Michigan Math. J. 47 (2000)

Stable Compactifications of Polyhedra

Steven C. Ferry

1. Introduction

To set the stage, we begin with some definitions.

Definition 1.1. (i) If X is a compact metric space and $Z \subset X$ is closed, then Z is said to be a *Z-set* if there is a homotopy $h_t : X \to X$ $(0 \le t \le 1)$ such that $h_0(x) = x$ for all x and $h_t(X) \subset X - Z$ for all $t > 0$. The model case is that in which X is a topological manifold and $Z = \partial X$. Another interesting case is the visual compactification of a CAT(0) space.

(ii) A separable metric space X is said to be an *ANR* if X can be embedded in separable Hilbert space in such a way that there is an open neighborhood U of X that retracts to X. All locally contractible finite-dimensional metric spaces are ANRs.

(iii) The *Hilbert cube* I^∞ is defined to be the product $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty}[0,1]$. A *Hilbert cube manifold* X is a separable metric space such that each point in X has an open neighborhood that is homeomorphic to an open subset of the Hilbert cube. Fundamental work of Chapman and West shows that every Hilbert cube manifold is the product of a locally finite polyhedron with I^∞ and that, for a given Hilbert cube manifold, the polyhedron is unique up to simple homotopy.

(iv) If X is a locally compact ANR, then a compact metric space $\bar{X}$ containing X is said to be a *$\mathcal{Z}$-compactification* of X if $Z = \bar{X} - X$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in $\bar{X}$. It follows easily from the definition of $\mathcal{Z}$-set and Hanner's criterion for ANR-ness [10] that, in this case, $\bar{X}$ is also an ANR.

(v) If $\{(K_i, \alpha_i)\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of finite CW complexes K_i and maps $\alpha_i : K_i \to K_{i-1}$, then the *inverse mapping telescope* $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ is obtained from the disjoint union of the mapping cylinders of the α_i by identifying the top of the mapping cylinder of α_i with the base of the mapping cylinder of α_{i+1}.

In [4], Chapman and Siebenmann gave necessary and sufficient conditions for a noncompact Hilbert cube manifold X to admit a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification. Stated geometrically, their condition was that X admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification if and only if X is homeomorphic to the product of an inverse mapping telescope with the Hilbert cube. In the same paper it was asked whether a locally finite polyhedron X admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification whenever $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification.

Received March 10, 1999. Revision received April 3, 2000.
The author was partially supported by NSF grant no. DMS-9626101.

In [9], Guilbault gave an example of a locally finite 2-dimensional polyhedron X such that $X \times Q$ is $\mathcal{Z}$-compactifiable but such that X itself admits no $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification. In that paper, he asked whether $X \times I^k$ was $\mathcal{Z}$-compactifiable for any finite k. Our theorem answers his question in the affirmative. We note that there has been a good deal of interest in $\mathcal{Z}$-compactifications, particularly in the case of compactifications of universal covers of finite aspherical polyhedra. See [1] for a nice discussion of this topic.

THEOREM. *If X is a locally finite n-dimensional polyhedron and $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification, then $X \times I^{2n+5}$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification.*

DEFINITION 1.2. Let $f: X \to Y$ be a proper map with X and Y locally compact finite-dimensional ANRs. If $\bar{Y} = Y \cup B$ is a compactification of Y, we define $\bar{f}: \bar{X} = X \cup B \to \bar{Y}$ to be $f \coprod \mathrm{id}$ and give $\bar{X}$ the topology generated by the open subsets of X together with sets of the form $\bar{f}^{-1}(U)$, where $U \subset \bar{Y}$ is open. By a slight abuse of notation, we will use $\bar{X}$ to denote $X \cup_f B$.

The theorem is a consequence of the following three propositions.

PROPOSITION 1.3. *If P is a locally finite polyhedron of dimension $\leq n$ such that $P \times Q$ admits a boundary, then P is simple-homotopy equivalent to an inverse mapping telescope of n-dimensional polyhedra.*

PROPOSITION 1.4. *If $f: X \to Y$ is a proper CE map between locally compact ANRs and if $\bar{Y} = Y \cup B$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification of Y, then $\bar{X} = X \cup_f B$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification of X.*

PROPOSITION 1.5. *If P^n is a locally finite n-dimensional polyhedron $(n \geq 3)$ and if P collapses to a locally finite subpolyhedron Q, then $Q \times I^{2n+1}$ collapses to P. In fact, if $c: P \to Q$ is a proper PL surjection with contractible point-inverses, then given any function $\varepsilon: Q \to (0, \infty)$ we can find a proper PL surjection with contractible point-inverses $k: Q \times I^{2n+1} \to P$ such that the composition $c \circ k: Q \times I^{2n+1} \to Q$ is ε-close to projection.*

Given these propositions, here's the proof of our theorem.

Proof. If X is a locally finite n-dimensional polyhedron such that $X \times Q$ admits a boundary, then Proposition 1.3 states that X is simple-homotopy equivalent to an inverse mapping telescope $T = \mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$, where the K_i are finite n-dimensional polyhedra and the α_i are PL maps.

In [16], Wall showed that, if K and L are simple-homotopy equivalent finite CW-complexes of dimension $\leq n$ $(n \geq 3)$, then there is a finite CW-complex P of dimension $\leq (n+1)$ such that P collapses to both K and L. Using the simple homotopy theory of [8], Wall's proof carries over to locally finite polyhedra. Given the PL version of this result for locally finite complexes, we obtain a locally finite polyhedron P of dimension $n+2$ with CE–PL maps to X and to T. By the cylinder completion theorem [4, p. 180], T admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification. Since P has a CE map to T, P also admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification. Since P has a CE map to

X, Proposition 1.5 shows that $X \times I^{2n+5}$ collapses to P and, by Proposition 1.4, that $X \times I^{2n+5}$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification. □

We now proceed with the proofs of Propositions 1.3–1.5.

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Except for the dimension estimate, this is the geometric characterization theorem of [4], which states that $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification if and only if X is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to an inverse mapping telescope. We obtain the dimension estimate by examining the proof in [4]. If X is a locally finite n-dimensional polyhedron such that $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification, choose a nested collection V_i of cocompact subpolyhedra of X with bicollared boundaries so that $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i = \emptyset$. Since $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification, each of the V_i has the homotopy type of some finite n-dimensional polyhedron K_i. The inclusion maps $V_{i+1} \to V_i$ induce maps $\alpha_{i+1}\colon K_{i+1} \to K_i$ that are well-defined up to homotopy. The argument of [4, pp. 204–206] shows that X is simple-homotopy equivalent near infinity to the inverse mapping telescope $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ and infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to a telescope that agrees with $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ everywhere except at the first stage. At the end of this paper, we will sketch a proof of this result. □

We begin the proof of Proposition 1.4 with a useful homotopy invariance result for $\mathcal{Z}$-sets.

Proposition 1.6. *Let (X, Z) and (Y, Z) be compact metric pairs that are homotopy equivalent* rel *Z by maps and homotopies which are the identity on Z and which take the complement of Z to the complement of Z. Then Z is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in X if and only if Z is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in Y.*

Proof. We start the proof of this proposition by giving a more precise statement of the properties of the maps and homotopies described in its statement. Here is what we are given:

(i) a map $f\colon (X, Z) \to (Y, Z)$ with $f\big|_Z = \mathrm{id}$ and $f(X - Z) \subset Y - Z$;
(ii) a map $g\colon (Y, Z) \to (X, Z)$ with $g\big|_Z = \mathrm{id}$ and $g(Y - Z) \subset X - Z$;
(iii) a homotopy $h_t\colon X \to X$ with $h_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $h_t\big|_Z = \mathrm{id}$ for all t; also, $h_t(X - Z) \subset X - Z$ for all t;
(iv) a homotopy $k_t\colon Y \to Y$ with $k_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $k_t\big|_Z = \mathrm{id}$ for all t; also, $k_t(Y - Z) \subset Y - Z$ for all t;
(v) a homotopy $\alpha_t\colon Y \to Y$ with $\alpha_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $\alpha_t(Y) \subset Y - Z$ for all $t > 0$.

Our goal is to produce a homotopy $\beta_t\colon X \to X$ so that $\beta_0 = \mathrm{id}$ and $\beta_t(X) \subset X - Z$ for all $t > 0$. This will show that Z is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in X when it is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in Y. The other half of the argument is completely symmetric.

We first show that we can construct $\bar{\alpha}$ having property (v) and such that $\bar{\alpha}_t(y) = y$ whenever $d(y, Z) \geq t$. In order to do so, we define $\sigma : Y \times [0,1] \to [0,1]$ by the formula

$$\sigma(y,t) = \begin{cases} t - d(y,Z) & \text{if } d(y,Z) \leq t, \\ 0 & \text{if } d(y,Z) \geq t, \end{cases}$$

and then let $\bar{\alpha}_t(y) = \alpha_{\sigma(y,t)}(y)$. To conserve notation, we will drop the bar and assume that $\alpha_t(y) = y$ when $d(y, Z) \geq t$.

Next, let $\bar{\beta}_t(x) = g \circ \alpha_t \circ f : X \to X$. We see that $\beta_t(x) \subset X - Z$ for all $t > 0$ and that $\beta_t(x) = g \circ f(x)$ when $d(f(x), Z) \geq t$. Let $\tau : X \times (0,1] \to [0,1]$ be defined by the formula

$$\tau(x,t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d(f(x), Z) \geq 2t, \\ 2 - \frac{d(f(x),Z)}{t} & \text{if } t \leq d(f(x), Z) \leq 2t, \\ 1 & \text{if } d(f(x), Z) \leq t. \end{cases}$$

Let $\bar{h}_t(x) = h_{\tau(x,t)}(x)$. Strictly speaking, this function $\bar{h}_t$ is defined only for $t > 0$, but it extends over $t = 0$ by setting $\bar{h}_0(x) = x$ for all x. To prove continuity, we need to show that if $(x_i, t_i) \to (x^*, 0)$ then $\bar{h}_{t_i}(x_i) \to x^*$. We consider two cases: if $x^* \in X - Z$, then $\bar{h}_{t_i}(x_i) = x_i$ for large i and $\bar{h}_{t_i}(x_i) \to x^*$; if $x^* \in Z$, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that, if $d(x, x^*) < \delta$, then $d(h_t(x), x^*) < \varepsilon$ for all t. It follows immediately that $\bar{h}_{t_i}(x_i) \to x^*$ in this case, as well.

Finally, we define $\beta_t(x)$ by the formula

$$\beta_t(x) = \begin{cases} \bar{h}_t(x) & \text{if } d(f(x), Z) \geq t, \\ \bar{\beta}_t(x) & \text{if } d(f(x), Z) \leq t. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to check that $\beta_t(x)$ is well-defined and satisfies property (v). When $d(f(x), Z) = t$, we have $\bar{h}_t(x) = \bar{\beta}_t(x) = g \circ f(x)$. When $t = 0$, we have $\beta_0(x) = \bar{h}_0(x) = x$ for all x; for $t > 0$, we have either

$$\beta_t(x) = g \circ \alpha_t \circ f(x) \subset g(Y - Z) \subset X - Z$$

or $\beta_t(x) = h_{\tau(x,t)}(x)$. We have $\beta_t(x) \in X - Z$ in this last case, since $x \notin Z$. (To clarify this last assertion, note that $x \in Z$ and $t > 0$ guarantee that $\beta_t(x) = \bar{\beta}_t(x)$.) It follows that $\beta_t(x) \subset X - Z$ for all $t > 0$, so Z is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in X. □

We are now in a position to prove Proposition 1.4.

Proof of Proposition 1.4. This follows immediately from Proposition 1.6 using a general property of cell-like maps between ANRs: If $f : X \to Y$ is a cell-like map between locally compact ANRs, then for any open cover α of Y there is a map $g : Y \to X$ such that $f \circ g$ is α-homotopic to the identity and $g \circ f$ is $f^{-1}(\alpha)$-homotopic to the identity. (A homotopy $h_t : Z \to Z$ is a $\mathcal{U}$-homotopy, $\mathcal{U}$ an open cover of Z, if for each $z \in Z$ we have $\{h_t(z) \mid 0 \leq t \leq 1\} \subset U_z$ for some $U_z \in \mathcal{U}$; if $\mathcal{U}$ is an open cover of Y and $f : X \to Y$ is continuous, then $f^{-1}(\mathcal{U})$ is the cover of X consisting of sets $f^{-1}(U)$ with $U \in \mathcal{U}$.) See [12] for a proof in the finite-dimensional case and [11] for an extension to the infinite-dimensional case.

Adopting the notation of Proposition 1.4, it is not hard to use this general property to produce a map $\bar{g} : \bar{Y} \to \bar{X}$ and homotopies $h_t : \bar{X} \to \bar{X}$ and $k_t : \bar{Y} \to \bar{Y}$ which are the identity on B and which send complements of B to complements of B. Since we have given ourselves that B is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in $\bar{Y}$, it follows that B is a $\mathcal{Z}$-set in $\bar{X}$ (and that $\bar{X}$ is an ANR). □

Finally, we prove Proposition 1.5.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Let $c\colon P^n \to Q$ be a PL map with contractible point-inverses. For simplicity, we will assume that n, the dimension of P, is at least 3. Choose a one-to-one PL map $\iota\colon P \to \operatorname{int} I^{2n+1}$ and consider the diagram

$$c \times \iota\colon P \to Q \times I^{2n+1} \to Q,$$

where the last map is the projection. To conserve notation, we will identify P with its image under $c \times \iota$.

Let σ be a simplex of Q in some (fixed) triangulation and denote by P_σ the intersection of P with $Q_\sigma = \sigma \times I^{2n+1}$; of course, P_σ is just $c^{-1}\sigma$. Now let N_σ be a regular neighborhood of $P_\sigma \cup (\partial\sigma \times I^{2n+1})$ in Q_σ. The inclusion $N_\sigma \to Q_\sigma$ is a homotopy equivalence and so, by excision, the inclusion $\operatorname{Fr} N_\sigma \to (Q_\sigma - \operatorname{int}(N_\sigma))$ is a homology equivalence. Since P_σ is codimension-3 in $\sigma \times I^{2n+1}$, it follows that $\operatorname{Fr} N_\sigma \to (Q_\sigma - \operatorname{int}(N_\sigma))$ is also a homotopy equivalence. By the relative h-cobordism theorem, $(Q_\sigma - \operatorname{int}(N_\sigma))$ is homeomorphic to $\operatorname{Fr} N_\sigma \times [0,1]$. Hence there is a PL collapse from Q_σ to $P_\sigma \cup (\partial\sigma \times I^{2n+1})$. Inducting down from the top-dimensional simplices of Q gives a PL collapse from $Q \times I^{2n+1}$ to P. The ε-estimate in the statement of Proposition 1.5 follows immediately by taking a triangulation of Q with ε-small simplices. $\square$

REMARK 1.7. (i) For experts, the estimates—both the dimension estimate and the $\varepsilon(x)$-estimate—in Proposition 1.5 will probably be the most interesting novelties in this paper. Dierker's original idea was to note that if $X \nearrow Y$ then $Y \subset X \times [0,1]$ and $X \times [0,1] \searrow Y$. Iterating this construction, one derives a proof that if X and Y are finite polyhedra and $X \searrow Y$ then $Y \times I^q \searrow X$ for some q. There is no estimate on the q in terms of $\dim X$ and $\dim Y$ and there is no hint as to whether a similar result should hold for locally finite polyhedra. Brown and Cohen [2] modified Dierker's construction to obtain a somewhat different $\varepsilon(x)$-estimate for finite polyhedra. Dierker's dimension estimate remained unchanged. They used their improved Dierker's lemma to give a short proof of the following: If X and Y are simple-homotopy equivalent polyhedra, then $X \times Q$ and $Y \times Q$ are homeomorphic Hilbert cube manifolds. Proposition 1.5 leads to such a proof for locally finite polyhedra.

(ii) Proposition 1.6 gives a quick proof that, if K and L are homotopy equivalent finite aspherical polyhedra and $\tilde{K}$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-structure in the sense of [1], then so does $\tilde{L}$. This is also proven in [1]—it's a design criterion for the definition of $\mathcal{Z}$-structure—but it is occasionally useful (e.g., one might someday want a parameterized version of the theorem) to have proofs of such facts that come directly from formulas, rather than relying on Hurewicz- and Whitehead-type theorems.

2. An Expanded Proof of Proposition 1.3

We begin with some further discussion of Proposition 1.3.

If X is a finite-dimensional polyhedron such that $X \times Q$ admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification, choose cocompact subpolyhedra $V_i \subset X$ so that $X = V_1 \supset V_2 \supset \cdots$ and $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i = \emptyset$. The compactification of $X \times Q$ induces compactifications of all the $V_i \times Q$. These are compact ANRs, so by West's theorem [17] they have the homotopy types of finite complexes K_i. For $n \geq 3$, Wall [15] showed that an n-dimensional complex that is homotopy equivalent to a finite complex is homotopy equivalent to a finite n-dimensional complex, so we may assume that each K_i has dimension equal to $\max(n, 3)$. Let $\alpha_i \colon K_i \to K_{i-1}$ and $j_i \colon K_i \to V_i$ be maps such that the diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd} K_i & K_{i+1} \arrow[l, "\alpha_{i+1}"'] \\ V_i \arrow[u, leftarrow, "j_i", "\cong"'] & V_{i+1} \arrow[l, hook'] \arrow[u, leftarrow, "j_{i+1}", "\cong"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

homotopy commute for all i. Then there is an obvious map from $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ to X that is equal to j_i on each K_i. It is easy to verify that this map satisfies the conditions of the proper Whitehead theorem of [7], so the map is a proper homotopy equivalence. This uses the finite dimensionality of both X and $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$. It remains to show that this homotopy equivalence is a simple-homotopy equivalence near infinity.

By the geometric characterization theorem of [4], we know that X is proper-homotopy equivalent to $\mathrm{Tel}(L_i, \beta_i)$ for some finite polyhedra L_i and maps β_i, so it suffices to prove that proper-homotopy equivalent telescopes are simple equivalent near infinity. Our argument is extracted from an old argument of Siebenmann [13].

First, note that if $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z$ is a sequence of finite polyhedra and maps, then there is a simple homotopy equivalence rel $X \coprod Z$ from $M(f) \cup_Y M(g)$ to $M(g \circ f)$. Here, $M(f)$ denotes the mapping cylinder of f. Also, if $f, g \colon X \to Y$ are homotopic maps, then there is a simple homotopy equivalence rel $X \coprod Y$ from $M(f)$ to $M(g)$. These lemmas can be found in [5]. One consequence of this is that an inverse mapping telescope is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to a telescope obtained by "passing to subsequences" (i.e., by passing to a subsequence of the polyhedra and composing the appropriate bonding maps).

If $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ and $\mathrm{Tel}(L_i, \beta_i)$ are proper-homotopy equivalent, we can pass to subsequences and, retaining our original notation, obtain a homotopy commuting diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} K_1 \arrow[d, "f_1"] & K_2 \arrow[l, "\alpha_2"'] \arrow[d, "f_2"] & K_3 \arrow[l, "\alpha_3"'] \arrow[d, "f_3"] & K_4 \arrow[l, "\alpha_4"'] \arrow[d, "f_4"] & \cdots \arrow[l] \\ L_1 & L_2 \arrow[l, "\beta_2"] \arrow[ul, "g_2"'] & L_3 \arrow[l, "\beta_3"] \arrow[ul, "g_3"'] & L_4 \arrow[l, "\beta_4"] \arrow[ul, "g_4"'] & \cdots . \arrow[l] \end{tikzcd}$$

Using the simple-homotopy lemmas mentioned previously, one can see that $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$ is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to the inverse telescope of the sequence

$$K_1 \xleftarrow{g_2} L_2 \xleftarrow{f_2} K_2 \xleftarrow{g_3} L_3 \xleftarrow{f_3} K_3 \longleftarrow \cdots$$

and that $\mathrm{Tel}(L_i, \beta_i)$ is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to the inverse telescope of the sequence

$$L_1 \xleftarrow{f_2} K_1 \xleftarrow{g_2} L_2 \xleftarrow{f_2} K_2 \xleftarrow{g_3} L_3 \xleftarrow{f_3} K_3 \longleftarrow \cdots .$$

The map f_1 is a homotopy equivalence, since K_1 and L_1 are both homotopy equivalent to X. The last mapping telescope is therefore infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to the mapping telescope of the sequence

$$K_1' \xleftarrow{g_2'} L_2 \xleftarrow{f_2} K_2 \xleftarrow{g_3} L_3 \xleftarrow{f_3} K_3 \longleftarrow \cdots$$

where K_1' is an n-dimensional complex that is simple-homotopy equivalent to L_1. This, in turn, is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to the mapping telescope of the sequence

$$K_1' \xleftarrow{g_2' \circ f_2} K_2 \xleftarrow{g_3 \circ f_3 \sim \alpha_3} K_3 \xleftarrow{g_4 \circ f_4 \sim \alpha_4} K_4 \longleftarrow \cdots,$$

which shows both that X is infinite simple-homotopy equivalent to the mapping telescope of a sequence of finite n-dimensional polyhedra, as desired, and that the telescope can be taken to be $\mathrm{Tel}(K_i, \alpha_i)$, except for a possible change in the first term of the sequence. □

In [4, p. 207], the authors refer to an unpublished theorem of Ferry. Since the result has never been published, it seems reasonable to include the original proof in this paper. The result is also an immediate corollary of Torunczyk's characterization [14] of Hilbert cube manifolds.

THEOREM. *If M is a Hilbert cube manifold and $\bar{M} = M \cup B$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification of M, then $\bar{M}$ is a Hilbert cube manifold.*

Proof. $\bar{M}$ is ε-dominated by M for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and so, by Hanner's criterion [10], $\bar{M}$ is an ANR. By a well-known theorem of Edwards [3], $\bar{M} \times Q$ is a Hilbert cube manifold. By Z-set unknotting, we see that the cell-like map $\bar{M} \times Q \to (\bar{M} \times Q)/\sim$ obtained by shrinking out factors of Q in $B \times Q$ is shrinkable, so $(\bar{M} \times Q)/\sim$ is a Hilbert cube manifold. But the projection $M \times Q \to M$ can be approximated arbitrarily closely by homeomorphisms, so $\bar{M} \times Q$ is homeomorphic to $\bar{M}$ and $\bar{M}$ is a Hilbert cube manifold. □

3. A Proper-Homotopy Question

Recently, there has been a resurgence of interest in the problem of $\mathcal{Z}$-compactifying polyhedra. Much of this interest involves the case in which the polyhedron in question is the universal cover of a finite aspherical polyhedron. (Recall that a polyhedron K is *aspherical* if its universal cover is contractible.) There is a nice discussion of this in [1].

The goal of this section is to remind interested readers that a locally finite polyhedron that admits a $\mathcal{Z}$-compactification must satisfy a certain tameness condition due to Chapman and Siebenmann. Here is the statement of the condition.

DEFINITION 3.1. A locally finite polyhedron X is *tame at infinity* if, for every compact $A \subset X$, there is a larger compact B such that the inclusion $X - B \to X - A$ factors up to homotopy through a finite complex. Thus, we require that there exist a finite complex K and maps $j: X - B \to K$ and $p: K \to M - A$ so that $\beta \circ \alpha$ is homotopic to the inclusion.

QUESTION. If K is a finite aspherical polyhedron, must $\tilde{K}$ be tame at infinity?

References

[1] M. Bestvina, *Local homology properties of boundaries of groups,* Michigan Math. J. 43 (1996), 123–139.
[2] M. Brown and M. M. Cohen, *A proof that simple-homotopy equivalent polyhedra are stably homeomorphic,* Michigan Math. J. 21 (1974), 181–191.
[3] T. A. Chapman, *Lectures on Hilbert cube manifolds,* CBMS Regional Conf. Ser. in Math., 28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1976.
[4] T. A. Chapman and L. C. Siebenmann, *Finding a boundary for a Hilbert cube manifold,* Acta Math. 137 (1976), 171–208.
[5] M. M. Cohen, *A course in simple-homotopy theory,* Grad. Texts in Math., 10, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.
[6] P. Dierker, *Note on collapsing $K \times I$ where K is a contractible polyhedron,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (1968), 425–428.
[7] F. T. Farrell, L. R. Taylor, and J. B. Wagoner, *The Whitehead theorem in the proper category,* Compositio Math. 27 (1973), 1–23.
[8] F. T. Farrell and J. B. Wagoner, *Algebraic torsion for infinite simple homotopy types,* Comment. Math. Helv. 47 (1972), 502–513.
[9] C. R. Guilbault, *A non-Z-compactifiable polyhedron whose product with the Hilbert cube is Z-compactifiable,* preprint, 1998.
[10] O. Hanner, *Some theorems on absolute neighborhood retracts,* Ark. Mat. 1 (1951), 389–408.
[11] W. E. Haver, *Mappings between ANRs that are fine homotopy equivalences,* Pacific J. Math. 58 (1975), 457–461.
[12] R. C. Lacher, *Cell-like mappings and their generalizations,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 83 (1977), 495–552.
[13] L. C. Siebenman, *Chapman's classification of shapes: A proof using collapsing,* Manuscripta Math. 16 (1975), 373–384.
[14] H. Torunczyk, *On CE-images of the Hilbert cube and characterization of Q-manifolds,* Fund. Math. 106 (1980), 31–40.
[15] C. T. C. Wall, *Finiteness conditions for CW complexes,* Ann. of Math. (2) 81 (1965), 55–69.
[16] ———, *Formal deformations,* Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 16 (1966), 342–352.
[17] J. E. West, *Mapping Hilbert cube manifolds to ANRs: A solution to a conjecture of Borsuk,* Ann. of Math. (2) 106 (1977), 1–18.

Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08854-8019

sferry@math.rutgers.edu