subset X \text{ finite}\},$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is cardinality,  $\partial F$  is the set of edges between  $F$  and  $X \setminus F$ , and  $\text{Vol}(F) = \sum_{x \in F} \deg(x)$ . By the well-known criterion of Følner, a finitely generated group is amenable if and only if one ( $\iff$  each) of its Cayley graphs is amenable in the latter sense.

**(2.13) Corollary.** *The graph  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  is amenable if and only if all  $q_i$  coincide.*

*Proof.* By a theorem of SOARDI AND WOESS [41], a vertex-transitive graph is amenable if and only if its automorphism group (or equivalently, any closed, transitive subgroup) is both amenable and unimodular. Theorem 2.7 yields the result.  $\square$

A *co-compact lattice* in a locally compact group is a discrete, countable subgroup such that the factor space is compact. The following is standard.

**(2.14) Lemma.** *If  $X$  is a locally finite, vertex-transitive graph, then a subgroup  $\Gamma$  of  $\text{Aut}(X)$  is a co-compact lattice if and only if  $\Gamma$  acts on  $X$  with finitely many orbits and finite vertex stabilizers.*

*Proof.* We prove the “only if”; the “if” is then an easy exercise. If  $\Gamma$  is co-compact then there is a relatively compact set  $K \subset \text{Aut}(X)$  such that  $\text{Aut}(X) = \Gamma K$ . If  $o \in X$  is arbitrarily chosen (a “root”), then relative compactness of  $K$  means that  $F = Ko \subset X$  is finite. Transitivity of  $\text{Aut}(X)$  implies that  $\Gamma F = X$ , whence  $\Gamma$  acts with finitely many orbits.

Suppose that for some  $x$  the stabilizer  $\Gamma_x$  contains a sequence of distinct elements. Since the stabilizer of  $x$  in  $\text{Aut}(X)$  is compact, that sequence must have an accumulation point. This contradicts discreteness of  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

A non-unimodular group cannot contain a co-compact lattice. Recall that when  $\Gamma$  is a finitely generated group and  $S = S^{-1} \subset \Gamma$  is a finite set of generators, then the *Cayley graph*  $X(\Gamma, S)$  of  $\Gamma$  with respect to  $S$  has vertex set  $\Gamma$ , and the edges are all  $[x, y]$ , where  $x, y \in \Gamma$  and  $x^{-1}y \in S$ . The group  $\Gamma$  acts by left multiplication on  $X(\Gamma, S)$ , the action is transitive, and all vertex stabilizers are trivial. In view of Theorem 2.7, we now get the following.

**(2.15) Corollary.** *Assume that the  $q_j$  do not all coincide; then  $\text{Aut}(\text{DL})$  does not possess any co-compact lattice. Therefore,  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  cannot be the Cayley graph of a finitely generated group.*

### 3. CAYLEY GRAPHS

We now study in more detail the case when  $q_1 = \dots = q_d = q$  all coincide. In this case, we write  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  for the horocyclic product of  $d$  trees with degree  $q + 1$ . The fact that  $\text{DL}_2(q) = \text{DL}(q, q)$  is a Cayley graph of the lamplighter group  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathfrak{Z}_q = \mathbb{Z}/(q\mathbb{Z})$ , has been explained (and exploited) in the papers by WOESS [46] alone and with BARTHOLDI [3] and BROFFERIO [14]. We now study the general case. For investigations in a similar spirit, but with different methods and applied to different graphs (one-skeletons of affine buildings), see e.g. CARTWRIGHT AND STEGER [20].

Let  $\mathfrak{L}_q$  be a commutative ring of order  $|\mathfrak{L}_q| = q$  with multiplicative unit 1, and choose  $\ell \in \mathfrak{L}_q$ . Consider the ring  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$  of all formal Laurent series

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{t} + \ell) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_k (\mathbf{t} + \ell)^k, \quad a_k \in \mathfrak{L}_q, \quad \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{Z} : a_k = 0 \forall k < n_0.$$

If  $a_{n_0} \neq 0$  in this representation, then we write  $\mathbf{v}_\ell(\mathbf{f}) = n_0$  for the *valuation* of  $\mathbf{f}$  with respect to  $(\mathbf{t} + \ell)$ , setting  $\mathbf{v}_\ell(0) = \infty$ . The corresponding *absolute value* is

$$|\mathbf{f}|_\ell = q^{-\mathbf{v}_\ell(\mathbf{f})}.$$

It defines a complete ultrametric on  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$ . Every closed ball in this ultrametric has radius  $q^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and is also open.

We shall write  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))^*$  for the multiplicative group of *invertible* elements in  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$ .

Following the explanation given in [19], we can identify  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$  with the “lower” boundary  $\partial^* \mathbb{T}_q$ , where the vertex set of  $\mathbb{T}_q$  is the set of all closed balls  $x = B_\ell(\mathbf{f}, q^n)$  with radius  $q^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and midpoint  $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$ . Relating this with the description of §2, the predecessor of vertex  $x$  as above is  $x^- = B_\ell(\mathbf{f}, q^{n+1})$ . The vertices on the  $n$ -th horocycle are, by definition, precisely all balls with radius  $q^{-n}$ , which form a partition of  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$ .

Conversely, starting with  $\mathbb{T}_q$ , for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we can label the edges between each vertex in  $H_k$  and its  $q$  successors with the elements of  $\mathfrak{L}_q$  as in Figure 1, so that the sequence of labels on the geodesic from  $\omega$  to  $x \in H_n$  is  $(a_k)_{k < n}$  with only finitely many  $a_k \neq 0$ . Then  $x = B_\ell(\mathbf{g}, q^{-n})$ , where  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{k < n} a_k (\mathbf{t} + \ell)^k$ .

Using this description, one sees that the group  $\text{Aff}(\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell)))$  of all affine matrices

$$(3.2) \quad g = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))^*, \quad \mathbf{b} \in \mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell))$$

embeds into  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$  as a closed subgroup that acts transitively on the tree. Namely, the image of a ball  $x = B_\ell(\mathbf{f}, q^n)$  as above under such a matrix is the ball

$$(3.3) \quad gx = B(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{f}, q^{n-m}), \quad \text{where } m = \mathbf{v}_\ell(\mathbf{a}).$$

In the same way, we can also consider the ring  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1}))$  of all formal Laurent series  $\mathbf{f} = \sum_k a_k \mathbf{t}^{-k}$  over  $\mathfrak{L}_q$  in the variable  $\mathbf{t}^{-1}$  with the valuation  $\mathbf{v}_\infty(\mathbf{f}) = n_0$  if  $n_0$  is minimal such that  $a_{n_0} \neq 0$ . Again, we have the identification with  $\partial^* \mathbb{T}_q$ , but in this specific case, we define the  $n$ -th horocycle to consist of all closed balls in  $\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1}))$  with radius  $q^{-n-1}$ . Again, the group  $\text{Aff}(\mathfrak{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1})))$  embeds into  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$  as a closed subgroup that acts transitively.

Now suppose that there are distinct elements  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{d-1} \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  such that their pairwise differences  $\ell_i - \ell_j$  ( $i \neq j$ ) are invertible. Consider the ring

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{R}_d(\mathfrak{L}_q) = \mathfrak{L}_q[(\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{-1}, \dots, (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{-1}, \mathbf{t}]$$

of all polynomials over  $\mathfrak{L}_q$  in the variables  $(\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{-1}, \dots, (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{-1}, \mathbf{t}$ . They are of the form

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{t} + \ell_1, \dots, \mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1}) = \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}},$$

where only finitely many of the coefficients  $a_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}} \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  are  $\neq 0$ .

Note that  $\mathcal{R}_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$  depends not only on  $d$  and  $\mathcal{L}_q$ , but also on the choice of the  $\ell_i$ . The same is true for the group  $\Gamma_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$  in the next theorem.

**(3.6) Theorem.** *If  $\mathcal{L}_q$  contains distinct elements  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{d-1}$  such that their pairwise differences are invertible, then the Diestel-Leader graph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is the Cayley graph of the group  $\Gamma = \Gamma_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$  of affine matrices*

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}} & \mathbf{P} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{R}_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$$

with respect to the generators

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t} + \ell_i & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{\pm 1}, \quad b \in \mathcal{L}_q, i \in \{1, \dots, d-1\} \quad \text{and} \\ \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)(\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^{-1} & b(\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \in \mathcal{L}_q, i, j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}, i \neq j.$$

*Proof.* Each of  $\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell_i))$  ( $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ ) and  $\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1}))$  is the completion of  $\mathcal{R}_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$  in its respective ultrametric. Indeed, for each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and distinct  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ , we can write  $(\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^k$  as a Laurent series in  $(\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)$  as well as in  $\mathbf{t}^{-1}$ , namely

$$(3.8) \quad (\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{k}{n} (\ell_j - \ell_i)^{k-n} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)^n = \sum_{n=-k}^{\infty} \binom{k}{k+n} \ell_j^{n+k} \mathbf{t}^{-n}.$$

Also, for each non-negative  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ , we can write  $\mathbf{t}^k$  as a polynomial in  $\mathbf{t} + \ell_j$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbf{t}^k = \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} (-\ell_j)^{k-n} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^n.$$

A straightforward computation shows that for all  $k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{\ell_i}((\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}}) &= k_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{v}_{\infty}((\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}}) &= -k_1 - \cdots - k_{d-1}, \end{aligned}$$

summing up to 0. In particular, it follows from (3.10) that the diagonal embedding

$$(3.11) \quad \mathcal{R}_d(\mathcal{L}_q) \hookrightarrow \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)) \times \mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1})),$$

where  $\mathbf{P} \mapsto (\mathbf{P}_1, \dots, \mathbf{P}_d)$  with  $\mathbf{P}_i = \mathbf{P}$  for all  $i$ , is discrete in this last direct product.

Following the above explanations, we can identify the vertices of the tree  $\mathbb{T}_q$  with balls in the respective ultrametric. Thus, we get  $d$  copies of  $\mathbb{T}_q$ . The first  $d-1$  correspond to  $\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)) \equiv \partial^* \mathbb{T}_q$  ( $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ ), and recall that in each of these cases, we define the  $n$ -th horocycle to consist of all closed balls with radius  $q^{-n}$  ( $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ). The last copy of  $\mathbb{T}_q$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1})) \equiv \partial^* \mathbb{T}_q$ , but also recall that this time, we define the  $n$ -th horocycle to consist of all closed balls with radius  $q^{-n-1}$ .

Each of the  $d$  groups  $\text{Aff}(\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)))$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$  and  $\text{Aff}(\mathcal{L}_q((\mathbf{t}^{-1})))$  is a closed subgroup of  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$  that acts transitively on the tree. By (3.11), the diagonal embedding of  $\Gamma_d(\mathcal{L}_q)$  into their direct product is discrete. By (3.10), combined with (3.3), the action

of  $\Gamma_d(\mathfrak{L}_q)$  on  $(\mathbb{T}_q)^d$  is such that the subgraph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is preserved. The last step in showing that  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is a Cayley graph of our group consists in exhibiting a correspondence between graph and group that is bijective and compatible with the group action:

*Claim.* For all  $k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , each  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{R}$  has a unique decomposition into Laurent polynomials  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(1)} + \dots + \mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(d)}$ , where

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(i)} &= \sum_{n < k_i} a_{n,i} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(d)} &= \sum_{n \geq -(k_1 + \dots + k_{d-1})} a_{n,d} \mathbf{t}^n \end{aligned}$$

with  $a_{n,i} \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  and  $\neq 0$  only for finitely many  $n$  ( $i = 1, \dots, d$ ).

*Proof of the claim.* By multiplying with  $(\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{-k_1} \dots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{-k_{d-1}}$ , one sees that it is sufficient to prove this for  $k_1 = \dots = k_d = 0$ . The existence of a decomposition (3.12) is an easy exercise which we leave to the reader. Uniqueness requires a bit more care. To this end, we have to prove that

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(1)} + \dots + \mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(d)} = 0$$

implies that  $\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)} = 0$  for all  $i$ . Suppose that for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ , we have  $\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)} \neq 0$ . Write  $\mathbf{Q}$  for the left-hand side of (3.13) after subtracting  $\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)}$ . Then  $\mathbf{v}_{\ell_i}(\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)}) < 0$ , but by (3.8) and (3.9),

$$\mathbf{v}_{\ell_i}(\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)}) = \mathbf{v}_{\ell_i}(\mathbf{Q}) \geq 0,$$

a contradiction. Thus,  $\mathbf{P}_{0, \dots, 0}^{(i)} = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ , and consequently also for  $i = d$ , concluding the proof of the claim.

Our choice for the origin is now  $o = o_1 \dots o_d$ , where  $o_i = B_{\ell_i}(0, 1)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d-1$  and  $o_d = B_{\infty}(0, q^{-1})$ . Let  $g = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \dots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}} & \mathbf{P} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_d(q)$ . In view of the claim we obtain a bijective correspondence  $g \leftrightarrow x = x_1 \dots x_d = go$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &= g_i o_i = B_{\ell_i}(\mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(i)}, q^{-k_i}), \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \quad \text{and} \\ x_d &= g_d o_d = B_{\infty}(\mathbf{P}_{k_1, \dots, k_{d-1}}^{(d)}, q^{k_1 + \dots + k_{d-1} - 1}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, when writing  $go$ , we intend the image of  $g$  under diagonal embedding, while  $g_i o_i$  refers again to  $g_i = g$ , but this time acting on the  $i$ -th tree of the horocyclic product: as isometries of  $T_i = \mathbb{T}_q$ , the  $g_i$  are distinct.

Compatibility with the group action is straightforward:  $(gh)o = g(ho)$  for all  $g, h \in \Gamma$ .

Finally, using (3.3), one checks that for each  $b \in \mathfrak{L}_q$ ,  $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{t} + \ell_i & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps the origin  $o$  to one of its neighbours of type  $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_d$ , where  $i \neq d$ . Analogously,  $\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_i)(\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^{-1} & b(\mathbf{t} + \ell_j)^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  maps  $o$  to one of its neighbours of type  $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$ , where  $i \neq j$ .  $\square$

We now study how we can implement Theorem 3.6 for specific values of  $q$  and  $d$ .

### A. $\text{DL}_3(q)$ and a finitely presented extension of the lamplighter group.

If  $q \geq 2$  is arbitrary and  $d = 2$  (two trees) or  $d = 3$  (three trees), then we can use for  $\mathfrak{L}_q$  the ring  $\mathfrak{Z}_q$  of integers modulo  $q$ . Indeed, we may choose  $\ell_1 = 0$  and  $\ell_2 = 1$ .

Thus, for the lamplighter group, we start with the ring  $\mathcal{R}_2(\mathfrak{Z}_q) = \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, t]$  of all Laurent polynomials  $P = P(t) = \sum_{k=K}^L a_k t^k$  (with integers  $K \leq L$  and  $a_k \in \mathfrak{Z}_q$ ).

**(3.14) Corollary.** *The graph  $DL_2(q) = DL(q, q)$  is a Cayley graph of the Lamplighter group  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$ , represented as the group  $\Gamma_2(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  of affine matrices*

$$\begin{pmatrix} t^k & P \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}, P \in \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, t]$$

with respect to the generators

$$\begin{pmatrix} t & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \in \mathfrak{Z}_q,$$

and their inverses.

For  $DL_3(q)$ , we use  $\mathcal{R}_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q) = \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, (t+1)^{-1}, t]$ , which consists of all

$$P = P(t, t+1) = \sum_{k=K}^L \sum_{m=M}^N a_{k,m} t^k (t+1)^m,$$

where  $K, L, M, N \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $K \leq L$ ,  $M \leq N$ ,  $a_{k,m} \in \mathfrak{Z}_q$ .

**(3.15) Corollary.** *The Diestel-Leader graph  $DL_3(q) = DL(q, q, q)$  is the Cayley graph of the group  $\Gamma = \Gamma_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  of affine matrices*

$$\begin{pmatrix} t^k (t+1)^m & P \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad k, m \in \mathbb{Z}, P \in \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, (t+1)^{-1}, t]$$

with respect to the generators

$$\begin{pmatrix} t & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t+1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t^{-1}+1 & b t^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \in \mathfrak{Z}_q,$$

and their inverses.

The group  $\Gamma_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  is finitely presented, see BAUMSLAG [4, 5] and also below in §4. Thus, by Corollaries 3.14 and 3.15 we recover a concrete way of embedding the infinitely presented group  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$  into the finitely presented, metabelian group  $\Gamma_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$ .

How can we extend the above to  $DL_d(q)$  with larger  $d$ ? If  $d \geq 4$ , we cannot always find  $d-1$  elements  $\ell_i \in \mathfrak{Z}_q$  whose pairwise differences are invertible. We note the following cases where we still can work with  $\mathfrak{Z}_q$ .

(i) When  $q$  is *odd* and  $d = 4$  then we can use  $\ell_1 = 0$ ,  $\ell_2 = 1$  and  $\ell_3 = -1 \equiv q-1$  (modulo  $q$ ). Thus,  $\mathcal{R}_4(\mathfrak{Z}_q) = \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, (t+1)^{-1}, (t-1)^{-1}, t]$ , and  $DL_4(q)$  is a Cayley graph of the associated group of affine matrices.

(ii) When  $q$  is *prime* and  $d \leq q+1$  then we can use  $\ell_1 = 0, \dots, \ell_{d-1} = d-2$ . Again,  $DL_d(q)$  is a Cayley graph of the group of affine matrices  $\Gamma_d(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  associated with  $\mathcal{R}_d(q) = \mathfrak{Z}_q[t^{-1}, (t+1)^{-1}, \dots, (t+d-2)^{-1}, t]$ .

The last case (where  $\mathfrak{Z}_q = \mathbb{F}_q$ , the field of order  $q$ ) points towards a more general answer.

## B. $DL_d(q)$ and quasi-isometries.

For arbitrary  $q \geq 2$ , let  $q = p_1 \cdots p_r$  be its factorization as a product of prime powers.

(*Caution:* the  $p_\iota$  are prime powers, not necessarily primes themselves !) Suppose first that  $p_\iota \geq d - 1$  for all  $\iota \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and let  $\mathbb{F}_{p_\iota}$  be the field of order  $p_\iota$ . Now construct the ring

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbb{F}_q = \mathbb{F}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}_{p_r}$$

with coordinate-wise addition and multiplication. Let  $\ell_{\iota,1}, \dots, \ell_{\iota,d-1}$  be distinct elements of each  $\mathbb{F}_{p_\iota}$ , and set  $\ell_j = (\ell_{1,j}, \dots, \ell_{r,j}) \in \mathbb{F}_q$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d - 1$ . Then all the differences  $\ell_i - \ell_j$  ( $i \neq j$ ) are invertible elements of  $\mathbb{F}_q$ . Therefore, we can apply Theorem 3.6 with the ring

$$\mathcal{R}_d(\mathbb{F}_q) = \mathbb{F}_q[(\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{-1}, \dots, (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{-1}, \mathbf{t}]$$

of all Laurent polynomials over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  in  $\mathbf{t} + \ell_1, \dots, \mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1}$ .

**(3.17) Corollary.** *Let  $q = p_1 \cdots p_r$  be the factorization of  $q$  in prime powers, and suppose  $p_\iota \geq d - 1$  for all  $\iota \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . Then  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is a Cayley graph of the group  $\Gamma = \Gamma_d(\mathbb{F}_q)$  of affine matrices*

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\mathbf{t} + \ell_1)^{k_1} \cdots (\mathbf{t} + \ell_{d-1})^{k_{d-1}} & \mathbf{P} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{R}_d(\mathbb{F}_q)$$

When  $d \geq p_\iota$  for some  $\iota \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , then we cannot use the above construction. However, we can show that  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is quasi-isometric with  $\text{DL}_d(q^s)$  for arbitrary  $s \geq 1$ , and when  $s$  is sufficiently large, it is a Cayley graph by Corollary 3.17.

Recall that a quasi-isometry between two metric spaces  $(X_1, d_1)$  and  $(X_2, d_2)$  is a mapping  $\phi : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$  such that there are constants  $A > 0$ ,  $B \geq 0$  with

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} A^{-1}d_2(\phi x_1, \phi y_1) - B &\leq d_1(x_1, y_1) \leq A d_2(\phi x_1, \phi y_1) + B \quad \text{and} \\ d(x_2, \phi X_1) &\leq B \quad \text{for all } x_1, y_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2. \end{aligned}$$

For connected graphs, quasi-isometry refers to the discrete graph metric, and for finitely generated groups, it refers to the word metric, i.e., the graph metric of one of its Cayley graphs: for a finitely generated group  $\Gamma$ , any two of its Cayley graphs with respect to finite, symmetric generating sets are quasi-isometric (with  $B = 0$ , i.e., bi-Lipschitz). Quasi-isometry of groups has been an object of intensive study in geometric group theory since its introduction by GROMOV [30]. For the following, recall the group  $\mathcal{A}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  defined in Proposition 2.5.

**(3.19) Proposition.** *For arbitrary  $q_1, \dots, q_d \geq 2$  and  $s \geq 2$ , the graphs  $\text{DL}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s)$  and  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  are quasi-isometric.*

*The quasi-isometry has the following property: if  $\Gamma \leq \mathcal{A}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ , then the subgroup*

$$\Gamma_s = \{g = g_1 \cdots g_d \in \Gamma : \mathfrak{h}(g_i) \in s\mathbb{Z}, i = 1, \dots, d\}$$

*embeds into  $\mathcal{A}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s)$ , and if  $\Gamma$  acts transitively and/or with trivial stabilizers on  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ , then it also acts transitively and/or with trivial stabilizers on  $\text{DL}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s)$ .*

*Proof.* In the tree  $\mathbb{T}_{q_i}$ , consider the horocycles  $H_{sn}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Their union becomes the vertex set of  $\mathbb{T}_{q^s}$ , if we introduce new edges as follows: if  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $x \in H_{sn}$ , then draw an edge between  $x$  and  $x^{-s} \in H_{s(n-1)}$ , where  $x^{-k}$  is defined recursively by  $x^{-1} = x^-$  (the predecessor of  $x$ ), and  $x^{-k-1} = (x^{-k})^-$ . See Figure 4, where  $q = 2$  and  $s = 3$ .






Figure 4

In this way, by inverting the arrow in Figure 4, we get a mapping  $\phi_i : \mathbb{T}_{q_i^s} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{q_i}$  which is one-to-one from the horocycle  $H_n(\mathbb{T}_{q_i^s})$  onto  $H_{sn}(\mathbb{T}_{q_i})$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Furthermore,

$$(3.20) \quad d(\phi_i x, \phi_i y) = s \cdot d(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{h}(\phi_i x) = s \cdot \mathfrak{h}(x) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \mathbb{T}_{q_i^s}.$$

(Here,  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  refers to the respective graph metric in each of the two involved graphs.) Clearly,  $\phi_i$  is a quasi-isometry, and by (3.20), we can embed the group  $\{g \in \text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_i}) : \mathfrak{h}(g) \in s\mathbb{Z}\}$  into  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_{q_i^s})$  by  $g \mapsto \phi_i^{-1} \circ g \circ \phi_i$ .

We now define  $\phi : \text{DL}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s) \rightarrow \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  by  $\phi = \phi_1 \cdots \phi_d$ , that is, the action of  $\phi$  on the  $i$ -th coordinate  $x_i$  of  $x = x_1 \cdots x_d \in \text{DL}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s)$  is given by  $x_i \mapsto \phi_i x_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, d$ ). It is now straightforward that  $\phi$  is a quasi-isometry with the asserted properties.  $\square$

**(3.21) Corollary.** *For arbitrary  $q$  and  $d \geq 2$ , the graph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is quasi-isometric with  $\text{DL}_d(q^s)$ , which is a Cayley graph of the group  $\Gamma_d(\mathbb{F}_{q^s})$ , when  $s$  is sufficiently large.*

*Proof.* As above, let  $q = p_1 \cdots p_r$  be the factorization of  $q$  in prime powers. Now choose  $s$  sufficiently large such that  $p_i^s \geq d - 1$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . Then  $\text{DL}_d(q^s)$  is the Cayley graph of the group  $\Gamma_d(\mathbb{F}_{q^s})$  by Corollary 3.17.  $\square$

**(3.22) Remarks.** (a) In conclusion, we are not able to prove that *every* Diestel-Leader graph  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  is itself a Cayley graph. The first open case is  $\text{DL}_4(2)$ , the horocyclic product of 4 trees with the same branching number 2 ( $\equiv$  degree 3).

(b) Proposition 3.19 leads to the following question: is it true that two Diestel-Leader graphs are quasi-isometric if and only if there are  $r, s \geq 1$  such that (up to permutation of their “coordinate” trees) they are of the form  $\text{DL}(q_1^r, \dots, q_d^r)$  and  $\text{DL}(q_1^s, \dots, q_d^s)$ . For the case  $d = 2$ , compare with WORTMAN [47, §4] and the results of ESKIN, FISHER AND WHYTE [25].

(c) The following generalizes the conjecture of DIESTEL AND LEADER [23] that  $\text{DL}(2, 3)$  is not quasi-isometric to any Cayley graph: is it true that  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  for  $d \geq 2$  is quasi-isometric with a Cayley graph of some finitely generated group if and only if  $q_1 = \dots = q_d$ ? For  $d = 2$ , see once more [25].

#### 4. THE DL COMPLEX

We compute homotopical properties of DL in this section, and combine this information with the results of the previous section to derive conclusions on groups acting on DL.

We defined DL as a graph in the introduction; for our purposes, it is now better to view DL as a cell complex (in which cells are represented by subsets of the vertex set), whose 1-skeleton is the graph defined by (1.1) and (1.2).

Let therefore  $T_1 = \mathbb{T}_{q_1}, \dots, T_d = \mathbb{T}_{q_d}$  be our homogeneous trees with their respective Busemann functions. We now turn  $\text{DL} = \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  into a cell complex, whose vertex set  $\text{DL}^0$  (0-skeleton) is given by (1.1). Now choose for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  a subset  $E_i \subset X_i$  of cardinality 1 or 2; if  $E_i = \{x, y\}$ , then  $x \sim y$  has to be an edge of  $T_i$ . To this choice there corresponds an  $s$ -dimensional cell

$$\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d) = \{x_1 \cdots x_d \in \text{DL}^0 : x_i \in E_i \text{ for all } i\},$$

whenever  $|\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)| \geq 2$ , with  $s = |E_1| + \dots + |E_d| - d - 1$ . The faces of  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  are all  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_{j-1}, F_j, E_{j+1}, \dots, E_d)$  for all possible choices of  $j$  and  $F_j \subset E_j$  with  $|F_j| = 1$  and  $|E_j| = 2$ .

The 1-skeleton of DL is given by the condition (1.2), and the dimension of the DL complex is  $d - 1$ . If  $d = 2$  then there are no cells of dimension  $\geq 2$ , and we recover the original construction of DL as a graph.

**(4.1) Remark.** A cell is always of the form  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$ , where each  $E_i$  is either  $\{x_i\}$  or  $\{x_i, y_i\}$  with  $x_i \sim y_i$  and  $\mathfrak{h}(y_i) = \mathfrak{h}(x_i) + 1$ .

If  $d \geq 3$  then besides the 1-dimensional cells (the edges), there are also two kinds of 2-dimensional cells: there must be precisely three indices  $j < k < l$  such that  $|E_j| = |E_k| = |E_l| = 2$ . The requirement that  $|\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)| \geq 2$  is met when  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) \in \{-1, -2\}$ . If now  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) = -1$ , then  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is a triangle, with corners  $x_1 \cdots x_{j-1} y_j x_{j+1} \cdots x_d$ ,  $x_1 \cdots x_{k-1} y_k x_{k+1} \cdots x_d$  and  $x_1 \cdots x_{l-1} y_l x_{l+1} \cdots x_d$ . If  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) = -2$ , then  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is also a triangle but of a different kind: its corners have the form  $x_1 \cdots y_j \cdots y_k \cdots x_d$ ,  $x_1 \cdots y_j \cdots y_l \cdots x_d$  and  $x_1 \cdots y_k \cdots y_l \cdots x_d$ .

If  $d \geq 4$ , then in addition, there are also three kinds of 3-dimensional cells: there is now a set  $I$  of four indices with  $|E_i| = 2$  if  $i \in I$ , and we must have  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) \in \{-1, -2, -3\}$ . If  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) = -1$ , then  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is a tetrahedron, spanned by the vertices  $z_1 \dots z_d$  with  $z_j = y_j$  for precisely one  $j \in I$ , and all other  $z_i = x_i$ . If  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) = -2$ , then  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is an octahedron, spanned by the vertices  $z_1 \dots z_d$  with  $z_j = y_j$  for precisely two  $j \in I$  (there are  $6 = \binom{4}{2}$  choices). If  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) = -3$ , then  $\gamma(E_1, \dots, E_d)$  is again a tetrahedron, spanned by the vertices  $z_1 \dots z_d$  with  $z_j = y_j$  for precisely three  $j \in I$ .

In general, if  $d \geq s + 1$  there are  $s$  kinds of  $s$ -dimensional cells, according to the values of  $\sum \mathfrak{h}(x_i) \in \{-1, \dots, -s\}$ , and  $|E_i| = 2$  for all  $i$  in a set  $I \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$  of cardinality  $s + 1$ .

**(4.2) Definition.** Choose  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  and points  $b = b_1 \cdots b_d$ ,  $t = t_1 \cdots t_d$ ,  $t' = t'_1 \cdots t'_d \in \prod_i T_i$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  we have (a)  $\sum_i \mathfrak{h}(b_i) = -R$ , (b)  $b_i = t_i \wedge t'_i$  (the greatest common ancestor), and (c)  $\mathfrak{h}(t_i) = \mathfrak{h}(t'_i) = \mathfrak{h}(b_i) + R$ .

The octahedron  $\mathcal{O}_{t, t', b}$  is the subcomplex of DL spanned by the vertices  $x_1 \cdots x_d$  such that  $x_i$  lies on the path  $\overline{t_i t'_i}$  for all  $i$ .

The “downward” geodesics in  $T_i$  of length  $R$  starting at  $b_i$  can be ordered lexicographically by the sequence (“word”) of length  $R$  of the labels (in  $\{0, \dots, q_i - 1\}$ ) along their

edges. The octahedron  $\mathcal{O}_{t,t',b}$  is *basic* if for all  $i$  the geodesic  $\overline{b_i t'_i}$  is the immediate successor of  $\overline{b_i t_i}$ , that is, all labels coincide except the first ones, which differ by 1. See Figure 5.




Figure 5

If  $d = 3$ , octahedra are usual octahedra: six extremal vertices and eight triangular faces with side lengths  $R$ . Each face is subdivided into basic triangles with side lengths 1, that is, 2-cells; see Figure 6. For arbitrary  $d$ , octahedra have  $2d$  vertices and  $2^d$  top-dimensional faces.

A basic octahedron in  $\text{DL}(q_1, q_2, q_3)$ . The face spanned by  $b_1 b_2 t_3$ ,  $b_1 t_2 b_3$  and  $t_1 b_2 b_3$  consists of all  $x_1 x_2 x_3 \in \text{DL}$  with  $x_i \in \overline{b_i t_i}$ .




Figure 6

**(4.3) Lemma.** Let  $\iota_i, \iota'_i$  be distinct geodesics from  $\omega_i$  to the “lower” boundary  $\partial^* T_i$  in  $T_i$ , and set  $\mathcal{P} = (\iota_1 \cup \iota'_1) \times \dots \times (\iota_d \cup \iota'_d) \cap \text{DL}$ .

Let  $b_i$  be the bifurcation point of  $\iota_i$  and  $\iota'_i$ ; set  $R = -\sum_i \mathfrak{h}(b_i)$ ; and let  $t_i, t'_i$  be the points respectively on  $\iota_i, \iota'_i$  with  $\mathfrak{h}(t_i) = \mathfrak{h}(t'_i) = \mathfrak{h}(b_i) + R$ .

If  $R > 0$ , then  $\mathcal{P}$  retracts to the octahedron  $\mathcal{O}_{t,t',b}$ . If  $R \leq 0$ , then  $\mathcal{P}$  is contractible.

Furthermore, every octahedron is homeomorphic to a sphere of dimension  $d - 1$ .

*Proof.* Assume first  $R > 0$ . Then clearly  $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_{t,t',b}$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Consider a point  $x = x_1 \dots x_d$  in  $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{O}$ . We will retract it to  $\mathcal{O}$ . Consider (1) in increasing order the coordinates  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}(x_i) < \mathfrak{h}(b_i)$  and, at the same time, (2) in decreasing order, the coordinates  $j$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}(x_j) > \mathfrak{h}(t_j)$ . Move  $x$ , at unit speed, down on coordinate  $i$  and up on coordinate  $j$ , until  $x_i = b_i$  or  $x_j \in \{t_j, t'_j\}$ ; when this happens,

move to the next  $i$  or  $j$ . If there are no more  $j$ 's available, keep moving up on the selected coordinate  $j$ .

This process defines a retraction, i.e., a continuous map  $\rho : \mathcal{P} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$  with  $\rho(x, 0) = x$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(x, t) \in \mathcal{O}$ .

If  $R \leq 0$ , then this process also produces a retraction, but now towards a single point in  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The last claim of the lemma is clear: an octahedron is topologically the  $d$ -fold join<sup>1</sup> of a pair of points, that is, a  $(d - 1)$ -dimensional sphere.  $\square$

The following result bears a strong similarity with Theorem 4.1 of BESTVINA AND BRADY [6]. However, there does not seem to be a natural discrete ambient group acting on  $\coprod T_i$  that would be required for their theorem to apply directly.

**(4.4) Theorem.** *The Diestel-Leader graph  $DL(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  has the homotopy type of a wedge of countably many  $(d - 1)$ -spheres, that is, the topological space obtained by glueing together all those spheres at one single point. These spheres correspond bijectively to basic octahedra.*

*Proof.* Embed each tree  $T_i$  in the upper half plane  $\mathbb{H}$  in such a way that  $\omega_i \equiv i\infty$ , the “lower” boundary  $\partial^*T_i$  lies in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and such that its edges are ordered lexicographically, i.e., the edges labeled  $0, 1, \dots, q_i - 1$  appear in left-to-right order below any vertex. Let  $\Omega_i$  be the set of all geodesics in  $T_i$  going from  $\omega_i$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

The tree  $T_i$ , topologically, may be obtained from the disjoint union of the geodesics in  $\Omega_i$  by glueing them along specified half-geodesics from a vertex to  $\omega_i$ . Therefore, the product  $T_1 \times \dots \times T_d$  may be viewed as a disjoint union of hyperplanes glued along “hyper-octants”, and is naturally embedded in  $\mathbb{H}^d$ .

Similarly,  $DL$  is obtained by considering the disjoint union of the planes  $l_1 \times \dots \times l_d \cap DL$  for all  $l_i \in \Omega_i$ , and glueing them along subspaces. It is naturally embedded in a codimension-one contractible subspace  $W$  of  $\mathbb{H}^d$ .

The homotopy type of  $DL$ , therefore, is that of a wedge of “pieces”, which are glued together at one single point. Each “piece” is specified by two lexicographically consecutive geodesics  $l_i, l'_i$  in each tree  $T_i$ , and is of the form  $\mathcal{P} = (l_1 \cup l'_1) \times \dots \times (l_d \cup l'_d) \cap DL$ . It naturally is a subspace of  $W$ . By Lemma 4.3, this piece  $\mathcal{P}$  is either contractible, or retracts to an octahedron, which is pure by the choice of  $l_i, l'_i$ . Furthermore all basic octahedra appear in this way.

Finally, it is obvious that there are countably many basic octahedra, since there are countably many choices of  $b_i, t_i$  and  $t'_i$ .  $\square$

Recall that a group  $\Gamma$  is of *type  $F_d$*  if it is the fundamental group of an aspherical cell complex (i.e. a  $K(\Gamma, 1)$ ) whose  $d$ -skeleton is compact. (“Aspherical” means that it is a topological space whose fundamental cover is contractible.) In particular, “type  $F_1$ ” means “finitely generated”, and “type  $F_2$ ” means “finitely presented”.

<sup>1</sup>Recall that the join of two spaces  $X, Y$  is  $X \star Y = X \times [0, 1] \times Y / \{(x, 0, y) \sim (x, 0, y'), (x, 1, y) \sim (x, 1, y')\}$ ; it is classical that the join of a  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional sphere and an  $(m - 1)$ -dimensional sphere is a  $(m + n - 1)$ -dimensional sphere.

**(4.5) Corollary.** *If  $\mathrm{DL}_d(q)$  is a Cayley graph of a group  $\Gamma$ , then  $\Gamma$  is of type  $F_{d-1}$ , but not of type  $F_d$ . In particular, if  $d \geq 2$ , it is finitely generated, and if  $d \geq 3$ , it is finitely presented.*

*Proof.* The cell complex  $\Gamma \backslash \mathrm{DL}$  is compact, and by Theorem 4.4 it approximates up to dimension  $d - 1$  a classifying space  $K(\Gamma, 1)$ . This proves that  $\Gamma$  is of type  $F_{d-1}$ . On the other hand,  $K(\Gamma, 1)$  has as many  $d$ -cells as there are  $\Gamma$ -orbits on basic octahedra, and there are infinitely many of them, so  $\Gamma$  is not of type  $F_d$ .  $\square$

In particular, the group  $\Gamma_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  is finitely presented, and contains as a subgroup the lamplighter group  $\Gamma_2(\mathfrak{Z}_q) \cong \mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$ .

The first example of a finitely presented group that is not of type  $F_3$  was discovered by STALLINGS [42]. It was only later, in particular through the work of BIERI [8], that Stallings' group was interpreted as the kernel of an epimorphism to  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Explicit embeddings of the lamplighter group were already known: JOHNSON [31] embeds it first in the group  $G$  of permutations of  $\mathbb{Z}$  that are translations outside of a finite set (as the subgroup generated by the transposition  $(1, 2)$  and the translation  $n \mapsto n + 2$ ); and then naturally embeds  $G$  in the group  $\tilde{G}$  of permutations of a three-branched star which are translations outside of a finite set; he finally exhibits a presentation of  $\tilde{G}$ . (This group does *not* act transitively and with trivial stabilizers on  $\mathrm{DL}_3(q)$ .) Homological properties of some metabelian groups were studied by BUX [15], and the groups he considers are closely related to the matrix groups appearing in Theorem 3.6.

The Cayley graph of  $\Gamma_3(\mathfrak{Z}_q)$  contains unbounded “dead ends”, as was first noticed by CLEARY AND RILEY [21]. It is easy to see geometrical properties of this group in its DL description.

BAUMSLAG [4, 5] proves that every finitely generated metabelian group can be embedded in a finitely presented metabelian group. His construction is quite explicit: the group into which  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$  embeds has presentation

$$(4.6) \quad \Gamma = \langle a, s, t \mid a^q, [s, t], [a, a^t], a^{-t} a a^s \rangle.$$

In fact, this presentation can be interpreted in terms of “lamplighters” quite naturally as follows.

Consider the abelian group  $\mathfrak{W}$  of all finitely supported functions  $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{Z}_q$  (the *configurations* of “lamps”). Thus,  $\mathfrak{W}$  is generated by all point masses  $\delta_{x,y}$  at position  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  (with  $\delta_{x,y}(x, y) = 1 \in \mathfrak{Z}_q$  and 0 elsewhere). Let  $\mathfrak{W}$  be the subgroup generated by all elements of the form  $\delta_{x,y} + \delta_{x+1,y} - \delta_{x,y+1}$ , where  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ . The group  $\mathbb{Z}^2 = \langle s, t \rangle$  acts by translations on  $\mathfrak{W}$  preserving  $\mathfrak{W}$ , and one has  $\Gamma \cong \langle s, t \rangle \ltimes (\mathfrak{W}/\mathfrak{W})$ , by identifying the element  $a$  of the presentation (4.6) with  $\delta_{0,0}$ , and more generally  $a^{s^x t^y}$  with  $\delta_{x,y}$ .

Using Corollary 3.15, it is easy to identify  $\Gamma$  with  $\mathrm{DL}_3(q)$ , under the correspondence

$$a \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad s \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} (1+t)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We also remark that in our context it may be more adequate to replace  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  with  $\mathbb{A}_2$  via the correspondence  $(x, y) \mapsto (x, y, -x - y)$ .

More generally, a presentation of  $\Gamma_d(q)$  may be read from DL, as follows.

**(4.7) Theorem.** *Under the hypotheses and with the notation of Corollary 3.17, if  $d \geq 3$ , the group  $\Gamma_d(q)$  admits the presentation*

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_d(q) = \langle & g_{i,j,\lambda}, 1 \leq i, j \leq d (i \neq j), \lambda \in \mathfrak{Z}_q \mid g_{i,j,\lambda} g_{j,i,-\lambda}, \\ & g_{j,i,\lambda} g_{k,j,\mu} g_{i,k,\nu} \text{ whenever } \lambda + \mu + \nu = 0, \\ & g_{i,j,\lambda} g_{j,k,\mu} g_{k,i,\nu} \text{ whenever } \lambda + \mu + \nu = 0 \text{ and } \lambda \ell_k + \mu \ell_i + \nu \ell_j = 0 \text{ and } d \neq i, j, k, \\ & g_{i,j,\lambda} g_{j,d,\mu} g_{d,i,\nu} \text{ whenever } \mu + \nu = 0 \text{ and } \lambda + \mu \ell_i + \nu \ell_j = 0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 4.4, the 2-skeleton of DL is simply connected if  $d \geq 3$ . Therefore a presentation of  $\Gamma_d(q)$  may be read from this 2-skeleton. The generators are the  $\Gamma_d(q)$ -orbits of edges, and the relations are the  $\Gamma_d(q)$ -orbits of 2-cells. These orbits can be identified with the neighbourhood of a given vertex. There are  $d(d-1)q$  generators, since this last number is the vertex degree in  $\text{DL}_d(q)$ .

The group element  $g_{i,j,\lambda}$  maps  $o$  to its neighbour  $x$  of type  $\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j$  with label  $\lambda$ , that is,  $x_j = o_j^-$ ,  $x_i^- = o_i$ , and the label on the edge  $[o_i, x_i]$  of  $T_i$  is  $\lambda$ . Thus, the inverse of  $g_{i,j,\lambda}$  is  $g_{j,i,-\lambda}$ .

There are  $d(d-1)(d-2)q^2$  relations of length 3 corresponding to the first kind of triangles indicated in Remark 4.1; these are given by the relations in the third line. There are also  $d(d-1)(d-2)q$  relations of length 3 corresponding to the second kind of triangles indicated in Remark 4.1; these are given by the relations in the last two lines.  $\square$

Note that the generators  $g_{i,d,\lambda}$  and  $g_{i,j,\lambda}$  seem to have different roles in the above presentation. This asymmetry can be masked as follows: define polynomials  $\Lambda_i = t + \ell_i$  for  $i < d$ , and  $\Lambda_d = 1$ . Then the presentation can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_d(q) = \langle & g_{i,j,\lambda}, 1 \leq i, j \leq d (i \neq j), \lambda \in \mathfrak{Z}_q \mid g_{i,j,\lambda} g_{j,i,-\lambda}, \\ & g_{j,i,\lambda} g_{k,j,\mu} g_{i,k,\nu} \text{ whenever } \lambda + \mu + \nu = 0, \\ & g_{i,j,\lambda} g_{j,k,\mu} g_{k,i,\nu} \text{ whenever } \lambda \Lambda_k + \mu \Lambda_i + \nu \Lambda_j = 0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, combining with Corollary 4.5, we obtain:

**(4.8) Corollary.** *The lamplighter group  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$  can, for all  $d$ , be embedded in a metabelian group of type  $F_d$ .*

*Proof.* We will use some algebraic number theory in the proof.

Factor  $q = p_1 \cdots p_r$  as a product of prime powers. It suffices to embed  $\mathfrak{Z}_{p_i} \wr \mathbb{Z}$  in a metabelian group of type  $F_d$ . Indeed,  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \cong \mathfrak{Z}_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{Z}_{p_r}$ , so that by identifying  $\mathbb{Z}$  with the principal diagonal of  $\mathbb{Z}^r$  via  $k \leftrightarrow (k, \dots, k)$ , we can embed  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$  into the direct product of the  $\mathfrak{Z}_{p_i} \wr \mathbb{Z}$ . But type  $F_d$  is inherited by products.

Write therefore  $p_i = p^n$  as a prime power, and let  $s$  be such that  $p^s \geq d$ . The field  $\mathbb{F}_{p^s}$  contains elements  $\ell'_1, \dots, \ell'_d$  whose pairwise differences are invertible.

There exists a unique non-ramified extension  $\mathbb{K}$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , with ring of integers  $\mathfrak{D}$  and maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M} = p\mathfrak{D}$ , such that  $\mathfrak{D}/\mathcal{M} \cong \mathbb{F}_{p^s}$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbb{K}$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ -vector space of dimension  $s$ , and  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a free  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -module of rank  $s$ . For all  $i$ , let  $\ell''_i$  be an arbitrary preimage of  $\ell'_i$  in  $\mathfrak{D}$  under the natural projection  $\mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{p^s}$ . Then the pairwise differences  $\ell''_i - \ell''_j$  lie in  $\mathfrak{D} \setminus \mathcal{M}$ , and are therefore invertible in  $\mathfrak{D}$ .

Now set  $\mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{M}^n$ ; since  $\mathbb{Z}_p/p^n\mathbb{Z}_p \cong \mathfrak{Z}_{p^n}$ , this is a free  $\mathfrak{Z}_{p^n}$ -module. Let  $\ell_i$  be the image of  $\ell_i''$  in  $\mathfrak{L}$ . The pairwise differences of the different  $\ell_i$  are again invertible in  $\mathfrak{L}$ .

In the group  $\Gamma_{d+1}(\mathfrak{L})$  — which has type  $F_d$  by Corollary 4.5 — consider the elements  $x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $y = \begin{pmatrix} 1+\ell_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Then  $x$  has order  $p^n$ , and the subgroup  $\langle x, y \rangle$  of  $\Gamma_{d+1}(\mathfrak{L})$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{Z}_{p^n} \wr \mathbb{Z}$ .  $\square$

Note that it is not possible to embed  $\mathfrak{Z}_q \wr \mathbb{Z}$  in a metabelian group of type  $F$  (i.e., one with a compact  $K(\Gamma, 1)$ ). Indeed recall the following from BIERI AND GROVES [9]: a group  $G$  is of type  $FP_n$ , for  $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , if the trivial  $G$ -module  $\mathbb{Z}$  admits a  $\mathbb{Z}G$ -projective resolution of bounded rank in each dimension up to  $n$ ; this condition is weaker than type  $F_n$ . A group  $G$  is of type  $FP$  if it is of type  $FP_\infty$  and has finite cohomological dimension; this condition is weaker than type  $F$ , but it also implies that  $G$  is torsion-free. In [9] it is proven that a metabelian group of type  $FP_\infty$  is virtually of type  $FP$ , and therefore is virtually torsion-free.

**(4.9) Remark.** Assume that  $\Gamma$  is one of the groups with Cayley graph  $DL_d(q)$ , constructed in §3. Then  $\Gamma$  is in most cases an “automata group”, as we shall explain below. But it is never an “automatic group” in the sense of EPSTEIN ET AL. [24]. Indeed, by Corollary 4.5,  $\Gamma$  is of type  $F_{d-1}$  but not of type  $F_d$ ; in particular it is not of type  $FP_\infty$ . On the other hand, automatic groups are always of type  $FP_\infty$ , by [24, Theorem 10.2.6].

We briefly recall the definition of automata groups. Fix an alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Automata groups are permutation groups of the set of infinite words  $\Sigma^\infty$ . A family of *automatic transformations* is given by a machine with bounded memory computing the permutation in real time. It can be modeled by a finite set of states  $A$  and a function  $\Phi : A \times \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma \times A$  such that for all  $a \in A$  the composition  $((\tau, b) \mapsto \tau) \circ \Phi \circ (\sigma \mapsto (a, \sigma))$  is a permutation of  $\Sigma$ . The associated transformations  $T_a$ , for  $a \in A$ , act on infinite strings  $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2\cdots \in \Sigma^\infty$  by

$$T_a(\sigma) = \tau_1 T_b(\sigma_2\sigma_3\cdots), \text{ if } \Phi(a, \sigma_1) = (\tau_1, b).$$

The product and inverse of automatic transformations are easily seen to be automatic.

Assume now that the group  $\Gamma = \Gamma_d(\mathfrak{L}_q)$  is constructed as in Theorem 3.6 by use of elements  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{d-1} \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  whose pairwise differences are invertible. Assume furthermore that all  $\ell_i \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  are invertible. Identify  $\Sigma$  with  $\mathfrak{L}_q$ , and  $\Sigma^\infty$  with  $\mathfrak{L}_q[[t]]$ , the ring of formal power series in  $t$  over  $\mathfrak{L}_q$ .

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, d-1\}$ , consider the finite set of states  $A^{(j)} \cong \mathfrak{L}_q$  with associated affine transformations  $T_a^{(j)}$  of  $\Sigma^\infty \cong \mathfrak{L}_q[[t]]$  of the form

$$(4.10) \quad T_a^{(j)}(\mathbf{f}(t)) = a + (t + \ell_j)\mathbf{f}(t), \quad \text{where } a \in \mathfrak{L}_q.$$

Note here that invertibility of  $\ell_j$  implies that also the inverse transformation of  $T_a^{(j)}$  preserves  $\mathfrak{L}_q[[t]]$ . If we write  $\mathbf{f}(t) = b_0 + t\mathbf{g}(t)$  with constant term  $b_0 \in \mathfrak{L}_q$  and  $\mathbf{g}(t) \in \mathfrak{L}_q[[t]]$ , then

$$T_a^{(j)}(\mathbf{f}(t)) = (\ell_j b_0 + a) + t \cdot T_{b_0}^{(j)}(\mathbf{g}(t)),$$

and therefore each  $T_a^{(j)}$  is an automatic transformation, with

$$\Phi_j(a, b) = (\ell_j b + a, b).$$

Since  $\Gamma$  is generated by  $\{T_a^{(j)} : j = 1, \dots, d-1, a \in \mathfrak{L}_q\}$ , all its elements are automatic transformations. We note again that in the construction above we need  $\ell_j$  to be invertible; the inverse of  $T_a^{(j)}$  is the transformation defined on the set of states  $A^{(j)} \cong \mathfrak{L}_q$  by the map  $\bar{\Phi}(a, b) = ((b-a)\ell_j^{-1}, (b-a)\ell_j^{-1})$ .

For more general information on automata groups, see the survey by BARTHOLDI, GRIGORCHUK AND NEKRASHEVYCH [2].

We finally remark here that  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  has rational growth function  $\sum_{x \in \text{DL}} t^{d(x,o)}$ , where  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the graph metric. We intend to come back to this point on another occasion.

## 5. THE SPECTRUM OF SIMPLE RANDOM WALK

Recall the definition (1.5), (1.6) of the SRW operator  $P$ . It acts on the space  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$  of all square-summable functions  $f : \text{DL} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with the standard inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_x f(x)\overline{g(x)}$ . Since  $P$  is stochastic and self-adjoint, we have  $\|P\| = \rho(P) \leq 1$ , where  $\rho(P)$  is its spectral radius. We also set  $\rho'(P) = \min \text{spec}(P)$ , and write  $D = (d-1) \sum_i q_i$  for the (constant) vertex degree of  $\text{DL}$ .

### A. Polyhedra and horizontal functions.

We now generalize the method of [3], where the spectrum of SRW on the horocyclic product of two trees was considered.

A function  $f : \text{DL} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *horizontal* if it is finitely supported and

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{y_j \in \mathbb{T}_j : \mathfrak{h}(y_j) = \mathfrak{h}(x_j)} f(x_1 \cdots x_{j-1} y_j x_{j+1} \cdots x_d) = 0$$

for every  $x = x_1 \cdots x_d \in \text{DL}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ .

**(5.2) Lemma.** *The subspace of  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$  spanned by the horizontal functions is dense.*

*Proof.* Since the point masses  $\delta_x$  ( $x \in \text{DL}$ ) generate a dense subspace of  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$ , and since  $\text{DL}$  is vertex-transitive, it is sufficient to show that  $\delta_o$  (with  $o = o_1 \cdots o_d$ ) can be approximated in the  $\ell^2$ -norm by horizontal functions.

For each  $j$ , pick a vertex  $b_j = b_j^n$  of  $T_j$  on the horocycle  $H_{-n}^j$  of  $T_j$  that is not an ancestor of  $o_j$ . Now let  $f_j = f_j^{(n)}$  be the function on  $T_j$  defined by

$$f_j(x_j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x_j = o_j, \\ -q_j^{-n}, & \text{if } b_j \preceq x_j \in H_0^j, \\ 0 & \text{in all other cases.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $f = f^{(n)}$  be defined by  $f(x_1 \cdots x_d) = f_1(x_1) \cdots f_d(x_d)$ . This function is horizontal, and

$$\|f^{(n)} - \delta_o\|^2 = \prod_{j=1}^d (q_j^{-n} + 1) - 1 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad \square$$

**(5.3) Definition.** Let  $a_1, \dots, a_d$  be vertices of  $T_1, \dots, T_d$ , respectively, such that  $N = -\sum_{j=1}^d \mathfrak{h}(a_j) \geq 2$ . The *polyhedron*  $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{S}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  is the induced subgraph of  $\text{DL}$  on



the set

$$\{x_1 \cdots x_d \in \text{DL} : a_j \preceq x_j \forall j = 1, \dots, d\}$$

with *height*  $N = N(\mathbf{S})$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{S}$  is finite; the octahedra  $\mathcal{O}$  of Definition 4.2 are unions of  $2^d$  polyhedra of the same height. Set

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{h} &= \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{S}) = (\mathfrak{h}(a_1), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(a_d)) \in \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ B_{\mathbf{h}} &= \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{A}_{d-1} : k_j \geq \mathfrak{h}(a_j) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, d\}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$  are two polyhedra with the same height  $N = N(\mathbf{S}) = N(\tilde{\mathbf{S}})$ , then the graphs  $B_{\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{S})}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{h}(\tilde{\mathbf{S}})}$  are isomorphic. As a representative of their isomorphism class, we single out the following one, by a slight abuse of notation:

$$B_N = B_{(0, \dots, 0, -N)} = \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{A}_{d-1} : k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \geq 0, k_d \geq -N\}.$$

It contains  $\binom{N+d-1}{d-1}$  elements. If  $x = x_1 \cdots x_d$  is an element of  $\mathbf{S}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  and  $\mathfrak{h}(x) = (\mathfrak{h}(x_1), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(x_d))$  then  $\mathfrak{h}(x) - \mathbf{h} - N\mathbf{e}_d \in B_N$ . In particular, for each  $j$ , we have  $x_j \in T(a_j) = \{y_j \in T_j : a_j \preceq y_j\}$  and  $d(x_j, a_j) \leq N$ . The *boundary*  $\partial\mathbf{S}$  of  $\mathbf{S}$ , that is, the set of all points in  $\mathbf{S}$  having a neighbour in  $\text{DL} \setminus \mathbf{S}$ , consists of all points  $x \in \mathbf{S}$  for which there is at least one  $j$  such that  $x_j = a_j$ . The *interior* of  $\mathbf{S}$  is  $\mathbf{S}^\circ = \mathbf{S} \setminus \partial\mathbf{S}$ . Analogously, we set  $\partial B_{\mathbf{h}} = \{\mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}} : k_j = \mathfrak{h}(a_j) \text{ for some } j\}$  and  $B_{\mathbf{h}}^\circ = B_{\mathbf{h}} \setminus \partial B_{\mathbf{h}}$ , the boundary and interior of the graph  $B_{\mathbf{h}}$ , compare with Figure 7.




Figure 7

For  $\mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}$ , the  $\mathbf{k}$ -th *level* of  $\mathbf{S}$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\mathbf{k}} &= L_{\mathbf{k}}(a_1, \dots, a_d) = \{x \in \mathbf{S} : \mathfrak{h}(x_j) = k_j, j = 1, \dots, d\} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^d (T_j(a_j) \cap H_{k_j}^j) \end{aligned}$$

where  $H_m^j$  denotes the  $m$ -th horocycle of the tree  $T_j$ . As in Figure 1, we can label all edges of  $T_j$  by the elements of  $\mathfrak{Z}_{q_j}$  such that for each vertex of  $T_j$ , the edges to its successors carry all distinct labels. Write  $v_{j,l}$  for the successor of  $a_j$  such that the edge from  $a_j$  to

$v_{j,l}$  has label  $l \in \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j}$ . We choose a function  $\varphi^j : \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j}} \varphi^j(l) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j}} (\varphi^j(l))^2 = 1.$$

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we denote by  $f_k^j = f_k^j[a_j, \varphi^j] : T_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the function

$$(5.6) \quad f_k^j(x_j) = \begin{cases} \varphi^j(l) q^{\mathfrak{h}(a_j) - k + 1/2}, & \text{if } k > \mathfrak{h}(a_j) \text{ and } v_{j,l} \preceq x_j \in H_k^j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and we define for each  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{A}_{d-1}$  the following function on DL :

$$(5.7) \quad f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}(x) = f_{\mathbf{k}}[\mathcal{S}, \varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^d](x) = \prod_{j=1}^d f_{k_j}^j(x_j), \quad x = x_1 \cdots x_d \in \text{DL}.$$

Since  $f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}} \equiv 0$  on  $\text{DL} \setminus \mathcal{S}^\circ$ , we can also consider  $f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}$  as a function on  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  which is 0 on  $\partial \mathcal{S}$ .

**(5.8) Lemma.** *The functions  $f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}$ , where  $\mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}^o$  and  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}(\mathcal{S})$ , are horizontal and orthonormal in  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$ , and*

$$P f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_i q_j} f_{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j, \mathcal{S}}.$$

*Proof.* It is immediate by construction that the  $f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}$ ,  $\mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}^o$ , are horizontal and orthonormal. Regarding the action of  $P$ , first note that for each  $x_j \in T_j$ , we have

$$\sum_{y_j : y_j^- = x_j} f_k^j(y_j) = \sqrt{q_j} f_{k-1}^j(x_j),$$

and when  $x_j^- \neq a_j$  then also  $f_k^j(x_j^-) = \sqrt{q_j} f_{k+1}^j(x_j)$ . Thus, we have for  $x \in \text{DL} \setminus \partial \mathcal{S}$

$$\begin{aligned} P f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}(x) &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq i} \sum_{y \in N_{j,i}(x)} f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}(y) \\ &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d f_{k_i}^i(x_i^-) \sum_{j \neq i} \left( \sum_{y_j \in T_j : y_j^- = x_j} f_{k_j}^j(y_j) \right) \prod_{l \neq i, j} f_{k_l}^l(x_l) \end{aligned}$$

(using now that  $x \notin \partial \mathcal{S}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d \sqrt{q_i} f_{k_i+1}^i(x_i) \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_j} f_{k_j-1}^j(x_j) \prod_{l \neq i, j} f_{k_l}^l(x_l) \\ &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_i q_j} f_{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j, \mathcal{S}}(x). \end{aligned}$$

When  $x \in \partial \mathcal{S}$ , there is  $j'$  such that  $x_{j'} = a_{j'}$ . Thus, the double sum in the last line vanishes. On the other hand, we split the sum in the second line into three pieces. The first is the sum over all pairs  $(i, j)$  with  $i \neq j$  and both  $i, j \neq j'$ . Then  $\prod_{l \neq i, j} f_{k_l}^l(x_l) = 0$ ,

since this product contains the factor  $f_{k_{j'-1}}^j(a_{j'}) = 0$ . The second is the sum over all pairs  $(i, j)$  with  $i \neq j'$  and  $j = j'$ . Then  $\sum_{y_j^- = x_j} f_{k_j}^j(y_j) = 0$  since  $x_{j'} = a_{j'}$ . The third is the sum over all pairs  $(i, j)$  with  $i = j'$  and  $j \neq j'$ . But then  $f_{k_i}^i(x_i^-) = f_{k_{j'}}^{j'}(a_{j'}^-) = 0$ . Thus, we also have  $Pf_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}}(x) = 0$  when  $x \in \partial \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**(5.9) Corollary.** *If  $q_1 = \dots = q_d = q$  then for all  $\mathbf{k} \in B_N^o$ ,*

$$Pf_{\mathbf{k}, \mathcal{S}} = \frac{1}{d(d-1)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq i} f_{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j, \mathcal{S}}.$$

## B. The spectra of $Q$ and $P$ .

Lemma 5.8 leads us to consider the self-adjoint convolution operator on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$  defined by

$$(5.10) \quad Qf(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_i q_j} f(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j).$$

It leaves the subspace  $\ell^2(\mathbb{A}_{d-1})$  invariant.

**(5.11) Proposition.** *The spectrum of  $Q$  is an interval  $[\rho'(Q), \rho(Q)]$  with endpoints  $\rho(Q) = \sum_{i,j:j \neq i} \sqrt{q_i q_j} / D$  and  $\rho'(Q) \geq -1/(d-1)$ .*

- (i) *If there is an  $i$  such that  $\sqrt{q_i} > \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_j}$  then  $\rho'(Q) > -1/(d-1)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $d = 2$  then  $\rho'(Q) = -\rho(Q)$ .*
- (iii) *If for each  $i$  there is  $j \neq i$  such that  $q_i = q_j$  then  $\rho'(Q) = -1/(d-1)$ .*
- (iv) *In particular, if  $q_1 = \dots = q_d$  then  $\text{spec}(Q) = [-\frac{1}{d-1}, 1]$ .*

*Proof.* For  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_d) \in [0, 2\pi]^d$ , the conjugate of the operator  $Q$  with the Fourier transform is the operator of multiplication with the function

$$\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i,j:j \neq i} \sqrt{q_i q_j} \cos(t_i - t_j).$$

It is well known that  $\text{spec}(Q)$  coincides with the set of values of  $\widehat{Q}$ . As a continuous image of the connected set  $[0, 2\pi]^d$ , it must be an interval. The upper bound  $\rho(Q)$  is attained for  $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$ . For the lower bound, rewrite

$$\widehat{Q}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{D} \left( \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{q_j} e^{it_j} \right|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^d q_j \right) \geq -\frac{1}{D} \sum_{j=1}^d q_j = -\frac{1}{d-1}.$$

(Here,  $\mathbf{i}$  is the complex unit.)

In case (i), we have

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{q_j} e^{it_j} \right| \geq \sqrt{q_i} - \sum_{j \neq i} \sqrt{q_j} > 0,$$

whence  $\inf_{\mathbf{t}} \widehat{Q}(\mathbf{t}) > -1/(d-1)$ .

In case (ii), we find  $\widehat{Q}(\pi, 0) = -\rho(Q)$ .

In case (iii), suppose without loss of generality that there are  $2 \leq r(1) \leq \dots \leq r(s) = d$  such that  $r(l) - r(l-1) \geq 2$  and  $q_j = q_{r(l)}$  for  $r(l-1) < j \leq r(l)$ . For those  $j$ , we set  $t_j = 2\pi j / (r(l) - r(l-1))$ , so that  $\sum_{j=r(l-1)+1}^{r(l)} e^{it_j} = 0$ , whence  $\widehat{Q}(t_1, \dots, t_d) = -1/(d-1)$ .  $\square$

Now consider the vector space  $\mathfrak{X}_0(B_{\mathbf{h}})$  of all functions  $f : B_{\mathbf{h}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with  $f \equiv 0$  on  $\partial B_{\mathbf{h}}$ , and the symmetric operator (matrix)  $Q_{\mathbf{h}} : \mathfrak{X}_0(B_{\mathbf{h}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}_0(B_{\mathbf{h}})$  defined by

$$Q_{\mathbf{h}}f(\mathbf{k}) = \begin{cases} Qf(\mathbf{k}), & \text{if } \mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}^o, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{k} \in \partial B_{\mathbf{h}}. \end{cases}$$

Again by slight abuse of notation, we write  $Q_N$  for  $Q_{(0, \dots, 0, -N)}$ , acting on  $\mathfrak{X}_0(B_N)$ . Since  $B_{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $B_N$  are isomorphic when  $\langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = -N$ , we have  $\text{spec}(Q_{\mathbf{h}}) = \text{spec}(Q_N)$  in this case.

**(5.12) Lemma.**  $\text{spec}(Q) = \overline{\bigcup_{N \geq 2} \text{spec}(Q_N)}$ .

*Proof.* The operator  $Q$  is the simple random walk operator on  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$ . In particular,  $\text{spec}(Q)$  is the spectrum of  $Q$  acting on  $\ell^2(\mathbb{A}_{d-1})$ .

Consider functions in  $\mathfrak{X}_0(B_N)$  as functions on  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$  with value 0 outside of  $B_N^o$ . For each  $f \in \mathfrak{X}_0(B_N)$ , we have  $Q_N f(\mathbf{k}) = Qf(\mathbf{k})$  for each  $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{A}_{d-1} \setminus \partial B_N$ , while  $f \equiv 0$  on  $\partial B_N$ . Therefore

$$\langle Q_N f, f \rangle = \langle Qf, f \rangle \begin{cases} \leq \rho(Q) \langle f, f \rangle \\ \geq \rho'(Q) \langle f, f \rangle. \end{cases}$$

Consequently  $\rho'(Q) \leq \rho'(Q_N) \leq \rho(Q_N) \leq \rho(Q)$ , and

$$\text{spec}(Q_N) \subset [\rho'(Q), \rho(Q)] = \text{spec}(Q).$$

On the other hand, choose  $\lambda \in \text{spec} Q$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . As  $Q$  is self-adjoint there exists a *finitely supported*  $f \in \ell^2(\mathbb{A}_{d-1})$  of norm 1 such that  $\|\lambda f - Qf\| < \varepsilon$ . There is an  $\mathbf{h}$  such that  $f \in \mathfrak{X}_0(B_{\mathbf{h}})$  and  $Qf = Q_{\mathbf{h}}f$ . Thus, expanding  $f$  with respect to an orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{X}_0(B_{\mathbf{h}})$  consisting of  $Q_{\mathbf{h}}$ -eigenfunctions, we see that there must be an eigenvalue  $\lambda'$  of  $Q_{\mathbf{h}}$  such that  $|\lambda - \lambda'| < \varepsilon$ . Since  $\text{spec}(Q_{\mathbf{h}}) = \text{spec}(Q_N)$ , where  $N = -\langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{1} \rangle$ , the proof is complete.  $\square$

**(5.13) Lemma.** Let  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{S}(\widetilde{a}_1, \dots, \widetilde{a}_d)$  be two polyhedra, both of height  $\geq 2$ , and set  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{S})$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbf{h}} = \mathbf{h}(\widetilde{\mathbf{S}})$ . Furthermore let  $\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^d$  and  $\widetilde{\varphi}^1, \dots, \widetilde{\varphi}^d$  be functions on  $\mathfrak{Z}_{q_j}$  satisfying (5.5). For  $\mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}^o$  and  $\mathbf{l} \in B_{\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}}^o$ , write  $f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{S}} = f_{\mathbf{k}}[\mathbf{S}, \varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^d]$  and  $\widetilde{f}_{\mathbf{l}, \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}} = f_{\mathbf{l}}[\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}, \widetilde{\varphi}^1, \dots, \widetilde{\varphi}^d]$ .

Suppose that one of the following conditions is satisfied.

- (1)  $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \neq (\widetilde{a}_1, \dots, \widetilde{a}_d)$ , or
- (2)  $(a_1, \dots, a_d) = (\widetilde{a}_1, \dots, \widetilde{a}_d)$  and  $\varphi^j \perp \widetilde{\varphi}^j$  in  $\ell^2(\mathfrak{Z}_{q_j})$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ .

Then

$$\{f_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{S}} : \mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathbf{h}}^o\} \perp \{\widetilde{f}_{\mathbf{l}, \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}} : \mathbf{l} \in B_{\widetilde{\mathbf{h}}}^o\}.$$

*Proof.* (1) If  $\mathbf{S} \cap \widetilde{\mathbf{S}} = \emptyset$  then the above two sets are obviously orthogonal.

Suppose now  $S \cap \tilde{S} \neq \emptyset$ . There is  $j$  such that  $a_j \neq \tilde{a}_j$ , and  $a_j, \tilde{a}_j$  are comparable in the ancestor relation  $\preceq$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $a_1 \neq \tilde{a}_1$  and  $a_1 \preceq \tilde{a}_1$  and  $a_1 \neq \tilde{a}_1$ . Then  $\tilde{a}_1 \succ v_{1,l}$ , where the latter is one of the successors of  $a_1$  in  $T_1$ .

Let  $\mathbf{k} \in B_N^o$  and  $\mathbf{l} \in B_{\tilde{N}}^o$  be given. If  $\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{l}$  then certainly  $f_{\mathbf{k},S} \perp \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{l},\tilde{S}}$ , as these functions are supported on disjoint sets.

Assume therefore  $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{l}$ . By construction (5.6), the function  $f_{k_1}^1$  on the subtree of  $T_1$  is constant on the support of  $\tilde{f}_{k_1}^1$ . Also by construction, the sum of  $\tilde{f}_{k_1}^1$  over its support is  $= 0$ . Thus,

$$\sum_{x_1 \in T_1: \mathfrak{h}(x_1) = k_1} f_{k_1}^1(x_1) \tilde{f}_{k_1}^1(x_1) = 0,$$

that is,  $f_{k_1}^1 \perp \tilde{f}_{k_1}^1$ . Hence, again by construction (5.6),

$$\sum_x f_{\mathbf{k},S}(x) \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{l},\tilde{S}}(x) = \prod_j \sum_{x_j} f_{k_j}^j(x_j) \tilde{f}_{k_j}^j(x_j) = 0.$$

(2) If  $(a_1, \dots, a_d) = (\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_d)$  then  $\tilde{S} = S$  and  $\tilde{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{h}$ . If  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in B_N^o$  are distinct then  $f_{\mathbf{k},S}$  and  $f_{\mathbf{l},S}$  have disjoint support and are perpendicular. In the last remaining case, we compute

$$\langle f_{\mathbf{k},S}, \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{k},S} \rangle = \prod_{j=1}^d \langle \varphi^j, \tilde{\varphi}^j \rangle = 0. \quad \square$$

Now let  $\{\psi_{\mathbf{m},N} : \mathbf{m} \in B_N^o\}$  be an orthonormal basis of  $\mathfrak{A}_0(B_N)$  consisting of eigenfunctions (-vectors) of  $Q_N$  with associated eigenvalues  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m},N}$ , parametrized by all  $\mathbf{m} \in B_N^o$ . The following is immediate from Lemma 5.8 and the fact that for  $\langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{1} \rangle = -N$ , the natural isomorphism  $B_N \rightarrow B_{\mathbf{h}}$  is given by  $\mathbf{k} \mapsto \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{h} + N\mathbf{e}_d$ .

**(5.14) Corollary.** *Let  $S = S(a_1, \dots, a_d)$ ,  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}(S)$  and  $N = N(S)$ . The functions  $g_{\mathbf{m},S} : \text{DL} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined by*

$$g_{\mathbf{m},S} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in B_N^o} \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k}) f_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{h}+N\mathbf{e}_d,S}, \quad \mathbf{m} \in B_N^o,$$

are orthonormal and horizontal vectors in  $\ell^2(S)$  as well as  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$ . They satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \text{span} \{g_{\mathbf{m},S} : \mathbf{m} \in B_N^o\} &= \text{span} \{f_{\mathbf{k},S} : \mathbf{k} \in B_{\mathfrak{h}}^o\} \quad \text{and} \\ P g_{\mathbf{m},S} &= \lambda_{\mathbf{m},N} \cdot g_{\mathbf{m},S}. \end{aligned}$$

Remember that each function  $g_{\mathbf{m},S}$ , with  $\mathbf{m} \in B_N^o$ , depends not only on the polyhedron  $S = S(a_1, \dots, a_d)$ , but also on the functions  $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d$  of (5.5), that is,

$$(5.15) \quad g_{\mathbf{m},S} = g_{\mathbf{m}}[S, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d].$$

For each  $q_j$ , we now select functions  $\varphi_k^j$ ,  $k \in \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j} \setminus \{0\}$  that satisfy (5.5) and are mutually orthogonal:

$$(5.16) \quad \varphi_l^j(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & s = 0, \dots, l-2, \\ (q_j - l) / \sqrt{(q_j - l)(q_j + 1 - l)}, & s = l-1, \\ -1 / \sqrt{(q_j - l)(q_j + 1 - l)}, & s = l, \dots, q_j - 1. \end{cases}$$

**(5.17) Proposition.** *The set*

$$\mathfrak{B}_S = \{g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d] : \tilde{S} \subset S, \mathbf{m} \in B_{N(\tilde{S})}^o, l_j \in \mathfrak{J}_{q_j} \setminus \{0\}\},$$

where  $\tilde{S}$  runs through all polyhedra with height  $N(\tilde{S}) \geq 2$  contained in  $S$ , is an orthonormal basis of the vector space  $\mathfrak{V}_0 S$  of all functions which are horizontal and supported by  $S$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 5.13 and Corollary 5.14 imply that the elements of  $\mathfrak{B}_S$  are orthonormal, whence linearly independent. What remains is to show that  $\mathfrak{B}_S$  spans the whole of  $\mathfrak{V}_0(S)$ . We can replace each  $g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d] \in \mathfrak{B}_S$  with  $f_{\mathbf{m}+\mathbf{h}+N\mathbf{e}_d}[\tilde{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d]$ , since these last functions are also linearly independent and span the same vector space by Corollary 5.14.

Recall that  $L_{\mathbf{k}}$  denotes the  $\mathbf{k}$ -th level of the polyhedron  $S$  with height  $N = N(S)$ . A function  $f$  in the space of all complex functions supported by  $L_{\mathbf{k}}$  is horizontal if and only if it satisfies each of the equations

$$\sum_{y_j \in \mathbb{T}_j : \mathfrak{h}(y_j) = \mathfrak{h}(x_j)} f(x_1 \cdots x_{j-1} y_j x_{j+1} \cdots x_d) = 0,$$

for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  and  $x_i \in T_i(a_i) \cap H_{k_i}^j$  for each  $i \neq j$ . The number of these equations is  $\sum_{j=1}^d \prod_{i \neq j} q_i^{k_i - \mathfrak{h}(a_i)}$ , but they are not independent. By inclusion-exclusion, we find

$$\dim \mathfrak{V}_0(L_{\mathbf{k}}) = \prod_{i=1}^d (q_i^{k_i - \mathfrak{h}(a_i)} - 1).$$

The proof will be complete when we can show that  $\mathfrak{V}_0(L_{\mathbf{k}})$  is spanned by all the functions  $f_{\mathbf{k}}[\tilde{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d]$ , where  $\tilde{S} \subset S$ , which are supported in  $L_{\mathbf{k}}$ . To this end, we count all functions of this last type (which are linearly independent).

First of all, the interior of  $\tilde{S} = S(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_d)$  has to intersect  $L_{\mathbf{k}}$ . This means that for each  $j$ , we need to have  $\mathfrak{h}(a_j) \leq \mathfrak{h}(\tilde{a}_j) < k_j$ . There are  $\sum_{r=0}^{k_j - \mathfrak{h}(a_j) - 1} q_j^r$  points  $\tilde{a}_j$  of this type. Thus, the number of feasible polyhedra  $\tilde{S}$  is  $\prod_{j=1}^d (q_j^{k_j - \mathfrak{h}(a_j)} - 1) / (q_j - 1)$ .

The remaining choices that we have are those of the functions  $\varphi_l^j$ , where  $l \in \mathfrak{J}_{q_j} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ . There are  $\prod_{j=1}^d (q_j - 1)$  such choices, so that the total number of functions  $f_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d]$  supported in  $L_{\mathbf{k}}$  is  $\prod_{j=1}^d (q_j^{k_j - \mathfrak{h}(a_j)} - 1)$ . This number coincides with the dimension of  $\mathfrak{V}_0(L_{\mathbf{k}})$ , as claimed.  $\square$

We now can show that as sets, the spectra of  $P$  on  $\ell^2(\text{DL})$  and  $Q$  on  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$  coincide, although their “inner structure” is completely different. Indeed,  $\text{spec}(Q)$  is continuous, i.e., the associated spectral (Plancherel) measure is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure, while for  $\text{spec}(P)$ , we have the following.

**(5.18) Theorem.** *The spectrum of the operator  $P$  is pure point. It is the closure of the set of eigenvalues*

$$\text{spec}_p(P) = \left\{ \lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} : N \geq 2, \mathbf{m} \in B_N^o \right\} = \bigcup_{N \geq 2} \text{spec}(Q_N).$$

Each eigenvalue has infinite multiplicity. An associated orthonormal basis consisting of finitely supported eigenfunctions of  $P$  is given by

$$\mathfrak{B} = \left\{ g_{\mathbf{m}}[\mathbf{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d] : \mathbf{S} \text{ polyhedron in DL with } n(\mathbf{S}) \geq 2, \mathbf{m} \in B_{N(\mathbf{S})}^o, l_j \in \mathfrak{Z}_{q_j} \setminus \{0\} \right\},$$

where  $g_{\mathbf{m}}[\mathbf{S}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \dots, \varphi_{l_d}^d]$  is defined in Corollary 5.14 and (5.15).

*Proof.* Pick any function  $f$  on DL which is horizontal. Its support is then contained in an appropriate polyhedron  $\mathbf{S}$ . Proposition 5.17 implies that  $f$  is in the span of  $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathbf{S}}$ . Hence every horizontal function is a linear combination of functions in  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{B}$  is an orthonormal basis by Lemma 5.2, and the whole spectrum must consist of the closure of the set of associated eigenvalues.  $\square$

In particular, we get  $\rho(P) = \rho(Q)$ , that is, the spectral radius of  $P$  is

$$(5.19) \quad \rho(P) = \frac{2}{D} \sum_{i,j:i < j} \sqrt{q_i q_j}, \quad \text{where } D = (d-1) \sum_i q_i.$$

This formula might also have been derived in a completely different way, by use of Theorem 1(b) of [41].

For  $\text{DL}(q_1, q_2)$ , the eigenvalues of  $P$  can be computed explicitly [3]. In general, this amounts to the explicit computation of the eigenvalues of  $Q_N$  on  $B_N$ . For  $d \geq 3$ , this is the precise discrete analogue to computing the eigenvalues of the Laplacian on the  $(d-1)$ -dimensional Euclidean simplex whose side lengths are proportional to  $\sqrt{q_i q_j}$  (respectively). An explicit solution to this last problem is known only for equilateral triangles in dimension  $d-1=2$ , but in no other case: this solution goes back to the work of Lamé in the 19th century, see e.g. LAMÉ [33], and has reappeared in the literature several times (with or without knowledge of Lamé's work), see PINSKY [38], PRÁGER [39, 40], MC-CARTIN [36].

### C. The spectrum of $P$ on $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$ .

We now consider briefly the case of  $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$ , where we have from Corollary 5.9 that  $Q$  is the transition operator of SRW on  $\mathbb{A}_2$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{S}_3$  be the permutation group of  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ . For  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_3$  and  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, k_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ , we write  $\sigma \mathbf{k} = (k_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, k_{\sigma^{-1}(2)}, k_{\sigma^{-1}(3)})$ . Also, we write  $\mathfrak{A}_3$  for the subgroup of even permutations in  $\mathfrak{S}_3$ . Now we define the following functions for  $N \geq 2$ .

$$(5.20) \quad \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}N} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_3} \text{sign}(\sigma) \exp\left(\text{sign}(\sigma) \frac{2\pi i}{3N} \langle \mathbf{m}, \sigma \mathbf{k} \rangle\right), \quad \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{A}_2.$$

**(5.21) Proposition.** *We have the following.*

- (a)  $\psi_{\mathbf{m}, N} = 0$  on  $\partial B_N$  for each  $\mathbf{m} \in B_N^o$
- (b)  $\langle \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}, \psi_{\mathbf{m}', N} \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}')$  on  $B_N$  for all  $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in B_N^o$ ,
- (c)  $Q_N \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N} = \lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} \cdot \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}$  on  $B_N$ , where

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} = \frac{1}{3} \left( \cos\left(\frac{2\pi(m_1 - m_2)}{3N}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{2\pi(m_2 - m_3)}{3N}\right) + \cos\left(\frac{2\pi(m_3 - m_1)}{3N}\right) \right).$$

*Proof.* (a) The boundary of  $B_N$  consists of the points  $k(\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_3)$  (first part),  $k(\mathbf{e}_2 - \mathbf{e}_3)$  (second part) and  $N(\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_3) + k(\mathbf{e}_2 - \mathbf{e}_1) = (N - k, k, -N)$  (third part), where  $k = 0, \dots, N$ .

Let  $\tau_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{S}_3$  be the transposition of  $i$  and  $j$  ( $i \neq j$ ). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(k\mathbf{e}_i - k\mathbf{e}_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}N} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{A}_3} \left( \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3N} \langle \mathbf{m}, \sigma(k\mathbf{e}_i - k\mathbf{e}_j) \rangle\right) - \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3N} \langle \mathbf{m}, -\sigma\tau_{i,j}(k\mathbf{e}_i - k\mathbf{e}_j) \rangle\right) \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\psi_{\mathbf{m},N} = 0$  on the first and second parts of  $\partial B_N$ . Regarding the third part, note that for  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{A}_2$ ,

$$\langle \mathbf{m}, (N - k, k, -N) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{m}, \tau_{1,2}(N - k, k, -N) \rangle = (m_1 + m_2 - 2m_3)N \equiv 0 \pmod{3N}.$$

Therefore, pairing each element  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{A}_3$  with  $\sigma\tau_{1,2}$  as in the above sum yields that  $\psi_{\mathbf{m},N} = 0$  on the third part of  $\partial B_N$ .

(b) We have by construction

$$\psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k}) = \text{sign}(\sigma)\psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\text{sign}(\sigma)\sigma\mathbf{k}),$$

and since for  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{A}_2$ , each of  $\langle \mathbf{m}, (N, N, -2N) \rangle$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{m}, (N, -2N, N) \rangle$  and  $\langle \mathbf{m}, (-2N, N, N) \rangle$  is a multiple of  $3N$ , we get

$$\psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k}) = \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k} + (N, N, -2N)) = \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k} + (N, -2N, N)) = \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}(\mathbf{k} + (-2N, N, N)).$$

That is, up to a change of the sign,  $\psi_{\mathbf{m},N}$  is invariant under the group of motions of  $\mathbb{A}_2$  generated by the translations  $\mathbf{k} \mapsto \mathbf{k} + N(\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_j - 2\mathbf{e}_l)$ , where  $\{i, j, l\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ , and the reflections  $\mathbf{k} \mapsto -\tau_{i,j}\mathbf{k}$ , where  $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ . Now  $B_{3N}$  is the union of 9 distinct images of  $B_N$  under elements of that group, and those images meet only at their respective boundaries, where  $\psi_{\mathbf{m},N} = 0$ . Therefore

$$\langle \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}, \psi_{\mathbf{m}',N} \rangle_{B_{3N}} = 9 \langle \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}, \psi_{\mathbf{m}',N} \rangle_{B_N},$$

where the inner products are taken over  $B_{3N}$  and  $B_N$ , respectively. Also,  $\psi_{\mathbf{m},N} = 0$  on  $\partial B_{3N}$ . Recall that  $\sum_{k=0}^{3N-1} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3N}rk\right) = 0$  when  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  is not a multiple of  $3N$ . We now obtain, setting  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2, -k_1 - k_2)$  if  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are given,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \psi_{\mathbf{m},N}, \psi_{\mathbf{m}',N} \rangle_{B_N} \\ &= \frac{1}{54N^2} \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}} \text{sign}(\sigma\tau) \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{3N-1} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{3N} \langle \text{sign}(\sigma)\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{m} - \text{sign}(\tau)\tau^{-1}\mathbf{m}', \mathbf{k} \rangle\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{6} \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}} \text{sign}(\sigma^{-1}\tau) \delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\text{sign}(\sigma^{-1}\tau)\sigma\tau^{-1}\mathbf{m}') \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}} \text{sign}(\sigma) \delta_{\mathbf{m}}((\text{sign}(\sigma)\sigma\mathbf{m}') = \delta_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}'), \end{aligned}$$

as  $B_N^\sigma \cap (\text{sign}(\sigma)\sigma)B_N^\sigma = \emptyset$  for  $\sigma \neq \text{id}$ .

(c) is a straightforward computation. □



**(5.22) Corollary.** *The spectrum of the SRW operator  $P$  on  $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$  is the interval  $[-\frac{1}{2}, 1]$ . It is the closure of the set of eigenvalues*

$$\{\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} : N \geq 2, \mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{A}_2 \text{ with } m_1, m_2 > 0, m_3 > -N\}$$

given by Proposition 5.21(c).

The associated orthonormal basis of finitely supported eigenfunctions can be computed explicitly by use of the functions  $\psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}$  of (5.20), according to Theorem 5.18.

We remark here that the groups  $\Gamma_3(\mathbb{Z}_q)$  and  $\Gamma_d(\mathbb{F}_q)$  ( $d \geq 3$ ) constructed in Corollaries 3.15 and 3.17 are the first examples of finitely *presented* groups where SRW has a pure point spectrum.

#### D. Spectral measure and return probabilities on $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$ .

If  $\mathfrak{B}$  is the orthonormal basis of Theorem 5.18 and we write  $\lambda(g)$  for the eigenvalue associated with  $g \in \mathfrak{B}$ , then we see that the  $n$ -step transition probabilities  $p^{(n)}(x, y) = p^{(n)}(y, x) = \langle P^n \delta_x, \delta_y \rangle$  satisfy

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{aligned} p^{(n)}(x, y) &= \sum_{g \in \mathfrak{B}} \lambda(g)^n g(x)g(y) = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{spec}_p(P)} \lambda^n \mu_{x,y}(\lambda), \quad \text{where} \\ \mu_{x,y}(\lambda) &= \sum_{g \in \mathfrak{B}: \lambda(g)=\lambda} g(x)g(y) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the  $(x, y)$ -element  $\mu_{x,y}$  of the *spectral measure* of the self-adjoint operator  $P$ , see e.g. GRIGORCHUK AND ŽUK [29] for spectra of Markov operators on graphs, and [3] in the context of DL-graphs. Since  $\text{spec}(P)$  is pure point,  $\mu_{x,y}$  is an infinite sum of weighted point masses  $\mu_{x,y}(\lambda) \delta_\lambda$ . We want to have a closer look at the measure  $\mu_{x,x} = \mu_{o,o}$ , which plays the role of the *Plancherel measure*.

The eigenvalues found in Proposition 5.21 satisfy the obvious relation  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} = \lambda_{\ell \mathbf{m}, \ell N}$  for each  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . Besides, we also have  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} = \lambda_{\tau_{1,2} \mathbf{m}, N}$  (exchanging of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ ), and when  $N$  and  $\mathbf{m} \in B_N^o$  are such that  $2m_1 + 4m_2 = 3N$  then  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N} = -1/3$ . In general, it is a very delicate task to determine all  $(\mathbf{m}', N')$  for which  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}', N'} = \lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N}$ , where  $(\mathbf{m}, N)$  is given. Thus, instead of a complete description, we pull back  $\mu_{o,o}$  to a measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  on the parameter space

$$(5.24) \quad \mathcal{M} = \{(\mathbf{m}, N) : N \geq 2, \mathbf{m} \in B_N^o, \text{gcd}(N, m_1, m_2) = 1\},$$

by considering only the first, obvious relation above. (Since  $m_3 = -m_2 - m_1$ , the parametrization is in reality over all  $N \geq 2$  and  $m_1, m_2 \geq 1$  with  $m_1 + m_2 \leq N - 1$ .) We note that for any polyhedron  $\mathbb{S}$ , we have  $g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{\mathbb{S}}, \varphi_{l_1}^1, \varphi_{l_2}^2, \varphi_{l_3}^3](o) \neq 0$  if and only if  $o \in S^o$  and (since the edge from each  $o_j$  to its predecessor in  $T_j$  has label 0) if  $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 1$ . We write  $g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{\mathbb{S}}] = g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{\mathbb{S}}, \varphi_1^1, \varphi_1^2, \varphi_1^3]$ . Thus, for  $(\mathbf{m}, N) \in \mathcal{M}$ , we compute

$$\tilde{\mu}(\mathbf{m}, N) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} Z(\ell \mathbf{m}, \ell N), \quad \text{where} \quad Z(\mathbf{m}, N) = \sum_{\mathbb{S}: o \in S^o, N(\mathbb{S})=N} (g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{\mathbb{S}}](o))^2.$$

Now let  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{S}(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ ,  $o \in \mathbf{S}^o$ ,  $N(\mathbf{S}) = N$  and  $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{S})$ . Then  $a_j \preccurlyeq o_j$ ,  $a_j \neq o_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ), and  $\mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{h} - N\mathbf{e}_3 \in B_N^o$ . We get from Corollary 5.14 that

$$g_{\mathbf{m}}[\tilde{\mathbf{S}}](o) = \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}(\mathbf{k}) f_0(o) = \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}(\mathbf{k}) (q-1)^{3/2} q^{-N/2}.$$

If we vary  $\mathbf{S}$  such that  $N(\mathbf{S}) = N$  and  $o \in \mathbf{S}^o$ , then this amounts to varying  $\mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{S}) - N\mathbf{e}_3$  in  $B_N^o$ . Thus

$$Z(\mathbf{m}, N) = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in B_N^o} \psi_{\mathbf{m}, N}(\mathbf{k})^2 (q-1)^3 q^{-N} = (q-1)^3 q^{-N},$$

and therefore

$$(5.25) \quad \tilde{\mu}(\mathbf{m}, N) = (q-1)^3 / (q^N - 1).$$

The Plancherel measure  $\mu_{o,o}$  is the image of  $\tilde{\mu}$  under the mapping  $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{spec}(P)$ ,  $(\mathbf{m}, N) \mapsto \lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N}$ . (If  $m_1 \neq m_2$  then this mapping is at least two-to-one.) We get in particular the following nice expression for the  $n$ -step return probabilities.

**(5.26) Corollary.** *With  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N}$  defined as in (5.24) and Proposition 5.21, respectively, the  $n$ -step return probabilities for SRW on  $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$  are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} p^{(n)}(x, x) &= \sum_{(\mathbf{m}, N) \in \mathcal{M}} \lambda_{\mathbf{m}, N}^n (q-1)^3 / (q^N - 1) \\ &\sim A n^{1/6} \exp(-B n^{1/3}), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for some } A, B > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $a_n \sim b_n$  means that  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We omit the computational details of the asymptotic formula, which follow the method of [3, §5]. Since for  $d \geq 4$ , the precise information about the spectral measure is not available, we cannot extend the above corollary to all DL-graphs. However, a rougher estimate is available. If  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  are two sequences of positive numbers, then we say that  $a_n \preccurlyeq b_n$  if there are constants  $C, D > 0$  such that  $a_n \leq C b_{Dn}$ . If  $a_n \preccurlyeq b_n$  and  $b_n \preccurlyeq a_n$ , then we say that  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$  have the same *asymptotic type*, and write  $a_n \approx b_n$ . Thus, SRW on  $\text{DL}(q, q, q)$  satisfies  $p^{(n)}(x, x) \approx \exp(-n^{1/3})$  by the above, and the same is true for  $\text{DL}(q, q)$  (when  $n$  is even, since  $\text{DL}(q, q)$  is bipartite), see [7, 3]. Also, for arbitrary  $d$ , when  $q_1, \dots, q_d$  do not all coincide then  $\rho(P) < 1$ , that is,

$$p^{(n)}(x, x) \approx \exp(-n) \quad \text{on } \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d),$$

again considering only even  $n$  when  $d = 2$ .

**(5.27) Proposition.** *For each  $d \geq 3$ , SRW on  $\text{DL}_d(q)$  satisfies  $p^{(n)}(x, x) \approx \exp(-n^{1/3})$ .*

*Proof.* We follow a well-known method, see e.g. [45, §14–15]. It is a general fact that on a vertex-transitive graph with exponential growth,  $p^{(n)}(x, x) \preccurlyeq \exp(-n^{1/3})$ , see [45, Corollary 14.5(b)]. Thus, we only need to prove the lower bound. This is based on the following estimate, where we take  $x = o$ , and  $A_m$  is a suitably chosen finite set of vertices of our graph, see e.g. [45, §15].

$$p^{(2n)}(o, o) \geq \text{Pr}_o[Z_n \in A_m]^2 / |A_m|,$$

where  $Z_n$  is the random position of the random walk starting at  $o$ . (For details of the probabilistic notions, see §6 below.)

Now let  $a_j = o_j^{-m}$  be the  $m$ -th predecessor of  $o_j$ , and set  $A_m = \mathcal{S}(a_1, \dots, a_d)$ . The cardinality of this set is of the order of  $C m^{d-1} q^{dm}$ . Let  $Z_{j,n} \in T_j$  be the  $j$ -th coordinate of  $Z_n$ . If  $Z_n \notin A_m$  then there must be  $k \leq n$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}(Z_{j,k}) < -m$ . Thus, if we set

$$S_n = \max\{|\mathfrak{h}(Z_{j,k})| : j = 1, \dots, d, k \leq n\},$$

then  $\Pr_o[Z_n \in A_m] \geq \Pr_o[S_n \leq m]$ . Since  $\mathfrak{H}(Z_n) = (\mathfrak{h}(Z_{1,n}), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(Z_{d,n}))$  defines a translation invariant random walk on  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1} \cong \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ , Lemma 1.2 of ALEXOPOULOS [1] implies that there are constants  $C', D' > 0$  such that

$$\Pr_o[S_n \leq m] \geq C' \exp(-D'n/m^2).$$

Therefore

$$p^{(2n)}(o, o) \geq \tilde{C} \exp\left(-\tilde{D}\left(\frac{n}{m^2} + m + \log m\right)\right).$$

Setting  $m = \lfloor n^{1/3} \rfloor$ , we obtain the claimed lower estimate.  $\square$

## 6. THE POISSON BOUNDARY OF RANDOM WALK

In this section, we consider a larger class of random walks than those of §5. On  $\text{DL} = \text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$ , consider a stochastic transition matrix

$$P = (p(x, y))_{x, y \in \text{DL}}$$

with the following properties:

- (i) *irreducibility*: For each  $x, y \in \text{DL}$  there is  $N$  such that the  $(x, y)$ -element of  $P^N$  satisfies  $p^{(N)}(x, y) > 0$ .
- (ii) *group-invariance*: the group

$$\Gamma = \{g \in \mathcal{A} : p(gx, gy) = p(x, y) \text{ for all } x, y \in \text{DL}\}$$

acts transitively on  $\text{DL}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is as in Proposition 2.5.

- (iii) *finite first moment*: for the graph metric  $d(\cdot, \cdot)$  of  $\text{DL}$ ,

$$m_1(P) = \sum_x p(o, x) d(o, x) < \infty.$$

Let  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$  be the random walk on  $\text{DL}$  governed by  $P$ , and let  $\Pr_{x_0}$  be the probability measure on the associated trajectory space for the initial point  $Z_0 = x_0$ . Thus,

$$\Pr_{x_0}[Z_{k+n} = y \mid Z_k = x] = p^{(n)}(x, y)$$

whenever  $\Pr_{x_0}[Z_k = x] = p^{(k)}(x_0, x) > 0$ .

Since  $\text{DL}$  is a vertex-transitive graph with exponential growth, the random walk is *transient*, that is,

$$\Pr_x[d(Z_n, Z_0) \rightarrow \infty] = 1,$$

see WOESS [45, Theorem 5.13]. Our first question is whether one can give a more precise geometric description of how  $(Z_n)$  tends to infinity in  $\text{DL}$ .

**(6.1) Definition.** The *geometric compactification*  $\widehat{\text{DL}}$  of DL is the closure of DL in  $\prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{T}_j$ . The *geometric boundary* of DL is

$$\partial\text{DL} = \widehat{\text{DL}} \setminus \text{DL} = \left\{ \zeta = \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_d \in \prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{T}_j : \zeta_j = \omega_j \text{ for at least one } j \right\}.$$

To justify the last fact, first observe that  $\left(\prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{T}_j\right) \setminus \left(\prod_{j=1}^d T_j\right)$  consists of all  $\zeta = \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_d \in \prod_{j=1}^d \widehat{T}_j$  such that  $\zeta_j \in \partial T_j$  for at least one  $j$  (while it may well be that some  $\zeta_i$  are vertices in  $T_i$ ). Now, if such a  $\zeta$  is the limit of a sequence  $x_n = x_{1,n} \cdots x_{d,n} \in \text{DL}$ , then we can distinguish the following cases:

(1) If there are coordinates  $i$  such that  $|\mathfrak{h}(x_{i,n})| \rightarrow \infty$  then there must be some  $j$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}(x_{j,n}) \rightarrow -\infty$  and consequently  $x_{j,n} \rightarrow \omega_j$ .

(2) If  $|\mathfrak{h}(x_{i,n})|$  is bounded for each  $i$ , then there still must be some coordinate  $j$  such that  $d(o_j, x_{j,n}) \rightarrow \infty$ . But in this case, we also must have  $\mathfrak{u}(o_j, x_{j,n}) \rightarrow \infty$ , see (2.2). Therefore  $x_{j,n} \rightarrow \omega_j$ .

In general, up to a permutation of the coordinates, the situation will be as follows: there are indices  $1 \leq r \leq s \leq d$  such that  $\zeta_j = \omega_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq r$  (and  $\mathfrak{h}(x_{j,n})$  may be bounded or unbounded from below as well as from above!),  $\zeta_j \in \partial^* T_j$  for  $r < j \leq s$  (and  $\mathfrak{h}(x_{j,n}) \rightarrow \infty$ ), and  $\zeta_j \in T_j$  for  $s < j \leq d$  (and  $x_{j,n} = \zeta_j$  for all but finitely many  $n$ ).

For a detailed description of boundary and convergence in the case  $d = 2$  (two trees), see [14, (5.3)] or BERTACCHI [7].

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , let  $\Gamma_j$  be the image of  $\Gamma$  under the projection  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Aff}(T_j)$ . This group acts transitively on  $T_j$ . Write  $Z_{j,n}$  for the image of  $Z_n$  under the projection  $\text{DL} \rightarrow T_j$ . Then  $(Z_{j,n})$  is an irreducible random walk on  $T_j$  whose transition probabilities  $p_j(x_j, y_j)$  are  $\Gamma_j$ -invariant. We also consider the image

$$\mathfrak{H}(Z_n) = (\mathfrak{h}(Z_{1,n}), \dots, \mathfrak{h}(Z_{d,n})) \in \mathbb{A}_{d-1}.$$

This defines a random walk on  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$  whose transition probabilities are invariant under translation by elements of  $\mathbb{A}_{d-1}$ . In the same way,  $(\mathfrak{h}(Z_{j,n}))_{n \geq 0}$  is a translation invariant random walk on  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Its increments are i.i.d. integer random variables with expected value

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_j(P) = E_o(\mathfrak{h}(Z_{j,1})) = \sum_{x \in \text{DL}} p(o, x) \mathfrak{h}(x_j),$$

which is finite, since  $|\alpha_j| \leq m_1(P)$ . Note that  $\sum_j \alpha_j = 0$ , so that there must be  $j$  with  $\alpha_j \leq 0$ . Applying the results of [19] and (for convergence to the boundary when  $\alpha_j = 0$ ) BROFFERIO [12, Theorem 3.1], one finds the following under the above assumptions (i)-(iii).

**(6.2) Proposition.** *For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , we have for the distance on  $T_j$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{d(Z_{j,n}, Z_{0,n})}{n} = |\alpha_j| \quad \text{Pr}_x\text{-almost surely,}$$

*and there is a  $\partial T_j$ -valued random variable  $Z_{j,\infty}$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_{j,n} = Z_{j,\infty} \quad \text{Pr}_x\text{-almost surely}$$

in the topology of  $\widehat{T}$ , for every  $x \in \text{DL}$ . One has the following.

(a) If  $\alpha_j \leq 0$  then  $Z_{j,\infty} = \omega_j$  almost surely.

(b) If  $\alpha_j > 0$  then  $Z_{j,\infty}$  is a  $\partial^*T_j$ -valued random variable whose  $\text{Pr}_x$ -distribution is a continuous measure (i.e., it carries no point mass) supported by the whole of  $\partial^*T_j$ .

*Proof.* The results in [19] and [12] are formulated for random walks on  $\text{Aff}(\mathbb{T}_q)$ , that is, for  $R_n o$ , where  $R_n = g_0 X_1 \cdots X_n$  (group product) and the  $X_n$  are i.i.d. group-valued random variables. The only point that we have to clarify is that our situation arises as a special case of that form.

There is a standard method for turning a  $\Gamma$ -invariant random walk on a transitive graph into  $R_n o$ , where  $(R_n)$  is a random walk on  $\Gamma$ ; see e.g. KAIMANOVICH AND WOESS [32, Prop. 2.15]. Indeed, if  $dg$  is the left Haar measure on the (locally compact, totally disconnected) group  $\Gamma$ , then

$$(6.3) \quad \mu(dg) = p(o, go) dg$$

defines a probability measure on  $\Gamma$ . Now let  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be i.i.d.  $\mu$ -distributed in  $\Gamma$ . Then  $Z_n = g_0 X_1 \cdots X_n o$  defines a Markov chain on the graph with  $Z_0 = g_0 o$  and transition matrix  $P$ .  $\square$

Let us write  $\Lambda_j(\alpha_j) = \{\omega_j\}$  if  $\alpha_j \leq 0$ , and  $\Lambda_j(\alpha_j) = \partial^*T_j$  if  $\alpha_j > 0$ , and define the following Borel subset of  $\partial \text{DL}$ :

$$(6.4) \quad \Lambda = \prod_{j=1}^d \Lambda_j(\alpha_j).$$

**(6.5) Corollary.** *Under assumptions (i)-(iii), there is a  $\Lambda$ -valued random variable  $Z_\infty$  such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Z_n = Z_\infty \quad \text{Pr}_x\text{-almost surely}$$

in the topology of  $\widehat{\text{DL}}$ , for every  $x \in \text{DL}$ . The  $\text{Pr}_x$ -distribution  $\nu_x$  of  $Z_\infty$  is a Borel probability measure supported by the whole of  $\Lambda$ . It is a continuous measure unless  $\Lambda = \{\omega_1 \cdots \omega_d\}$  is trivial, which happens precisely when  $\alpha_j = 0$  for all  $j$ .

The measures  $\nu_x$  satisfy  $\nu_x = \sum_y p(x, y) \nu_y$  and are mutually absolutely continuous.

(The last statement is immediate by factoring through the first step of the random walk, and using irreducibility.)

Thus, we see that the space  $\Lambda$  together with the family of *harmonic measures*  $\nu_\bullet = (\nu_x)_{x \in \text{DL}}$  is a *boundary* of the random walk  $(Z_n)$  in the sense of [32], a notion going back to FURSTENBERG [28]. Indeed, the group  $\Gamma$  defined in (ii) acts on  $\Lambda$ , i.e.,  $\Lambda$  is a  $\Gamma$ -space, and we have the convolution identity  $\mu * \nu_o = \nu_o$  for the probability measure  $\mu$  on  $\Gamma$  defined in (6.3). This identity holds since  $\delta_g * \nu_o = \nu_{go}$  for every  $g \in \Gamma$ .

We now want to decide whether this is the “best” (biggest) model, as a measure space, for distinguishing limit points at infinity of our random walk. To formulate this question more precisely, we recall that a  $P$ -harmonic function is a function  $h : \text{DL} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$h(x) = \sum_y p(x, y)h(y)$ . Now, if  $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Lambda, \nu_\bullet)$ , then

$$h(x) = \int_\Lambda \varphi d\nu_x$$

defines a mapping from  $L^\infty(\Lambda, \nu_\bullet)$  to the space of all bounded harmonic functions. When the mapping is bijective,  $(\Lambda, \nu_\bullet)$  is called the *Poisson boundary* of the random walk. This boundary is unique up to isomorphism of measure spaces. For precise details in the present setting of a group-invariant random walk on a transitive graph, we refer to [32]; additional information can be found in the references given there. The following theorem should be compared with the main result (based on a different method) of BROFFERIO [13], who considers the Poisson boundary of random walks on finitely generated groups of affine mappings with rational coefficients: those groups act on a “weighted” horocyclic product of distinct trees with hyperbolic upper half plane.

**(6.6) Theorem.** *Under assumptions (i)-(iii),  $(\Lambda, \nu_\bullet)$  is the Poisson boundary of the random walk  $(Z_n)$  on DL.*

*Proof.* For the proof, we apply the *ray criterion* of KAIMANOVICH, see [32, Thm. 5.18]. Formulated in our specific terms of  $\Lambda$  and DL, it says the following.

Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is a  $\Gamma$ -space carrying a family of probability measures  $\nu_\bullet = (\nu_x)_{x \in \text{DL}}$  such that  $\delta_g * \nu_o = \nu_{go}$  and  $\nu_o = \sum_x p(o, x)\nu_x$ . Then  $(\Lambda, \nu_\bullet)$  is the Poisson boundary of the random walk  $(Z_n)$ , provided that there is a sequence of measurable mappings  $\Pi_n : \Lambda \rightarrow \text{DL}$  such that, in the graph metric of DL,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} d(Z_n, \Pi_n(Z_\infty)) = 0 \quad \text{Pr}_o\text{-almost surely.}$$

We now construct  $\Pi_n$ . We know that  $\alpha_j \leq 0$  for some  $j$ , and assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha_d \leq 0$ . Let now  $\xi = \xi_1 \cdots \xi_d \in \Lambda$  be given, so that  $\xi_j \in \partial T_j$  for each  $j$ , and  $\xi_j = \omega_j$  for at least one  $j$ . By Proposition 6.2,  $\xi_d = \omega_d$ .

For integer  $k \geq 0$ , denote by  $\xi_j(k)$  the element on the geodesic  $\overline{o_j \xi_j}$  at distance  $k$  from  $o_j$ . Similarly, if  $\xi_j \in \partial^* T_j$  and  $k \geq 0$ , denote by  $\xi_j[k]$  the element on the geodesic  $\overline{o_j \xi_j}$  which lies on the horocycle  $H_k^j$  of  $T_j$  and, in case there are two such elements (only when  $k = 0$ ), is furthest possible from  $o_j$ . Finally, if  $\xi_j = \omega_j$  and  $k \leq 0$  then the geodesic  $\overline{o_j \xi_j}$

intersects  $H_k$  at the point  $\xi_j[k] = \omega_j(|k|)$ . See Figure 8.




Figure 8

Note that

$$(6.7) \quad d(\xi_j[k], \xi_j(|k|)) = d(o_j, \xi_j[0]).$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_n(\xi) &= x_1 \cdots x_d, \quad \text{where } x_j = \Pi_{j,n}(\xi_j) = \xi_j[k_j] \quad \text{with} \\ k_j &= \lceil \alpha_j n \rceil, \quad j = 1, \dots, d-1, \quad \text{and } k_d = -k_1 - \dots - k_{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is well defined: when  $\alpha_j > 0$  we have  $\xi_j \in \partial^* T_j$  and  $k_j > 0$ , so that  $H_{k_j}^j$  intersects  $\overline{o_j \xi_j}$  in a unique point. When  $j < d$  and  $\alpha_j \leq 0$  we have  $\xi_j = \omega_j$  and  $k_j \leq 0$ , so that  $H_{k_j}^j$  also intersects  $\overline{o_j \omega_j}$  in a unique point. This also holds for  $j = d$ , since  $k_d \leq -\alpha_1 n - \dots - \alpha_{d-1} n = \alpha_d n \leq 0$ .

We now apply the results and methods of [19]. Since  $m_1(P) < \infty$ , we also have  $m_1(P_j) < \infty$ , where  $P_j$  is the transition matrix of  $(Z_{j,n})_{n \geq 0}$  on  $T_j$ . This implies via the law of large numbers that

$$\frac{1}{n} d(Z_{j,n+1}, Z_{j,n}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \mathfrak{h}(Z_{j,n}) \rightarrow \alpha_j \quad \text{Pr}_o\text{-almost surely.}$$

Applying [19, Def. 1 and Prop. 1], one obtains that  $(Z_{j,n})_n$  is almost surely a *regular sequence* in  $T_j$ , that is,

$$\frac{1}{n} d(Z_{j,n}, Z_{j,\infty}(\lceil \alpha_j n \rceil)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{Pr}_o\text{-almost surely.}$$

Now (6.7) implies that in the metric of  $T_j$  also

$$\frac{1}{n} d(Z_{j,n}, \Pi_{j,n}(Z_{j,\infty})) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{Pr}_o\text{-almost surely.}$$

Since for arbitrary  $x, y \in \text{DL}$  we have  $d(x, y) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d d(x_j, y_j)$ , we obtain that in the metric of DL

$$\frac{1}{n} d(Z_n, \Pi_n(Z_\infty)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{Pr}_o\text{-almost surely,}$$

so that the criterion applies.  $\square$

Since  $Z_{j,n} \rightarrow \omega_j$  almost surely, when  $\alpha_j \leq 0$ , we may omit this part in the description of the Poisson boundary, and can consider the harmonic measures  $\nu_x$  as measures on the product of all  $\partial^*T_j$  where  $\alpha_j > 0$ .

**(6.8) Corollary.** *The Poisson boundary of the random walk  $(Z_n)$  satisfying (i)-(iii) can be identified with the space*

$$\prod_{j:\alpha_j>0} \partial^*T_j.$$

*When  $\alpha_j = 0$  for all  $j$  then the Poisson boundary is trivial, and all bounded harmonic functions are constant.*

*In particular, for SRW on  $\text{DL}(q_1, \dots, q_d)$  we have, setting  $\bar{q} = (q_1 + \dots + q_d)/d$ , that the Poisson boundary can be identified with*

$$\prod_{j:q_j>\bar{q}} \partial^*T_j;$$

*it is trivial precisely when all  $q_j$  coincide.*

Indeed, for SRW, we compute  $\alpha_j = (q_j - \bar{q})d/D$ , where  $D$  is the vertex degree in DL.

## 7. OUTLOOK

Here are some further examples of Busemann pairs that are not necessarily trees or tree-like.

In some graph-theoretical papers, such graphs are said to have *property Z*, because they admit a graph homomorphism onto the canonical Cayley graph of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , that is, the two-way-infinite path. See in particular the interesting papers by CAMERON, PRAEGER AND WORMALD [16], EVANS [26], and MALNIČ, MARUŠIČ, SEIFTER AND ZGRABLIĆ [34], where digraphs (oriented graphs) are studied whose isometry group acts transitively on the set of oriented paths of length  $s$ , for every  $s$ . Of course, in our setting we consider the underlying undirected graph, where the edges' orientation is forgotten. Besides the homogenous trees (with orientation according to the ancestor relation),  $\text{DL}(q_1, q_2)$  itself provides an example of this type.

If  $\Gamma$  is any finitely generated group which admits a group homomorphism onto the additive group  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then suitable Cayley graphs of  $\Gamma$  will have property Z, i.e., they will be Busemann pairs. For example, we can take the usual lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  where two points are neighbours if they are at distance 1, and define  $\mathfrak{h}(k_1, \dots, k_d) = k_1 + \dots + k_d$ .

A more interesting example is the amenable Baumslag-Solitar group  $\text{BS}_q = \langle a, b \mid ab = b^q a \rangle$ . It has a natural homomorphism onto the infinite cyclic group generated by  $a$ , and its Cayley graph with respect to the set of generators  $\{a^{\pm 1}, (ab)^{\pm 1}\}$  has property Z. Indeed, it is a discretization of the horocyclic product of the hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}$  and the tree  $\mathbb{T}_q$ , and fully merits the name Busemann pair.

The horocyclic product of the hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}$  and a tree is called *treebolic space*  $\text{HT}(q, r)$  in forthcoming work of BENDIKOV, SALOFF-COSTE, SALVATORI AND WOESS. Here, one considers the tree  $\mathbb{T}_r$  as a 1-complex, where each edge is a homomorphic copy



of the unit interval, the tree metric is extended in the natural way to the interior of each edge, and the Busemann (horocycle) function with respect to the reference end becomes  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued. Then  $\text{HT}(q, r)$  consists of all pairs  $(z, w) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{T}_r$  with  $\text{Im} z = q^{h(w)}$ . This is a 2-dimensional complex with a natural metric inherited from  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{T}_r$ . The group  $\text{BS}_q$  acts by isometries and with compact quotient on  $\text{HT}(q, q)$ , compare with FARB AND MOSHER [27]. Treebolic space is another example of a Busemann pair, with real-valued Busemann function.

In a similar way, the construction of horocyclic products of two hyperbolic planes leads to *Sol*-groups, resp. *Sol*-manifolds, compare with [25]. They are also Busemann pairs with real-valued Busemann function.

More generally, one can also consider “Busemann pairs” where the horocycle function  $h$  takes its values in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  (or  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , or any Abelian group). The horocyclic product of two or more spaces of this type (all with the same  $d$ ) is then defined in the same way as in (1.1). (This construction has already been suggested in [32, p. 356].) For example,  $\tilde{A}_d$ -buildings have a boundary at infinity and a Busemann (horocycle) function with respect to a given boundary point that is  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ -valued, compare e.g. with CARTWRIGHT [18]. The resulting horocyclic products are the object of current investigations by J. PARKINSON.

**Acknowledgments.** We acknowledge an email exchange with Brian J. McCartin on the spectrum of the Laplacian on equilateral triangles. We are particularly indebted to Christophe Pittet for an extremely useful discussion about the construction of co-compact lattices in the isometry group of  $\text{DL}_3(q)$ . Fruitful conversations with André Henriques and Christian Wüthrich are gratefully acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alexopoulos, G.: *A lower estimate for central probabilities on polycyclic groups*, Canadian J. Math. **44** (1992) 897–910.
- [2] Bartholdi, L., Grigorchuk, R. I., and Nekrashevych, V.: *From fractal groups to fractal sets*, in: *Fractals in Graz 2001* (eds. P. Grabner and W. Woess), pp. 25–118, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003.
- [3] Bartholdi, L., and Woess, W.: *Spectral computations on lamplighter groups and Diestel-Leader graphs*, J. Fourier Analysis Appl. **11** (2005) 175–202.
- [4] Baumslag, G.: *A finitely presented metabelian group with a free abelian derived group of infinite rank*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (1972) 61–62.
- [5] Baumslag, G.: *Finitely presented metabelian groups*, Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Theory of Groups (Australian Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1973), pp. 65–74. Lecture Notes in Math. **372**, Springer, Berlin, 1974.
- [6] Bestvina, M., and Brady, N.: *Morse theory and finiteness properties of groups*, Invent. Math. **129** (1997), 445–470.
- [7] Bertacchi, D.: *Random walks on Diestel-Leader graphs*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **71** (2001) 205–224.
- [8] Bieri, R.: *Homological dimension of discrete groups*, Queen Mary College Mathematics Notes, 1976.
- [9] Bieri, R., and Groves, J. R. J.: *Metabelian groups of type  $(\text{FP})_\infty$  are virtually of type  $(\text{FP})$* , Proc. London Math. Soc. **45** (1982), 365–384.
- [10] Bogley, W. A., and Harlander, J.: *Improving tameness for metabelian groups*, New York J. Math. **10** (2004), 287–294.
- [11] Bridson, M. R.: *Doubles, finiteness properties of groups, and quadratic isoperimetric inequalities*, J. Algebra **214** (1999) 652–667.

- [12] Brofferio, S.: *Renewal theory on the affine group of an oriented tree*, J. Theoret. Probab. **17** (2004) 819–859.
- [13] Brofferio, S.: *Poisson boundary for finitely generated groups of rational affinities*, J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.), to appear.
- [14] Brofferio, S., and Woess, W.: *Green kernel estimates and the full Martin boundary for random walks on lamplighter groups and Diestel-Leader graphs*, Annales Inst. H. Poincaré (Prob. & Stat.), to appear.
- [15] Bux, K.-U.: *Finiteness properties of certain metabelian arithmetic groups in the function field case*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **75** (1997) 308–322.
- [16] Cameron, P. J., Praeger, Ch. E., and Wormald, N. C.: *Infinite highly arc transitive digraphs and universal covering digraphs*, Combinatorica **13** (1993) 377–396.
- [17] Cartier, P.: *Fonctions harmoniques sur un arbre*, Symposia Math. **9** (1972) 203–270.
- [18] Cartwright, D. I.: *Spherical harmonic analysis on buildings of type  $\tilde{A}_n$* , Monatsh. Math. **133** (2001) 93–109.
- [19] Cartwright, D. I., Kaimanovich, V. A., and Woess, W.: *Random walks on the affine group of local fields and of homogeneous trees*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **44** (1994) 1243–1288.
- [20] Cartwright, D. I., and Steger, T.: *A family of  $\tilde{A}_n$ -groups*, Israel J. Math. **103** (1998) 125–140.
- [21] Cleary, S., and Riley, T. R.: *A finitely presented group with unbounded dead-end depth*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2006) 343–349.
- [22] Dicks, W., and Schick, Th.: *The spectral measure of certain elements of the complex group ring of a wreath product*, Geom. Dedicata **93** (2002) 121–137.
- [23] Diestel, R., and Leader, I.: *A conjecture concerning a limit of non-Cayley graphs*, J. Algebraic Combin. **14** (2001) 17–25.
- [24] Epstein, D. B. A., Cannon, J. W., Holt, D. F., Levy, S. V. F., Paterson, M. S., and Thurston, W. P.: *Word processing in groups*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 1992.
- [25] Eskin, A., Fisher, D., and Whyte, K.: *Coarse differentiation of quasi-isometries I: spaces not quasi-isometric to Cayley graphs*, preprint, Univ. Chicago (2006); arXiv:math.GR/0607207.
- [26] Evans, D. M.: *An infinite highly arc-transitive digraph*, European J. Combin. **18** (1997) 281–286.
- [27] Farb, B., and Mosher, L.: *A rigidity theorem for the solvable Baumslag-Solitar groups. With an appendix by Daryl Cooper*, Invent. Math. **131** (1998) 419–451.
- [28] Furstenberg, H.: *Random walks and discrete subgroups of Lie groups*. In *Advances in Probability and Related Topics*, 1 (P. Ney, ed.), pp. 1–63, M. Dekker, New York, 1971.
- [29] Grigorchuk, R. I., and Żuk, A.: *The lamplighter group as a group generated by a 2-state automaton, and its spectrum*, Geom. Dedicata **87** (2001) 209–244.
- [30] Gromov, M.: *Infinite groups as geometric objects*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Warsaw, 1983), pp. 385–392, PWN, Warsaw, 1984.
- [31] Johnson, D. L.: *Embedding some recursively presented groups*, Groups St. Andrews 1997 in Bath, II, 410–416, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **261**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [32] Kaimanovich, V. A., and Woess, W.: *Boundary and entropy of space homogeneous Markov chains*, Ann. Probab. **30** (2002) 323–363.
- [33] Lamé, G.: *Mémoire sur la propagation de la chaleur dans les polyèdres*, J. de l'École Polytechnique **22** (1833), 194–251.
- [34] Malnič, A., Marušič, D., Seifert, N., and Zgrablić, B.: *Highly arc-transitive digraphs with no homomorphism onto  $\mathbb{Z}$* , Combinatorica **22** (2002) 435–443.
- [35] Margulis, G. A.: *Discrete Subgroups of Semisimple Lie Groups*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) **17**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [36] McCartin, B. J.: *Eigenstructure of the equilateral triangle. I. The Dirichlet problem*, SIAM Rev. **45** (2003), 267–287.
- [37] Paterson, A. L. T.: *Amenability*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **29**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1988.
- [38] Pinsky, M. A.: *Completeness of the eigenfunctions of the equilateral triangle*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **16** (1985), 848–851.
- [39] Práger, M.: *Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the Laplace operator on an equilateral triangle*, Appl. Math. **43** (1998), 311–320.

- [40] Práger, M.: *Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the Laplace operator on an equilateral triangle for the discrete case*, Appl. Math. **46** (2001), 231–239.
- [41] Soardi, P. M., and Woess, W.: *Amenability, unimodularity, and the spectral radius of random walks on infinite graphs*, Math. Z. **205** (1990) 471–486.
- [42] Stallings, J.: *A finitely presented group whose 3-dimensional integral homology is not finitely generated*, Amer. J. Math. **85** (1963) 541–543.
- [43] Trofimov, V. I.: *Automorphism groups of graphs as topological groups*, Math. Notes **38** (1985) 171–720.
- [44] Woess, W.: *Topological groups and infinite graphs*, Discrete Math. **95** (1991) 373–384.
- [45] Woess, W.: *Random Walks on Infinite Graphs and Groups*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **138**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [46] Woess, W.: *Lamplighters, Diestel-Leader graphs, random walks, and harmonic functions*, Combinatorics, Probability & Computing **14** (2005) 415–433.
- [47] Wortman, K.: *A finitely-presented solvable group with a small quasi-isometry group*, preprint, Cornell Univ. (2005); [arXiv:math.GR/0507191](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0507191).

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE (EPFL),  
INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES B (IMB),  
1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND

*E-mail address:* laurent.bartholdi@gmail.com

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK,  
UNIVERSITÄT WIEN,  
NORDBERGSTRASSE 15, 1090 WIEN, AUSTRIA

*E-mail address:* markus.neuhauser@univie.ac.at

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATISCHE STRUKTURTHEORIE (MATH C),  
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT GRAZ,  
STEYRERGASSE 30, 8010 GRAZ, AUSTRIA

*E-mail address:* woess@TUGraz.at