

Irreducible generating tuples of Fuchsian groups

Ederson Dutra* and Richard Weidmann

October 10, 2022

Abstract

L. Louder showed in [Lou] that any generating tuple of a surface group is Nielsen equivalent to a stabilized standard generating tuple i.e. $(a_1, \dots, a_k, 1 \dots, 1)$ where (a_1, \dots, a_k) is the standard generating tuple. This implies in particular that irreducible generating tuples, i.e. tuples that are not Nielsen equivalent to a tuple of the form $(g_1, \dots, g_k, 1)$, are minimal. In [Dut] the first author generalized Louder's ideas and showed that all irreducible and non-standard generating tuples of sufficiently large Fuchsian groups can be represented by so-called almost orbifold covers endowed with a rigid generating tuple.

In the present paper a variation of the ideas from [W2] is used to show that this almost orbifold cover with a rigid generating tuple is unique up to the appropriate equivalence. It is moreover shown that any such generating tuple is irreducible. This provides a way to exhibit many Nielsen classes of non-minimal irreducible generating tuples for Fuchsian groups.

As an application we show that generating tuples of fundamental groups of Haken Seifert manifolds corresponding to irreducible horizontal Heegaard splittings are irreducible.

1 Introduction

Studying Nielsen equivalence classes of generating tuples of surface groups and more generally Fuchsian groups has a long history, starting with the work of Zieschang [Zie] on fundamental groups of orientable surfaces. He showed that any minimal generating tuple of a surface group is Nielsen equivalent to the standard generating tuple. Variations of the cancellation methods developed by Zieschang were then successfully employed by Rosenberger to study Nielsen classes of minimal generating tuples for many Fuchsian groups [R1, R2, R3]. Nielsen classes of minimal generating tuples were then studied by Lustig and Moriah using innovative algebraic ideas [L, LM1, LM2]; recently this led to a classification in all but a few exceptional cases [LM3].

Non-minimal generating tuples were first studied in the groundbreaking work of Louder [Lou] who proved that any generating tuple of a surface group is Nielsen equivalent to a stabilized standard tuple, i.e. a tuple of the form $(a_1, \dots, a_k, 1 \dots, 1)$ where (a_1, \dots, a_k) is the standard generating tuple. In particular any two generating tuples of the same size are Nielsen equivalent, thus a true analogue of Nielsen's theorem for free groups holds for surface groups. Louder's proof can be thought of as a folding argument in an appropriate category of square complexes and he shows that any square complex representing a generating tuple can be folded and unfolded onto a square complex representing a stabilized standard generating tuple.

In the case of Fuchsian groups the situation is more subtle and more interesting. In [Dut] the first author generalized the ideas of Louder to the context of sufficiently large Fuchsian groups, i.e. Fuchsian groups that are not triangle groups. Dutra proved that any

*The first author was supported by FAPESP, São Paulo Research Foundation, grants 2018/08187-6 and 2021/12276-7.

non-standard irreducible generating tuple can be represented by a so called almost orbifold cover with a rigid generating tuple, in the case that all elliptic elements are of order 2 this implies a direct generalization of Louder's result. Recall that a tuple is reducible if it is equivalent to a tuple of the form $(g_1, \dots, g_k, 1)$ and irreducible otherwise. Clearly minimal generating tuples are irreducible, the converse does not hold in general.

Almost orbifold covers are branched maps that are close to being orbifold covers.

Definition 1.1. Let \mathcal{O} be a closed cone-type 2-orbifold and \mathcal{O}' a compact cone-type 2-orbifold with a single boundary component. A map $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is called an *almost orbifold cover* if exists a point $x \in \mathcal{O}$ and a closed disk $D \subset \mathcal{O}$ containing x such that $D \setminus \{x\}$ contains no cone points such the following hold:

1. $\eta^{-1}(D) = D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m \cup S$ where D_i is a disk for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $S = \partial\mathcal{O}'$.
2. $\eta|_{\mathcal{O}' \setminus \eta^{-1}(D)} : \mathcal{O}' \setminus \eta^{-1}(D) \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \setminus D$ is an orbifold cover.
3. $\eta|_{D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m} : D_1 \cup \dots \cup D_m \rightarrow D$ is an orbifold cover.
4. $\eta|_S : S \rightarrow \partial D$ is a cover.

The *degree* of η is defined as the degree of the cover $\eta|_{\mathcal{O}' \setminus \eta^{-1}(D)}$. We say that η is a *special almost orbifold cover* if $\deg(\eta|_S) < m$ and $\deg(\eta|_S)$ does not divide m , where m is the order of x .

Remark 1.2. Throughout this paper we are mostly interested in the case where the point $x \in \mathcal{O}$ is a cone point. This is particular always the case if η is a special almost orbifold covering.

Remark 1.3. It is easily verified that η can be extended to an orbifold cover by gluing in a disk with cone point of order $\frac{m}{\deg(\eta|_S)}$ iff $\deg(\eta|_S)$ divides m .

Example 1.4. Let $\mathcal{O} = T^2(15, 14)$ and $\mathcal{O}' = F(15, 14, 7)$ where F is a once punctured orientable surface of genus two. Consider the map $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ described in Fig. 1 where the effect of η on the component containing the cone point of order 7 is described in Fig. 2. Let $x \in \mathcal{O}$ be the cone point of order 15 and D be the disk depicted in Fig. 1. Then $\eta^{-1}(D) = D_1 \cup S$ and η defines an orbifold cover $\mathcal{O}' \setminus D_1 \cup S \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \setminus D$ of degree three. Thus η is an almost orbifold cover of degree 3. As $\eta|_S : S \rightarrow \partial D$ is of degree two we conclude that η is special.




Figure 1: η is special of degree 3.

Definition 1.5. A marking of \mathcal{O} is a pair $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ where η is an almost orbifold cover and $[T']$ is a Nielsen equivalence class of generating tuples of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$. We say that the Nielsen class $[\eta_*(T')]$ is represented by the marking $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$.

We say that a generating tuple T of the fundamental group of a compact cone-type 2-orbifold with $q \geq 1$ boundary components is *rigid* if T is not Nielsen-equivalent to a tuple $(g_1, \dots, g_l, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q)$ where $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_q$ correspond to the boundary components.




Figure 2: A half turn rotation.

Definition 1.6. Let $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ be a marking of the orbifold \mathcal{O} .

1. We say that $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ is *standard* if the following hold:
 - (a) η has degree one.
 - (b) if \mathcal{O} is not a surface, then the exceptional point of η is of order ≥ 2 .
 - (c) some (and therefore any) tuple in $[T']$ is minimal.
2. We say that $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ is *special* if η is special and $[T']$ consists of rigid generating tuples of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$.

Definition 1.7. We say that a generating tuple T of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is *standard* if there is a standard marking $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ of \mathcal{O} such that $[\eta_*(T')] = [T]$.

In [Dut] it is shown that any non-standard irreducible generating tuple of a sufficiently large 2-orbifold is represented by a special marking. The main purpose of this paper is to establish the uniqueness of this marking and the fact that generating tuples represented by special markings are irreducible:

Theorem 1.8. *Let \mathcal{O} be a sufficiently large cone type 2-orbifold and let T be a non-standard irreducible generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Then there is a unique special marking $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ such that $[T] = [\eta_*(T')]$.*

Theorem 1.9. *Let \mathcal{O} be a sufficiently large cone type 2-orbifold. If*

$$(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$$

is a special marking such that η'_ is surjective, then $\eta_*(T')$ is irreducible.*

Example 1.10. Let $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the special almost orbifold cover given in Example 1.4. A presentation for $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is given by

$$\langle a_1, b_1, s_1, s_2 \mid s_1^{15}, s_2^{14}, s_1 s_2 = [a_1, b_1] \rangle.$$

Consider the generating tuple

$$T' = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \sigma_3)$$

of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ as described in Fig. 3. Then

$$\eta_*(T') = (s_1, s_2, a_1, b_1^{-1} a_1 b_1, b_1^3, b_1 s_1 b_1, b_1 s_2^2 b_1^{-1}).$$

Using the relation $s_1 = [a_1, b_1] s_2^{-1}$ in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ we can rewrite $\eta_*(T')$ as

$$(a_1 b_1 a_1^{-1} b_1^{-1} s_2^{-1}, s_2, a_1, b_1^{-1} a_1 b_1, b_1^3, b_1 a_1 b_1 a_1^{-1} b_1^{-1} s_2^{-1} b_1, b_1 s_2^2 b_1^{-1}).$$

Thus $\eta_*(T')$ is Nielsen equivalent to

$$(b_1 a_1^{-1} b_1^{-1}, s_2, a_1, b_1^{-1} a_1 b_1, b_1^3, b_1, b_1 s_2^2 b_1^{-1})$$




Figure 3: The tuple T' .

which can be shown to be Nielsen equivalent to $(a_1, b_1, s_2, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. Therefore, $\eta_*(T')$ is reducible. This shows that the restriction to rigid generating tuples of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ is necessary to guarantee that the corresponding tuple in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is irreducible. On the other hand, according to Lemma 3.2,

$$T' := (\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \gamma_1, \sigma_3^2)$$

is a rigid generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$. The previous Theorem therefore implies that

$$\eta_*(T') = (s_1^2, s_2^3, a_1, b_1^{-1}a_1b_1, b_1^3, b_1s_1b_1, b_1s_2^4b_1^{-1}).$$

is irreducible. This is an example of a non-minimal irreducible generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$.

We expect that our approach can also be used to classify standard generating tuples up to Nielsen equivalence, completing the work of Moriah and Lustig. We plan to address this question in a future paper. While the underlying ideas we employ should also be able to study generating tuples of triangle groups, it is clear that new language needs to be developed to carry out this approach in these remaining cases.

There is an interesting relationship between almost orbifold covers and horizontal Heegaard splittings of Seifert 3-manifolds. If M is a Seifert 3-manifold and T is generating tuple of $\pi_1(M)$ corresponding to a horizontal Heegaard splitting then the image T' of T in the fundamental group of the base orbifold is naturally represented by an almost orbifold cover which is induced by the Heegaard splitting. Theorem 1.9 gives us therefore a way to establish the irreducibility of T' and therefore of T . We obtain the following:

Theorem 1.11. *Let M be a Haken orientable Seifert 3-manifold with orientable base space and T be a tuple corresponding to a horizontal Heegaard splitting. Then T is irreducible if and only if the Heegaard splitting is irreducible.*

Note that we need to exclude the small Seifert manifolds as their base orbifolds are not sufficiently large. We actually give a new proof of Theorem 8.1 of [Se] in this setting.

2 Strategy of proof

In this section we briefly sketch the strategy of the proof of the main theorems. At this point we cannot introduce the subtle notions needed to be precise. Thus this section remains vague, maybe even pointless.

Nielsen's theorem states that any two generating m -tuples of the free groups F_n are Nielsen equivalent. The folding proof of Nielsen's theorem (in the case $m = n$) goes as follows): Identify the free group with $\pi_1(R_n)$ where R_n is the rose with n petals. Any generating n -tuple T can be represented by a tuple (Γ, u_0, Y, E, f) where Γ is a graph with base point $u_0 \in V\Gamma$, $Y \subset \Gamma$ is a maximal tree, $E = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ is an orientation of $E\Gamma \setminus EY$ and $f : \Gamma \rightarrow R_n$ is a π_1 -surjective morphism. The represented tuple is $(f_*(s_1), \dots, f_*(s_n))$

where $s_i \in \pi_1(\Gamma, u_0)$ is represented by the closed path whose only edge not contained in Y is e_i . Now the graph can be folded onto R_n using Stallings folds [St] yielding a sequence

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{k-1}, \Gamma_k = R_n$$

such that Γ_{i+1} is obtained from Γ_i by a single Stalling fold p_i . One observes that we can define tuples $(\Gamma_i, u_0^i, Y_i, E_i, f_i)$ with $f_{i+1} \circ p_i = f_i$ for all i such that all tuples represent the same Nielsen class. As the initial tuple defines T and the terminal tuples defines the standard basis, the theorem follows. Note that it is crucial that any folding sequence yields essentially the same (folded) object. Thus there is only one Nielsen-class and therefore there is no need to distinguish distinct classes.

A similar argument can be used to prove Grushko's theorem [Gr] which states that any generating tuple of a free product $A * B$ is Nielsen equivalent to a tuple of the form $(a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_l)$. This argument relies on folding sequences in the category of (marked) graphs of groups with trivial edge groups, see [Du] and [BF] where folding sequences for graphs of groups were studied. In this case one obtains a sequence of graphs of groups with trivial edge groups where each vertex is marked with a generating tuple of its vertex group and where the terminal object is the 1-edge graph of groups corresponding to the free product $A * B$ and the vertices are marked with generating tuples of (a_1, \dots, a_k) of A and (b_1, \dots, b_l) of B , respectively. Unlike in the case of free groups, the terminal object is not unique, however in the case of irreducible generating tuples it was shown in [W2] that any terminal object that occurs is marked by generating tuples (a'_1, \dots, a'_k) and (b'_1, \dots, b'_l) that are Nielsen-equivalent to (a_1, \dots, a_k) and (b_1, \dots, b_l) , respectively. This implies the strongest possible uniqueness result for the output of Grushko's theorem. The simple but somewhat subtle idea underlying the proof in [W2] relies on considering appropriate equivalence classes of marked graphs or groups (or more precisely \mathbb{A} -graphs) to be vertices where vertices are connected by edges if one can be obtained by the other by a fold. The result then follows by observing connectivity of the graph and establishing that there is unique vertex of minimal complexity.

The proofs of Louder [Lou] and Dutra [Dut] can be thought of as a variation of the proof of Grushko, but in a different category. It is shown that any Nielsen equivalence class of irreducible generating tuples is represented by a folded object which represents a standard generating tuple in the case of surfaces (Louder) or is a special marking in the case of sufficiently large cone type 2-orbifolds. In the first case the uniqueness is then immediate and in the second case it follows if all cone points are of order 2. The main objective of this paper is to show that in the second case the folded object is unique up to the appropriate equivalence. To do so we broadly follow the strategy of [W2], however both the language developed and the arguments applied are significantly more involved.

We will use the language of \mathbb{A} -graph as developed in [KMW] and rely on a number of results of [Dut]. Moreover a certain degree of familiarity with both of these papers is assumed. Following Louder and Dutra we decompose the fundamental group of the orbifold \mathcal{O} under consideration as the fundamental group of a graph of groups \mathbb{A} corresponding to a decomposition of \mathcal{O} along essential simple closed curves. The paper has two main chapters, Chapter 3 and Chapter 4:

1. In Chapter 3 we study generating tuples of fundamental groups of orbifolds with boundary, those are the groups that occur as vertex groups of \mathbb{A} . In Section 3.1 we collect basic facts about Nielsen classes generating tuples, in particular we characterize rigid generating tuples. In the subsequent sections we study finitely generated subgroups of the vertex groups of \mathbb{A} where some of the generators are assumed to be peripheral, i.e. conjugate to elements of the adjacent edge groups. We study these so-called partitioned tuples up to the natural equivalence. As the groups under consideration are fundamental groups of graphs of groups with trivial edge groups we can rely on a variation of the arguments from [W2] to prove Proposition 3.11,

i.e. to show that any equivalence class of partitioned tuples corresponds to a unique geometric situation.

2. In Chapter 4 we encode (Nielsen equivalence classes of) irreducible non-standard generating tuples by marked \mathbb{A} -graphs up to some natural equivalence. We then show that any such Nielsen class is encoded by a unique object of minimal complexity, which corresponds to a special almost orbifold cover with a rigid generating tuple. This essentially proves Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9. In the argument the subtle results from Chapter 3 are crucial.

In Chapter 5 we give a proof of Theorem 1.11 which is essentially a corollary of Theorem 1.9.

3 The local case

In this chapter we discuss (partitioned) generating tuples of fundamental groups of compact orbifolds with boundary. These groups are free products of cyclic groups.

The orbifold \mathcal{O} with underlying surface F and cone points of orders m_1, \dots, m_r is denoted by $F(m_1, \dots, m_r)$. If \mathcal{O} has $q \geq 1$ boundary components, then a presentation (also called the standard presentation) for $G := \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is given by:

$$\langle a_1, \dots, a_h, c_1, \dots, c_q, s_1, \dots, s_r \mid s_1^{m_1}, \dots, s_r^{m_r}, R \cdot s_1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_r = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_q \rangle \quad (*)$$

where c_1, \dots, c_q correspond to the boundary components and s_1, \dots, s_r correspond to the cone points of \mathcal{O} . The word R and h are given by:

1. h is a non-negative and even integer and $R = [a_1, a_2][a_3, a_4] \cdot \dots \cdot [a_{h-1}, a_h]$ if F is orientable of genus $h/2$;
2. $h \geq 1$ and $R = a_1^2 \cdot \dots \cdot a_h^2$ if F is non-orientable of genus h .

From (*) we readily see that for any $1 \leq k \leq q$ we have

$$G = \langle a_1, \dots, a_h, c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_q \mid - \rangle * \langle s_1 \mid s_1^{m_1} \rangle * \dots * \langle s_r \mid s_r^{m_r} \rangle \quad (**)$$

Let $g \in G$ be non-trivial element of finite order. Thus $g = us_i^k u^{-1}$ for some $u \in G$, $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, m_i - 1\}$. We say that g is *angle-minimal* if $k = \pm | \langle s_i \rangle : \langle s_i^k \rangle |$. A generating tuple T of a non-trivial subgroup of $u \langle s_i \rangle u^{-1}$ is said to be *angle-minimal* if T consist of a single angle-minimal element.

3.1 Generating tuples of fundamental groups of orbifolds with boundary

The classification of Nielsen equivalence classes of generating tuples of G is therefore given by the following theorem where the first part is a consequence of Grushko's theorem and the second part is due to Lustig [L], see also [W2].

Theorem 3.1 (Grushko, Lustig). *Let \mathcal{Q} and G as above. Then any irreducible generating tuple T of G is Nielsen equivalent to*

$$(a_1, \dots, a_h, s_1^{\nu_1}, \dots, s_r^{\nu_r}, c_1, \dots, c_{q-1})$$

with $0 < \nu_i \leq \frac{m_i}{2}$ and $\gcd(\nu_i, m_i) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. The ν_i are uniquely determined by the Nielsen equivalence class of T .

The previous theorem enables us to characterize rigid generating tuples of G . Recall that these are generating tuples of G that are not Nielsen equivalent to a generating tuple containing simultaneously one element corresponding to each boundary component.

Lemma 3.2. Let \mathcal{O} and G be as above. Let $T = (a_1, \dots, a_h, s_1^{\nu_1}, \dots, s_r^{\nu_r}, c_1, \dots, c_{q-1})$ be an irreducible generating tuple of G with $0 < \nu_i \leq \frac{m_i}{2}$ and $\gcd(\nu_i, m_i) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then the following are equivalent:

1. $\nu_i = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.
2. T is Nielsen equivalent to a tuple containing c_1, \dots, c_q .
3. There exist g_1, \dots, g_q in G such that T is Nielsen equivalent to a tuple containing $g_1 c_1 g_1^{-1}, \dots, g_q c_q g_q^{-1}$.

Before we give a proof we need one simple lemma, it might be well-known but the authors are not aware of any reference.

Lemma 3.3. Let $G = A * B$ be a free product and $T = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$ be a generating tuple for G such that $g_1 = ab$ with $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Then T is Nielsen equivalent to (g'_1, \dots, g'_k) with $g'_i \in A \cup B$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that either $g'_1 = a$ or $g'_1 = b$. We can furthermore assume that $g_j = g'_j$ for all j with $g_j \in A \cup B$.

Sketch of proof. Let \mathbb{A} be the graph of groups with a single edge pair $\{e, e^{-1}\}$ with trivial edge group and vertices $v_0 = \alpha(e)$ and $v_1 = \omega(e)$ such that $G_{v_0} = A$ and $G_{v_1} = B$. Then $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0) \cong G$. Clearly there exists a marked \mathbb{A} -graph (\mathcal{B}, u_0) (see [W2]) such that the following hold (see Figure 4):

- (a) T_{u_0} consists precisely of the elements of T that lie in A .
- (b) There exists an edge $f \in EB$ with label $(1, e, 1)$ and $\alpha(f) = u_0$ such that the tuple T_{u_1} at $u_1 = \omega(f)$ consists of the elements of T that lie in B .
- (c) There exists an edge $f' \in EB$ with label (a, e, b) such that $\alpha(f') = u_0$ and $\omega(f') = u_1$. The closed loop f', f^{-1} therefore corresponds to $g_1 = ab$.
- (d) The elements of $\{g_2, \dots, g_k\} \setminus (A \cup B)$ are represented by non-degenerate loops based at u_0 .




Figure 4: $\{g_{i_1}, \dots, g_{i_l}\} = \{g_2, \dots, g_k\} \setminus (A \cup B)$.

The folding proof of Grushko's theorem transforms this wedge of circles into an edge with the elements sitting in the vertex groups. It now suffices to observe that we can choose the folding sequence in such a way that the label of f is unchanged and the label of f' is unchanged unless it is modified by an auxiliary move of type A2 just before identifying f and f' with an elementary fold of type IIIA. After this auxiliary move the label of f' is either $(1, e, b)$ or $(a, e, 1)$. Thus the subsequent fold either adds the element a to T_{u_0} or the element b to T_{u_1} . The assertion follows. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.2. The result is easily verified if $\mathcal{O} = D^2(m_1)$ as in this case $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{m_1}$. Thus we may assume that $\mathcal{O} \neq D^2(m_1)$.

(1) \implies (2) Suppose first that $\nu_i = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. After appropriate left and right multiplications of $s_i = s_i^{\nu_i}$ with powers of the other elements of the tuple we can

replace s_i by c_q . Thus T is equivalent to $(a_1, \dots, a_p, s_1^{\nu_1}, \dots, s_{i-1}^{\nu_{i-1}}, s_{i+1}^{\nu_{i+1}}, \dots, s_r^{\nu_r}, c_1, \dots, c_q)$ which proves the assertion.

(2) \implies (3) is trivial.

(3) \implies (1) The proof is by induction on r . The case $r = 0$ is trivial as \mathcal{O} is in this case a surface and a simple homology argument shows that for fundamental groups of surfaces with boundary there is no irreducible generating tuple containing elements corresponding to all boundary curves.

Suppose that $r \geq 1$ and there exist g_1, \dots, g_q in G such that T is Nielsen equivalent to a tuple T' containing $g_1 c_1 g_1^{-1}, \dots, g_q c_q g_q^{-1}$. We have to show that $\nu_i = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. After a global conjugation (which preserves the Nielsen class of T since it generates G) we may assume that $g_q = 1$. As we have excluded the case $\mathcal{O} = D^2(m_1)$, we can write

$$G = A * B = \langle a_1, \dots, a_h, c_1, \dots, c_{q-1}, s_1, \dots, s_{r-1} \rangle * \langle s_r \rangle.$$

Recall that $c_q = a s_r$ with $a \in A$ corresponding to a boundary component of the orbifold \mathcal{O}' with the cone point of order m_r turned into an ordinary point. It now follows from Lemma 3.3 that T' (and therefore T) is Nielsen equivalent to a tuple T'' consisting entirely of elements from $A \cup B$ such that one of the following holds:

1. T'' contains s_r .
2. T'' contains a .

In the first case the conclusion is immediate as the remaining element of T'' must be equivalent to a standard generating tuple of A by Theorem 3.1.

In the second case T'' contains a generating set of A containing conjugates of all boundary components (as the folding proof of Grushko's theorem preserves the conjugacy class of elliptic elements and therefore of the conjugates of c_1, \dots, c_{q-1}). The conclusion now follows by induction. \square

Lemma 3.5 below is a variation of the well-known fact that $\text{rank}(U_1) \leq \text{rank}(U_2)$ if U_1 and U_2 are finite index subgroups of a finitely generated free groups F such that $U_2 \leq U_1$. This almost remains true in a free product of cyclic groups. As in the free group case this follows from a simple Euler characteristic argument. We first record the following well-known (trivial) fact.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_{m_1} * \dots * \mathbb{Z}_{m_r}$ with $2 \leq m_i \leq \infty$. Then*

$$1 - r \leq \chi(G) := 1 - r + \sum_{i=1}^r 1/m_i \leq 1 - r/2,$$

and therefore

$$1 - \chi(G) \leq \text{rank}(G) \leq 2 - 2\chi(G).$$

Furthermore

$$\text{rank}(G) = 1 - \chi(G) \quad \text{iff} \quad m_i = \infty \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq i \leq r$$

and

$$\text{rank}(G) = 2 - 2\chi(G) \quad \text{iff} \quad m_i = 2 \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq i \leq r.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $G = \mathbb{Z}_{m_1} * \dots * \mathbb{Z}_{m_r}$ with $2 \leq m_i \leq \infty$ and $T = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$ be a minimal generating tuple of a finite index subgroup $H \leq G$. Let $g \in G$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. (g_1, \dots, g_k, g) is reducible.
2. $H \cong F_k$, $\langle H, g \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 * \dots * \mathbb{Z}_2$ ($k + 1$ free factors) and $|\langle H, g \rangle : H| = 2$.

Proof. We can assume that g does not lie in $H = \langle g_1, \dots, g_k \rangle$ as (g_1, \dots, g_k, g) is otherwise Nielsen equivalent to $(g_1, \dots, g_k, 1)$ and therefore reducible. We can further assume that G is not cyclic as the assertion is trivial in this case. Thus $\chi(G) \leq 0$ and therefore $\chi(H) \leq 0$.

Put $U := \langle H, g \rangle$. Clearly $|G : U| \leq \frac{1}{2}|G : H|$ and therefore $\chi(H) \leq 2\chi(U)$. By Kurosh's subgroup theorem both H and U are free products of cyclics themselves, thus by Lemma 3.4 we have

$$\text{rank}(U) \leq 2 - 2\chi(U) \leq 2 - \chi(H) = 1 + (1 - \chi(H)) \leq 1 + \text{rank}(H)$$

with $\text{rank}(U) = 1 + \text{rank}(H)$ iff $U \cong F_k$ and $H \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 * \dots * \mathbb{Z}_2$ (with $k + 1$ free factors) and $|U : H| = 2$. This last case puts us into case (2), while the case $\text{rank}(U) \leq \text{rank}(H)$ clearly puts us into case (1) by Lemma 3.1. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let G, T and H be as in Lemma 3.5 and $g, h \in G$. Then (g_1, \dots, g_k, g, h) is reducible.*

3.2 Partitioned tuples

In this section we define the notion of partitioned tuples and equivalence of partitioned tuples in the fundamental group of compact orbifolds with boundary.

If \mathcal{O} is a compact orbifold with boundary then we call $g \in G = \pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ *peripheral* if g is conjugate to an element of a subgroup corresponding to a boundary component. If G is given by the standard presentation

$$\langle a_1, \dots, a_h, c_1, \dots, c_q, s_1, \dots, s_r \mid s_1^{m_1}, \dots, s_r^{m_r}, R \cdot s_1 \cdot \dots \cdot s_r = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_q \rangle$$

then g is peripheral if and only if g is conjugate into $\langle c_i \rangle$ for some $1 \leq i \leq q$. A *label* of a peripheral element g is a pair $(o, i) \in G \times \{1, \dots, q\}$ such that $g \in o\langle c_i \rangle o^{-1}$. A *labeled peripheral element* is a peripheral element endowed with a label.

Remark 3.7. If \mathcal{O} is hyperbolic then labels are unique in the following sense: if (o, i) and (o', i') are labels of the same peripheral element $g \in G$, then $i = i'$ and $o' = oc_i^k$ for some integer k . This follows from the following facts:

- (i) the subgroups $\langle c_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle c_q \rangle$ are malnormal, i.e. $g \in G$ lies in the peripheral subgroup $\langle c_i \rangle$ if and only if $g\langle c_i \rangle g^{-1} \cap \langle c_i \rangle \neq 1$.
- (ii) the subgroups $\langle c_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle c_q \rangle$ are conjugacy separable, i.e. when $i \neq j$ then $g\langle c_i \rangle g^{-1} \cap \langle c_j \rangle = 1$ for any $g \in G$.

Let G be a (arbitrary) group. A *partitioned tuple* in G is a pair $\mathcal{P} = (T, P)$ consisting of two tuples $T = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $P = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ of elements of G . We call P the *peripheral tuple* and $T \oplus P$ the *underlying tuple* of \mathcal{P} .

If G is the fundamental group of a compact orbifold with boundary, then we assume that P consists only of labeled peripheral elements.

An *elementary transformation* applied to $\mathcal{P} = (T, P)$ is a move of one of the following types:

- (1) replace $T = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ by a Nielsen equivalent tuple $T' = (g'_1, \dots, g'_m)$.
- (2) replace $P = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ by $P' = (\gamma_{\sigma(1)}^{\varepsilon_1}, \dots, \gamma_{\sigma(n)}^{\varepsilon_n})$ for some $\sigma \in S_n$ and $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \in \{\pm 1\}$.
- (3) for some $1 \leq k \leq n$ replace γ_k by $h^\varepsilon \gamma_k h^{-\varepsilon}$ where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$ and

$$h \in \{g_1, \dots, g_m, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{k-1}, \gamma_{k+1}, \dots, \gamma_n\}.$$

If G is the fundamental group of a compact orbifold we assume that the label of γ_k changes in the obvious way, i.e. if γ_k has label (o_k, i_k) , then $h\gamma_k h^{-1}$ has label (ho_k, i_k) .

- (4) for some $1 \leq l \leq m$ replace g_l by $h_1^{\varepsilon_1} g_l h_2^{\varepsilon_2}$ where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \{g_1, \dots, g_{l-1}, g_{l+1}, \dots, g_m, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}$.

We say that two partitioned tuples \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are *equivalent*, and write $\mathcal{P} \sim \mathcal{P}'$, if there are partitioned tuples $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{k-1}, \mathcal{P}_k = \mathcal{P}'$ such that \mathcal{P}_i is obtained from \mathcal{P}_{i-1} by an elementary equivalence for $1 \leq i \leq k$. The equivalence class of \mathcal{P} is denoted by $[\mathcal{P}]$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $F_n = F(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $G = H * F_n$ for some group H . Let $0 \leq r \leq n$. Suppose that*

$$(T_1 \oplus (g_{r+1}x_{r+1}g_{r+1}^{-1}, \dots, g_nx_n g_n^{-1}), (g_1x_1g_1^{-1}, \dots, g_r x_r g_r^{-1}))$$

and

$$(T_2 \oplus (h_{r+1}x_{r+1}h_{r+1}^{-1}, \dots, h_nx_n h_n^{-1}), (h_1x_1h_1^{-1}, \dots, h_r x_r h_r^{-1}))$$

are equivalent and minimal partitioned generating tuples. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_1 := (T_1, (g_1x_1g_1^{-1}, \dots, g_nx_n g_n^{-1})) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_2 := (T_2, (h_1x_1h_1^{-1}, \dots, h_nx_n h_n^{-1}))$$

are equivalent and are (both) equivalent to $(T, (x_1, \dots, x_r, \dots, x_n))$ for some T .

Proof. Consider the free product decomposition $G = H * \langle x_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle x_n \rangle$. The folding proof of Grushko's theorem (which preserves the element $g_i x_i g_i^{-1}$ and $h_i x_i h_i^{-1}$ up to conjugacy as these elements are elliptic in the above splitting of G) shows that \mathcal{P}_1 is equivalent to $(T_3, (x_1, \dots, x_n))$ and that \mathcal{P}_2 is equivalent to $(T_4, (x_1, \dots, x_n))$ where T_3 and T_4 are generating tuples of H . As the underlying tuples are moreover Nielsen equivalent and irreducible it follows from the main result of [W2] that T_3 and T_4 are Nielsen equivalent which implies that the partitioned tuples $(T_3, (x_1, \dots, x_n))$ and $(T_4, (x_1, \dots, x_n))$ are equivalent. Thus \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 are equivalent and equivalent to $(T, (x_1, \dots, x_n))$. \square

From now on we only consider partitioned tuples of element of the fundamental group of a compact orbifold with boundary. Most of the following definitions are motivated by Louder's notion of coverlike morphisms between square complexes, see Definition 7.1 from [Lou]. The only exception is the notion of partitioned tuples of almost covering type as they cannot occur in the surface case.

(1) Partitioned tuples of simple type. We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} is of *simple type* if \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T, (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n))$ such that $U = \langle T \rangle * \langle \gamma_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma_n \rangle$ and $\text{rank}(U) = \text{size}(T) + n$ where $U \leq G$ is generated by the underlying tuple of \mathcal{P} .

Partitioned tuples of orbifold covering type were defined in [Dut] using almost orbifold coverings induced by orbifold covers. Here we give a slightly different (but equivalent) definition.

(2) Partitioned tuples of orbifold covering type. A marking of *orbifold covering type* is a pair $(\eta' : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$ where the following hold:

- (a) η' is an orbifold covering of finite degree.
- (b) $[\mathcal{P}']$ is the equivalence class of a partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}' = (T', P')$ in $G' := \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ such that the following hold:
 - (i) there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of P' and the boundary components of \mathcal{O}' .
 - (ii) if \mathcal{O}' is a surface (that is, \mathcal{O}' has no cone points) then $(T' \oplus P') \setminus \{\gamma'\}$ is a minimal generating tuple of G' for any $\gamma' \in P'$.
 - (ii') if \mathcal{O}' is not a surface (that is, \mathcal{O}' has at least one cone point), then $T' \oplus P'$ is a minimal generating tuple of G' .

We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} is of *orbifold covering type* if there is a marking

$$(\eta' : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$$

of orbifold covering type such that \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $\eta'_*(\mathcal{P}') := (\eta'_*(T'), \eta'_*(P'))$. When \mathcal{O}' has no cone points we will also say that \mathcal{P} is of *surface covering type*.

(3) *Partitioned tuples of almost orbifold covering type.* A marking of *almost orbifold covering type* is a pair $(\eta' : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$ where the following hold:

- (a) η' is a special almost orbifold covering.
- (b) $[\mathcal{P}']$ is the equivalence class of a partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}' = (T', P')$ in $G' := \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ such that the following hold:
 - (i) there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of P' and the non-exceptional boundary components of \mathcal{O}' .
 - (ii) $T' \oplus P'$ is a rigid (and therefore minimal) generating tuple of G' .

We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} is of *almost orbifold covering type* if there is a marking $(\eta' : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$ of almost orbifold covering type such that \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $\eta'_*(\mathcal{P}')$.

(R) *Reducible partitioned tuples.* We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} is *reducible* if \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T' \oplus (1), P')$.

(FPE) *Partitioned tuples that fold peripheral elements.* We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} *folds peripheral elements* if \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T, (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \oplus P)$ such that the labels of γ_1 and γ_2 satisfy $i := i' = i''$ and $o'' = o'c_i^z$ for some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 3.9. It follows from the equations $i := i' = i''$ and $o'' = o'c_i^z$ that $\langle \gamma', \gamma'' \rangle \leq G$ is cyclic. The converse does not hold. For instance, assume that $\mathcal{O} = D^2(2, 2)$. Hence

$$G = \langle s_1, s_2, c_1 \mid s_1^2, s_2^2, c_1^{-1}s_1s_2 \rangle.$$

Consider the partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P} = (\emptyset, (\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$ where $\gamma_1 = c_1 = s_1s_2$ is labeled $(1, 1)$ and $\gamma_2 = s_1c_1s_1^{-1}$ is labeled $(s_1, 1)$. Then $\langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle$ is cyclic but \mathcal{P} does not fold peripheral elements. One can easily check that \mathcal{P} is of surface covering type with corresponding orbifold an annulus.

(OR) *Partitioned tuples with an obvious relation.* We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} *has an obvious relation* if \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$ such that

$$|o\langle c_i \rangle o^{-1} : U \cap o\langle c_i \rangle o^{-1}| < |o\langle c_i \rangle o^{-1} : \langle \gamma \rangle|$$

where $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle \leq G$ and (o, i) is the label of γ .

Observe that a partitioned tuple can be simultaneously of type (R), (FPE) and (OR). For example, let $\mathcal{P} = ((\gamma_1), (\gamma_1, \gamma_1^2))$ where G and γ_1 are as in remark 3.9.

(4) *We say that a partitioned tuple is of type (4) if it is of one of the types (R), (FPE) or (OR).*

Small orbifolds were defined in [Dut]. In the present work we use a slightly more restrictive definition. In particular all results from [Dut] hold in the current setting.

Definition 3.10. We say that an orbifold is *small* if it is isomorphic to one of the following types of orbifolds:

- (1) A Möbius band with no cone points.
- (2) A disk with two cone points, i.e. $D^2(m_1, m_2)$.
- (3) A annulus with one cone point, i.e. $A(m_1)$.




Figure 5: Small orbifolds.

- (4) A pair of pants without cone points.

The main purpose of Chapter 3 is to establish Proposition 3.11 below which is a strengthening of Proposition 2.9 of [Dut].

Proposition 3.11. *Let \mathcal{O} be a small orbifold, and let \mathcal{P} be an arbitrary partitioned tuple in $G = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Then \mathcal{P} is of one of the type (1)-(4).*

Moreover (1), (2), (3) and (4) are mutually exclusive and if case (2) or (3) occurs, then the marking $(\eta' : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$ representing $[\mathcal{P}]$ is unique.

That any partitioned tuples falls into one of the cases (1) - (4) is precisely Proposition 2.9 of [Dut], thus we need to prove the second part.

Remark 3.12. The uniqueness of η' in Proposition 3.11 is trivial if (2) occurs as η' is just the covering map corresponding to the subgroup generated by the underlying tuple of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' is any lifting of \mathcal{P} .

3.3 Decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs

In the following we represent partitioned tuples in the fundamental group of an orientable small orbifold by so-called decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. Here \mathbb{A} is the splitting of the fundamental group of the (orientable small) orbifold \mathcal{O} given by:

1. The underlying graph A of \mathbb{A} has vertex set $VA = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and edge set

$$EA = \{e_i^{\pm 1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq q\}.$$

The edges e_1, \dots, e_q have initial vertex v_1 and terminal vertex v_2 .

2. All edge groups in \mathbb{A} are trivial. The vertex groups are defined as

$$A_{v_i} = \langle s_{v_i} \mid s_{v_i}^{m_i} \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_{m_i} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2.$$

The base vertex of \mathbb{A} is set to be v_1 . Observe that the valence of v_1 and v_2 equals the number of boundary components of \mathcal{O} , that is, $q = \text{val}(v_1, A) = \text{val}(v_2, A)$.

Some definitions from Section 3 of [Dut] will also be given here, but even so we assume that the reader is familiar with the language developed there.

For each $1 \leq i \leq q$, let $c_i := s_{v_1}^{\varepsilon_i}, e_i, s_{v_2}^{\varepsilon_i}, e_{i+1}^{-1}, 1$ where $\varepsilon_1 = 1$ and $\varepsilon_i = 0$ for $i \geq 2$. The element $[c_i] \in \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1) \cong G$ represented by c_i will also be denoted by c_i . Note that c_1, \dots, c_n correspond to the boundary components of \mathcal{O} .

We need to extend the notion of peripheral elements to the fundamental group of \mathbb{A} -graphs. Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathbb{A} -graph with associated graph of groups \mathbb{B} . A closed path p in \mathbb{B} is called a *peripheral path of \mathcal{B}* if $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(p) = a \cdot c_i^z \cdot a^{-1}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, some $a \in A_{v_1}$, and some positive integer z . Note that a and i are uniquely determined by p . Assume that u_1 is a vertex of \mathcal{B} of type v_1 . For any \mathbb{B} -path q from u_1 to $\alpha(p)$, we call

$$h_{p,q} := [q \cdot p \cdot q^{-1}] \in \pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_1)$$

a peripheral element of $\pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_1)$ associated to p , or simply a peripheral element. The corresponding peripheral element

$$\gamma := \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(h_{p,q}) = [\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(q \cdot p \cdot q^{-1})]$$

of $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1)$ has a natural label defined in terms of p and q , namely

$$(o_\gamma, i_\gamma) := ([\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(q) \cdot a], i) \in \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1) \times \{1, \dots, q\}.$$

Definition 3.13. A decorated \mathbb{A} -graph is a tuple $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ where the following hold:

1. \mathcal{B} is a finite \mathbb{A} -graph.
2. u_1 is a vertex of \mathcal{B} such that $[u_1] = v_1$, the base vertex of \mathbb{A} .
3. for each $u \in VB$, T_u is a generating tuple of $B_u \leq A_{[u]}$.
4. $(p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ is a tuple of peripheral paths of \mathcal{B} .

The \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B} (resp. the underlying graph B of \mathcal{B}) is called the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph (resp. underlying graph) of \mathfrak{B} .

Remark 3.14. Observe that a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph in which the tuple of peripheral paths is empty can also be seen as a marked \mathbb{A} -graph as defined in [W2].

Induced decoration. We will need the notion of decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graphs. Let

$$\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$$

be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. For any sub- \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and any vertex $u'_1 \in VB'$ such that $[u'_1] = v_1$ we define

$$\mathfrak{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', u'_1, (T_{u'})_{u' \in VB'}, (p'_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n'})$$

where $T'_u = T_u$ for all $u \in VB'$ and where $(p'_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n'}$ consists of those peripheral paths in $(p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ that lie in the graph of groups \mathbb{B}' associated to \mathcal{B}' . We say that \mathfrak{B}' is a decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathfrak{B} carried by \mathcal{B}' .

Convention 3.15. Whenever u_1 belongs to $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}$, for instance, if $\mathcal{B}' = \text{core}(\mathcal{B}, u_1)$, we will assume $u'_1 = u_1$ so that \mathfrak{B}' is completely determined by \mathcal{B}' .

Moreover, any decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathfrak{B} carried by $\text{core}(\mathcal{B})$ will be denoted by $\text{core}(\mathfrak{B})$ and the decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph carried by $\text{core}(\mathcal{B}, u_1)$ will be denoted by $\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}, u_1)$.

Remark 3.16. Observe that the peripheral paths p_1, \dots, p_n in the defining data of \mathfrak{B} are reducible closed \mathbb{B} -paths and are therefore contained in $\text{core}(\mathbb{B})$ and in $\text{core}(\mathbb{B}, u'_1)$ for any $u'_1 \in VB$. Thus $(p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ is the tuple of peripheral paths in $\text{core}(\mathfrak{B})$, regardless of the base vertex, and in $\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}, u_1)$.

Associated partitioned tuple. Let $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. We say that a set $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \subseteq EB$ containing n distinct edges of B is a set of collapsing edges of \mathfrak{B} if (1) $f_i \neq f_j^{-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ and (2) there is $\sigma \in S_n$ such that for any $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the path $p_{\sigma(k)}$ decomposes as

$$p_{\sigma(k)} = p'_{\sigma(k)} \cdot (1, f_k, 1) \cdot p''_{\sigma(k)}$$

with $p'_{\sigma(k)}$ and $p''_{\sigma(k)}$ contained in $\mathbb{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_k}$. We say that \mathfrak{B} is collapsible if \mathfrak{B} admits a set of collapsing edges.

Any collapsible decorated \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ defines an equivalence class of partitioned tuples in $\pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_1)$ as follows. Assume

- (i) $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \in EB$ is a set of collapsing edges of \mathfrak{B} , see Definition 3.9 of [Dut],

- (ii) Y is a maximal subtree of $B' := B_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$,
- (iii) E is an orientation of $EB' - EY$.

For any $u \in VB$ let $[u_1, u]_Y := e_{u,1}, \dots, e_{u,l_u}$ be the unique reduced path in Y from u_1 to u and let $q_u := 1, e_{u,1}, 1, \dots, e_{u,l_u}, 1$ be the corresponding \mathbb{B} -path. We define $(T_{\mathfrak{B}}, P_{\mathfrak{B}})$ as follows:

1. $T_{\mathfrak{B}}$ consists of the following elements: $g_e := [q_{\alpha(e)} \cdot (1, e, 1) \cdot q_{\omega(e)}^{-1}]$ for each $e \in E$ and $g_{u,b} := [q_u \cdot b \cdot q_u^{-1}]$ for each $b \in T_u$.
2. $P_{\mathfrak{B}}$ consists of the peripheral elements $\gamma_j = [q_{\alpha(p_j)} \cdot p_j \cdot q_{\alpha(p_j)}^{-1}]$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Note that $(T_{\mathfrak{B}}, P_{\mathfrak{B}})$ depends on various choices. However, Lemma 3.12 from [Dut] shows that the equivalence class of $(T_{\mathfrak{B}}, P_{\mathfrak{B}})$ does not depend on the choice of the collapsing edges f_1, \dots, f_n and the choice of the maximal subtree $Y \subseteq B'$. It therefore makes sense to define $[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{B}}]$ as the equivalence class determined by $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{\mathfrak{B}}, P_{\mathfrak{B}}) = (\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{\mathfrak{B}}), \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(P_{\mathfrak{B}}))$ where $(T_{\mathfrak{B}}, P_{\mathfrak{B}})$ corresponds to an arbitrary set of collapsing edges and arbitrary maximal subtree. We say that the collapsible decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} *represents* the class $[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{B}}]$.

Equivalence of decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. We define equivalence of decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs in terms of auxiliary moves and Nielsen equivalences of the vertex tuples. The effect of auxiliary moves and elementary folds on a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph is described in Section 3.2 of [Dut] which in turn is strongly based on the definitions given in [W2].

We say that two decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{B}' are *equivalent* if there exists a finite sequence $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}_0, \mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_k = \mathfrak{B}'$ of decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs such that for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ one of the following holds:

- (1) \mathfrak{B}_i is obtained from \mathfrak{B}_{i-1} by an auxiliary move (in the case of an A0 move we assume it is admissible with respect to the base vertex u_1^{i-1} of \mathfrak{B}_{i-1}).
- (2) \mathfrak{B}_i is obtained from \mathfrak{B}_{i-1} by replacing the generating tuple of some vertex tuple by a Nielsen equivalent generating tuple.
- (3) \mathfrak{B}_i is obtained from \mathfrak{B}_{i-1} by removing a trivial element from a vertex tuple and adding it to another vertex tuple.

We denote the equivalence class of a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} by $\mathfrak{b} = [\mathfrak{B}]$.

In [Dut, Lemma 3.14] it is shown that two collapsible decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs that are related by auxiliary moves determine equivalent partitioned tuples in $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1)$. For elementary equivalences that change the vertex tuples this is easily verified. Therefore, for any equivalence class $\mathfrak{b} = [\mathfrak{B}]$ of collapsible decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs we define $[\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{b}}] := [\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{B}}]$ for some (and therefore any) representative \mathfrak{B} of $\mathfrak{b} = [\mathfrak{B}]$.

Lemma 3.17. *Let \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 be equivalent decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs with underlying graph B . Suppose that both admit an elementary fold that identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 based on $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$. Let \mathfrak{B}'_1 and \mathfrak{B}'_2 be the resulting decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. Then \mathfrak{B}'_1 and \mathfrak{B}'_2 are equivalent.*

Proof. This is a consequence of the proof of Lemma 6 in [W2] and the way the decoration is modified when auxiliary moves are applied to decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. \square

Special types of decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. We will be mainly interested in tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs and decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs of (almost) orbifold covering type. We observe that the definition of decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs of (almost) orbifold covering type we are going to give here is slightly different from that given in [Dut, Section 3.7] in the sense that we do not require the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph to be minimal. Before giving the definitions we recall some notions introduced in Subsection 3.6 from [Dut].

Let $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. We say that \mathfrak{B} *self-folds* if there are $f \in EB$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $p_k = p'_k \cdot (1, f, 1) \cdot p''_k \cdot (1, f, 1) \cdot p'''_k$.

We say that \mathfrak{B} *folds peripheral paths* if there are $f \in EB$ and $j \neq k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i_j = i_k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and that $p_j = p'_j \cdot (1, f, 1) \cdot p''_j$ and $p_k = p'_k \cdot (1, f, 1) \cdot p''_k$.

We say that \mathfrak{B} *folds squares* if either \mathfrak{B} folds peripheral paths or \mathfrak{B} self-folds.

A *directed graph* Γ is a pair $(V\Gamma, E\Gamma)$ consisting of a vertex set $V\Gamma$ and an edge set $E\Gamma \subseteq V\Gamma \times V\Gamma$. An edge (v, w) is usually denoted by $v \mapsto w$. A *circuit* is a directed graph isomorphic to

$$\mathcal{C}_n = (\{1, \dots, n\}, \{(1, 2), \dots, (n-1, n), (n, 1)\})$$

for some $n \geq 1$. An *interval* is a directed graph isomorphic to

$$\mathcal{I}_n = (\{1, \dots, n\}, \{(1, 2), \dots, (n-1, n)\})$$

for some $n \geq 1$. Note that \mathcal{I}_1 is a degenerate interval as it consists of a single vertex.

The length of $\Gamma = (V\Gamma, E\Gamma)$ is defined as $length(\Gamma) := |E\Gamma|$.

Assume that \mathfrak{B} does not fold squares. The definition of peripheral paths says that, for each $1 \leq j \leq n$, there are $a_j \in A_v$ and $i_j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ such that $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(p_j) = a_j \cdot c_{i_j}^{z_j} \cdot a_j^{-1}$ for some positive integer z_j .

Let $u \in VB$. The local graph $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(u)$ of \mathfrak{B} at u is defined as the directed graph having vertex set $V\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(u) = Star(u, B) := \{f \in EB \mid \alpha(f) = u\}$ and edge set consisting of all pairs of vertices (f, g) for which there is $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that, up to a cyclic permutation, $p_j = p'_j \cdot (1, f^{-1}, b, g, 1) \cdot p''_j$. The label of the edge $f \mapsto g$ is defined as

$$label(f \mapsto g) := (j, b) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times B_u. \quad (*)$$

Remark 3.18. The restriction to decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs that do not fold squares guarantees that (*) is well-defined. This follows from the fact that, up to a cyclic permutation, the edges f^{-1} and g occur in the underlying path of a unique peripheral path of \mathfrak{B} . This also implies that the components of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(u)$ are (possibly degenerate) intervals and circuits.

Remark 3.19. Let \mathfrak{B} be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that does not fold squares and let $w \in VB$. Put $v := [w] \in VA$. Assume that $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(w)$ is a circuit. It is shown in [Dut, Section 3.6] that the following hold:

1. $val(v, A)$ divides $length(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(w))$.
2. $length(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(w)) \geq val(v, A) \cdot |A_{[w]} : B_w|$.
3. \mathcal{B} is locally surjective at w .
4. \mathcal{B} is folded at $w \in VB$ iff $length(\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(w)) = val(v, A) \cdot |A_v : B_w|$.

Definition 3.20. Let $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph.

(1) We say that \mathfrak{B} is *tame* if \mathfrak{B} is collapsible, does not fold squares and all vertex tuples are minimal.

(2) We say that \mathfrak{B} is an *orbifold cover* if the following hold:

- (a) if $u \notin core(\mathcal{B})$ then $T_u = \emptyset$.
- (b) the decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph $core(\mathfrak{B})$ is a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold covering type as defined in [Dut, Definition 3.34], that is, $core(\mathfrak{B})$ satisfies the following conditions:
 - (C1) $core(\mathfrak{B})$ is folded and does not fold squares.
 - (C2) for each $w \in VB_{core}$ the local graph $\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(w)$ is a circuit such that

$$length(\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(w)) \leq val(v, A) \cdot |A_v|.$$

where $v = [w] \in VA$.

- (C3) for each $w \in VB_{core}$ the vertex tuple T_w has size ≤ 1 .
- (C4) there is a vertex $y \in VB_{core}$ such that one of the following holds:
- (i) if $B_y = 1$, then $T_y = (1)$ and $T_x = \emptyset$ for all $x \neq y$. In this case we also say that \mathfrak{B} is of surface covering type.
 - (ii) if $B_y \neq 1$, then T_y is angle-minimal and T_x is minimal for all $x \neq y$.
- (3) We say that \mathfrak{B} is an *almost orbifold cover* if the following hold:
- (a) if $u \notin core(\mathfrak{B})$ then $T_u = \emptyset$.
 - (b) the decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph $core(\mathfrak{B}) \subset \mathfrak{B}$ is a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph of almost orbifold covering type as defined in [Dut, Definition 3.35], that is, $core(\mathfrak{B})$ satisfies the following conditions:

(C1') $core(\mathfrak{B})$ does not fold squares.

(C2') for each $w \in VB_{core}$ the local graph $\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(w)$ is a circuit such that

$$length(\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(w)) \leq val(v, A) \cdot |A_v|$$

where $v := [w] \in VA$.

(C3') for each $w \in VB_{core}$ the vertex tuple T_w has size ≤ 1 .

(C4') there is a vertex $y \in VB_{core}$ such that the following hold:

- (i) if $x \in VB_{core}$ is distinct from y , then
 - (a) $core(\mathfrak{B})$ is folded at x .
 - (b) T_x is minimal and if $B_x \neq 1$, then T_x is not angle-minimal.
- (ii) at y the following hold:
 - (a) the vertex group B_y is non-trivial.
 - (b) $core(\mathfrak{B})$ is not folded at y .
 - (c) $T_y = (s_v^{d_y})$ where $d_y = \frac{length(\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(y))}{val(v, A)}$ and $v = [y] \in VA$.

(4) We say that \mathfrak{B} is *bad* if \mathfrak{B} is neither tame nor an (almost) orbifold cover.

Remark 3.21. In an (almost) orbifold cover \mathfrak{B} for each $x \in VB_{core}$ we have

$$val(v, A) \cdot |A_v : B_x| \leq length(\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{B})}(x)) \leq val(v, A) \cdot |A_v|$$

where $v = [x] \in VA$.

Lemma 3.22. *Let \mathfrak{B} be minimal tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. Assume that a fold F based on f_1 and $f_2 \in EB$ with $x = \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2) \in VB$ yields a minimal (almost) orbifold cover \mathfrak{C} . Then the following hold:*

1. $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$, that is, F is of type IIIA.
2. if $f \in EB \setminus \{f_1^{\pm 1}, f_2^{\pm 1}\}$ then f occurs in the underlying path of exactly one peripheral path of \mathfrak{B} . In other words, the edge pair $\{f, f^{-1}\}$ is crossed twice (in opposite directions) by the peripheral paths of \mathfrak{B} .
3. there is $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that f_1^ε and $f_2^{-\varepsilon}$ occur in the underlying path of exactly one peripheral path of \mathfrak{B} and $f_1^{-\varepsilon}$ and f_2^ε do not occur at all.
4. If \mathfrak{C} is of surface covering type, then a fold that identifies f_1^{-1} and f_2^{-1} can also be applied to \mathfrak{B} . In any case no other fold can be applied to \mathfrak{B} .

Proof. Since \mathfrak{C} is not collapsible F does not preserve collapsibility. Lemma 3.20 of [Dut] implies that F is of type IIIA. This shows that (1) holds.

Put $y := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$. Since F only affects $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(x)$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y)$ it follows that $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(z)$ is a circuit for all z distinct from x and y . At x and y one of the following hold:

- (a) both $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(x)$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y)$ contain a circuit and there is i such that f_i and f_i^{-1} are not crossed by the peripheral paths in \mathfrak{B} .
- (b) both $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(x)$ and $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y)$ are intervals with initial vertex f_1 and f_2 and f_1^{-1} and f_2^{-1} respectively.

Observe that (a) cannot occur since this would imply that \mathfrak{B} is not collapsible. Therefore (b) occurs which is exactly what (2) and (3) claim.

If \mathfrak{C} is a surface cover then F adds the trivial element to y . This means that a fold that identifies f_1^{-1} and f_2^{-1} (and adds the trivial element to x) can also be applied to \mathfrak{B} . \square

Lemma 3.23. *Let \mathfrak{B} be a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph such that the following hold:*

1. \mathfrak{B} is not collapsible and does not fold squares.
2. there is a vertex u in \mathfrak{B} such that $T_u \neq \emptyset$.
3. \mathfrak{B} folds onto an (almost) orbifold cover \mathfrak{C} with a single elementary fold.

Then \mathfrak{B} is an (almost) orbifold cover.

Proof. Assume that

$$\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C} = (\mathcal{C}, w_1, (S_w)_{w \in VC}, (q_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n}).$$

Let F be the fold that turns \mathfrak{B} into \mathfrak{C} . By definition, $F(u_1) = w_1$, $q_j = F(p_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ and T_u is a subtuple of $S_{F(u)}$ for all $u \in VB$.

As \mathfrak{B} does not fold squares and is not collapsible, there is a decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph

$$\mathfrak{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', u'_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB'}, (p_{j_k})_{1 \leq k \leq n'})$$

of \mathfrak{B} such that any pair of edges in B' (the underlying graph of \mathcal{B}') is crossed twice (in opposite directions) by the peripheral paths $p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_{n'}}$ and where $u'_1 \in VB'$ such that $[u'_1] = v_1 \in VA$.

Claim 3.24. *F maps B' isomorphically onto C_{core} . In particular, \mathfrak{B}' contains all peripheral paths p_1, \dots, p_n .*

proof of claim. We compare the local graphs in \mathfrak{B}' with the corresponding local graphs in \mathfrak{C} . We observe the following:

- (a) As \mathfrak{B}' does not fold squares and every edge is crossed twice by p_{j_1}, \dots, p_{j_k} it follows that, for each $u' \in VB'$, the local graph $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}'}(u')$ is a non-empty union of circuits.
- (b) The definition of (almost) orbifold covers implies that $w \in VC_{core}$ iff $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}(w)$ contains a circuit. Moreover, for any $w \in VC_{core}$, the components of $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}(w) \setminus \Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{C})}(w)$ are degenerate segments (i.e. consist of single vertices).

Let $u' \in VB'$. As $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}'}(u')$ contains a circuit we see that the corresponding local graph $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{C}}(F(u'))$ contains a circuit. It follows from (b) that $F(u') \in VC_{core}$. As \mathfrak{C} does not fold squares, F cannot identify edges in $Star(u', B')$. Thus F induces a bijection

$$V\Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}'}(u') = Star(u', B') \rightarrow Star(F(u'), C_{core}) = V\Gamma_{core(\mathfrak{C})}(F(u')).$$

Thus $F|_{B'} : B' \rightarrow C_{core}$ is a covering. As edges from B' cannot be identified (since otherwise \mathfrak{C} would fold squares) we see that $F|_{B'}$ has degree one. Therefore $F|_{B'}$ is an isomorphism. \square

Claim 3.25. *F does not affect any vertex tuple of \mathfrak{B}' .*

Proof. Suppose that a vertex tuple of \mathfrak{B}' is affected by F , that is, $T_{x'} \neq S_{F(x')}$ for some $x' \in VB'$. The vertex tuple $T_{x'}$ must be empty as all vertex tuples in \mathfrak{C} are of size at most one. In particular, $B_{x'} = 1$. Condition (C2), or condition (C2') in the almost orbifold cover case, combined with remark 3.19(4) imply that \mathfrak{B}' is folded at x' . Since $F|_{B'}$ is an isomorphism it follows that $\text{core}(\mathfrak{C})$ is also folded at x . It follows from condition (C2) or (C2') depending on \mathfrak{C} combined with remark 3.19(4) that $C_{F(x')} = 1$. Thus $S_{F(x)} = (1)$ and so \mathfrak{C} is a surface cover. This implies that all vertex tuples in \mathfrak{B} are empty, a contradiction. \square

The previous claim implies that the fold cannot be of type IIIA because the affected vertex would lie in C_{core} and therefore in B' . It also implies that if a vertex does not lie in B' then the associated tuple is empty. In fact, if y has non-empty tuple then $F(y)$ lies necessarily in C_{core} . Thus there is y' in B' such that $F(y') = F(y)$ and so $T_y = \emptyset$ and $S_{F(y')} = S_{F(y)} = T_y \neq T_{y'}$.

Therefore $B' = B_{\text{core}}$ and all vertices not in B_{core} are equipped with the empty tuple. This completes the proof that \mathfrak{B} is an (almost) orbifold cover. \square

3.4 The directed graph $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$

In [W2] a graph of equivalence classes of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs representing a fixed Nielsen equivalence class of generating tuples of a free product is defined. In this section we define a similar graph for a fixed equivalence class of partitioned tuples in $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1) \cong \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Let \mathcal{P} be a partitioned tuple in $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1)$. We define $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ as follows:

1. The vertices of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ are the equivalence classes of minimal (with respect to the base vertex) tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs that represent $[\mathcal{P}]$.
2. Two vertices \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{b}' of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ are connected by a directed edge $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}'$ if there are representatives \mathfrak{B} of \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{B}' of \mathfrak{b}' such that:
 - (a) There exists a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathfrak{B}}$ that is obtained from \mathfrak{B} by an elementary fold.
 - (b) $\mathfrak{B}' = \text{core}(\bar{\mathfrak{B}}, \bar{u}_1)$ where \bar{u}_1 corresponds to the base vertex u_1 of \mathfrak{B} .

We say that a vertex \mathfrak{b} *projects* onto a vertex \mathfrak{b}' if there is an oriented path in $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ from \mathfrak{b} to \mathfrak{b}' . A vertex that does not project onto any vertex is called a *root*.

The *height* of a vertex \mathfrak{b} of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ is defined by $h(\mathfrak{b}) := \frac{1}{2}|EB|$ where B is the underlying graph of some and therefore any representative of \mathfrak{b} . It follows immediately from the definition that $h(\mathfrak{b}') \leq h(\mathfrak{b}) - 1$ if $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}'$.

Lemma 3.26. *The graph $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ is connected.*

Proof. The proof is a variation of the proof of Lemma 7 of [W2]. Let \mathfrak{b} be a vertex of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. We first observe that there exists a vertex \mathfrak{b}' of very specific type that projects onto \mathfrak{b} .

Let \mathfrak{B} be an arbitrary representative of \mathfrak{b} . Choose a set of collapsing edges $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ of \mathfrak{B} and a maximal subtree Y of B_{f_1, \dots, f_n} . Let

$$\mathcal{P}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y = (T_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y, P_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y)$$

be the associated partitioned tuple in $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1)$. By definition $\mathcal{P}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y$ is equivalent to \mathcal{P} . We construct a tame decorated marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}' , which will be called *normal*, that represents $[\mathcal{P}]$ and such that the following hold:

1. the underlying graph B' of \mathfrak{B}' is topologically the one point union of circles and lollipops, see Figure 7.

2. Any element of $T_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ is represented by a possibly degenerate loop based at the base vertex u'_1 and any peripheral element of $P_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is represented by a lollipop with possibly degenerate stick; the decoration is by the simple closed path corresponding to the candy part of the lollipops.
3. \mathfrak{b}' projects onto \mathfrak{b} , in particular \mathfrak{b}' and \mathfrak{b} lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$.

Note that any normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph is tame and minimal (with respect to the base vertex).

The construction has two steps. In the first step we unfold the peripheral elements into lollipops in successive order using auxiliary moves and inverse folds of type IA. Note that this is possible as f_1, \dots, f_n are collapsing edges meaning that we can unfold the k -th lollipop starting at both ends of f_k only affecting edges of B_{f_1, \dots, f_k} . Let $\mathcal{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$ be




Figure 6: The lollipops correspond to peripheral elements.

the sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathcal{B} corresponding to the sub-graph B_{f_1, \dots, f_n} of B . As in the unfolding process the edges f_1, \dots, f_n are removed, no peripheral path from \mathfrak{B} lies in $\mathbb{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$. Hence the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathfrak{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$ carried by $\mathcal{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$ has no peripheral paths and therefore $\mathfrak{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$ is a marked \mathbb{A} -graph in the sense of [W2].

In the second step we unfold $\mathfrak{B}_{f_1, \dots, f_n}$ into a wedge of circles corresponding to the elements of T_{f_1, \dots, f_n}^Y as in the proof of Lemma 7 of [W2]. Note that the elements represented by elements of $T_{u_1}^Y$ are not unfolded, i.e. are represented by degenerate loops.




Figure 7: The loops correspond to the non-peripheral elements.

The obtained normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}' is clearly tame and so are all intermediate decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs in the folding sequence that carries \mathfrak{B}' into \mathfrak{B} . Thus the vertex \mathfrak{b}' represented by \mathfrak{B}' and the vertex \mathfrak{b} represented by \mathfrak{B} lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$.

Note that vertices of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ that are represented by normal tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. Indeed, this follows from the fact that any partitioned tuple is represented by a unique equivalence class $[\mathfrak{B}]$ of normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs that have the property that any loop and any lollipop is mapped to a reduced \mathbb{A} -path. Moreover, any other normal tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph folds onto a normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph equivalent to \mathfrak{B} .

It therefore suffices to show that for any normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} with corresponding partitioned tuple \mathcal{P}_1 and any partitioned tuple \mathcal{P}_2 equivalent to \mathcal{P}_1 , there exists a

normal decorated marked \mathbb{A} graph \mathfrak{B}_2 with corresponding partitioned tuple \mathcal{P}_2 such that \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. It clearly suffices to consider the case that \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 are elementary equivalent.

The argument is now again similar to that in the proof of Lemma 7 in [W2]. If a non-peripheral element g_i is left or right multiplied with some element h represented by some lollipop or some loop distinct from the loop representing g_i , then the corresponding loop is unfolded along this lollipop or loop, see Figure 8, and if some peripheral element is conjugated by some h then the lollipop is unfolded along the corresponding lollipop or loop, see Figure 9.




Figure 8: Some non-peripheral element g_i is right multiplied with h .




Figure 9: Some peripheral element is conjugated by h .

□

Definition 3.27. Let \mathfrak{b} be a vertex of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. We say that \mathfrak{b} is:

1. a pre-(almost) orbifold cover if \mathfrak{b} has a representative that folds onto an (almost) orbifold cover with a single fold.
2. pre-bad if \mathfrak{b} has a representative that folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph with a single fold.

Lemma 3.28. *If \mathfrak{b} is a pre-(almost) orbifold cover, then \mathfrak{b} is not pre-bad.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 3.22. □

Lemma 3.29. *There is a pre-bad vertex in $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ iff \mathcal{P} is of type (4).*

Proof. Assume that \mathfrak{b} is a pre-bad vertex of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. By definition \mathfrak{b} has a representative \mathfrak{B} that folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}' . Thus we are in one of the following cases:

1. \mathfrak{B}' folds squares.
2. \mathfrak{B}' does not fold squares and one of the following occurs:
 - (a) \mathfrak{B}' is collapsible.
 - (b) \mathfrak{B}' is not collapsible.

If (1) occurs, then [Dut, Lemma 3.18] implies that \mathcal{P} folds peripheral elements or has an obvious relation; hence \mathcal{P} is of type (4).

If (2.a) occurs, then some vertex tuple in \mathfrak{B}' is non-minimal (and therefore reducible). In this case, as the corresponding partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{B}'}$ contains a copy of each vertex tuple of \mathfrak{B}' , we conclude that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{B}'}$ and therefore \mathcal{P} is reducible. Hence \mathcal{P} is of type (4).

If (2.b) occurs, then the proof of [Dut, Proposition 3.38] shows that \mathcal{P} is reducible, or folds peripheral elements, or has an obvious relation. Hence \mathcal{P} is of type (4).

To see that the converse holds we give a pictorial description of a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that represents $[\mathcal{P}]$ and folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph.

Assume that \mathcal{P} is reducible. By definition \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}' = (T, P)$ such that $T = (1, g_2, \dots, g_m)$. Consider the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} shown in Fig. 10 where $f_1, f_2 \in EB$ are both labeled $(1, e, 1)$. The fold that identifies f_1 and f_2 yields a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph as it replaces $T_{u'} = \emptyset$ by $T'_{u'} = (1)$. Therefore $\mathfrak{b} := [\mathfrak{B}] \in V\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ is pre-bad.




Figure 10: The pre-bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} in the case \mathcal{P} is reducible.

Assume that \mathcal{P} folds peripheral elements. By definition, \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}' = ((g_1, \dots, g_m), (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n))$ such that $i := i_1 = i_2$ and $o_2 = o_1 c_i^z$ for some integer z where (o_k, i_k) is the label of γ_k for $k = 1, \dots, n$. Consider the normal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} shown in Fig. 11, where q' and q'' are \mathbb{B} -paths such that $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(q') = \mu_{\mathcal{B}}(q)$ and $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(q'') = c_i^z$. After folding $q'q''$ into qp_1 we obtain a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph as shown in Fig. 12. The resulting decorated \mathbb{A} -graph clearly folds onto a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that folds squares. Consequently $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ contains a pre-bad vertex.

Finally, assume \mathcal{P} has an obvious relation. By definition, \mathcal{P} is equivalent to

$$((g_1, \dots, g_m), (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n))$$

such that

$$w_n := |o_n \langle c_{i_n} \rangle o_n^{-1} : U \cap o_n \langle c_{i_n} \rangle o_n^{-1}| < |o_n \langle c_{i_n} \rangle o_n^{-1} : \langle \gamma_n \rangle| = z_n \quad (*)$$

where $U \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is generated by $\{g_1, \dots, g_m, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}\}$ and (o_k, i_k) is the label of γ_k for $k = 1, \dots, n$. We may assume $o_n = 1$, so that $\gamma_n = c_{i_n}^{z_n}$. We consider three cases depending on $\mathcal{P}' := ((g_1, \dots, g_m), (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}))$.

Case 1. \mathcal{P}' is of simple type. Thus there is a folded tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}' that represents $[\mathcal{P}']$. Let \mathfrak{B} be the tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph described in Fig. 13, that is, a circuit $p = p'p''$ is glued to the base vertex u'_1 of \mathfrak{B}' such that $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(p) = c_{i_n}^{z_n}$ and $\mu_{\mathcal{B}}(p') = c_{i_n}^{w_n}$.




Figure 11: The decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} in the case \mathcal{P} folds peripheral elements.




Figure 12: Folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph.

It follows from (*) that p' can be folded with a closed path that lies entirely in \mathbb{B}' . The resulting decorated \mathbb{A} -graph folds onto a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that folds peripheral paths because the first edge of p' can be folded with the first edge of p'' , see Fig. 13. Hence the corresponding edge is crossed twice by the peripheral paths in the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph.




Figure 13: The decorated \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}' \cup \{p', p''\}$.

Case 2. \mathcal{P}' is of (almost) orbifold covering type. Let \mathfrak{B}' be a minimal tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that represents $[\mathcal{P}']$ such that a single elementary fold of type IIIA turns \mathfrak{B}' into an (almost) orbifold covering type. Let \mathfrak{B} be the tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathfrak{B}' by gluing a path p to the base vertex u'_1 of \mathfrak{B}' such that $\mu_{\mathfrak{B}'}(p) = c_{i_n}^{z_n}$. Then \mathfrak{B} is tame and contains \mathfrak{B}' as a decorated sub- \mathbb{A} -graph. Observe that the fold that turns \mathfrak{B}' into an (almost) orbifold cover can also be applied to \mathfrak{B} and so yields a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph which is the join of an (almost) orbifold cover and a circuit, and hence is not a (almost) orbifold cover. Therefore the vertex represented by \mathfrak{B} is pre-bad.

Case 3. \mathcal{P}' is reducible, or fold peripheral elements, or has an obvious relation. In this

case we apply the same argument as in the previous paragraphs with \mathcal{P}' playing the role of \mathcal{P} . \square

3.5 Proof of Proposition 3.11

In this subsection we study bifurcations in the directed graph $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ motivated by the fact that Proposition 3.11 follows easily once we prove that one of the following happens:

- (R1) There is a unique root in $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ represented by a folded decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. In this case, according to [Dut, Lemma 3.23] \mathcal{P} is of simple type, that is, is of type **(1)**.
- (R2) All roots of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ are pre-orbifold covers and they fold onto equivalent orbifold covers. In this case, according to [Dut, Lemma 3.37], \mathcal{P} is of orbifold covering type, that is, \mathcal{P} is of type **(2)**.
- (R3) All roots of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ are pre-almost orbifold covers that fold onto equivalent almost orbifold covers. In this case, according to [Dut, Lemma 3.37], \mathcal{P} is of almost orbifold covering type, that is, \mathcal{P} is of type **(3)**.
- (R4) All roots of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ are pre-bad. In this case, \mathcal{P} is of type **(4)**.

This is accomplished by proving the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.30. *Assume that $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}'$. If \mathfrak{b} is pre-bad, then \mathfrak{b}' is pre-bad.*

Lemma 3.31. *Let \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 be vertices of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{b}_1 \neq \mathfrak{b}_2$ and $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (A) \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are pre-bad vertices.
- (B) \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are pre-(almost) orbifold covers that project onto equivalent (almost) orbifold covers.
- (C) there is a vertex \mathfrak{b}' such that $\mathfrak{b}_i \mapsto \mathfrak{b}'$ for $i = 1, 2$. In other words, \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 have a common projection in $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$.

Proof of Lemma 3.30 and Lemma 3.31. For both proofs we need to consider the situation that elementary folds F_1 and F_2 are applicable to decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs equivalent to a minimal (with respect to the base vertex) tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs. \mathfrak{B} .

Suppose that F_1 identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 and is based on $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2) \in VB$ and F_2 identifies the edges f_3 and f_4 and is based on $x' := \alpha(f_3) = \alpha(f_4) \in VB$. Let \mathfrak{B}_1 (resp. \mathfrak{B}_2) denote the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathfrak{B} by F_1 (resp. F_2).

Lemma 3.17 implies that any elementary fold that identifies f_1 and f_2 (resp. f_3 and f_4) in a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph equivalent to \mathfrak{B} yields a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph equivalent to \mathfrak{B}_1 (resp. \mathfrak{B}_2). This allows us to replace \mathfrak{B} with an equivalent decorated \mathbb{A} -graph, which we still denote by \mathfrak{B} (observe that we only need auxiliary moves of type A2) in which the labels of f_1 and f_2 are (a, e, b_1) and (a, e, b_2) , and the labels of f_3 and f_4 are (c, \bar{e}, d_1) and (c, \bar{e}, d_2) . After applying an auxiliary move of type A0 to \mathfrak{B} and possibly after exchanging f_3 and f_4 we can further assume that one of the following holds:

- (i) $f_3 = f_1$ and $f_4 = f_2$, i.e. F_1 and F_2 identify the same pair of edges in \mathfrak{B} .
- (ii) F_1 and F_2 are elementary of type IIIA and $f_3 = f_1^{-1}$ and $f_4 = f_2^{-1}$.
- (iii) F_1 and F_2 are of type IA and $\omega(f_3) = \omega(f_1)$ and $\omega(f_4) = \omega(f_2)$.
- (iv) F_1 and F_2 are elementary and commute, i.e. if $i \neq j$ then F_i does not change the topology of the subgraph that carries F_j .




Figure 14: F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA.




Figure 15: F_1 and F_2 are of type IA.

We first show that \mathfrak{B}_1 is equivalent to \mathfrak{B}_2 if (i) or (ii) occurs. In fact, if (i) occurs then the equivalence follows from Lemma 3.17. If (ii) occurs, then \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 differ by a trivial element at the vertex tuples at x and x' , see Fig. 16. This follows as F_1 adds the trivial element to the vertex tuple $T_{x'}$ and F_2 adds the trivial element to the vertex tuple T_x . Thus \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 are equivalent.




Figure 16: F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA.


To prove Lemma 3.30 we need to consider the situation in which \mathfrak{B}_1 is tame and \mathfrak{B}_2 is bad (or vice versa) and show that \mathfrak{B}_1 folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. To prove Lemma 3.31 we need to consider the situation in which \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 are tame but not equivalent and we need to show that one of the following holds:

1. \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 fold onto bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs (thus (A) occurs).
2. \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 fold onto equivalent (almost) orbifold covers (thus (B) occurs).
3. \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 fold onto equivalent tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs (thus (C) occurs).

We can therefore assume that \mathfrak{B}_1 is not equivalent to \mathfrak{B}_2 . We observe that configuration (iii) or configuration (iv) necessarily occurs.

Let F'_1 denote the fold that identifies the edges f_3 and f_4 in \mathfrak{B}_1 and F'_2 denote the fold that identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 in \mathfrak{B}_2 . Observe that F'_1 and F'_2 are of type IIIA if configuration (iii) holds, and F'_i and F'_i ($i = 1, 2$) are of same type if configuration (iv)

holds.



An argument entirely analogous to [W2, Lemma 8] shows that the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}'_1 that is obtained from \mathfrak{B}_1 by F'_1 is equivalent to the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}'_2 that is obtained from \mathfrak{B}_2 by F'_2 . Thus in both configurations \mathfrak{B}'_1 is equivalent to \mathfrak{B}'_2 .

We consider the case in which \mathfrak{B}_1 is tame and \mathfrak{B}_2 is bad (and therefore not tame) and the case in which both \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 are tame. The first case provides a proof for Lemma 3.30 and the second case provides a proof for Lemma 3.31.

Case 1. Assume that \mathfrak{B}_1 is tame and \mathfrak{B}_2 is bad. We will show that \mathfrak{B}'_2 is bad which implies that \mathfrak{B}'_1 is also bad. There are three subcases.

Case 1(a): \mathfrak{B}_2 folds squares. By definition, there is $f \in EB_2$ such that f is crossed twice by the peripheral paths in \mathfrak{B}_2 . Thus $F'_2(f) \in EB'_2$ is crossed twice by the peripheral paths in \mathfrak{B}'_2 . Therefore \mathfrak{B}'_2 (and also \mathfrak{B}'_1) folds squares. This shows that \mathfrak{B}_1 folds onto a bad decorated \mathbb{A} -graph and is therefore pre-bad.

Case 1(b): \mathfrak{B}_2 does not fold squares and is collapsible. As \mathfrak{B}_2 is not tame there is $w \in VB_2$ such that T_w^2 is not minimal. Let $v := F'_2(w) \in VB'_2$. Thus T_w^2 is a sub-tuple of $T_v^{2'}$ and so $T_v^{2'}$ is not minimal. If \mathfrak{B}'_2 is collapsible, then it is bad (and so is \mathfrak{B}'_1). If \mathfrak{B}'_2 is not collapsible, then it follows from Lemma 3.20 of [Dut] that F'_2 is of type IIIA. Thus F'_2 adds an element to some vertex tuple of \mathfrak{B}_2 . Thus two vertices have non empty tuple in \mathfrak{B}'_2 and one of them is not minimal some vertex in \mathfrak{B}'_2 has tuple of size greater than 1. In both cases \mathfrak{B}'_2 cannot be an (almost) orbifold cover. Therefore \mathfrak{B}'_2 (and therefore also \mathfrak{B}'_1) is bad.

Case 1(c): \mathfrak{B}_2 does not fold squares and is not collapsible. Lemma 3.20 of [Dut] implies that F_2 is of type IIIA, i.e. $\omega(f_3) = \omega(f_4)$. Thus the tuple associated to $y_2 := F_2(\omega(f_3)) = F_2(\omega(f_4)) \in VB_2$ is non-empty. Since the property of being non-collapsible is preserved under folds we see that \mathfrak{B}'_2 is not collapsible. Lemma 3.23 implies that \mathfrak{B}'_2 cannot be an (almost) orbifold cover because \mathfrak{B}_2 is bad. Therefore \mathfrak{B}'_2 (and therefore also \mathfrak{B}'_1) is bad. This completes the proof of case (1).

Case 2. Assume now that \mathfrak{B}_1 and \mathfrak{B}_2 are tame. Denote by \mathfrak{b}_i the vertex of $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ represented by $\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}_i, u_i)$. If \mathfrak{B}'_i is bad, then clearly \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are pre-bad. If \mathfrak{B}'_i is an (almost) orbifold cover, then \mathfrak{b}_i are pre-(almost) orbifold covers. Finally, if \mathfrak{B}'_i is tame, then \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 have a common projection, namely $\mathfrak{b}' := [\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}'_1, u'_1)] = [\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}'_2, u'_2)]$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.11. We first show that $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ has only roots of one type meaning that exactly one of cases (R1)-(R4) spelled out in the beginning of this subsection occurs. The proof is by contradiction. Thus we assume that $\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}$ contains distinct types. As shown in [W2] the set

$$\Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}^* := \{\mathfrak{b} \in \Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]} \mid \mathfrak{b} \text{ projects onto roots of distinct types}\}$$

is non-empty. Choose $\mathfrak{b} \in \Omega_{[\mathcal{P}]}^*$ such that $h(\mathfrak{b})$ is minimal. Let \mathfrak{b}'_1 and \mathfrak{b}'_2 be roots of distinct type that \mathfrak{b} projects onto. Choose \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 such that $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \mathfrak{b}_i$ and \mathfrak{b}_i projects onto \mathfrak{b}'_i for $i = 1, 2$. The minimality of $h(\mathfrak{b})$ implies that there is no common projection of \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 . As \mathfrak{b}'_1 and \mathfrak{b}'_2 are of distinct types, \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are not pre-(almost) orbifold covers whose representatives fold onto equivalent (almost) orbifold covers. Lemma 3.31 implies that \mathfrak{b}_1 and \mathfrak{b}_2 are bad vertices. Lemma 3.30 implies that \mathfrak{b}'_1 and \mathfrak{b}'_2 are bad vertices which means that they are the same type, a contradiction.

This completes the proof of the proposition as the uniqueness claim in the case of partitioned tuples of (almost) orbifold covering type follows from Lemma 3.31. \square

3.6 Auxiliary results regarding partitioned tuples

In this section we prove some auxiliary results regarding partitioned tuples in the fundamental group of a small orbifold. The main ingredient is the notion of *foldability* of an \mathbb{A} -graph.

Let \mathcal{C} be an \mathbb{A} -graph and let u be a vertex of \mathcal{C} . We say that two edges f and g starting at u are equivalent if $[f] = [g] \in EA$ and $o_f^c = co_g^c \in A_{[u]}$ for some $c \in C_u$ (that is, f and g can be folded by a not necessarily elementary fold). The number of distinct equivalence classes is denoted by $l_{\mathcal{C}}(u)$.

Remark 3.32. Observe that when \mathcal{C} is locally surjective the number of equivalence classes is given by $l_{\mathcal{C}}(u) = \text{val}(u, A) \cdot |A_v : C_u|$ for any $u \in VC$, where $v = [u] \in VA$.

Definition 3.33. The *foldability* of \mathcal{C} at $u \in VC$ is defined as

$$\text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(u) := \text{val}(u, C) - l_{\mathcal{C}}(u).$$

The *foldability* of \mathcal{C} is defined as

$$\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}) := \sum_{u \in VC} \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(u).$$

Definition 3.34. The *foldability* of a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} is defined as

$$\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}) := \text{fold}(\text{core}(\mathfrak{B}))$$

where \mathcal{B} is the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathfrak{B} .

Lemma 3.35. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' be \mathbb{A} -graphs. Assume that \mathcal{C} is locally surjective and \mathcal{C}' is obtained from \mathcal{C} by a single fold of type IIIA affecting the vertex y that preserves the rank of the fundamental group.*

Then the fold replaces the trivial vertex group C_y by a non-trivial vertex group C'_y and the following hold:

- (1) *$\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') < \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk and $C'_y = A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence $\mathcal{O} = D^2(2, m)$ for some $m \geq 2$.*
- (2) *$\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') = \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if one of the following occurs:*
 - (a) *the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is an annulus and $C_y = A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence $\mathcal{O} = A(2)$.*
 - (b) *the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk, $C'_y \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$. Hence $\mathcal{O} = D^2(4, m)$ for some $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Assume the fold identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 with $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$. As the fold affects the vertex y we have $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2) = y$.

The first claim is trivial as the fold is assumed to be rank preserving. Note further that \mathcal{C}' is also locally surjective since any vertex of \mathcal{C}' is the image of some vertex of \mathcal{C} . We can therefore use remark 3.32 to compute $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}')$.

At x we have $\text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(x) = \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(x) - 1$ since C_x does not change and two equivalent edges starting at x get identified. As two edges starting at y also get identified, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(y) - \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) &= \text{val}(y, C') - l_{\mathcal{C}'}(y) - \text{val}(y, C) + l_{\mathcal{C}}(y) \\ &= (\text{val}(y, C) - 1) - \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : C'_y| - \\ &\quad - (\text{val}(y, C) - \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : C_y|) \\ &= (\text{val}(y, C) - 1) - \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : C'_y| - \\ &\quad - (\text{val}(y, C) - \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]}|) \\ &= -1 + \text{val}([y], A) \cdot (|A_{[y]}| - |A_{[y]} : C'_y|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') - \text{fold}(\mathcal{C}) &= \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(x) - \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(x) + \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(y) - \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) \\
&= -1 - 1 + \text{val}([y], A) \cdot (|A_{[y]}| - |A_{[y]} : C'_y|) \\
&= -2 + \text{val}([y], A) \cdot (|A_{[y]}| - |A_{[y]} : C'_y|)
\end{aligned}$$

(1) The previous calculation shows that $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') < \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if

$$\text{val}([y], A) \cdot (|A_{[y]}| - |A_{[y]} : C'_y|) \leq 1,$$

which implies that

$$\text{val}([y], A) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |A_{[y]} : C'_y| = |A_{[y]}| - 1.$$

Note that

$$|A_{[y]} : C'_y| = |A_w| - 1 \quad \text{iff} \quad A_{[y]} = C'_y \cong \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

Moreover $\text{val}([y], A) = 1$ implies that the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk which proves the claim.

(2) The calculations from the previous paragraphs show that $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') = \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if $\text{val}([y], A) \cdot (|A_{[y]}| - |A_{[y]} : C'_y|) = 2$. i.e. if one of the following occurs:

- (i) $\text{val}([y], A) = 2$ and $|A_{[y]} : C'_y| = |A_{[y]}| - 1$.
- (ii) $\text{val}([y], A) = 1$ and $|A_{[y]} : C'_y| = |A_{[y]}| - 2$.

Item (i) occurs if and only if $A_{[y]} = C_y \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$. Hence we are in situation (2.a). Item (ii) occurs if and only if $A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$ and $C'_y \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ since \mathbb{Z}_n contains a non-trivial subgroup of index $n - 2$ if and only if $n = 4$. As $\text{val}([y], A) = 1$ the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk and so we are in situation (2.b). \square

Lemma 3.36. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' be \mathbb{A} -graphs. Assume that \mathcal{C} is locally surjective and that \mathcal{C}' is obtained from \mathcal{C} by a single fold of type IA identifying vertices y_1 and y_2 that preserves the rank of the fundamental group.*

Then $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') \geq \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') = \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if one of the following hold:

- (a) *the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is an annulus and $A_{[y_1]} = A_{[y_2]} = 1$.*
- (b) *the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk and $A_{[y_1]} = A_{[y_2]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

Proof. Assume that the fold is based on the edges f_1 and f_2 with $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$. Thus $y_1 = \omega(f_1)$ and $y_2 = \omega(f_2)$. Denote the common image of y_1 and y_2 (resp. f_1 and f_2) under the fold by y (resp. f). Thus $[y] = [y_1] = [y_2] \in VA$ and $[f] = [f_1] = [f_2] \in EA$.

As in the previous lemma we have $\text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(x) = \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(x) - 1$. On the other hand, as the fold is ranking preserving, we can assume that $C_{y_1} = 1$. Consequently $C'_y = C_{y_2}$. A simple calculation then yields

$$\text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}'}(y) - \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(y_1) - \text{fold}_{\mathcal{C}}(y_2) = -1 + \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]}|$$

and so

$$\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') - \text{fold}(\mathcal{C}) = -2 + \text{val}([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]}|.$$

Consequently,

$$\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') < \text{fold}(\mathcal{C}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{val}([y], A) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |A_{[y]}| = 1.$$

But this cannot occur because if \mathbb{A} has only one edge then its vertex groups are non-trivial.

Moreover, $\text{fold}(\mathcal{C}') = \text{fold}(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if one of the following holds:

- (i) $\text{val}([y], A) = 2$ and $|A_{[y]}| = 1$.

(ii) $val([y], A) = 1$ and $|A_{[y]}| = 2$

Therefore we are in case (a) if (i) occurs and in case (b) if (ii) occurs. \square

Definition 3.37. We say that a partitioned tuple \mathcal{P} in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is *critical* if one of the following holds:

1. \mathcal{P} is of simple type and is equivalent to (T', P') such that T' contains an angle-minimal element.
2. \mathcal{P} is of type **(2)**, that is, \mathcal{P} is of orbifold covering type.
3. \mathcal{P} is of type **(4)**, that is, \mathcal{P} is reducible, folds peripheral elements, or has an obvious relation.

Otherwise we say that \mathcal{P} is *non-critical*.

Lemma 3.38. *Let \mathcal{P} be a partitioned tuple in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. If \mathcal{P} is equivalent to (T, P) such that T contains an angle-minimal element, then \mathcal{P} is critical.*

Proof. It suffices to show that \mathcal{P} cannot be of almost orbifold covering type. It is not hard to construct a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B} that represents $[\mathcal{P}]$ with the property that some vertex tuple contains an angle-minimal element. Any decorated \mathbb{A} -graph (tame or not) that is obtained from \mathfrak{B} by finitely many folds will have the same property. This shows that \mathfrak{B} does not fold onto a pre-almost orbifold cover because in pre-almost orbifold covers all vertex tuples are angle-minimal. Therefore \mathcal{P} is not of almost orbifold covering type. \square

Proposition 3.39. *Let (T, P) be a partitioned tuple of simple type in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ and let b be an arbitrary element of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. If $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ is of finite index, then $(T \oplus (b), P)$ is critical.*

Proof. Choose a folded and minimal (i.e. $\mathcal{B} = \text{core}(\mathcal{B}, u_1)$) tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph

$$\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$$

that represents the equivalence class of (T, P) . We construct a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}' such that (i) \mathfrak{B}' represents the equivalence class of $(T \oplus (b), P)$ and (ii) $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}') = 2$.

We first glue a circuit p to the base vertex $u_1 \in VB$ such that the corresponding \mathbb{A} -path $\mu_{\mathcal{B}'}(p)$ represents $b \in \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_1) \cong \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Denote the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph by $\bar{\mathfrak{B}}$. Observe that




Figure 17: Folding the loop p into \mathfrak{B} .

\mathcal{B} is a sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of $\bar{\mathfrak{B}}$. Therefore we can define $\bar{\mathfrak{B}} := (\bar{\mathcal{B}}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$. The hypothesis that $|G : U| < \infty$ implies that \mathcal{B} is locally surjective. Therefore, all but one edge of p , say f , can be folded into \mathcal{B} . Let \mathfrak{B}' denote the resulting decorated \mathbb{A} -graph. The construction of \mathfrak{B}' is described in Fig. 17. Note that \mathfrak{B}' is tame since \mathfrak{B} is not affected in this folding sequence. As Fig. 17 suggests, one can also obtain \mathfrak{B}' from \mathfrak{B} by gluing a non-loop edge to \mathcal{B} . Since $VB' = VB$ and $B_u = B'_u$ for all $u \in VB'$ it follows that the \mathbb{A} -graph underlying \mathfrak{B}' is locally surjective. Moreover, the above description of \mathfrak{B}' implies that $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}') = 2$.

Any fold that preserves tameness necessarily preserves the rank of the fundamental group. Therefore, if $(T \oplus (b), P)$ is of almost orbifold covering type (resp. of simple type)

then \mathfrak{B}' folds onto a pre-almost orbifold cover (resp. onto a folded decorated \mathbb{A} -graph) \mathfrak{B}'' . In both cases $fold(\mathfrak{B}'') < 2$ and therefore some fold decreases foldability. Lemmas 3.35 and 3.36 imply that there is a tame decorated \mathbb{A} -graph \mathfrak{B}''' that represents $(T \oplus (b), P)$ such that some vertex tuple contains an angle-minimal element. Therefore $(T \oplus (b), P)$ is equivalent to (T', P') such that T' contains an angle-minimal element. Lemma 3.38 implies that $(T \oplus (b), P)$ is critical. \square

Proposition 3.40. *Let $\mathcal{P} = (T, P)$ be a partitioned tuple of simple type and let $c \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ correspond to a boundary component of \mathcal{O} , that is, c is a maximal peripheral element of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Assume that $\langle c \rangle \cap \langle T \oplus P \rangle = \langle c^z \rangle$ for some $z \neq 0$ and let $w \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $(T, (c^w) \oplus P)$ is critical.*

Proof. Put $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle$ and let $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the covering corresponding to $U \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. We may assume that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements in $(c^z) \oplus P$ and the compact boundary components of \mathcal{O}' . In fact, if there is $\gamma \in P$ such that γ and c^z correspond to the same boundary component of \mathcal{O}' then $(T, (c^w) \oplus P)$ folds peripheral elements; hence it is critical. If there is a boundary component of \mathcal{O}' that does not correspond to any element in $(c^z) \oplus P$ then (T, P) is equivalent to $(T' \oplus (c^z), P')$ and so $(T, (c^w) \oplus P)$ is equivalent to $(T' \oplus (c^z), (c^w) \oplus P')$ which is either reducible or has an obvious relation; again it is critical. Therefore U is of finite index in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Now an argument similar to the argument given in the previous lemma shows that $(T, (c^w) \oplus P)$ is critical. \square

Lemma 3.41. *Let $\mathfrak{B} = (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ be an almost orbifold cover with exceptional vertex $y \in VB$. Then $fold(\mathfrak{B}) \geq 2$ unless the following hold:*

- (i) *the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk and $A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2l+1}$ for some $l \geq 1$.*
- (ii) *$val(y, B) = 2$. In particular, $T_y = (s_{[y]}^2)$ and hence $B_y = A_{[y]}$.*

Proof. By definition, \mathfrak{B} is folded at all vertices except at y . Moreover, $B_y = \langle s_{[y]}^d \rangle$ where

$$val([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]}| > val([y], A) \cdot d = length \Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y) > val([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y|.$$

The previous inequalities imply that the generator $s_{[y]}^d$ of B_y is not angle-minimal. Thus there is $r \geq 2$ such that $d = r \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y|$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} fold(\mathfrak{B}) &= fold_{\mathcal{B}}(y) \\ &= val(y, B) - l_{\mathcal{B}}(y) \\ &= length \Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y) - val([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y| \\ &= r \cdot val([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y| - val([y], A) \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y| \\ &= (r - 1) \cdot val_A([y]) \cdot |A_{[y]} : B_y| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $fold(\mathfrak{B}) \leq 1$ if and only if $val([y], A) = 1$, $r = 2$ and $|A_{[y]} : B_y| = 1$. The equality $|A_{[y]} : B_y| = 1$ implies that $d = r$ and the equality $val([y], A) = 1$ implies that underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk since $val([y], A)$ coincides with the number of boundary components of \mathcal{O} . Moreover

$$d - 1 = val([y], A)d - val([y], A)|A_{[y]} : B_y| = length \Gamma_{\mathfrak{B}}(y) - val([y], A)|A_{[y]} : B_y| \leq 1$$

implies that $d \leq 2$ and therefore $d = 2$. As $\langle s_{[y]}^2 \rangle = B_y = A_{[y]}$ it follow that $A_{[y]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{2l+1}$. \square

Proposition 3.42. *Let (T, P) be a partitioned tuple of (almost) orbifold covering type in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Then the partitioned tuples $(T \oplus (b), P)$ and $(T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$ are critical for any $b \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ and for any labeled peripheral element $\gamma \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof. Assume first that (T, P) is of orbifold covering type. We will show that $(T \oplus (b), P)$ is critical. The argument to show that $(T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$ is critical is analogous.

Let $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the covering corresponding to $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Choose a boundary component $C \subseteq \partial\mathcal{O}$ and let $c \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ correspond to C . We may arrange (T, P) so that $P = P_0 \oplus (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s)$ where $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ correspond to the boundary components of \mathcal{O}' that cover C . By definition, there are $a_i \in \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\gamma_i = a_i c^{z_i} a_i^{-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. After conjugating (T, P) by a_1^{-1} we may assume that $\gamma_1 = c^{z_1}$.

Since maximal peripheral subgroups of U have the form $u\langle\gamma\rangle u^{-1}$ with $u \in U$ and $\gamma \in P$, there is $u \in U$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $u\langle\gamma_j\rangle u^{-1} = b\langle c \rangle b^{-1} \cap U$. Thus $b = ua_j c^z$ for some $u \in U$ and some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $j \geq 2$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (T \oplus (b), P_0 \oplus (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s)) &\sim (T \oplus (a_j c^z), P_0 \oplus (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_j, \dots, \gamma_s)) \\ &\sim (T \oplus (a_j c^z), P_0 \oplus (a_j c^z \gamma_1 c^{-z} a_j^{-1}, \dots, \gamma_j, \dots, \gamma_s)) \\ &= (T \oplus (a_j c^z), P_0 \oplus (a_j c^{z_1} a_j^{-1}, \dots, a_j c^{z_j} a_j^{-1}, \dots, \gamma_s)). \end{aligned}$$

which shows that \mathcal{P} folds peripheral elements. If $j = 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (T \oplus (b), P_0 \oplus (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s)) &= (T \oplus (uc^z), P_0 \oplus (c^{z_1}, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s)) \\ &\sim (T \oplus (c^z), P_0 \oplus (c^{z_1}, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s)) \\ &= (T \oplus (c^w), P_0 \oplus (c^{z_1}, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s)). \end{aligned}$$

where $z = qz_1 + w$ with $0 \leq w < z_1$. Therefore \mathcal{P} is reducible (if $w = 0$) or has an obvious relation (if $w \neq 0$).

Assume now that (T, P) is of almost orbifold covering type. Let $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [\mathcal{P}'])$ be a marking of almost orbifold covering type that represents the equivalence class of (T, P) . By definition, there is a cone point x of \mathcal{O} such that

$$\eta|_{\mathcal{O}' \setminus \eta^{-1}(x)} : \mathcal{O}' \setminus \{\eta^{-1}(x)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \setminus \{x\}$$

is an orbifold cover of finite degree. Therefore $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle$ is of finite index in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. Let $\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the covering corresponding to $U := \langle T \oplus P \rangle \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ and let $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m \in U$ correspond to the boundary components of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. Since U is of finite index it follows that any peripheral element of U is (in U) conjugate into $\langle \delta_i \rangle$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$. From the fact that $\eta|_{\mathcal{O}' \setminus \{\eta^{-1}(x)\}}$ is of finite degree we conclude that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ there is (not unique) $\gamma \in P$ such that γ is conjugate (in U) into $\langle \delta_i \rangle$. The argument is now similar to the argument given in the previous case. \square

Proposition 3.43. *Let (T, P) be an arbitrary partitioned tuple in $G := \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ and let γ a labeled peripheral element of G . Then one of the following holds:*

- (1) $(T \oplus (\gamma), P)$ is critical.
- (2) $(T \oplus (\gamma), P)$ and $(T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$ are non-critical and of simple type.

Proof. Put $\mathcal{P} := (T \oplus (\gamma), P)$ and $\mathcal{P}' := (T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$. Note first that the definition of equivalence implies that if \mathcal{P}' is equivalent to $(T', (\gamma') \oplus P')$ then \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T' \oplus (\gamma'), P')$.

We need to consider all possibilities for \mathcal{P}' spelled out in Proposition 3.11

(1) \mathcal{P}' is of simple type. By definition, \mathcal{P}' is equivalent to $(T', (\gamma') \oplus (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n))$ such that $U = \langle T' \rangle * \langle \gamma' \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_n \rangle$ and $\text{rank}(U) = \text{size}(T) + \text{size}(P) + 1$ where $U := \langle T \oplus (\gamma) \oplus P \rangle$ and γ' correspond to γ . We observed in the previous paragraph that \mathcal{P} is equivalent to $(T' \oplus (\gamma'), (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n))$. Therefore \mathcal{P}' of simple type implies that \mathcal{P} is also of simple type.

Let $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the cover corresponding to $U \leq G$. Observe that \mathcal{P}' is non-critical iff $T \oplus (\gamma) \oplus P$ is a rigid generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\text{core}(\mathcal{O}'))$ which is equivalent to \mathcal{P} be

non-critical. Therefore \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' are either non-critical of simple type (which puts us exclusively in case (2)) or both are critical (which puts us exclusively into case (1)).

(2) \mathcal{P}' is of orbifold covering type. Let $\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the orbifold covering corresponding to $U := \langle T \oplus (\gamma) \oplus P \rangle \leq \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. If \mathcal{O}' is a surface, then \mathcal{P} is clearly reducible since γ is a consequence of the remaining generators. If \mathcal{O}' has at least one cone point then we the standard presentation of $U = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}')$ reveals that (up to equivalence) the elements in P determine free factors of U . Since $T \oplus (\gamma) \oplus P$ is a minimal non-rigid generating tuple of U we conclude that \mathcal{P} is equivalent to (T', P') with T' containing an angle-minimal element. Therefore \mathcal{P} is critical and of simple type.

(3) \mathcal{P}' is of almost orbifold covering type. Let $\mathfrak{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', u'_1, (T'_{u'})_{u' \in VB'}, (p'_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n+1})$ be a minimal (i.e. $\mathcal{B}' = \text{core}(\mathfrak{B}')$) almost orbifold cover that corresponds to $[\mathcal{P}']$ and let $y \in VB'$ be the exceptional vertex of \mathfrak{B}' . We may assume that the peripheral path p'_{n+1} corresponds to γ . Observe that $\mathcal{P} = (T \oplus (\gamma), P)$ is represented by the tame and minimal decorated \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathfrak{B} := (\mathcal{B}, u_1, (T_u)_{u \in VB}, (p_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n})$ where $(\mathcal{B}, u_1) = (\mathcal{B}', u'_1)$, $T_u = T'_{u'}$ for all $u \in VB = VB'$, and $p_j = p'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$, that is, we obtain \mathfrak{B} by simply removing the peripheral path p'_{n+1} from the defining data of \mathfrak{B}' .

In what follows we can assume that all folds preserve the rank of the fundamental groups since otherwise \mathcal{P} is either of type (4) or of surface covering type, and therefore critical. There are two cases to consider depending on the foldability of \mathfrak{B} .

Case 1. $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}) = \text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}') \geq 2$. Since the foldability of pre-(almost) orbifold covers is equal to one and the foldability of folded decorated \mathbb{A} -graphs is equal to zero, we conclude that, if \mathfrak{B} folds onto such a decorated \mathbb{A} -graph, there must be some fold that decreases foldability. According to Lemma 3.35 and Lemma 3.36, an element of order two must be added to some vertex tuple, which implies that \mathcal{P} is equivalent to (\bar{T}, \bar{P}) with \bar{T} containing an element of order two and therefore angle-minimal. This shows that \mathcal{P} is critical.

Case 2. $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}) = \text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}') = 1$. Lemma 3.41 applied to the almost orbifold cover \mathfrak{B}' implies that the following hold:

- (i) the underlying surface of \mathcal{O} is a disk and $A_{[y]} = \langle s_{[y]} \mid s_{[y]}^{2l+1} \rangle$.
- (ii) $\text{val}(y, B) = \text{val}(y, B') = 2$ and $T_y = T'_y = (s_{[y]}^2)$.

Observe that (i) and (ii) imply that $B_y = B'_y = A_{[y]}$. Put $\text{Star}(y, B) := \{f_1, f_2\}$. As $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}) = \text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}') = 1$ we conclude that the only fold that can be applied to \mathfrak{B} is the fold, which we denote by F , that identifies f_1 and f_2 . Let \mathfrak{B}'' be the decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathfrak{B} by F .

If the foldability increases then the argument given in case 1 shows that \mathcal{P} is critical.

If $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}'') < \text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}) = 1$ then $\text{fold}(\mathfrak{B}'') = 0$ and so \mathfrak{B}'' is folded. In particular \mathfrak{B}'' cannot be an almost orbifold cover. Lemma 3.36 tells us that folds of type IA do not decrease foldability. Thus F is of type IIIA; hence $z := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2) \in VB$. Lemma 3.35(1) implies that the following hold:

- (i') $A_{[z]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$; hence $\mathcal{O} = D^2(2, 2l + 1)$.
- (ii') F adds $s_{[z]}^{\pm 1}$ to $B_z = B'_z = 1$; hence $B''_z = A_{[z]}$.

From this we conclude that \mathcal{P} if \mathcal{P} is of simple type then it is critical since \mathfrak{B}'' contains a tuple with an angle-minimal element.

Finally we deal with the case that F preserves foldability. Lemma 3.36 combined with the fact that $\mathcal{O} = D^2(m_1, m_2)$ with $m_2 = 2l + 1$, implies that F is of type IIIA, that is, $z := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2) \in VB = VB'$. Lemma 3.35 implies that $A_{[z]} \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$ and F adds $s_{[z]}^2$ to B''_z which is angle-minimal. From this we conclude, that \mathcal{P} cannot be of almost orbifold cover and if \mathcal{P} is of simple type then it is critical. Both claims follow from the fact that any decorated \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathfrak{B}'' by a fold will contain a vertex tuple with an angle-minimal element.

(4) \mathcal{P}' is reducible. Then \mathcal{P} is reducible and therefore critical.

(5) \mathcal{P}' has an obvious relation. Thus $\mathcal{P}' = (T, (\gamma) \oplus P)$ is equivalent to a partitioned tuple $(T'', (\gamma'') \oplus P'')$ such that

$$z'' := |o'' \langle c_{i''} \rangle (o'')^{-1} : U'' \cap o'' \langle c_{i''} \rangle (o'')^{-1}| < |o'' \langle c_{i''} \rangle (o'')^{-1} : \langle \gamma'' \rangle|$$

where $U'' = \langle T'' \oplus P'' \rangle$ and (o'', i'') is the label of γ'' . Let $\gamma' \in (\gamma'') \oplus P''$ correspond to γ , that is, γ is carried by the elementary equivalences onto γ'

If $\gamma' \in P''$ then the previous inequality shows that \mathcal{P} has an obvious relation. Thus assume $\gamma'' = \gamma'$, that is, γ'' corresponds to γ . We can also assume that $\mathcal{P}'' := (T'', P'')$ is of simple type since all other possibilities for \mathcal{P}'' imply that \mathcal{P} is critical. We can further assume that the elements of P'' correspond to all but one boundary component of the orbifold corresponding to U'' as otherwise we can assume that T'' contains $o'' c_{i''}'' (o'')^{-1}$ and so \mathcal{P} is reducible. These assumptions on \mathcal{P}'' imply that $|\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}) : U''| < \infty$. It now follows from Lemma 3.39 that $(T \oplus (\gamma), P)$ is critical.

(6) \mathcal{P}' folds peripheral elements. By definition \mathcal{P}' is equivalent to

$$(T'', (\gamma_1'', \gamma_2'') \oplus P'')$$

such that the labels of γ_1'' and γ_2'' satisfy $i := i_{\gamma_1''} = i_{\gamma_2''}$ and $o_{\gamma_1''} = o_{\gamma_2''} c_i^z$ for some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. If none of γ_1'', γ_2'' correspond to γ , then $P'' = (\gamma'') \oplus P_0''$ with γ'' corresponding to γ . Thus \mathcal{P} is equivalent to

$$(T'' \oplus (\gamma''), (\gamma_1'', \gamma_2'') \oplus P_0'')$$

which shows that \mathcal{P} folds peripheral elements. Thus assume that γ_1'' corresponds to γ . Thus \mathcal{P} is equivalent to

$$(T'' \oplus (\gamma_1''), (\gamma_2'') \oplus P'')$$

which in turn is equivalent to

$$(T'' \oplus (\gamma''), (\gamma_2'') \oplus P'')$$

with $\gamma'' \in \langle \gamma_1'', \gamma_2'' \rangle$ such that $\gamma'' = 1$ or

$$|o_{\gamma_1''} \langle c_{i_{\gamma_1''}} \rangle o_{\gamma_1''}^{-1} : \langle \gamma'' \rangle| < |o_{\gamma_1''} \langle c_{i_{\gamma_1''}} \rangle o_{\gamma_1''}^{-1} : \langle \gamma_1'' \rangle|.$$

Therefore \mathcal{P} is either reducible or has an obvious relation. \square

Corollary 3.44. *Let (T, P) and (T_0, P_0) be a partitioned tuples in $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. If (T, P) is critical or of (almost) orbifold covering type, then $(T \oplus T_0, P \oplus P_0)$ is critical.*

Proof. If (T, P) is of (almost) orbifold covering type then the result follows from Proposition 3.42.

If (T, P) is of type (4) then the result is easily verified.

Finally if (T, P) is of simple type then (T, P) is equivalent to (\bar{T}, \bar{P}) such that \bar{T} contains an angle-minimal element. The result now follows as $(T \oplus T_0, P \oplus P_0)$ is equivalent to $(\bar{T} \oplus T_0, \bar{P} \oplus P_0)$. \square

4 The global picture

In this section we will recall some definitions contained in Section 4 of [Dut]. We nevertheless assume that the reader is familiar with the language developed in [Dut].

Let \mathcal{O} be a sufficiently large orbifold. Then there is a non-empty (not unique) collection $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t$ of pairwise disjoint simple closed curves on \mathcal{O} such that the closure of each component of $\mathcal{O} - \gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \gamma_t$ is a small orbifold. Let $\mathbb{A}' := \mathbb{A}'(\mathcal{O}, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t)$ be the corresponding graph of groups and let $v_0 \in VA'$. The orbifold version of the Seifert-Van

Kampen theorem implies that $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}', v_0) \cong \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. For technical reasons we replace \mathbb{A}' by its barycentric subdivision \mathbb{A} . Thus for each edge e of \mathbb{A}' there is a vertex v_e with infinite cyclic group corresponding to γ_i for some i . The vertices of \mathbb{A} arising from edges of \mathbb{A}' are called *peripheral* and the remaining vertices will be called *non-peripheral*.

We use the same terminology for \mathbb{A} -graphs, i.e. we say that a vertex u of an \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B} is *peripheral* (resp. *non-peripheral*) if the corresponding vertex $[u] \in VA$ is peripheral (resp. non-peripheral). The set of peripheral (resp. non-peripheral) vertices is denoted by $V_p\mathcal{B}$ (resp. $V_{np}\mathcal{B}$).

Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathbb{A} -graph and $f \in EB$ labeled (a, e, b) such that $x := \alpha(f)$ is non-peripheral and $B_f \neq 1$. Then any generator of the cyclic group $\alpha_f(B_f) = a\alpha_e(B_f)a^{-1} \leq B_x$ is called a *peripheral element associated to f* . Any peripheral element associated to f will be denoted by γ_f . *Throughout we will always assume that any such γ_f is labeled $(a, e) \in A_{[x]} \times \text{Star}([x], A)$.* For more details see [Dut, Subsection 4.1].

4.1 Marked \mathbb{A} -graphs

In this section we define marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. Before we need to recall the notion of \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type defined in Subsection 4.2 of [Dut].

Definition 4.1. We say that a finite and folded \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{C} is of *orbifold type* if:

1. \mathcal{C} is non-empty (possibly consisting of a single vertex).
2. $|A_{[x]} : C_x| < \infty$ for all $x \in VC \cup EC$.
3. \mathcal{C} is locally surjective at non-peripheral vertices.
4. there is at least one vertex at which \mathcal{C} is not locally surjective.

An \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type consisting of a single vertex is called *degenerate*. Otherwise we say that it is *non-degenerate*.

Definition 4.2. Let \mathcal{C} be an \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type. A *boundary vertex* of \mathcal{C} is a vertex at which \mathcal{C} is not locally surjective.

To any \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type \mathcal{C} there corresponds a unique compact orbifold $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}$ with non-empty boundary which is defined as the union of the finite covers of the vertex orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_{[u]}$ corresponding to the subgroups $C_u \leq A_{[u]} = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{[u]})$ as u ranges over the vertex set of \mathcal{C} . The fundamental group of the graph of groups associated to \mathcal{C} is canonically isomorphic (via Seifert-van-Kampen Theorem) to the fundamental group of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}$. We say that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is *the orbifold associated to \mathcal{C}* .

Observe that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a simple closed curve iff \mathcal{C} is degenerate. If \mathcal{C} is non-degenerate, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the boundary vertices of \mathcal{C} and the boundary components of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}$.

Definition 4.3. A *marked \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type* is a triple $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})$ where \mathcal{C} is an \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type, $u_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a vertex of \mathcal{C} and $T_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a rigid generating tuple of $\pi_1(\mathbb{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}})$ meaning that the corresponding generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}}) \cong \pi_1(\mathbb{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}})$ is rigid.

Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathbb{A} -graph and let \mathcal{C} be a collection of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs of orbifold type such that the following hold:

- (A.1) for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$, the \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{C} is a sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathcal{B} .
- (A.2) the members of \mathcal{C} are pairwise disjoint.

The set of *vertices of orbifold type* with respect to \mathcal{C} and the set of *edges of orbifold type* with respect to \mathcal{C} are defined as

$$V_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}}B := \bigcup_{(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}} VC \quad \text{and} \quad E_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}}B := \bigcup_{(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}} EC.$$

The set of *exceptional vertices* with respect to \mathcal{C} , and the set of *exceptional edges* with respect to \mathcal{C} are defined as

$$V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B = V_{np}B \setminus V_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}}B \quad \text{and} \quad E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B := EB \setminus E_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}}B.$$

Definition 4.4. Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathbb{A} -graph. A *marking* of \mathcal{B} consists of the following:

- (I) a finite collection \mathcal{C} of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs of orbifold type satisfying conditions (A.1) and (A.2).
- (II) a partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}_u = (T_u, P_u)$ in $A_{[u]} = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{[u]})$ for each $u \in VB$ that is exceptional with respect to \mathcal{C} , that is, for each $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B$.

such that the following hold:

1. for any $u \in V_pB$ with $B_u \neq 1$ there is $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $u \in VC$.
2. $P_u = (\gamma_{f_1}, \dots, \gamma_{f_n})$ where $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} = Star(u, B) \cap E(\mathcal{B})$ where $E(\mathcal{B})$ denotes the set $\{f \in EB \mid B_f \neq 1\}$.
3. $T_u \oplus P_u$ generates $B_u \leq A_{[u]}$.
4. for any $f \in E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B \cap E(\mathcal{B})$ with $\alpha(f) \in V_pB$ the following hold:
 - (a) there is $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\alpha(f)$ is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{C} .
 - (b) $\omega(f)$ is an exceptional vertex with respect to \mathcal{C} , i.e. $\omega(f) \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B$.
 - (c) $B_f = \alpha_{[f]}^{-1}(o_f^{-1}B_{\alpha(f)}o_f) = \alpha_{[f]}^{-1}(B_{\alpha(f)})$.
5. for any $f \neq g \in E(\mathcal{B})$ such that $\alpha(f) = \alpha(g) \in V_pB$ it holds $[f] \neq [g]$.

Definition 4.5. A *marked \mathbb{A} -graph* is a tuple $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B})$ where:

1. \mathcal{B} is π_1 -surjective, i.e. the homomorphism $\phi_{\mathcal{B}} : \pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$ associated to \mathcal{B} is surjective for some (and therefore any) $u_0 \in VB$ such that $[u_0] = v_0$.
2. $(\mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B})$ is a marking of \mathcal{B} .

The \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B} (resp. the underlying graph B of \mathcal{B}) is called the *underlying \mathbb{A} -graph* (resp. *underlying graph*) of \mathbf{B} .

Definition 4.6. A marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B})$ is a *special almost orbifold covering with a good marking* if the following hold:

1. $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B = \{u\}$ and \mathcal{P}_u is of almost orbifold covering type.
2. $E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B = Star(u, B)^{\pm 1}$ and $B_f \neq 1$ for all $f \in Star(u, B)$.
3. For each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ with \mathcal{C} is non-degenerate and each boundary vertex of u' of \mathcal{C} there is a unique $f \in Star(u, B)$ such that $\omega(f) = u'$.
4. For each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that \mathcal{C} is degenerate there are unique $f \neq f' \in Star(u, B)$ such that $\omega(f) = \omega(f') = u'$.

Definition 4.7. We say that a marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (T_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B})$ is *tame* if \mathcal{P}_u is non-critical and of simple type for any $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}B$.

Remark 4.8. Observe that a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking is not tame since it has an exceptional vertex such that the corresponding partitioned tuple is not of simple type.

The tuple associated to a marked \mathbb{A} -graph. In [Dut, Section 4.4] we explained how a marked \mathbb{A} -graph yields a Nielsen equivalence class of generating tuples of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}) \cong \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$. We recall the construction. Assume that $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B})$ is a (not necessarily tame) marked \mathbb{A} -graph. Let $Y \subseteq B$ be a maximal \mathcal{C} -subtree (that is, Y is a maximal subtree of B such that $Y \cap C$ is a maximal subtree of C for each $(C, u_C, T_C) \in \mathcal{C}$). Let E be a subset of EB such that E contains either e or e^{-1} for every pair $\{e, e^{-1}\} \subseteq E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B \setminus EY$. Let $u_0 \in VB$ with $[u_0] = v_0 \in VA$ (the base vertex of \mathbb{A}). Finally, for any $u \in VB$ let

$$p_u := 1, e_{u,1}, 1, \dots, 1, e_{u,d_u}, 1$$

where $e_{u,1}, \dots, e_{u,d_u}$ is the unique reduced path in Y from u_0 to u . We define $T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}$ as the tuple consisting of the following elements:

1. for every $e \in E$, the element $g_e := [p_{\alpha(e)} \cdot 1, e, 1 \cdot p_{\omega(e)}^{-1}]$.
2. for each $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$ and each b in T_u , the element $[p_u \cdot b \cdot p_u^{-1}]$.
3. for each $(C, u_C, T_C) \in \mathcal{C}$ and b in T_C , the element $[p_{u_C} \cdot b \cdot p_{u_C}^{-1}]$.

Remark 4.9. Note that for each $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$ there is a subtuple T_{Y,u_0}^u of $T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}$ that corresponds to T_u such that $\langle T_{Y,u_0}^u \rangle \leq \pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0)$ is isomorphic to $\langle T_u \rangle \leq B_u$. Similarly, for each $(C, u_C, T_C) \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a subtuple T_{Y,u_0}^C of $T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}$ that corresponds to T_C such that $\langle T_{Y,u_0}^C \rangle \leq \pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0)$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1(\mathbb{C}, u_C)$.

It is a consequence of [KMW, Proposition 2.4] that $T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}$ is a generating tuple of $\pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0)$. It further follows from [Dut, Lemma 4.16] that for a fixed base vertex u_0 the Nielsen equivalence class determined by $T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}$ does not depend on the choice of the maximal \mathcal{C} -subtree Y . When we replace u_0 by $u'_0 \in VB$ with $[u'_0] = v_0$ we obtain a tuple that is conjugate to $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}})$. Since conjugate generating tuples are Nielsen equivalent and since

$$\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0) = \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0)) = \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(\langle T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}} \rangle) = \langle \phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}) \rangle$$

we conclude that the Nielsen equivalence class of generating tuples of $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$ determined by $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}})$ does not depend on Y and on u_0 . Thus the following definition makes sense.

Definition 4.10. Let \mathbf{B} be a marked \mathbb{A} -graph. We define $[T_{\mathbf{B}}]$ as the Nielsen equivalence class determined by $\phi_{\mathcal{B}}(T_{Y,u_0}^{\mathbf{B}})$ where Y is an arbitrary maximal \mathcal{C} -subtree of B and u_0 is an arbitrary vertex of type v_0 .

Equivalence of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. In this section we define equivalence of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. Let $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B})$ be a (not necessarily tame) marked \mathbb{A} -graph. An elementary move on \mathbf{B} (see [Dut, Section 4.5]) consists of one of the following modifications:

- (1) A *Nielsen move*, i.e.
 - (i) for some $(C, u_C, T_C) \in \mathcal{C}$ replace T_C by a Nielsen equivalent tuple T'_C .
 - (ii) for some vertex $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$ replace T_u in $\mathcal{P}_u = (T_u, P_u)$ by a Nielsen equivalent tuple T'_u .
- (2) A *peripheral move of type (i)*, i.e. for some $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$ replace $P_u = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ in $\mathcal{P}_u = (T_u, P_u)$ by $P'_u = (\gamma_{\sigma(1)}^{\varepsilon_1}, \dots, \gamma_{\sigma(n)}^{\varepsilon_n})$ where $\sigma \in S_n$ and $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \in \{\pm 1\}$.
- (3) A tame auxiliary move of type A2.
- (4) A *peripheral move of type (ii)*: for some $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$ replace $T_u = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ in $\mathcal{P}_u = (T_u, P_u)$ by $T'_u = (g_1, \dots, g_{i-1}, \gamma g_i \gamma', g_{i+1}, \dots, g_m)$ where $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $\gamma, \gamma' \in P_u^{\pm 1}$.

(5) An auxiliary move of type A0 or of type A1.

Definition 4.11. We say that two marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{B}' are *equivalent*, and write $\mathbf{B} \approx \mathbf{B}'$, if \mathbf{B}' is obtained from \mathbf{B} by a finite sequence of elementary moves. The equivalence class of \mathbf{B} is denoted by \mathbf{b} .

It follows from [Dut, Lemma 4.18] that equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graphs define Nielsen equivalent generating tuples of $\pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$. Thus it makes sense to define $[T_{\mathbf{b}}] := [T_{\mathbf{B}}]$ where \mathbf{B} is an arbitrary representative of \mathbf{b} .

4.2 Tame elementary folds

In this section we discuss tame elementary folds that can be applied to a *tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph* $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{e \times c}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}})$. Such a fold yields an \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' (as any fold does) that does not always inherit a marking from \mathbf{B} . If it does, then the obtained marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}', (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{e \times c}^{\mathcal{C}' \mathcal{B}'}})$ represents the same Nielsen class as \mathbf{B} , i.e. $[T_{\mathbf{B}'}] = [T_{\mathbf{B}}]$, and has lower complexity. We do not allow all folds that are applicable to the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B} .

We first discuss folds of type IIA. They can be applied to an edge f if it satisfies conditions (II.1)-(II.3) introduced below. These conditions imply in particular that we do not apply such a fold to some edge if it can be folded by a fold of type IA or IIIA onto an edge with non-trivial edge group. The following lemma clarifies when such an edge f exists.

Lemma 4.12. *Let $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{e \times c}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}})$ be a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph. Let f be an edge of \mathcal{B} labeled (a, e, b) and initial vertex $x := \alpha(f)$. Suppose that the following hold:*

(II.1) $B_f = 1$.

(II.2) $B_x \cap a\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1} \leq A_{[x]}$ is non-trivial.

(II.3) f cannot be folded with any edge in $\text{Star}(x, \mathcal{B}) \cap E(\mathcal{B})$.

Then one of the following holds:

(El.0) x is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{C} for some $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$.

(El.1) x is exceptional (and hence \mathcal{P}_x is non-critical of simple type) and \mathcal{P}_x is equivalent to $(T' \oplus \langle \gamma' \rangle, (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n))$ such that

$$B_x = \langle T' \rangle * \langle \gamma' \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_n \rangle$$

where γ' is conjugate to a generator of $B_x \cap a\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1}$. In particular,

$$(T, \langle \gamma' \rangle \oplus \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n \rangle)$$

is non-critical and of simple type.

(El.2) x is exceptional, $B_x = \langle T_x \oplus P_x \rangle \leq A_{[x]}$ is of finite index, and the elements in P_x correspond to all but one boundary component of the orbifold corresponding to B_x .

Proof. Assume first that x is of orbifold type (which is the case if x is peripheral since (II.2) implies that $B_x \neq 1$). Thus there is $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $x \in VC$. By definition \mathcal{C} is locally surjective at all interior vertices. It therefore follows from (II.3) that x is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{C} , and so (El.0) holds.

Assume now that x is exceptional. The tameness of \mathbf{B} implies that \mathcal{P}_x is non-critical and of simple type. Let $\eta_x : \mathcal{O}_{B_x} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{[x]}$ be the orbifold covering corresponding to $B_x \leq A_{[x]} = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{[x]})$ and let $\gamma'_f \in A_{[x]}$ such that $\langle \gamma'_f \rangle = B_x \cap a\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1} \leq A_{[x]}$. Assume that $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} = \text{Star}(x, \mathcal{B}) \cap E(\mathcal{B})$. Thus $P_x = \langle \gamma_{f_1}, \dots, \gamma_{f_n} \rangle$.

If there is $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that γ'_f and γ_{f_i} correspond to the same boundary component of \mathcal{O}_{B_x} , then f can be folded with f_i and so we obtain a contradiction to (II.3). Thus we may assume that this is not the case. If \mathcal{O}_{B_x} has at least $k + 2$ (not necessarily compact) boundary components then

$$B_x = B_0 * \langle \gamma' \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_k \rangle$$

where γ'_i (resp. γ') correspond to the same boundary component of \mathcal{O}_{B_x} as γ_{f_i} (resp. γ_f). Now an argument similar as the one given in the proof of Lemma 3.8 shows that (El.1) holds. If \mathcal{O}_{B_x} has $k + 1$ boundary components then clearly (El.2) holds. \square

Remark 4.13. Observe that when (El.2) holds, then Lemma 3.2 together with the fact that \mathcal{P}_x is non-critical of simple type implies that $T_x \oplus P_x$ is a rigid generating tuple of $B_x \cong \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{B_x})$.

Remark 4.14. When (El.1) holds, then possibly after applying auxiliary moves to \mathbf{B} that only affect the vertex x and the edges starting at x , we may assume that

$$\mathcal{P}_x = (T' \oplus (\gamma'), (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n)).$$

This follows from [Dut, Lemma 4.17].

The previous remark motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.15. Let \mathbf{B} , f and x be as in Lemma 4.12. We say that f is *normalized* if (El.0) or (El.2) holds or if (El.1) holds and

$$\mathcal{P}_x = (T'_x \oplus (\gamma'_f), (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n)) \quad \text{and} \quad B_x = \langle T'_x \rangle * \langle \gamma'_f \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_n \rangle$$

where γ'_f is a generator of $B_x \cap a\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1}$.

Tame elementary folds of type IIA. Let f be a *normalized* edge of \mathbf{B} labeled (a, e, b) with $x := \alpha(f)$ and $y := \omega(f)$ and let γ'_f be a generator of $B_x \cap a\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1} \leq A_{[x]}$. Let \mathcal{B}' be the \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathcal{B} in the following way:

1. Replace $B_f = 1$ by $B'_f \leq A_e$ such that $\langle \gamma'_f \rangle = a\alpha_e(B'_f)a^{-1}$.
2. Replace B_y by $B'_y = \langle B_y, \gamma' \rangle \leq A_{[y]}$ where $\langle \gamma' \rangle = b^{-1}\omega_e(B'_f)b$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \xrightarrow{(a, e, b)} & & \xrightarrow{(a, e, b)} \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{B_f = 1} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{IIA} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{B'_f} & \bullet \\ B_x & & B_y & & B'_x = B_x & & B'_y = \langle B_y, \gamma' \rangle \end{array}$$

Figure 18: A tame elementary fold of type IIA based on $f \in EB$.

We say that \mathcal{B}' is obtained from \mathcal{B} by a *tame elementary fold of type IIA based on f* . Observe that \mathcal{B}' contains \mathcal{C} for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$.

Next we discuss when \mathcal{B}' inherits a marking from \mathbf{B} yielding a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' . We also define the notion of *good* and *bad* tame elementary folds. Roughly speaking bad tame elementary folds will be those that reveal reducibility of the tuple associated to \mathbf{B} .

We discuss the each of the cases (El.0), (El.1) and (El.2) separately.

Fold IIA(El.0): Suppose that (El.0) holds, i.e. there is $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that x is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{C} . The fact that f is normalized (more precisely, condition (II.3) of normalized edges) and Definition 4.4 imply that $B_g = 1$ for all $g \in Star(x, B) \setminus Star(x, C)$. We distinguish two cases depending on the type of $y = \omega(f)$.

1. If y is of orbifold type, then we say that the tame elementary fold based on f is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .

1. If $B_y \neq 1$, then we say that the tame elementary fold based on the edge f is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .
2. If $B_y = 1$, then we define a marking on \mathcal{B}' in the following way. We first define the collection \mathcal{C}' satisfying (A.1) and (A.2). Assume that $\text{Star}(x, B) \cap E(B) = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$. For each $1 \leq j \leq r$ let $(\mathcal{C}_j, u_{\mathcal{C}_j}, T_{\mathcal{C}_j}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\omega(f_j)$ is a boundary vertex of \mathcal{C}_j . Let C be the sub-graph of $B = B'$ that has vertex set

$$VC = VC_1 \cup \dots \cup VC_r \cup \{x, y\}$$

and edge set

$$EC = EC_1 \cup \dots \cup EC_r \cup \{f_1, \dots, f_r, f\}^{\pm 1}.$$

Denote by \mathcal{C} (resp. \mathcal{C}') the sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of \mathcal{B} (resp. of \mathcal{B}') carried by C . It follows from condition (II.3) that \mathcal{C}' is an \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type contained in \mathcal{B}' .

Next we provide a rigid generating tuple of $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}', x)$. The fold along f carries \mathcal{C} into \mathcal{C}' . As $B_y = 1$ epimorphism $\nu : \pi_1(\mathcal{C}, x) \rightarrow \pi_1(\mathcal{C}', x)$ induced by the fold is an isomorphism. Chose a maximal subtree $Y_C \subseteq C$ and for each $1 \leq i \leq r$ let

$$p_i := 1, e_{i,1}, 1, \dots, 1, e_{i,l_i}, 1$$

where $e_{i,1}, \dots, e_{i,l_i}$ is the unique reduced path in Y_C from x to $u_{\mathcal{C}_i}$. Put

$$T'_x := \nu(T_x) \quad \text{and} \quad T'_i := \nu(p_i T_{\mathcal{C}_i} p_i^{-1})$$

for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Since $T_x \oplus P_x$ is a rigid generating tuple of B_x it follows that

$$T_{\mathcal{C}'} := T'_x \oplus T'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T'_r$$

is a rigid generating tuple of $\pi_1(\mathcal{C}', x)$. Thus $(\mathcal{C}', u_{\mathcal{C}'}, T_{\mathcal{C}'})$ is a marked \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type such that $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}'$, and hence

$$\mathcal{C}' := (\mathcal{C} \setminus \{(\mathcal{C}_1, u_{\mathcal{C}_1}, T_{\mathcal{C}_1}), \dots, (\mathcal{C}_r, u_{\mathcal{C}_r}, T_{\mathcal{C}_r})\}) \cup \{(\mathcal{C}', x, T_{\mathcal{C}'})\}$$

is a collection of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs of orbifold type satisfying condition (A.1). Condition (A.2) follows as no member of \mathcal{C} contains x or y . Observe also that the $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} B = V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B \setminus \{x\}$. We then define




Figure 20: The marking of \mathcal{B}' when (El.2) holds.

$$\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', u_0, \mathcal{C}', (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} B})$$

where $\mathcal{P}'_u = \mathcal{P}_u$ for all $u \neq x$. In this case we say that the fold is *good*. Note that x turn into a vertex of orbifold type in \mathbf{B}' .

We now discuss tame elementary folds of type IA and IIIA. Those are elementary folds of type IA or IIIA such that the edge group of at least one of the edges involved in the fold is trivial. These types of fold are less subtle than the case of folds of type IIA as no preprocessing/normalization is required, see Remark 4.14 and Definition 4.15. Let

$$\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B})$$

be a *tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph* and suppose that \mathcal{B}' is obtained from \mathcal{B} by a tame elementary fold of type IA or IIIA. We proceed as before by considering the various cases by defining a marking of \mathcal{B}' if appropriate and calling the folds *good* or *bad*.

Tame elementary folds of type IA. In this case the fold identifies a pair of distinct edges f_1 and f_2 in B with same label (a, e, b) , same initial vertex $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$, and distinct terminal vertices $y_1 := \omega(f_1)$ and $y_2 := \omega(f_2)$.

The common image of f_1 and f_2 (resp. y_1 and y_2) in B' under the fold will be denoted by f (resp. by y), see Figure 21. As the fold is tame we may assume that B_{f_2} is trivial. Thus $B'_f = \langle B_{f_1}, B_{f_2} \rangle = B_{f_1}$ and $B'_y = \langle B_{y_1}, B_{y_2} \rangle$. We say that \mathcal{B}' is obtained from \mathcal{B} by




Figure 21: A tame elementary fold of type IA

a *tame elementary fold of type IA*. We distinguish the cases that x is non-peripheral and that x is peripheral.

Fold IA(1). Suppose that x is non-peripheral. There are two subcases.

1. If $B_{y_1} = 1$ or $B_{y_2} = 1$, then the image of the marking of \mathcal{B} under the fold is a marking for \mathcal{B}' defining a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' . In this case we say that the tame elementary fold is *good*.
2. If $B_{y_1} \neq 1$ and $B_{y_2} \neq 1$ then we say that the tame elementary fold is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .

Fold IA(2). Suppose that x is peripheral (and hence, y_1 and y_2 are non-peripheral). We distinguish the cases that at least one of the vertices y_1 and y_2 is of orbifold type and the case that none of them is of orbifold type.

1. Let $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$ and suppose that y_i is of orbifold type.
 - (a) If B_{y_j} is trivial, then the image of the marking $(\mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B})$ of \mathcal{B} under the fold is a marking of \mathcal{B}' defining a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' . In this case we say that the tame elementary fold is *good*.
 - (b) If the vertex group B_{y_j} is non-trivial, then we say that the tame elementary fold is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .
2. Suppose that y_1 and y_2 are not of orbifold type. Thus y_1 and y_2 are exceptional, and so $\mathcal{P}_{y_1} = (T_{y_1}, P_{y_1})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{y_2} = (T_{y_2}, P_{y_2})$ are non-critical and of simple type. Observe that \mathcal{B}' contains \mathcal{C} for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$. We define

$$\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B'}).$$

Since y_1 and y_2 are exceptional it follows that

$$V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B' = (V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B - \{y_1, y_2\}) \cup \{y\}.$$

The partitioned tuples are given by $\mathcal{P}'_w = \mathcal{P}_w$ if $w \neq y$ and $\mathcal{P}'_y = (T_{y_1} \oplus T_{y_2}, P_{y_1} \oplus P_{y_2})$. Again we consider all possible cases for \mathcal{P}'_y .

- (a) If \mathcal{P}'_y is non-critical of simple type then \mathbf{B}' is tame and we call the fold *good*.
- (b) If \mathcal{P}'_y is of almost orbifold covering type, then \mathbf{B}' is not tame.

Let \mathbf{B}'' be the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}' by successively removing valence one vertices with trivial group and their adjacent edges. Then one of the following occurs:

- i. \mathbf{B}'' is a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking. Then we say that the tame elementary fold is *good*.
 - ii. The previous case does not occur. Then we say that fold is *bad*.
- (c) If \mathcal{P}'_y is not of the two types above, then again we say that the tame elementary fold is *bad*.

Tame elementary folds of type IIIA. In this case two edges f_1 and f_2 labeled (a, e, b_1) and (a, e, b_2) with $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$ and $y := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ are identified into a single edge f labeled (a, e, b_1) , see Figure 22.




Figure 22: A tame elementary fold of type IIIA

To simplify notation we identify the vertex set of the graph B' (underlying \mathcal{B}') with the vertex set of the graph B (underlying \mathcal{B}). As the fold is tame we may assume that B_{f_2} is trivial. Thus $B'_f = \langle B_{f_1}, B_{f_2} \rangle = B_{f_1}$ and $B'_y = \langle B_y, b \rangle$ where $b := b_1^{-1}b_2 \in A_{[y]}$. We say that \mathcal{B}' is obtained from \mathcal{B} by a *tame elementary fold of type IIIA*. As in the previous case we distinguish the cases that x is non-peripheral and that x is peripheral. We distinguish two cases depending on the type of x .

Fold IIIA(1): Suppose that x is non-peripheral (hence, y is peripheral).

1. If $B_y \neq 1$, then we say that the fold is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .
2. If $B_y = 1$ and $b_1 = b_2$, then we say that the fold is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .
3. If $B_y \neq 1$ and $b_1 \neq b_2$, then we call the fold *good* and define a marking for \mathcal{B}' as follows. Observe that \mathcal{B}' contains \mathcal{C} for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$. We define

$$\mathcal{C}' = \mathcal{C} \cup \{(\mathcal{C}'', u_{\mathcal{C}''}, T_{\mathcal{C}''})\}$$

where $(\mathcal{C}'', u_{\mathcal{C}''}, T_{\mathcal{C}''})$ is the degenerate marked \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type consisting of the peripheral vertex y and rigid generating tuple $T_{\mathcal{C}''} = (b)$. Thus $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} B = V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} B$. We then define

$$\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}', (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} B'})$$

where $\mathcal{P}'_w = \mathcal{P}_w$ for all $w \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} B'$.

Fold IIIA(2): Suppose that x is peripheral (hence y is non-peripheral). We need to distinguish the cases that y is of orbifold type and the case that y is exceptional.

1. If y is of orbifold type, then the fold is *bad* and we define no marking of \mathcal{B}' .

2. If y is exceptional then $\mathcal{P}_y = (T_y, P_y)$ is non-critical of simple type. Observe that \mathcal{B}' contains \mathcal{C} for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$. Thus $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}' = V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}$. We define

$$\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}'})$$

where $\mathcal{P}'_u = \mathcal{P}_u$ if $u \neq y$ and

$$\mathcal{P}'_y = (T_y \oplus (b), P_y).$$

To decide if the fold is good or bad we consider all possibilities for the partitioned tuple \mathcal{P}'_y as in FoldIA(2)(2).

Lemma 4.16. *If a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' is obtained from a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B} by a tame elementary fold, then $[T_{\mathbf{B}'}] = [T_{\mathbf{B}}]$. In particular, $[T_{\mathbf{b}'}] = [T_{\mathbf{b}}]$.*

Proof. We will give a detailed proof for the case of folds of type IA. The remaining cases are slightly simpler and follows from inspecting the various cases. We follow the notation from the previous paragraphs.

As the fold yields a marked \mathbb{A} -graph at least one of the vertices y_1 and y_2 , say y_2 , is not of orbifold type. This implies that the intersection of \mathcal{C} (with $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})$ in \mathcal{C}) with $f_1 \cup f_2$ is contained in the segment f_1 . We distinguish two cases.

(1) $\mathcal{C} \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)$ is connected for all $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ (it might be a single vertex or the entire edge f_1). In this case we can choose a maximal \mathcal{C} -subtree Y that contains $f_1 \cup f_2$. The image Y' of Y under the fold is clearly a maximal subtree of \mathcal{B}' that contains f . The fold maps \mathcal{C} isomorphically onto \mathcal{C}' for each $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})$ in \mathcal{C} . Thus $Y' \cap \mathcal{C}'$ is a maximal subtree of \mathcal{C}' for each $(\mathcal{C}', u_{\mathcal{C}'}, T_{\mathcal{C}'}) \in \mathcal{C}'$, that is, Y' is a maximal \mathcal{C}' -subtree. To complete the argument observe that $\phi_{\mathbf{B}}(T_{Y, u_0}^{\mathbf{B}}) = \phi_{\mathbf{B}'}(T_{Y', u'_0}^{\mathbf{B}'})$.

(2) There is $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}}) \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{C} \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \{x, y_1\}$. In this case $\bar{\mathcal{C}} \cap (f_1 \cup f_2) = \emptyset$ for all $(\bar{\mathcal{C}}, u_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}, T_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}) \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})\}$. Moreover, the assumption that the fold yields a




Figure 23: The intersection $\mathcal{C} \cap (f_1 \cup f_2)$ is not a tree.

marked \mathbb{A} -graph implies that $B_{y_2} = 1$. We can therefore choose a maximal \mathcal{C} -subtree Y that contains f_2 . The image of $Y \setminus \{f_1, f_2\}^{\pm 1}$ under the fold is a maximal \mathcal{C}' -subtree Y' of \mathcal{B}' . Observe that $f_1 \in E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B} \setminus EY$ and $f \in E_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'} \mathcal{B}' \setminus EY'$. It is not hard to see that

$$T_{Y, u_0}^{\mathbf{B}} = T \oplus (g_Y) \quad \text{and} \quad T_{Y', u'_0}^{\mathbf{B}'} = T' \oplus (g'_{Y'})$$

where $g_Y \in \pi_1(\mathbb{B}, u_0)$ corresponds to f_1 and $g'_{Y'} \in \pi_1(\mathbb{B}', u'_0)$ corresponds to f such that

$$h := \phi_{\mathbf{B}}(g_Y) = \phi_{\mathbf{B}'}(g'_{Y'}).$$

Observe now that each element of $\phi_{\mathbf{B}'}(T')$ is obtained from an element of $\phi_{\mathbf{B}}(T)$ by doing nothing, or by left or right multiplication with h or by conjugation with $h^{\pm 1}$. Therefore $\phi_{\mathbf{B}}(T_{Y, u_0}^{\mathbf{B}})$ is Nielsen equivalent to $\phi_{\mathbf{B}'}(T_{Y', u'_0}^{\mathbf{B}'})$. This completes the proof in the case of a tame elementary fold of type IA. \square

The core of a marked \mathbb{A} -graph. In this section we explain how the core of the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph of a marked \mathbb{A} -graph inherits a marking. Let $\mathbf{B} = (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{B}})$ be a (not necessarily tame) marked \mathbb{A} -graph.

If $\mathcal{B} = \text{core}(\mathcal{B})$ then there is nothing to do. Otherwise there is $f \in EB$ such that $\text{val}(\omega(f), B) = 1$ and $B_{\omega(f)} = t_f^{-1}\omega_{[f]}(B_f)t_f$. There are two cases depending on the vertex group at $\omega(f)$:

1. $B_{\omega(f)} = 1$. Let \mathcal{B}' be the \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathcal{B} by removing the edge pair $\{f, f^{-1}\}$ and the vertex $\omega(f)$. Note that \mathcal{C} is contained in \mathcal{B}' for all $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})$ in \mathcal{C} . Moreover, $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{B}' = V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\omega(f)\}$.

We define $\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{B}'})$ where $\mathcal{P}'_u = \mathcal{P}_u$ for all $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{B}'$.

2. $B_{\omega(f)} \neq 1$. There are two subcases depending on the tameness of \mathbf{B} .
 - (a) \mathbf{B} is tame. In this case there is a unique tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' such that \mathbf{B} is obtained from \mathbf{B}' defined as in case (1) by a tame elementary fold of type IIA based on f .
 - (b) \mathbf{B} is not tame. It is not hard to see that in this case $\alpha(f)$ is exceptional. As $B_f \neq 1$ the partitioned tuple at $\alpha(f)$ has the form

$$\mathcal{P}_{\alpha(f)} = (T_{\alpha(f)}, (\gamma_f) \oplus P_{\alpha(f)})$$

where $\gamma_f \in B_{\alpha(f)}$ is the peripheral element associated to f . On the other hand $\omega(f)$ is peripheral and of orbifold type as $B_{\omega(f)} \neq 1$.

Let \mathcal{B}' be the \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathcal{B} by replacing B_f and $B_{\omega(f)}$ by $B'_f = 1$ and $B_{\omega(f)} = 1$ respectively. Note that \mathcal{C} is contained in \mathcal{B}' for all $(\mathcal{C}, u_{\mathcal{C}}, T_{\mathcal{C}})$ in \mathcal{C} .

We define $\mathbf{B}' = (\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{C}, (\mathcal{P}'_u)_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}}\mathcal{B}'})$ where $\mathcal{P}'_u = \mathcal{P}_u$ if $u \neq \alpha(f)$ and

$$\mathcal{P}'_{\alpha(f)} = (T_{\alpha(f)} \oplus (\gamma_f), P_{\alpha(f)}).$$

In both cases the new marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' such that (i) $\text{core}(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}'$ and (ii) $|EB'| < |EB|$ or $|EB'| = |EB|$ but $|E(\mathcal{B}')| < |E(\mathcal{B})|$. Now we repeat the argument with \mathbf{B}' playing the role of \mathbf{B} . After finitely many steps we obtain a marking for $\text{core}(\mathcal{B})$. We denote this marked \mathbb{A} -graph by $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$. *We will always assume that $\text{core}(\mathcal{B})$ is equipped with this marking also called the induced marking.*

Lemma 4.17. *Let \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{B}' be tame marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. If \mathbf{B} is equivalent to \mathbf{B}' , then $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ is equivalent to $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}')$.*

Proof. Note that in going from \mathbf{B} to $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ we do not need to apply elementary moves. This implies that we can carry $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ onto $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}')$ by the same elementary moves that carry \mathbf{B} onto $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}')$. \square

4.3 The graph associated to a generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$

We now proceed as in the local case, that is, to any generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$ we associate a directed graph. We then show that in the case of a non-standard irreducible generating tuple this graph has a unique root which corresponds to the special almost orbifold covering with a good marking that represents the Nielsen class of the generating tuple.

Let $T = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ be a generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}) = \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$. The directed graph $\Omega_{[T]}$ associated to the Nielsen class of T is defined as follows.

- The vertex set $V\Omega_{[T]}$ of $\Omega_{[T]}$ is the set of all equivalence classes of minimal marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{b} such that $[T_{\mathbf{b}}] = [T]$ and some (and therefore any) representative of \mathbf{b} is either tame or is a special almost orbifold cover with a good marking.
- There is a directed edge $\mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{b}_2$ from \mathbf{b}_1 to \mathbf{b}_2 if there are representatives \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 of \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 such that \mathbf{B}_2 is the core (with the induced marking) of the *marked \mathbb{A} -graph* that is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by a *good tame elementary fold*.

We define a height function $h : V\Omega_{[T]} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ by $h(\mathbf{b}) = (|EB|, |EB| - |E(\mathcal{B})|)$ where \mathcal{B} and B are the underlying \mathbb{A} -graph and underlying graph respectively of an arbitrary representative of \mathbf{b} . Throughout this section we assume that $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ is endowed with the lexicographic order. Recall that $E(\mathcal{B}) = \{f \in EB \mid B_f \neq 1\}$. Observe that h is well defined as equivalent tame marked \mathbb{A} -graphs have the same underlying graph and all edges have isomorphic edge groups.

Let \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{b}' be vertices of $\Omega_{[T]}$. We say that \mathbf{b} *projects* onto \mathbf{b}' , and write $\mathbf{b} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}'$, if there is a directed path in $\Omega_{[T]}$ from \mathbf{b} to \mathbf{b}' . It is clear that $h(\mathbf{b}') < h(\mathbf{b})$ if $\mathbf{b} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}'$.

We say that $\mathbf{b} \in V\Omega_{[T]}$ is a *root* if there is no $\mathbf{b}' \in \Omega_{[T]}$ such that $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{b}'$. The following lemma characterizes the roots of $\Omega_{[T]}$.

Lemma 4.18. *A vertex \mathbf{b} of $\Omega_{[T]}$ is a root if and only if one of the following occurs:*

- (1) *some (and therefore any) representative of \mathbf{b} is folded.*
- (2) *some (and therefore any) representative of \mathbf{b} is a special almost orbifold cover with a good marking.*
- (3) *if a tame elementary fold is applicable to a representative of \mathbf{b} , then the fold is bad.*

Proof. The lemma follows immediately from the definition of the edge set of $\Omega_{[T]}$ and the fact that no tame elementary fold is applicable to a special almost orbifold cover with a good marking. \square

Remark 4.19. According to [Dut, Lemma 4.20] a generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}) \cong \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$ that is represented by a folded marked \mathbb{A} -graph is either reducible or standard. This follows from the fact that a folded π_1 -surjective \mathbb{A} -graph recovers the splitting of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O})$. We conclude that T is standard or reducible whenever $\Omega_{[T]}$ has a root represented by a folded marked \mathbb{A} -graph.

Definition 4.20. We say that $\mathbf{b} \in V\Omega_{[T]}$ is *pre-bad* if a bad tame elementary fold is applicable to some representative of \mathbf{b} .

Remark 4.21. Note that roots of type (3) are pre-bad vertices. However, pre-bad vertices are not necessarily roots as a good tame elementary fold can still be applicable to some representative of the vertex.

Lemma 4.22. *Let \mathbf{B} be a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph. Then \mathbf{B} admits a bad tame elementary fold if, and only if, $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ admits a bad tame elementary fold.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ is obtained from \mathbf{B} by removing a single edge f . We can further assume that the bad tame elementary fold F identifies f with some edge g in $\text{Star}(\alpha(f), B)$ as all other folds can also be applied to $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$.

We give a complete argument for the case $\omega(f)$ is peripheral (the case $\omega(f)$ non-peripheral can be proven similarly). In this case the badness of F means that $B_{\omega(f)} \neq 1$ (which implies that $B_f \neq 1$ since f is not in the core of \mathcal{B}) and $B_{\omega(g)} \neq 1$. The tameness of F implies that $B_g = 1$. The fact that F is elementary means that f and g have the same label. Thus

$$B_{\alpha(g)} \cap o_g \alpha_{[f]}(A_{[g]}) o_g^{-1} = B_{\alpha(f)} \cap o_f \alpha_{[f]}(A_{[f]}) o_f^{-1} \neq 1,$$

and so a fold of type IIA based on g can be applied to $\text{core}(\mathcal{B})$. This fold is tame since $\alpha(f)$ and f lie in some sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type or $\alpha(f)$ is exceptional and $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha(f)}$ is of simple type (and so the edges in $\text{Star}(\alpha(f), B) \cap E(\mathcal{B})$ correspond to distinct boundary components of the orbifold corresponding to $B_{\alpha(f)}$). This fold is bad since $B_{\omega(g)} \neq 1$. \square

Lemma 4.23. *Let \mathbf{B} be a marked \mathbb{A} -graph. Then $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ is a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking iff $B_f = 1$ for all $f \notin \text{core}(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. Assume that $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ is obtained from \mathbf{B} by removing a single edge f with non-trivial group. We will show that $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ cannot be an almost orbifold cover with a good marking.

Assume first that $\omega(f)$ is non-peripheral. Then $\alpha(f)$ is peripheral and of orbifold type since $B_{\alpha(f)} \neq 1$. Condition (5) of Definition 4.4 implies that $B_h = 1$ for all $h \in \text{Star}(\alpha(f), \mathbf{B}) \setminus \{f\}$ with $[h] = [f]$. Therefore $\alpha(f)$ is a vertex of orbifold type in $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ for which $\text{Star}(\alpha(f), B_{\text{core}}) \cap E(\text{core}(\mathbf{B}))$ contains at most one edge. However, it follows from the definition that in a special almost orbifold cover with a good marking all peripheral vertices have exactly two incident edges with non-trivial group.

Assume now that $\omega(f)$ is peripheral. Then $\alpha(f)$ is exceptional. In going from \mathbf{B} to $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ we turn $\alpha(f)$ into an exceptional vertex of simple type if $\alpha(f)$ is of orbifold type or we replace $\mathcal{P}_{\alpha(f)} = (T_{\alpha(f)}, (\gamma_f) \oplus P_{\alpha(f)})$ by $(T_{\alpha(f)} \oplus (\gamma_f), P_{\alpha(f)})$. In the second case, Proposition 3.43 implies that $(T_{\alpha(f)} \oplus (\gamma_f), P_{\alpha(f)})$ is not of almost orbifold covering type. This shows that in both cases $\text{core}(\mathbf{B})$ cannot be an almost orbifold cover with a good marking since it violates condition (1) of Definition 4.6. \square

Lemma 4.24. *The graph $\Omega_{[T]}$ is connected.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{b}_1 = [\mathbf{B}_1]$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 = [\mathbf{B}_2]$ be distinct vertices of $\Omega_{[T]}$. We need to show that \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[T]}$.

In [Dut, Lemma 3.24] it is observed that \mathbf{B}_i can be unfolded until we obtain a marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}'_i with trivial edge groups. Note that \mathbf{B}'_i is minimal since otherwise \mathbf{B}_i would not be minimal. Let \mathbf{b}'_i be the vertex of $\Omega_{[T]}$ represented by \mathbf{B}'_i . Since \mathbf{B}_i is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_i by finitely many good tame elementary folds of type IIA it follows that $\mathbf{b}'_i \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}_i$. In particular \mathbf{b}'_i and \mathbf{b}_i lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[T]}$. It therefore suffices to show that \mathbf{b}'_1 and \mathbf{b}'_2 lie in the same component.

Observe now that \mathbf{B}'_i is a marked \mathbb{A} -graph in the sense of [W2]. Thus the argument used in [W2, Lemma 7] applies in our case to show that the vertices \mathbf{b}'_1 and \mathbf{b}'_2 lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[T]}$. Therefore \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 lie in the same component of $\Omega_{[T]}$. \square

The main steps in the proofs of our main results are the following two Propositions whose proofs we postpone to the next section.

Proposition 4.25. *Let \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{b}' be vertices of $\Omega_{[T]}$ such that $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{b}'$. If \mathbf{b} is pre-bad bad, then \mathbf{b}' is pre-bad.*

Proposition 4.26. *Let \mathbf{b} , \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 be distinct vertices of $\Omega_{[T]}$. Assume that $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{b}_2$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 are pre-bad vertices.
2. $\mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{b}_2$ or $\mathbf{b}_2 \mapsto \mathbf{b}_1$.
3. There is a vertex $\mathbf{b}' \in \Omega_T$ such that $\mathbf{b}_i \mapsto \mathbf{b}'$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Assuming Proposition 4.25 and Proposition 4.26 we can finish the argument for our main results.

Proposition 4.27. *If $\Omega_{[T]}$ has a root represented by a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking, then this root is unique.*

Proof. Let \mathbf{b}_1 be a root represented by a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking. Suppose that $\Omega_{[T]}$ has a root distinct from \mathbf{b}_1 . We claim that there is a root $\mathbf{b}_2 \neq \mathbf{b}_1$ such that for some vertex \mathbf{b} we have $\mathbf{b} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{b} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}_2$.

Choose a root \mathbf{b}_2 and a path p connecting \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 such that the number of local minima with respect to the height function is minimal among all pairs (\mathbf{b}_2, p) . It clearly suffices to show that p has no local minima besides \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 , as \mathbf{b} can then be chosen to be the vertex of p at which this local maximum is attained. If p has another local minimum

at a vertex \mathbf{b}^* , then \mathbf{b}^* projects onto either \mathbf{b}_1 or onto some root distinct from \mathbf{b}_1 . In both situations we find a pair as above with fewer local minima which is a contradiction.

Choose (\mathbf{b}_2, p) as above such that the single maximum of p occurs at a minimal height among all such pairs. Choose \mathbf{b}'_1 and \mathbf{b}'_2 such that $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \mathbf{b}'_i$ and that $\mathbf{b}'_i \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}_i$. The minimality assumption implies that there is no vertex \mathbf{b}'' such that $\mathbf{b}'_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}''$ and $\mathbf{b}'_2 \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{b}''$. Proposition 4.26 implies that \mathbf{b}'_1 and \mathbf{b}'_2 are pre-bad. Proposition 4.25 implies that \mathbf{b}_1 is pre-bad, a contradiction since vertices represented by special almost orbifold covers with good markings are not pre-bad. The last claim follows from the fact that special almost orbifold covers with good markings do not admit tame elementary folds. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let T be a non-standard irreducible generating tuple of $\pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}) \cong \pi_1(\mathbb{A}, v_0)$. The main Theorem of [Dut] says that $[T]$ can be represented by a special marking $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T])$. Let \mathbf{b} be the corresponding vertex of $\Omega_{[T]}$. It follows from the previous proposition that \mathbf{b} is the unique root of $\Omega_{[T]}$. Therefore the special marking $(\eta : \mathcal{O}' \rightarrow \mathcal{O}, [T'])$ representing the Nielsen class of T is unique. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Suppose to the contrary that $T := \eta_*(T')$ is reducible. Thus $\Omega_{[T]}$ contains a pre-bad vertex and therefore, according to Proposition 4.26, $\Omega_{[T]}$ contains a pre-bad root. This contradicts the uniqueness established in Proposition 4.27. \square

4.4 Edges of $\Omega_{[T]}$

In this section we study edges in $\Omega_{[T]}$. The subtle part being that vertices are defined as equivalence classes of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs while edges are defined using representatives.

Throughout this section we assume the following: $\mathbf{B}_1 = (\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{C}_1, (\mathcal{P}_{u,1})_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}_1} \mathcal{B}_1})$ and $\mathbf{B}_2 = (\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{C}_2, (\mathcal{P}_{u,2})_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}_2} \mathcal{B}_2})$ are minimal tame marked \mathbb{A} -graphs which are equivalent and tame elementary folds F_1 and F_2 are applicable to \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 respectively. We denote the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph by \mathcal{B}'_i .

Convention 4.28. *To have a unified notation we will stick to the following notation:*

- The underlying graph of \mathcal{B}_1 (and therefore also of \mathcal{B}_2 since \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 are equivalent) will be denoted by B and the underlying graph of \mathcal{B}'_i will be denoted by B'_i .
- If $x \in VB \cup EB$, then the group of x in \mathcal{B}_i will be denoted by $B_{x,i}$.
- If F_i induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_i , then the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph will be denoted by

$$\mathbf{B}'_i = (\mathcal{B}'_i, \mathcal{C}'_i, (\mathcal{P}'_{u,i})_{u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'_i} \mathcal{B}'_i})$$

where $\mathcal{P}'_{u,i} = (T'_{u,i}, P'_{u,i})$ for all $u \in V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}'_i} \mathcal{B}'_i$.

- If F_1 (resp. F_2) is of type IA/IIIA, then it identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 (resp. g_1 and g_2) with $x := \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2) \in VB$ (resp. $w := \alpha(g_2) = \alpha(g_1) \in VB$).
- F_1 (resp. F_2) is of type IIA, then it is based on $f \in EB$ (resp. $g \in EB$) with $x := \alpha(f) \in VB$ and $y := \omega(f) \in VB$ (resp. $w := \alpha(g) \in VB$ and $z := \omega(g) \in VB$).

Remark 4.29. The following remarks, which follow immediately from the definition of elementary moves, will be frequently used without further comment:

(i) $y \in VB$ is peripheral (resp. non-peripheral) in \mathbf{B}_1 iff y is peripheral (resp. non-peripheral) in \mathbf{B}_2 . Thus there is no ambiguity in saying that $y \in VB$ is a peripheral (resp. non-peripheral) vertex.

(ii) For any peripheral vertex $y \in VB$ (resp. for any edge $f \in EB$) we have $B_{y,1} = B_{y,2}$ (resp. $B_{f,1} = B_{f,2}$). It therefore makes sense to write B_y (resp. B_f) instead of $B_{y,1}$ and $B_{y,2}$ (resp. $B_{f,1}$ and $B_{f,2}$). In particular, $E(\mathcal{B}_1) = E(\mathcal{B}_2) \subseteq EB$.

(iii) $y \in VB$ is exceptional in \mathbf{B}_1 (resp. of orbifold type) iff y is exceptional (resp. orbifold type) in \mathbf{B}_2 . Thus $V_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}_1}B = V_{orb}^{\mathcal{C}_2}B$ and $V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}_1}B = V_{exc}^{\mathcal{C}_2}B$. We can therefore simply say that y is an exceptional vertex (resp. is a vertex of orbifold type).

(iv) If $y \in VB$ is exceptional, then there is $g \in A_{[y]}$ and a partitioned tuple (T, P) in $A_{[y]} = \pi_1^o(\mathcal{O}_{[y]})$ equivalent to $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{y,2} = g(T, P)g^{-1}$. This shows that the orbifold covering corresponding to $\langle T_{y,1} \oplus P_{y,1} \rangle \leq A_{[y]}$ coincides with the orbifold covering corresponding to $\langle T_{y,2} \oplus P_{y,2} \rangle \leq A_{[y]}$. It therefore makes sense to denote it simply by $\eta_y : \mathcal{O}'_y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{[y]}$.

(v) Observe that there are exactly two types of bad tame elementary folds. The first type consists of those folds that do not induce a marking on the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph, which occurs exactly when a vertex of orbifold type is affected. The second type of bad folds consists of those folds that do induce a marking on the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph but the core fails to be tame or an almost orbifold cover.

Applying tame elementary folds of the same type to the same edge(s) of equivalent tame marked \mathbb{A} -graphs does not necessarily yield equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graphs as in the local picture. The following lemma clarifies when this is the case.

Lemma 4.30. *Assume that the following hold:*

- (a) F_i induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_i for $i = 1, 2$.
- (b) F_1 and F_2 are of the same type and affect the same edge(s).

Then the marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are equivalent unless F_1 and F_2 are of type IA or of type IIIA and the following holds:

- (i) $B_{f_1} = B_{f_2} = 1$.
- (ii) $o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_1 o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(c)$ and $o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_2 o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(d)$ with $g \in A_{[x]}$, $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \in B_{x,1}$ and $c \neq d \in A_e$, where $e := [f_1] = [f_2] \in EA$.
- (iii) $t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(c)t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_1 h_1^{-1}$ and $t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(d)t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_2 h_2^{-1}$ with $\beta_i \in B_{\omega(f_i),1}$ and $h_1, h_2 \in A_{[\omega(f_1)]} = A_{[\omega(f_2)]}$ such that $h_1 = h_2$ if $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$.

In particular, $B_{x,1} \cap o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(A_e)(o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1})^{-1} \neq 1$ and $B_{x,2} \cap o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} \alpha_e(A_e)(o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2})^{-1} \neq 1$.

Remark 4.31. As F_i is elementary it holds $o_{f_i}^{\mathcal{B}_i} = o_{f_i}^{\mathcal{B}'_i} \in A_{[x]}$. Moreover, $t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_i} = t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_i}$ if $\omega(f_1) \neq \omega(f_2)$, that if F_1 and F_2 are of type IA.

Proof. The proof broadly follows the proof of [W2, Lemma 6]. The main difference is that peripheral moves in general do not commute with tame auxiliary moves of type A2 that are based on the same vertex.

Folds of type IIA. We first deal with the case in which both folds F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA. Assume that the label of $f = g$ in \mathcal{B}_i is (a_i, e, b_i) .

Assume first that x is exceptional (and hence y is peripheral). In this case $B_y = 1$ as F_1 and F_2 induce markings on the resulting \mathbb{A} -graphs. It is not hard to see that F_1 commutes with all elementary moves that affect neither x nor the initial elements of edges starting at x . F_1 also commutes with all auxiliary moves of type A0 that are based on x and with all auxiliary moves of type A1 that are based on edges starting at x . Thus we can assume that \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by tame auxiliary moves of type A2 based on edges starting at x and Nielsen/peripheral moves based on x . Therefore \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 differ only at x and $B_{x,1} = B_{x,2}$. It follows from [Dut, Lemma 4.17(i)] that $\mathcal{P}_{x,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{x,2}$ are equivalent. Since F_1 and F_2 are tame and elementary it follows that one of the following occurs:

(El.1) $\mathcal{P}_{x,i} = (T_{x,i} \oplus (\gamma'_{f,i}), P_{x,i})$ such that $B_{x,i}$ splits as

$$B_{x,i} = \langle T_{x,i} \rangle * \langle \gamma'_{f,i} \rangle * \langle \gamma_{f_1,i} \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma_{f_n,i} \rangle \leq A_{[x]}$$

where $\gamma'_{f,i}$ is a generator of $a_i\alpha_e(A_e)a_i^{-1} \cap B_{x,i}$ and $P_{x,i} = (\gamma_{f_1,i}, \dots, \gamma_{f_n,i})$. The definition of folds says that x stays exceptional in \mathbf{B}'_i and

$$\mathcal{P}'_{x,i} = (T_{x,i}, (\gamma'_{f,i}) \oplus P_{x,i}).$$

Proposition 3.43 implies that $\mathcal{P}'_{x,i}$ is non-critical and of simple type. It follows from Lemmas 3.8 (as $P_{x,1}$ and $P_{x,2}$ are equivalent) that $\mathcal{P}'_{x,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{x,2}$ are equivalent. Lemma 4.17(ii) of [Dut] implies that \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are equivalent.

(El.2) $B_{x,i} = \langle T_{x,i} \oplus P_{x,i} \rangle \leq A_{[x]}$ is of finite index and the elements in $P_{x,i}$ correspond to all but one boundary component of \mathcal{O}'_x . In this case \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are equivalent as the new marked \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type that emerges differ by auxiliary moves and by replacing its generating tuple by a Nielsen equivalent tuple.

We now deal with the case that x is peripheral. As F_1 and F_2 yield marked \mathbb{A} -graphs we conclude that y is exceptional in \mathbf{B}_1 (and therefore also in \mathbf{B}_2). In this case all elementary moves commute with the fold. This is easily verified unless \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by a tame auxiliary move of type A2 based on f^{-1} . Thus assume that \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by a tame auxiliary move of type A2 based on f^{-1} that replaces its label (a_1, e, b_1) by $(a_2, e, b_2) = (a_1, e, b_1\beta)$ for some $\beta \in T_{y,1}^{\pm 1} \oplus P_{y,1}^{\pm 1}$. Thus

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, (\gamma') \oplus P_{y,1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}'_{y,2} = (T_{y,2}, P_{y,2}) = (T_{y,1}, (\beta^{-1}\gamma'\beta) \oplus P_{y,1})$$

where γ' is the peripheral element added by F_1 . The A2 move based on f^{-1} is tame when applied to \mathbf{B}'_1 since β lies in $T_{y,1}^{\pm 1} \oplus (\gamma') \oplus P_{y,1}$. This move replaces $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ by $\mathcal{P}'_{y,2}$. Thus \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are equivalent.

Folds of type IA/IIIA. Assume now that F_1 and F_2 are of type IA or of type IIIA. We will give the argument in the case that F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA and leave the similar case of folds of type IA to the reader.

We argue in the case that x is peripheral, the case of non-peripheral x is simpler as both B_{f_1} and B_{f_2} are trivial by the fact that F_1 and F_2 yield marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. Observe that $y := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ is exceptional as F_1 and F_2 yield marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. Hence, both $\mathcal{P}_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, P_{y,1})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{y,2} = (T_{y,2}, P_{y,2})$ are non-critical and of simple type. Assume that the label of f_1 (resp. f_2) in \mathcal{B}_1 is (a, e, b_1) (resp. (a, e, b_2)). We can also assume that $B_{f_2} = 1$ as F_1 is tame.

All elementary moves that do not affect $f_1 \cup f_2$ clearly commute with F_1 and F_2 . Thus we can restrict our attention to those moves that do affect $f_1 \cup f_2$.

Auxiliary moves of type A0 that are based on x or on y as well as peripheral and Nielsen moves that are based on y also commute with F_1 and F_2 . If \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by tame auxiliary moves of type A2 based on f_1^{-1} and f_2^{-1} then

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), P_{y,1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}'_{y,2} = (T_{y,2}, P_{y,2}) = (T_{y,2} \oplus (\beta_1^{-1}b_1^{-1}b_2\beta_2), P'_{y,2}),$$

where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in T_{y,1}^{\pm 1} \oplus P_{y,1}^{\pm 1}$ and where $P'_{y,2} = P_{y,2}$ if $B_{f_1,1} = 1$ and $P'_{y,2}$ is obtained from $P_{y,2}$ by conjugating the peripheral element associated to f_1^{-1} by β_1^{-1} if $B_{f_1,1} \neq 1$. In both cases one easily checks that these partitioned tuples are equivalent which implies that \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 are equivalent.

Therefore we can assume that \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by auxiliary moves of type A2 and auxiliary moves of type A1 based on f_1 and f_2 as described in Fig. 24, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in B_x$ and $c, d \in A_e$. As fold F_2 is elementary we have $\alpha_1 a \alpha_e (c^{-1}) = \alpha_2 a \alpha_e (d^{-1})$. Therefore $\alpha_2^{-1} \alpha_1 = a \alpha_e (cd^{-1}) a^{-1}$, and hence $a \alpha_e (cd^{-1}) a^{-1} \in B_x$.

We will show that \mathbf{B}_1 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_2 if either $c = d$ or $B_{f_1} \neq 1$. In fact, if $c = d$, then the assertion is trivial as in this case the fact that F_2 is elementary implies that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, and hence the A1 and the A2 moves commute with the fold F_1 .

If $B_{f_1} \neq 1$ then condition (4) of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs guarantees that $B_{f_1} = \alpha_e^{-1}(a^{-1}B_x a)$. Thus, cd^{-1} lies in B_{f_1} and therefore $b_1^{-1}\omega_e(cd^{-1})b_1 \in B_y$. Thus

$$\mathcal{P}_{y,1} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), P_{y,1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{y,2} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(d^{-1}c)b_2), P_{y,1})$$




Figure 24: Elementary moves carrying \mathbf{B}_1 onto \mathbf{B}_2 .


are equivalent. Therefore \mathbf{B}_2 is obtained from \mathbf{B}_1 by first applying auxiliary moves of type A1 based f_1 and f_2 with $c, d \in A_e$, then applying tame auxiliary moves of type A2 which are also based on f_1 and f_2 with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in B_x$ respectively, and finally applying finitely many Nielsen and peripheral moves based on y that replace the element $b_1^{-1}b_2$ by

$$b_1^{-1}\omega_e(d^{-1}c)b_2 = b_1^{-1}\omega_e(d^{-1}c)b_1 \cdot b_1^{-1}b_2.$$

□

Corollary 4.32. *Assume that F_1 is of type IA or IIIA and induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 . If $B_{f_1} = 1$, then there exists a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B} such that the following hold:*

1. \mathbf{B} is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_2 and is obtained from \mathbf{B}_2 in the following way:
 - (a) By a (tame) auxiliary move of type A2 affecting the initial element of f_1 ,
 - (b) followed by an auxiliary move of type A1 applied to f_1
 - (c) and in the case that F_1 is of type IA, followed by an auxiliary move of type A0 applied to either $\omega(f_1)$ or $\omega(f_2)$.
2. A tame elementary fold based on f_1 and f_2 can be applied to \mathbf{B} such that the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}' is equivalent to \mathcal{B}'_1 .



Proof. The proof follows immediately from the proof of the previous lemma. □

Lemma 4.33. *Suppose that at least one of the folds F_1 and F_2 is good. Then the following configurations cannot occur:*

- (1) F_1 and F_2 are of type IA/IIIA, $f_1 = g_1^\varepsilon$ and $f_2 \neq g_2^\varepsilon$ with $B_{f_2} \neq 1 \neq B_{g_2}$ for some $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ (after exchanging the edges f_1 and f_2 if necessary).
- (2) F_1 is of type IA/IIIA with $B_{f_2} \neq 1$ and F_2 is of type IIA with $g \in \{f_1^{\pm 1}\}$ or vice versa, i.e. F_2 is of type IA/IIIA with $B_{g_2} \neq 1$ and F_1 is of type IIA with $f \in \{g_1^{\pm 1}\}$.
- (3) F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA with $g = f^{-1}$.

Remark 4.34. As the underlying graph of the graph of groups \mathbb{A} has no loop edges, the configurations $f_1 = g_1^\varepsilon$ and $f_2 = g_2^{-\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ cannot occur.

Proof. (1) Assume first that $f_1 = g_1$ and $f_2 \neq g_2$ with $B_{f_2} \neq 1 \neq B_{g_2}$. Since f_2 can be folded with f_1 and f_1 can be folded with g_2 we conclude that f_2 can be folded with g_2 . But this contradicts [Dut, Lemma 4.12(1)] as $B_{f_2} \neq 1 \neq B_{g_2}$ and \mathbf{B}_1 is tame.

Assume now that $g_1 = f_1^{-1}$, $g_2 \neq f_2^{-1}$ and $B_{f_2} \neq 1 \neq B_{g_2}$. We will get a contradiction by showing that both F_1 and F_2 are bad. After exchanging the roles of F_1 and F_2 , if necessary, we can assume that $x \in VB$ is peripheral. Since $B_{f_2} \neq 1 \neq B_{g_2}$ and $[g_2^{-1}] = [g_1^{-1}] = [f_1] = [f_2] \in EA$ it follows from condition (5) of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs that $\omega(g_2) \neq x = \omega(g_1)$. In particular F_2 is of type IA.

We give a complete argument in the case that F_1 is of type IIIA, the similar and slightly easier case of a fold of type IA is left to the reader. Denote $y := \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$. As F_1 is elementary, we can assume that f_i ($i = 1, 2$) has label (a, e, b_i) in \mathcal{B}_1 . Assume that in \mathcal{B}_1 the edge g_i ($i = 1, 2$) has label (c_i, e^{-1}, d_i) . Observe that, as $g_1 = f_1^{-1}$, we have

$$(c_1, e^{-1}, d_1) = (b_1^{-1}, e^{-1}, a^{-1}).$$

The badness of F_2 follows immediately from the fact that x and $\omega(g_2)$ are peripheral and of orbifold type which puts F_2 in case FoldIA(1)(1).

It remains to show that F_1 is bad. If y is of orbifold type this is immediate since F_1 falls into case FoldIIIA(2)(1). Thus we may assume y is exceptional. This implies that F_1 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 . Observe that the peripheral tuple $P_{y,1}$ has the form

$$(\gamma_{f_2^{-1}}, \gamma_{g_2}) \oplus \bar{P}_{y,1}$$

where $\gamma_{f_1^{-1}}$ and γ_{g_2} are the peripheral elements associated to f_2^{-1} and g_2 respectively. By definition, $\gamma_{f_2^{-1}} = b_2^{-1}\omega_e(c_{f_2^{-1}})b_2$ and $\gamma_{g_2} = c_2\omega_e(c_{g_2})c_2^{-1}$, where $c_{f_2^{-1}}, c_{g_2} \in A_e$. Since $g_1 = f_1^{-1}$ and g_2 can be folded in \mathcal{B}_1 (not necessarily an elementary fold), there are $\beta \in B_{y,1}$ and $c \in A_e$ such that

$$c_2 = \beta o_{f_1^{-1}}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_{e^{-1}}(c) = \beta b_1^{-1} \omega_e(c).$$

Hence $\gamma_{g_2} = \beta b_1^{-1} \omega_e(c_{g_2}) b_1 \beta^{-1}$. By definition, F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), (\gamma_{g_2}, \gamma_{f_2^{-1}}) \oplus \bar{P}_{y,1}).$$

After applying an elementary move on $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ that conjugates γ_{g_2} by $b_2 b_1^{-1} \beta^{-1}$, we obtain the partitioned tuple

$$(T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c_{g_2})b_1, b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c_{f_2^{-1}})b_2) \oplus \bar{P}_{y,1})$$

which clearly folds peripheral elements. Therefore $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ folds peripheral elements and hence F_1 is bad.

(2) After exchanging the roles of F_1 and F_2 if necessary, we can assume that F_1 is of type IA/IIIA and F_2 is of type IIA. Note that $g = f_1$ cannot occur because this violates the tameness of F_2 as g can be folded with f_2 and by hypothesis $B_{f_2} \neq 1$. Thus assume $g = f_1^{-1}$. We will show that both folds F_1 and F_2 are bad which contradicts the hypothesis that at least one of them is good.

Case 1: F_1 is of type IA. Assume that in \mathcal{B}_1 the labels of f_1 and f_2 are equal to (a, e, b) and that in \mathcal{B}_2 they are (a_1, e, b_1) and (a_2, e, b_2) respectively. We consider two cases according to the type of x .

Subcase a: x is non-peripheral. Thus y_1 and y_2 are peripheral. Observe that $B_{y_1} \neq 1 \neq B_{y_2}$, and hence y_1 and y_2 are of orbifold type. Thus F_1 is bad as it falls into case FoldIA(1)(2).

We show that F_2 is bad. If x is of orbifold type, the claim is trivial as F_2 adds an element to a vertex of orbifold type, i.e. F_2 is in case FoldIIA(El.0)(1). Thus assume that x is exceptional. The peripheral tuple $P_{x,2}$ contains the peripheral element γ_{f_2} associated to f_2 which, by definition, is given by $\gamma_{f_2} = a_2 \alpha_e(c_{f_2}) a_2^{-1}$ for some $c_{f_2} \in A_e$. The fold F_2 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{x,2}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{x,2} = (T_{x,2}, (\gamma')) \oplus P_{x,2} = (T_{x,2}, (\gamma_{f_2}, \gamma')) \oplus \bar{P}_{x,2}$$

where $\gamma' = a_1\alpha_e(c')a_1^{-1}$ with $c' \in A_e$ such that $\langle c' \rangle = \omega_e^{-1}(B_{y_1,2})$. Since f_1 and f_2 can be folded in \mathcal{B}_2 (not necessarily an elementary fold), there are $\beta \in B_{x,2}$ and $d \in A_e$ such that $a_1 = \beta a_2 \alpha_e(d)$. Thus $\gamma' = \beta a_2 \alpha_e(c') \beta^{-1} a_2^{-1}$. Therefore, after applying an elementary move on $\mathcal{P}'_{x,2}$ that conjugates γ' by β we obtain

$$(T_{x,2}, \underbrace{(a_2 \alpha_e(c_{f_2}) a_2^{-1})}_{\gamma_{f_2}}, a_2 \alpha_e(c') a_2^{-1}) \oplus \bar{P}_{x,2}.$$

Therefore $\mathcal{P}'_{x,2}$ folds peripheral elements and hence F_2 is bad.

Subcase b: x is peripheral. Since $B_{f_2} \neq 1$ it follows that $B_x \neq 1$ and therefore x of orbifold type. Thus F_2 is bad because it adds a peripheral element to a vertex of orbifold type, i.e. F_2 is as in case FoldIIA(El.1)(1) or FoldIIA(El.2)(1).

It remains to show that F_1 is bad. If y_2 is of orbifold type, F_1 is bad as we are in case FoldIA(2)(1b). Thus assume that y_2 is exceptional. The fact that F_2 is tame, implies that $y_1 := \omega(f_1)$ is exceptional. The fact that F_2 can be applied to \mathcal{B}_2 clearly implies that

$$\langle a_e^z \rangle = \omega_e^{-1}(bB_{y_1,1}b^{-1})$$

for some non-zero integer z , where a_e denotes a generator of A_e . By definition, F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y_1,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{y_2,1}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y',1} = (T_{y_1} \oplus T_{y_2}, P_{y_1} \oplus P_{y_2})$$

where $y' \in VB'_1$ denotes the image of y_1 and y_2 under F_1 in \mathcal{B}'_1 . The peripheral element associated to f_2^{-1} (in \mathcal{B}_1) is equal to $b^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^w)b$ for some non-zero integer w . Therefore, by Proposition 3.40 ,

$$\mathcal{P}'' := (T_{y_1}, (\gamma_{f_2^{-1}}) \oplus P_{y_1})$$

is critical. Since \mathcal{P}'' is a partitioned subtuple of $\mathcal{P}'_{y',1}$, the latter is critical. Therefore F_1 is bad.

Case 2. F_1 is of type IIIA. As F_1 is elementary, we can assume that in \mathcal{B}_1 the edges f_1 and f_2 have labels of type (a, e, b_1) and (a, e, b_2) respectively. Observe that if y is peripheral, then $g = f_1^{-1}$ and f_2^{-1} can be folded since they are of same type. i.e. $[f_2^{-1}] = [f_2^{-1}] \in EA$. But this contradicts the hypothesis that F_2 is tame since $B_{f_2} \neq 1$. Thus y is exceptional and hence x is peripheral. In this case F_2 is bad as it affects a vertex of orbifold type. Lemma 4.12 implies that $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ is non-critical of simple type as \mathbf{B}_1 and \mathbf{B}_2 are tame.

We claim that F_1 is also bad. The fact that F_2 can be applied to \mathcal{B}_2 clearly implies that there is a non-zero integer z such that

$$\langle b_1^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^z)b_1 \rangle = b_1^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b_1 \cap B_{y,1}.$$

Put $\gamma' := b_1^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^z)b_1$.

If $B_{y,1} = \langle T_{y,1} \oplus P_{y,1} \rangle$ has finite index in $A_{[y]}$, then the badness of F_1 follows from Lemma 3.39. Thus assume that $B_{y,1}$ has infinite index in $A_{[y]}$. In this case $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{P}' = (T' \oplus \langle \gamma' \rangle, (\gamma_{f_2^{-1}}) \oplus P')$$

such that

$$B_{y,1} = \langle T' \rangle * \langle \gamma' \rangle * \langle \gamma_{f_2^{-1}} \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_r \rangle$$

where $P' = \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_r \rangle$. By definition, F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ by

$$(T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), P_{y,1})$$

which is equivalent to

$$(T' \oplus \langle \gamma', b_1^{-1}b_2 \rangle, (\gamma_{f_2^{-1}}) \oplus P').$$

But $\gamma_{f_2^{-1}} = b_2^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^w)b_2$ for some non-zero integer w . Thus $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ has an obvious relation (if z is not a multiple of w) or $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ is reducible (if z is a multiple of w). Therefore F_1 is bad.

(3) We can assume without loss of generality that x is peripheral. Let (a, e, b) be the label of f in \mathcal{B}_1 . Since a fold along f is possible we have $B_x \neq 1$, and hence x is of orbifold type. On the other hand, the fact that a tame fold of type IIA based on f^{-1} can be applied to \mathcal{B}_2 implies that y is exceptional and that there is a non-zero integer z such that

$$\langle b^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^z b) \rangle = B_{y,1} \cap b^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b.$$

The badness of F_2 follows easily since F_2 adds an element to B_x . On the other hand, F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, (b^{-1}\omega_e(a_e^w)b) \oplus P_{y,1})$$

for some $w \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\langle a_e^w \rangle = \alpha_e^{-1}(A_e)$. Proposition 3.40 implies that $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ is critical which puts F_1 in case FoldIIA(El.0)(2.c) and so F_1 is bad. \square

The following configurations **(D1)**-**(D4)** play an important role in the proofs of Proposition 4.26 and Proposition 4.25 because they cannot be “normalized” in the sense of Lemma 4.35 below.

- (D1)** F_1 and F_2 are of type IA/IIIA and $\{f_1, f_2\} = \{g_1, g_2\}$ or F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA and $f = g$.
- (D2)** F_1 and F_2 are folds of type IA and after exchanging f_1 and f_2 if necessary, we may assume $y_1 := \omega(f_1) = \omega(g_1)$ and $y_2 := \omega(f_2) = \omega(g_2)$. All possible configurations are described in Figure 25.




Figure 25: The three configurations that can occur in case (2).

- (D3)** F_1 and F_2 are folds of type IIIA such that, after exchanging g_1 and g_2 if necessary, we have $f_1 = g_1^{-1}$ and $f_2 = g_2^{-1}$.
- (D4)** F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA with $f \neq g$ such that $x = w$ is non-peripheral, and F_1 and F_2 satisfy the elementary condition (El.1) and correspond to distinct boundary components of the orbifold \mathcal{O}'_x corresponding to $B_{x,1} = \langle T_{x,1} \oplus P_{x,1} \rangle \leq A_{[x]}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{x,1}$ is not equivalent to a partitioned tuple of the form $(\bar{T} \oplus (\bar{\gamma}_f, \bar{\gamma}_g), \bar{P})$ such that

$$B_{x,1} = \langle \bar{T} \rangle * \langle \bar{\gamma}_f \rangle * \langle \bar{\gamma}_g \rangle * \langle \bar{\gamma}_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \bar{\gamma}_r \rangle$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_f$ and γ'_f (resp. $\bar{\gamma}_g$ and γ'_g) corresponding to the same boundary of \mathcal{O}'_x and $\bar{P} = (\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_r)$, see Figure 26.

In the set-up it is desirable to have $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$ so that F_1 and F_2 are tame elementary folds that are applied to the same marked \mathbb{A} -graph. The following lemma tells us that, up to equivalence, we can almost always assume that this occurs without substantially changing the properties of F_1 and F_2 unless one of the configurations **(D1)**-**(D4)** occurs.

Lemma 4.35. *Assume that there is $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that F_i is good. If none of the configurations **(D1)**-**(D4)** occurs, then there exists a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B} that is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_i ($i = 1, 2$) and admits tame elementary folds \bar{F}_1 and \bar{F}_2 yielding \mathbb{A} -graphs $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ and $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$ such that the following hold:*




Figure 26: F_1 and F_2 correspond to distinct boundary components of \mathcal{O}'_x .

(a) If F_j induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_j , then \bar{F}_j induces a marking on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_j$ and the marked \mathbb{A} -graphs $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_j$ and \mathbf{B}'_j are equivalent.

(b) If F_j does not induce a marking on \mathcal{B}_j , then \bar{F}_j does not induce a marking on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_j$.

In particular, if F_i is good (resp. bad), then \bar{F}_i is good (resp. bad).

Remark 4.36. It follows immediately from the description of folds that F_1 (resp. F_2) does not induce a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 (resp. \mathcal{B}'_2) if and only if F_1 (resp. F_2) changes the group of some vertex of orbifold type. Therefore, if \mathbf{B} is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_1 (resp. to \mathbf{B}_2) and if \bar{F}_1 (resp. \bar{F}_2) is a tame elementary fold that can be applied to \mathbf{B} and is based on the same vertex and affects the same edges as F_1 (resp. F_2), then F_1 does not induce a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 if and only if \bar{F}_1 does not induce a marking on the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph.

Proof. We consider all possible configurations for F_1 and F_2 . The main idea is to turn the not necessarily elementary fold that identifies f_1 and f_2 in \mathcal{B}_2 (or that is based on f in the case F_1 is of type IIA) into an elementary fold without affecting the labels of g_1 and g_2 in \mathcal{B}_2 (or of g in the case F_2 is of a type IIA).

Case 1: F_1 and F_2 are of type IA/IIIA. As F_1 and F_2 are tame, we can assume that $B_{f_1} = 1 = B_{g_1}$. Moreover, after interchanging F_1 and F_2 if necessary, we may assume that if $B_{f_2} \neq 1$ then $B_{g_2} \neq 1$.

Assume that $f_1 \notin \{g_1^{-1}, g_2^{-1}\}$. Corollary 4.32 implies that there is a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B} such that the following holds:

- (1) \mathbf{B} is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_2 and is obtained from \mathbf{B}_2 in the following way:
 - (a) By a tame auxiliary move of type A2 applied to f_1 ,
 - (b) followed by an auxiliary move of type A1 based on f_1 ,
 - (c) and in the case F_1 is of type IA, followed by an auxiliary move of type A0 applied to either $\omega(f_1)$ or to $\omega(f_2)$.
- (2) A tame elementary fold \bar{F}_1 based on f_1 and f_2 can be applied to \mathbf{B} yielding an \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ such that:
 - (a) if F_1 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 , then \bar{F}_1 induces a marking on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ and the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}'_1 and $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ are equivalent.
 - (b) If F_1 does not induce a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 , then \bar{F}_1 does not induce a marking on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$.

Since configuration **(D2)** is excluded, we conclude that if F_1 is of type IA, then there is $k \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\omega(f_k) \notin \{\omega(g_1), \omega(g_2)\}$. Thus in going from \mathbf{B}_2 to \mathbf{B} we can arrange the auxiliary moves (a)-(c) so that the labels of g_1 and g_2 are not affected, and hence the fold \bar{F}_2 that identifies g_1 and g_2 in \mathcal{B} is also elementary.

By Remark 4.36, F_2 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_2 if and only if \bar{F}_2 induces a marking on $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$. In the affirmative case, Lemma 4.30 implies that the the marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$, which is obtained from \mathbf{B} by \bar{F}_2 , is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_2 .

Now assume that $f_1 \in \{g_1^{\pm 1}, g_2^{\pm 1}\}$. We claim that $f_2 \notin \{g_1^{\pm 1}, g_2^{\pm 1}\}$ and $B_{f_2} = 1$. Therefore we can apply the same argument from the previous paragraph with f_2 playing the role of f_1 .

If $f_1 = g_i$ for some i , then $f_2 \neq g_j$ ($i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$) because configuration **(D1)** is excluded. If $f_1 = g_i^{-1}$, then $f_2 \neq g_j^{-1}$ ($i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$) because configuration **(D3)** is excluded. This proves the first part of the claim.

It remains to show that $B_{f_2} = 1$ if $f_1 \in \{g_1^{\pm 1}, g_2^{\pm 1}\}$. The claim is trivial if $f_1 = g_2$ or $f_1 = g_2^{-1}$ because we assumed that $B_{f_2} = 1$ if $B_{g_2} = 1$. Thus assume that $f_1 = g_1$. Since f_2 and g_2 can be folded in \mathcal{B}_2 , it follows from [Dut, Lemma 4.12] that $B_{f_2} = 1$ or $B_{g_2} = 1$. Therefore $B_{f_2} = 1$. Now assume that $f_1 = g_1^{-1}$. The previous lemma and the hypothesis that at least one of the folds F_1 or F_2 is good, implies that $B_{f_2} = 1$.

Case 2. F_1 is of type IA/IIIA and F_2 is of type IIA. Note that F_2 stays tame elementary in any marked \mathbb{A} -graph equivalent to \mathbf{B}_2 unless F_2 satisfies the elementary condition (El.1) and $w = \alpha(g)$ is affected either by peripheral/Nielsen moves or g is affected by auxiliary moves of type A2. Thus if either w is not exceptional or w is exceptional but F_2 satisfies the elementary condition (El.2), then the lemma holds with $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_1$ and $\bar{F}_1 = F_1$ and \bar{F}_2 the tame elementary fold of type IIA based on g .

Thus we assume that w is exceptional and F_2 satisfies the elementary condition (El.1). Hence, $\mathcal{P}_{w,2} = (T'_{w,2} \oplus \langle \gamma'_g \rangle, P_{w,2})$ such that

$$B_{w,2} = \langle T'_{w,2} \rangle * \langle \gamma'_g \rangle * \langle \gamma_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma_r \rangle$$

where γ'_g is the peripheral element corresponding to F_2 and $P_{w,2} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \rangle$.

As F_1 is tame we can assume that $B_{f_1} = 1$. If $f_1 \neq g$, then we can apply the same argument as in the previous case as the A2 move applied to f_1 does not affect w . If $f_1 = g$ then it follows from Lemma 4.33(2) that $B_{f_2} = 1$. Therefore, we can apply the argument from Case 1 to f_2 instead of f_1 .

Case 3. F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA. If $x \neq w$, then the result follows easily as the elementary moves necessary to make the folds elementary affect distinct vertices. Thus assume that $x = w$. The result is also trivial if x is peripheral since in this case we can take $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_1$ and $\bar{F}_1 = F_1$ and \bar{F}_2 the tame elementary fold of type IIA based on g .

Assume that x is non-peripheral. Lemma 4.12 implies that x is exceptional. As configuration **(D1)** is excluded, $f \neq g$. Assume that the labels of f and g in \mathcal{B}_2 are (a, e, b) and (c, e', d) respectively. The fact that F_2 is elementary implies that $\mathcal{P}_{x,2} = (T'_{x,2} \oplus \langle \gamma'_g \rangle, P_{x,2})$ such that

$$B_{w,2} = \langle T'_{w,2} \rangle * \langle \gamma'_g \rangle * \langle \gamma_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma_r \rangle$$

where $P_{x,2} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \rangle$ and γ'_g is the peripheral element corresponding to the fold F_2 , i.e. $\langle \gamma'_g \rangle = c\alpha_{e'}(A_{e'})c^{-1} \cap B_{x,2}$. If F_1 and F_2 correspond to the same boundary component of the orbifold \mathcal{O}'_x corresponding to $B_{x,2}$ then $e = e'$ and $a = \beta c\alpha_{e'}(d)$ for some $\beta \in B_{x,2}$ and some $d \in A_{e'}$. In this case \mathbf{B} is defined as the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}_2 by an auxiliary move of type A2 based on f followed by an A1 move based on f that makes the label of f equal to (c, e, b') , see Figure 27. This clearly makes both folds elementary. The result now follows from Lemma 4.30.




Figure 27: $b' = \omega(d)b \in A_{[\omega(f)]}$.

Assume now that F_1 and F_2 correspond to distinct boundary components of \mathcal{O}'_x . As configuration **(D4)** is excluded, $\mathcal{P}_{x,2}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{P}'_x := (T'' \oplus (\bar{\gamma}_f, \bar{\gamma}_g), P'')$ such that

$$B_{x,1} = \langle T'' \rangle * \langle \bar{\gamma}_f \rangle * \langle \bar{\gamma}_g \rangle * \langle \gamma''_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma''_r \rangle$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_f$ and γ'_f (resp. $\bar{\gamma}_g$ and γ'_g) corresponding to the same boundary of the orbifold \mathcal{O}'_x and $P'' = (\gamma''_1, \dots, \gamma''_r)$. Let $a_f, c_g \in B_{x,2}$ such that $\langle \bar{\gamma}_f \rangle = a_g \alpha_e(A_e) a_g^{-1}$ and $\langle \bar{\gamma}_g \rangle = c_g \alpha_{e'}(A_{e'}) c_g^{-1} \cap B_{x,2}$. In this case \mathbf{B} is the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}_2 by elementary moves based on x that replaces $\mathcal{P}_{x,2}$ by \mathcal{P}'_x , followed by auxiliary moves of type A2 based on f and g making the labels of f and g equal to (a_f, e, b') and (c_g, e', d') respectively, see Figure 28. In \mathbf{B} the folds along f and g are elementary. The result now follows from Lemma 4.30. \square




Figure 28: The marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B} .

When $\mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$ (so that F_1 and F_2 are tame elementary folds that are applied to the same marked \mathbb{A} -graph) it is possible that one fold is no longer tame after the other is applied. The following lemma tells us when this occur.

Lemma 4.37. *Assume that $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$. Then F_i stays tame after F_j is applied unless:*

(D5) F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA with $f \neq g$ and $\alpha(f) = \alpha(g)$ such that f and g can be folded in $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ by an elementary fold.

Proof. The claim follows by an inspection of the various cases. \square

Observe that if **(D5)** occurs then F_i is not tame after F_j is applied since f and g can be folded and one of them has non-trivial group.

4.5 Proof of Proposition 4.25

This section is dedicated to the proof of Proposition 4.25. We assume the setup of the previous section as established in Convention 4.28. Let $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$. According to Lemma 4.17 and Lemma 4.22 it suffices to show that if F_i is good and F_j is bad, then there exists a tame marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}''_i that is equivalent to \mathbf{B}_i and admits a bad tame elementary fold. We first consider the “non-normalizable” configurations **(D1)**-**(D4)** and configuration **(D5)**. We then consider generic case, that is, the case when the conclusion of Lemmas 4.35 and 4.37 hold.

(D1) Possibly after exchanging the roles of F_1 and F_2 we can assume that F_1 is good and F_2 is bad. It is not hard to see that F_1 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 iff F_2 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_2 . As one of the folds is good, we conclude that both F_1 and F_2 induce markings on

the resulting \mathbb{A} -graphs. According to Lemma 4.30, \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are equivalent if F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA, and hence F_1 is good iff F_2 is good. Consequently F_1 and F_2 are of type IA/IIIA as F_2 is bad.

Claim 4.38. *The vertices $\omega(f_1)$ and $\omega(f_2)$ (which may coincide if F_1 is of type IIIA) are exceptional and therefore non-critical and of simple type.*

Proof. Assume that F_1 and F_2 are of type IA, that is, $\omega(f_1) \neq \omega(f_2)$. The case where F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA is handled similarly.

If $\omega(f_1)$ or $\omega(f_2)$, say $\omega(f_1)$, is of orbifold type then the badness of F_2 implies that $B_{\omega(f_2),i} \neq 1$. But then F_1 is also bad, a contradiction. Thus neither $\omega(f_1)$ nor $\omega(f_2)$ is of orbifold type.

If $\omega(f_1)$ and $\omega(f_2)$ are peripheral, then the previous paragraph implies that both have trivial group. But this implies that F_1 and F_2 are good which is a contradiction.

Therefore $\omega(f_1)$ and $\omega(f_2)$ are exceptional vertices. \square

The previous claim implies that F_1 and F_2 induce markings on \mathcal{B}'_1 and \mathcal{B}'_2 respectively. Moreover, as F_2 is bad and F_1 is good, we conclude that \mathbf{B}'_1 is not equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_2 . As $\omega(f_i)$ is non-peripheral it follows that x is peripheral and so $B_{x,1} = B_{x,2}$. Lemma 4.30 implies that the following holds:

- (i) $B_{f_1} = B_{f_2} = 1$.
- (ii) there are $g \in A_{[x]}$, $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \in B_x$ and $c \neq d \in A_e$ such that

$$o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_1 o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(c^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_2 o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(d^{-1}).$$

In particular,

$$B_x \cap o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(A_e)(o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1})^{-1} \neq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad B_x \cap o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} \alpha_e(A_e)(o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2})^{-1} \neq 1.$$

Moreover,

$$t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(c)t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_1 h_1^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(d)t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_2 h_2^{-1}$$

with $\beta_i \in B_{\omega(f_i),1}$ and $h_1, h_2 \in A_{[\omega(f_1)]} = A_{[\omega(f_2)]}$ such that $h_1 = h_2$ if $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$.

Assume that F_1 (and therefore F_2) is of type IIIA, the case of a fold of type IA is similar. Possibly after applying an A0 move based on $y = \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ with conjugating element $h_1 = h_2 \in A_{[y]}$ followed by A2 moves based on f_1 and f_2 with elements $\beta_1^{-1}, \beta_2^{-1} \in B_{y,2}$ respectively (since both moves commute with F_1 and F_2) we can assume that $t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(c)t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1}$ and $t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(d)t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1}$. In particular, $\mathcal{P}_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, P_{y,1})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{y,2} = (T_{y,2}, P_{y,2})$ are equivalent.

By definition, F_1 (resp. F_2) replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{y,2}$) by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), P_{y,1}) \quad (\text{resp. } \mathcal{P}'_{y,2} = (T_{y,2} \oplus (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c^{-1}d)b_2), P_{y,2})),$$

where $b_i := t_{f_i}^{\mathcal{B}_1}$. The fact that F_1 is good (resp. F_2 is bad) combined with the fact that $\text{core}(\mathcal{B}'_1)$ and $\text{core}(\mathcal{B}'_2)$ cannot be almost orbifold cover with good marking as f lies in the core of \mathcal{B}'_i and $B'_{f,1} = B'_{f,2} = 1$, implies that $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ is non-critical of simple type (resp. $\mathcal{P}'_{y,2}$ cannot be non-critical of simple type). Recall that f denotes the image of f_1 and f_2 under F_1 and F_2 .

Item (iii) means that $f' \in EB'$ violates condition (F2) of folded \mathbb{A} -graph. Let F'_1 be the fold of type IIA based on f that replaces $B'_{f,1} = 1$ by

$$B''_{f,1} = \langle c_{f'} \rangle$$

where $c_f \in A_e$ such that $B_{x,1} = \langle \alpha_e(c_{f'}) \rangle$. Assume first that f is normalized in \mathbf{B}'_1 (and hence F'_2 is tame and elementary). As x is peripheral this means that f cannot be folded with any edge from $\text{Star}(x, B') \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_1)$. By definition, F'_2 replaces

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), P_{y,1})$$

by

$$\mathcal{P}_{y,1}'' = (T_{y,1} \oplus (b_1^{-1}b_2), (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c_{f'})b) \oplus P_{y,1})$$

which is clearly equivalent to

$$(T_{y,2} \oplus (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c^{-1}d)b_2), (b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c_{f'})b_1) \oplus P_{y,2})$$

because condition (4) of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs implies that

$$b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c^{-1}d)b_1 \in \langle b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c_{f'})b_1 \rangle.$$

The badness of F_2' now follows from Corollary 3.44.

Assume now that f can be folded with some edge in $Star(x, B') \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_1)$ so that f is not normalized in \mathcal{B}'_1 and hence F_1' is not tame and elementary. In this case the argument used to prove item (2) of Lemma 4.33 shows that the fold that identifies f with an edge in $Star(x, B') \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_1)$ is bad.

(D2) We may without loss of generality assume that F_2 is bad. By Corollary 4.32, there is a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathbf{B}_1 equivalent to $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ such that the following hold:

- (i) the labels of f_1 and f_2 are equal to (a, e, b) and the labels of g_1 and g_2 are equal to (c, \bar{e}, d_1) and (c, \bar{e}, d_2) respectively.
- (ii) the marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{C}}_1$ that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by the fold \bar{F}_1 that identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_1 .
- (iii) if $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$ denotes the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by an A0 moves that makes the labels of g_1 and g_2 equal to (c, \bar{e}, d) , then the fold \bar{F}_2 that identifies g_1 and g_2 is bad.

Therefore there is no loss if we assume that $\mathbf{B}_1 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}_2 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$) and $\bar{F}_1 = F_1$ (resp. $F_2 = \bar{F}_2$).




Figure 29: The marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ in the three configurations that can occur in case (2).

Claim 4.39. *The vertices $y_1 = \omega(f_1) = \omega(g_1)$ and $y_2 = \omega(f_2) = \omega(g_2)$ are exceptional.*

Proof. The argument is entirely analogous to the argument for Claim 4.38. \square

The assumption that $\mathbf{B}_i = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_i$ clearly implies that

$$\mathcal{P}_{y_1,2} = \mathcal{P}_{y_1,1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{y_2,2} = \mathcal{P}_{y_2,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1} = (T_{y_1,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1}, P_{y_1,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1}).$$

See Fig. 30. The cores of \mathcal{B}'_1 and \mathcal{B}'_2 cannot be almost orbifold covers as they contain the subgraphs $f_1 \cup f_2$ and $g_1 \cup g_2$ respectively. The badness of F_2 therefore implies that

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,2} = (T_{y_1,1} \oplus T_{y_2,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1}, P_{y_1,1} \oplus P_{y_1,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1})$$




Figure 30: The bad tame elementary fold F'_1 .

is either critical or of almost orbifold covering type, where for simplicity y denotes the image of y_1 and y_2 under both F_1 and F_2 .

Let F'_1 denote the tame elementary fold of type IIIA that identifies the edges g_1 and g_2 in \mathcal{B}'_1 and let \mathcal{B}''_1 denote the resulting \mathbb{A} -graph. As y is exceptional it follows that F'_1 induces a marking on \mathcal{B}'_1 yielding a marked \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B}''_1 . We will show that F'_1 is bad. By definition, F'_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}''_{y,1} = (T_{y_1} \oplus T_{y_2} \oplus (d_1^{-1} d_2), P_{y_1} \oplus P_{y_2})$$

which is equivalent

$$(T_{y_1} \oplus T_{y_2}^{d_2^{-1} d_1} \oplus (d_1^{-1} d_2), P_{y_1} \oplus P_{y_2}^{d_2^{-1} d_1}).$$

the latter is the sum of two partitioned tuple one of which is either critical or of almost orbifold covering type. The result thus follows from Lemma 3.44.

(D3) Without loss of generality assume that F_1 is good. It follows from Corollary 4.32 that \mathcal{B}_1 can be replaced by an equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ such that the following hold:

- (i) the label of f_1 is (a, e, b) and the label of f_2 is $(a, e, \omega_e(c)b)$ for some non-trivial element $c \in A_e$.
- (ii) the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ by the fold \bar{F}_1 that identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 is equivalent to \mathcal{B}'_1 .
- (iii) if $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$ denotes the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ by an A1 move that makes the label of f_2 equal to $(a\alpha_e(c), e, b)$, then the fold \bar{F}_2 that identifies f_1^{-1} and g_2^{-1} is bad.

We can therefore assume that $\mathcal{B}_1 = \bar{\mathcal{B}}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_2 = \bar{\mathcal{B}}_2$) and that $F_1 = \bar{F}_1$ (resp. $F_2 = \bar{F}_2$). Denote $\gamma := b^{-1}\omega_e(c)b \in A_{[w]}$ and $\gamma' := a^{-1}\alpha_e(c)a \in A_{[x]}$ where $w = \omega(g_1) = \omega(g_2) \in EB$. There are two cases depending on the type of $x = \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$.

Case 1. x is peripheral (and hence w is non-peripheral). This case is illustrated in Figure 31. The assumptions that $\mathcal{B}_i = \bar{\mathcal{B}}_i$ implies that $\mathcal{P}_{w,1} = \mathcal{P}_{w,2}$.

The badness of F_2 means that $B_x \neq 1$. On the other hand, as F_1 is good, w is exceptional (and hence $\mathcal{P}_{w,1}$ is non-critical of simple type). By definition, F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{w,1}$ by $\mathcal{P}'_{w,1} = (T_{w,1} \oplus (\gamma), P_{w,1})$ which is non-critical. In particular, B_{f_1} and B_{f_2} must be

trivial. For if some of them, say B_{f_1} , is non-trivial, then $\mathcal{P}'_{w,1} = (T_{w,1} \oplus \langle \gamma \rangle, P_{w,1})$ is reducible or has an obvious relation as $\gamma_{f_1^{-1}}$ and γ lie in $b^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b$. In particular, the image f' of f_1 and f_2 under F_1 has trivial group in \mathcal{B}'_1 . This implies that the core of \mathbf{B}'_1 cannot be an almost orbifold cover. Thus, $\mathcal{P}'_{w,1}$ is non-critical of simple type and hence




Figure 31: The fold along f^{-1} is bad.

$$b^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b \cap B'_{w,1} = b^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b \cap \langle T_{w,1} \oplus \langle \gamma \rangle \oplus P_{w,1} \rangle = \langle \gamma \rangle$$

This shows that $(f')^{-1}$ violates condition (F2) of folded \mathbb{A} -graphs. Let F'_1 denote the fold of type IIA that is based on $(f')^{-1} \in EB'_1$. We claim that F'_1 is tame and elementary. In fact, we only need to show that $(f')^{-1}$ cannot be folded with any edge in $Star(w, B'_1) \cap E(B'_1)$. But this follows as $\langle \gamma \rangle \oplus P_{w,1}$ is part of a minimal generating set of $B'_{w,1}$. As the vertex group at x is non-trivial we are in case FoldIIA(El.1)(1), thus F'_1 is bad.

Case 2. x is non-peripheral (and hence w is peripheral). This case is illustrated in Figure 32. The hypotheses that F_1 is good implies that $B_w = 1$. In particular, $B_g = 1$ for all $g \in Star(w, B)$. By definition, F_1 replaces B_w by $B'_{w,1} = \langle \gamma \rangle \leq A_{[w]}$. On the other hand, as F_2 is bad, one of the following occurs:

- (1) x is of orbifold type.
- (2) x is exceptional and $\mathcal{P}'_{x,2} = (T_{x,2} \oplus \langle \gamma' \rangle, P_{x,2}) = (T_{x,1} \oplus \langle \gamma' \rangle, P_{x,1})$ cannot be non-critical of simple type.

Let F'_1 be the fold of type IIA based on $(f')^{-1} \in EB'_1$. We will show that F'_1 is bad tame elementary. The fact that w is peripheral combined with $Star(w, B'_1) \cap E(B'_1) = \emptyset$ imply that F'_1 is tame elementary since $(f')^{-1}$ satisfies conditions (II.1)-(II.3) and (El.0). It remains to show that F'_1 is bad. There are two cases:

Subcase a. x is of orbifold type. In this case F'_1 is bad as we are in case FoldIIA(El.0)(1).
Subcase b. x is exceptional (and therefore $\mathcal{P}'_{x,1} = \mathcal{P}_{x,1}$ is non-critical of simple type). By definition, F'_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}'_{x,1} = \mathcal{P}_{x,1} = (T_{x,1}, P_{x,1})$ by $\mathcal{P}''_{x,1} := (T_{x,1}, \langle \gamma' \rangle \oplus P_{x,1})$. Observe that \mathbf{B}''_1 cannot be an almost orbifold covering with a good marking since w is a free boundary vertex in \mathbf{B}''_1 . Therefore F'_1 is bad unless $\mathcal{P}''_{x,1}$ is non-critical of simple type. But $\mathcal{P}''_{x,1}$ cannot be non-critical of simple type since then $\mathcal{P}'_{x,1} = (T_{x,1} \oplus \langle \gamma' \rangle, P_{x,1})$ would also be non-critical of simple which contradicts (2).

(D4) We may assume without loss of generality that F_2 is bad, so that the peripheral vertex $z := \omega(g)$ has non-trivial group. This case is illustrated in Figure 33.

Let F'_2 be the fold of type IIA based on the edge g of \mathbf{B}'_1 . Observe that g cannot be folded with any edge in $Star(x, B'_1) \cap E(B'_1)$ because γ'_g is part of a minimal generating set of $B'_{x,1} = B_{x,1} = B_{x,2}$. Moreover, F'_2 is elementary because it satisfies condition (El.2).




Figure 32: The fold F'_1 is bad.




Figure 33: The folds F_2 and F'_2 along g are bad.

The badness of F'_2 follows from the fact that the vertex z has non-trivial group in \mathcal{B}'_1 since $B'_{z,1} = B_{z,1} = B_{z,2}$.

(D5) $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ and F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA with $f \neq g$ such that f and g can be folded in $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ by an elementary fold. Note that F_i is not tame after F_j is applied.

We may assume that F_1 is good and F_2 is bad. Let F denote the fold that identifies f and g in \mathcal{B}_1 . Note that since F_1 and F_2 are tame elementary the labels of f and g are not affected and therefore F is tame elementary. Let γ'_f (resp. γ'_g) be the element added by F_1 (resp. F_2) to $B_{y,1}$ (resp. $B_{z,2}$).

Case 1. $z = \omega(g)$ is of orbifold type (either peripheral or non-peripheral). Since F_1 is good it follows that $y = \omega(f) \neq \omega(g) = z$. In particular, F is of type IA. Note that $B'_{y,1} \neq 1$ since F_1 adds γ'_f to $B_{y,1}$. Therefore F is bad as it identifies the vertex of orbifold type z with the vertex y that has non-trivial group.

Case 2. $z = \omega(g)$ is exceptional (and hence x is peripheral of orbifold type). In this case

F_1 and F_2 satisfy the elementary condition (El.0). Note also that y is non-peripheral as $[y] = [z] \in VA$. Thus y is exceptional because F_1 is good.

We give a complete argument for the case $y \neq z$. The case $y = z$ is analogous. By definition F_1 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, P_{y,1})$ by $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} = (T_{y,1}, (\gamma'_f) \oplus P_{y,1})$ and F_2 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{z,1} = (T_{z,1}, P_{z,1})$ by $\mathcal{P}'_{z,1} = (T_{z,1}, (\gamma'_g) \oplus P_{z,1})$. As F_2 is bad it follows that $\mathcal{P}'_{z,1}$ cannot be non-critical of simple type.

On the other hand, F replaces the partitioned tuples $\mathcal{P}'_{y,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{z,1} = \mathcal{P}_{z,1} = \mathcal{P}_{z,2}$ by the partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P} := (T_{y,1} \oplus T_{z,1}, (\gamma'_f) \oplus P_{y,1} \oplus P_{z,1})$. Since F is elementary it follows that $\gamma'_g = \gamma'_f$. The badness of F now follows from Corollary 3.44.

Generic case. Thus the conclusion of Lemmas 4.35 and 4.37 holds. Thus we may assume that $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$ and that F_i stays tame after F_j is applied. Assume that F_1 is good. We will show that \mathbf{B}'_1 admits a bad tame elementary fold that is induced by F_2 .

Case 1. F_2 is of type IA/IIIA. As F_2 is tame elementary we can assume that:

- (i) there is $k \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $B_{g_k} = 1$.
- (ii) if F_2 is of type IA, then g_1 and g_2 are labeled (c, \bar{e}, d) .
- (ii)' if F_2 is of type IIIA then g_1 and g_2 are labeled (c, \bar{e}, d_1) and (c, \bar{e}, d_2) .

Claim 4.40. F_1 maps the subgraph $g_1 \cup g_2$ of B isomorphically into B'_1 .

Proof. Note that $g_1 \cup g_2$ is mapped isomorphically into B'_1 unless one of the following holds:

- (a) F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA and $\{f_1, f_2\} = \{g_1^{\pm 1}, g_2^{\pm 1}\}$.
- (b) F_1 and F_2 are of type IA and $\{\omega(f_1), \omega(f_2)\} = \{\omega(g_1), \omega(g_2)\}$.

Item (a) does not occur because configurations **(1)** and **(3)** are excluded while item (b) does not occur because configurations **(1)** and **(2)** are excluded. Therefore $g_1 \cup g_2$ is mapped isomorphically into B'_1 . \square

We will denote the image of g_1 and g_2 (resp. $z_i = \alpha(g_i) \in VB$ for $i = 1, 2$) under F_1 by g'_1 and g'_2 (resp. z'_i for $i = 1, 2$). If F_2 is of type IIIA then $z := z_1 = z_2$ and $z' := z'_1 = z'_2$. The previous claim therefore says that $g_1 \cup g_2$ is isomorphic to $g'_1 \cup g'_2$.

Claim 4.41. $B'_{g'_1,1} = 1$ or $B'_{g'_2,1} = 1$ (in \mathcal{B}'_1).

Proof. Suppose on the contrary $B'_{g'_1,1} \neq 1 \neq B'_{g'_2,1}$. Thus F_1 affects the edge group of $g_k \in EB$ (which is trivial). Observe that this occurs only when one of the following holds:

- (1) F_1 is of type IA/IIIA, $B_{f_i} \neq 1$, and $f_j = g_k^{\pm 1}$ for $i \neq j \in \{1, 2\}$.
- (2) F_1 is of type IIA and $f = g_k^{\pm 1}$.

Both cases are ruled out by Lemma 4.33. \square

Next observe that the fold that identifies g'_1 and g'_2 in \mathcal{B}'_1 , which we denote by F'_2 , is elementary unless the following holds:

- (a) F_1 is of type IIIA and replaces the edges f_1 and f_2 labeled (a, e, b_1) and (a, e, b_2) respectively by a single edge f' labeled (a, e, b_1) .
- (b) $f_2 = g_j^\varepsilon$ for some $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and some $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$.

To overcome this issue we can assume that the label of f' is (a, e, b_2) so that F'_2 is elementary. Observe that this makes no difference in our argument since instead of adding the element $b_1^{-1}b_2$ to the vertex group B_y we add $b_2^{-1}b_1$ which clearly gives equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graphs. In particular, we can assume that g'_i and g_i have the same label.

Therefore F'_2 is tame elementary. We can finally show that F'_2 is bad. We assume that F_2 is of type IA. The situations in which F_2 is of type IIIA is entirely analogous.

If one of the vertices z_1 or z_2 is of orbifold type, say z_1 , then the badness of F_2 means that $B_{z_2} \neq 1$. Since the image of a vertex of orbifold type under a marking preserving fold is still a vertex of orbifold type, z'_1 is of orbifold type in \mathbf{B}'_1 . By the definition of folds, B_{z_i} is a subgroup of $B'_{z'_i,1}$. Thus $B'_{z'_2,1} \neq 1$. Therefore, F'_2 is bad as it identifies z'_1 and z'_2 .

Assume now that z_1 and z_2 are not of orbifold type. The badness of F_2 implies that z_1 and z_2 are exceptional. In fact, if z_1 (and hence z_2) were peripheral then the assumption that they are not of orbifold type implies that $B_{z_1} = B_{z_2} = 1$. But then F_2 would be good. Thus z_1 and z_2 are non-peripheral and therefore exceptional.

By definition, F_2 replaces $\mathcal{P}_{z_1} = (T_{z_1}, P_{z_1})$ and $\mathcal{P}_{z_2} = (T_{z_2}, P_{z_2})$ by

$$\mathcal{P}'_{\bar{z},2} := (T_{z_1} \oplus T_{z_2}, P_{z_1} \oplus P_{z_2}).$$

where $\bar{z} := F_2(z_1) = F_2(z_2) \in VB'_2$. As F_2 is bad $\mathcal{P}'_{\bar{z},2}$ cannot be non-critical of simple type.

On the other hand, observe that $\mathcal{P}_{z_i} = (T_{z_i}, P_{z_i})$ is a partitioned subtuple of $\mathcal{P}'_{z'_i,1} = (T'_{z'_i,1}, P'_{z'_i,1})$ and by definition, F'_2 replaces $\mathcal{P}'_{z'_1,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}'_{z'_2,1}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}' := (T'_{z'_1,1} \oplus T'_{z'_2,1}, P'_{z'_1,1} \oplus P'_{z'_2,1}).$$

The badness of F'_2 follows from Lemma 3.44 as $\mathcal{P}'_{z'_2,1}$ is a partitioned subtuple of \mathcal{P}' .

Case 2. F_2 is of type IIA. We denote the image of $g \in EB$ (resp. $w = \alpha(g) \in VB$ and $z = \omega(g) \in VB$) under F_1 by $g' \in EB'_1$ (resp. $w' \in VB'_1$ and $z' \in VB'_1$).

Claim 4.42. F_1 does not change the group of g , i.e. $B'_{g',1} = 1$.

Proof. Indeed, $B'_{g',1} = 1$ unless one of the following holds:

- (C1) F_1 is of type IA/IIIA such that $B_{f_i} \neq 1$ and $f_j = g^{\pm 1}$ for $i \neq j$.
- (C2) F_1 is of type IIA based and $f = g^{\pm 1}$.

Both configurations are ruled out by Lemma 4.33. Therefore $B'_{g',1} = 1$ as claimed. \square

Therefore, as B_w is a subgroup of $B'_{w',1}$, a fold of type IIA along g' can be applied to \mathcal{B}'_1 . Denote this fold by F'_2 .

Claim 4.43. F'_2 is tame elementary.

Proof. Assume first that $B'_{w',1} = B_w \leq A_{[w]}$, i.e. F_1 does not affect the vertex w . Then F'_2 is tame elementary unless one of the following holds:

- (a) g' can be folded with some $h' \in \text{Star}(w', B'_1) \cap E(B'_1)$, i.e. g' is not normalized in \mathbf{B}'_1 .
- (b) F_2 satisfies condition (El.1) and F_1 changes the label of g .

Note that if (a) occurs then F_1 is of type IIA based on h . But then h can be folded with g in \mathcal{B} what does not occur because we assumed that **(D5)** does not occur. If (b) occurs then we argue as in the previous paragraph. This shows that F'_2 is tame elementary when F_1 does not affect the vertex w .

Assume now that $B_w \neq B'_{w',1}$. First observe that w is exceptional since good folds do not affect vertices of orbifold type.

We will give a complete argument for the case F_1 is of type IIIA with $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2) = w = \alpha(g)$. In this case F_1 replaces B_w by $B'_{w',1} = \langle B_w, b_1^{-1}b_2 \rangle \leq A_{[w]}$.

As F_1 is good it follows from Proposition 3.39 that B_w is of infinite index in $A_{[w]}$, and hence F_2 satisfies the elementary condition (El.1). Thus, \mathcal{P}_w has the form $(T'_w \oplus (\gamma'_g), P'_w)$ such that

$$B_w = \langle T'_w \rangle * \langle \gamma'_g \rangle * \langle \gamma'_1 \rangle * \dots * \langle \gamma'_r \rangle$$

where $P_w = (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_r)$ and γ'_g corresponds to the fold F_2 , i.e. $c\alpha_{\bar{e}}(A_{\bar{e}})c^{-1} \cap B_w = \langle \gamma'_g \rangle$. By definition F_1 replaces \mathcal{P}_w by $\mathcal{P}'_{w',1} = (T'_w \oplus (\gamma'_g, b_1^{-1}b_2), P'_w)$. Since F_1 is good it follows that $\mathcal{P}'_{w',1}$ is either non-critical of simple type or of almost orbifold covering type. But Proposition 3.43 rules out the second alternative. Thus $\mathcal{P}'_{w',1}$ is non-critical of simple type. Therefore, as γ'_g is part of a minimal generating set of $B'_{w',1}$, it follows that g cannot be folded with any edge with non-trivial group starting at h' . This shows that F'_2 is tame and satisfies the elementary condition (El.1). \square

We now show that F'_2 is bad. If z' is of orbifold type it is clear. Assume that z is exceptional. The badness of F_2 means that the partitioned tuple $(T_z, (\gamma') \oplus P_z)$ is not non-critical of simple type. Since (T_z, P_z) is a partitioned sub-tuple of $\mathcal{P}'_{z',1}$ and since F'_2 simply adds a peripheral element to $\mathcal{P}'_{z',1}$, it follows from Corollary 3.44 that the resulting partitioned tuple is critical. Therefore F'_2 is bad.

4.6 Proof of Proposition 4.26

The proof of this proposition will follow along the lines of the proof of Proposition 4.25. Thus we consider the “non-normalizable” configurations (D1)-(D5) and then we consider the generic case where we can assume that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$ and each of the folds stays tame after the other is applied.

Assume that F_1 and F_2 are good and that the marked \mathbb{A} -graphs $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}'_1)$ and $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}'_2)$ are not equivalent. Hence, by Lemma 4.17, \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are also not equivalent.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{B}_1 \approx \mathbf{B}_2 & \\ F_1 \swarrow & & \searrow F_2 \\ \mathbf{B}'_1 & & \mathbf{B}'_2 \end{array}$$

It follows from Lemma 4.22 that to establish Proposition 4.26 it suffices to verify, in all possible scenarios, that one of the following occurs:

- (A) There exist marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 such that \mathbf{B}''_i is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_i and \mathbf{B}''_i admits a bad tame elementary fold for $i \in \{1, 2\}$.
- (B) There exist marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 such that \mathbf{B}''_i is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_i for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and that \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 admit good tame elementary folds that yield equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graphs.

(D1) As \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 are not equivalent, Lemma 4.30 implies that the following holds:

- (i) F_1 (and therefore F_2) is of type IA/IIIA.
- (ii) $B_{f_1} = B_{f_2} = 1$.
- (iii) $o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_1 o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(c)$ and $o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = g\alpha_2 o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(d)$ with $g \in A_{[x]}$, $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2 \in B_{x,1}$ and $c \neq d \in A_e$ where $e := [f_1] = [f_2]$. In particular,

$$B_{x,1} \cap o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \alpha_e(A_e) (o_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1})^{-1} \neq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad B_{x,2} \cap o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} \alpha_e(A_e) (o_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2})^{-1} \neq 1.$$

Moreover,

$$t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(c) t_{f_1}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_1 h_1^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_2} = \omega_e(d) t_{f_2}^{\mathcal{B}_1} \beta_2 h_2^{-1}$$

with $\beta_i \in B_{\omega(f_i),1}$ and $h_1, h_2 \in A_{[\omega(f_1)]} = A_{[\omega(f_2)]}$ such that $h_1 = h_2$ if $\omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$.

Before proceeding with the argument we fix some notation. Observe that the graphs B'_1 and B'_2 underlying \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 coincide. We denote $B' := B'_1 = B'_2$. Moreover, for all $f' \in EB'$ we have $B'_{f',1} = B'_{f',2}$ which implies that $E := E(\mathcal{B}'_1) = E(\mathcal{B}'_2)$. The image of $x = \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$ under F_i will be denoted by x' .

We give a complete argument in the case F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA. The case of folds of type IA is similar and left to the reader. Denote the label of f_1 and f_2 in \mathcal{B}_1 by (a, e, b_1) and (a, e, b_2) respectively. After applying auxiliary moves of type A0 based on x and $y = \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ to \mathbf{B}_2 with conjugating element g and $h_1 = h_2$ respectively followed by auxiliary moves of type A2 based on f_1^{-1} and f_2^{-1} with elements β_1 and β_2 respectively (which does not affect the equivalence class of \mathbf{B}'_2) we can assume that the label of f_1 and f_2 in \mathcal{B}_2 are given by $(\alpha_1 a \alpha_e(c^{-1}), e, \omega_e(c) b_1)$ and $(\alpha_2 a \alpha_e(d^{-1}), e, \omega_e(d) b_2)$ respectively. Since F_1 and F_2 are good, $b_1 \neq b_2$ and $\omega_e(c) b_1 \neq \omega_e(d) b_2$. We distinguish two cases according to the type of x .

Case 1. The vertex x is peripheral. Note that

$$B_x := B_{x,1} = B_{x,2} = B'_{x',1} = B'_{x',2}.$$

As F_1 and F_2 are good, y is an exceptional vertex. Hence the partitioned tuples $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{y,2}$ are non-critical of simple type. As $B_{f_1} = B_{f_2} = 1$, we can assume that $(T, P) := \mathcal{P}_{y,1} = \mathcal{P}_{y,2}$ as the elementary moves needed to turn \mathbf{B}_1 into \mathbf{B}_2 do not affect $\mathcal{P}_{y,1}$.

We now look at the marked \mathbb{A} -graphs \mathbf{B}'_1 and \mathbf{B}'_2 . Item (iii) combined with $B_x = B'_{x',i}$ implies that a fold of type IIA based on $f' \in EB'$ can be applied to \mathcal{B}'_i . We denote this fold by F'_i . Moreover, since all edges in $Star(x', B') \setminus \{f'\}$ have the same label in \mathcal{B}'_1 and in \mathcal{B}'_2 it follows that f' can be folded with some edge in $Star(x, B'_1) \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_1)$ if, and only if, f' can be folded with some edge in $Star(x, B'_2) \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_2)$.

Sub-case a. f' cannot be folded with an edge in $Star(x, B'_1) \cap E(\mathcal{B}'_1)$. Since x is peripheral it follows that F'_1 and F'_2 are tame.

Let \mathbf{B}''_i be the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_i by the fold F'_i . Therefore the partitioned tuple at $y' = \omega(f')$ in \mathbf{B}''_1 is equal to

$$\mathcal{P}''_{y',1} = (T_y \oplus (b_1^{-1} b_2), (\gamma) \oplus P_y)$$

and in \mathbf{B}''_2 is equal to

$$\mathcal{P}''_{y',2} := (T_y \oplus (b_1^{-1} \omega_e(c^{-1} d) b_2), (\gamma) \oplus P_y)$$

where $\gamma := b_1^{-1} \omega_e(a_e^z) b_1$ and $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\langle a_e^z \rangle = \alpha_e^{-1}(a^{-1} B_x a) = \alpha_e^{-1}(B_x)$. It follows from condition (4) of marked \mathbb{A} -graphs that $b_1^{-1} \omega_e(c^{-1} d) b_2 \in \langle \gamma \rangle$ which implies that $\mathcal{P}''_{y',1}$ and $\mathcal{P}''_{y',2}$ are equivalent. [Dut, Lemma 4.17] implies that \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 are equivalent. Therefore F'_1 is bad if, and only if, F'_2 is bad. This shows that (A) occurs if F'_1 and F'_2 are bad and that (C) occurs if F'_1 and F'_2 are good.

Sub-case b. there is $h' \in Star(x', B') \cap E$ that can be folded with f' . An argument similar to that of sub-case (a) shows \mathbf{B}'_1 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_2 if $\omega(h') = y'$. Thus $\omega(h')$ and y must be distinct.

Let F''_i denote the fold that identifies f' and h' and let u'' denote the common image of the vertices y' and $\omega(h')$. As the group of f' is trivial, F''_1 and F''_2 are tame. Moreover, by Lemma 4.30, we may assume that F''_1 and F''_2 are elementary since the group of $B'_{h',1} \neq 1 \neq B'_{h',2}$.

If $\omega(h')$ is of orbifold type, then F''_1 and F''_2 are bad since $B'_{y',1} \neq 1 \neq B'_{y',2}$. Thus assume that $\omega(h')$ is exceptional. Observe that we may without loss of generality assume that $(T, P) := \mathcal{P}'_{\omega(h'),1} = \mathcal{P}'_{\omega(h'),2}$. Hence the partitioned tuple at u'' in \mathbf{B}''_1 is equal to

$$\mathcal{P}''_{u'',1} = (T \oplus T_y \oplus (b_1^{-1} b_2), (\gamma) \oplus P \oplus P_y)$$

while the partitioned tuple at u in \mathbf{B}''_2 is equal to

$$\mathcal{P}''_{u'',2} = (T \oplus T_y \oplus (b_1^{-1} \omega_e(c^{-1} d) b_2), (\gamma) \oplus P \oplus P_y).$$

It is not hard to see that these partitioned tuples are equivalent which implies that \mathcal{B}''_1 is equivalent to \mathcal{B}''_2 . This shows that F''_1 is good if, and only if, F''_2 is good.

Case 2. $x = \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$ is non-peripheral. In this case the group of $y = \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ in \mathcal{B}_i ($i = 1, 2$) is trivial since F_1 and F_2 are good. In particular, the group of edges starting at y is also trivial.

By definition, F_1 and F_2 replace the trivial group $B_y = B_{y,1} = B_{y,2}$ by the non-trivial groups $B'_{y,1} = \langle b_1^{-1}b_2 \rangle$ and $B'_{y,2} = \langle b_1^{-1}\omega_e(c^{-1}d)b_2 \rangle$ respectively. Thus a fold of type IIA based on $(f')^{-1}$ can be applied to \mathbf{B}'_1 and to \mathbf{B}'_2 . On the other hand, (iii) implies that

$$B'_{x',1} \cap \alpha\alpha_e(A_e)a^{-1} \neq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad B'_{x',2} \cap \alpha_1\alpha_e(c^{-1})\alpha_e(A_e)\alpha_e(c)a^{-1}\alpha_1^{-1} \neq 1.$$

Lemma 3.40 therefore implies that F'_1 and F'_2 are bad.

(D2) It follows from Corollary 4.32 that \mathbf{B}_1 can be replaced by an equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ such that the following hold:

- (i) the labels of f_1 and f_2 do not change and the labels of g_1 and g_2 are of type (c, \bar{e}, d_1) and (c, \bar{e}, d_2) , see Figure 34.
- (ii) the marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}'_1$ that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by the fold \bar{F}_1 that identifies f_1 and f_2 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_1 .
- (iii) if $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$ denotes the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by an A0 move that makes the labels of g_1 and g_2 coincide, then the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$ by the fold \bar{F}_2 that identifies g_1 and g_2 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_2 .




Figure 34: The marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ in the three configurations that can occur).

Therefore we can assume that $\mathbf{B}_1 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}_2 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$) and $\bar{F}_1 = F_1$ (resp. $F_2 = \bar{F}_2$).

We first consider the case that y_1 and y_2 are peripheral. As F_1 and F_2 are good, at most one one of them has non-trivial vertex group. Thus there are two cases: If $B_{y_1,1} = B_{y_2,1} = 1$, then we are in case (B) since the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_1 by folding the edges g_1 and g_2 is equivalent to the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_2 by folding the edges f_1 and f_2 . If either $B_{y_1,1} \neq 1$ or $B_{y_2,1} \neq 1$, then we are in case (A). Indeed, the fold that identifies the edges g_1 and g_2 (resp. f_1 and f_2) in \mathbf{B}'_1 (resp. in \mathbf{B}'_2) is bad.

We now consider the case that y_1 and y_2 are non-peripheral. If one of the vertices y_1 or y_2 is of orbifold type, then the fact that F_1 and F_2 are good implies that the other vertex has trivial group. In this case the same argument as in the previous paragraph shows that (A) holds.

Finally assume that y_1 and y_2 are exceptional vertices, see Figure 35. Note that the graph does not always look exactly as in the figure, as the other two configurations of Figure 34 might also occur. However, in these situations exactly the same arguments can be applied.

The loop $g_1 \cup g_2$ lies in the core of the \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B}'_1 underlying \mathbf{B}'_1 . As F_2 is tame, the group of at least one of the edges g_1 and g_2 is trivial in \mathcal{B}_1 , and therefore also in \mathcal{B}'_1 .




Figure 35: F'_1 and F'_2 produce equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graphs.

Putting these facts together we conclude that $\text{core}(\mathbf{B}'_1)$ cannot be a special almost orbifold covering with a good marking. Therefore, as F_1 is good, the partitioned tuple

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,1} := (T_{y_1,1} \oplus T_{y_2,1}, P_{y_1,1} \oplus P_{y_2,1})$$

is non-critical of simple type, where y denotes the common image of y_1 and y_2 in \mathbf{B}'_1 . The same argument shows that the partitioned tuple

$$\mathcal{P}'_{y,2} := (T_{y_1,2} \oplus T_{y_2,2}, P_{y_1,2} \oplus P_{y_2,2}) = (T_{y_1,1} \oplus T_{y_2,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1}, P_{y_1,1} \oplus P_{y_2,1}^{d_2^{-1}d_1})$$

is of simple type.

Let F'_1 denote the tame elementary fold of type IIIA that identifies the edges g_1 and g_2 in \mathbf{B}'_1 and let \mathbf{B}''_1 denote the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph. Similarly, let F'_2 denote the tame elementary fold of type IIIA that identifies the edges f_1 and f_2 in \mathbf{B}'_2 and let \mathbf{B}''_2 denote the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph, see Figure 35. Note that \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 only differ at the vertex $y := \omega(f) = \omega(g)$ where the partitioned tuples are given by

$$\mathcal{P}''_{y,1} := (T_{y_1,1} \oplus T_{y_2,1} \oplus (d_1^{-1}d_2), P_{y_1,1} \oplus P_{y_2,1})$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}''_{y,2} := (T_{y_1,1} \oplus T_{y_2,1}^{d_1^{-1}d_2} \oplus (d_1^{-1}d_2), P_{y_1,1} \oplus P_{y_2,1}^{d_1^{-1}d_2}),$$

respectively. One easily verifies that $\mathcal{P}''_{y,1}$ and $\mathcal{P}''_{y,2}$ are equivalent. Therefore, by [Dut, Lemma 3.16], \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 are equivalent.

The equivalence between \mathbf{B}''_1 and \mathbf{B}''_2 implies that the fold F'_1 is good if, and only if, the fold F'_2 is good. Therefore we are in case (A) if F'_1 is good and we are in case (B) if F'_1 is bad.

(D3) F_1 and F_2 are folds of type IIIA with $f_1 = g_1^{-1}$ and $f_2 = g_2^{-1}$. We may assume without loss of generality that $x = \alpha(f_1) = \alpha(f_2)$ is peripheral (and hence $w = \omega(f_1) = \omega(f_2)$ is non-peripheral).

It follows from Corollary 4.32 that \mathbf{B}_1 can be replaced by an equivalent marked \mathbb{A} -graph $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ such that the following hold:

- (i) the label of f_1 is (a, e, b) and the label of f_2 is $(a, e, \omega_e(c)b)$ for some non-trivial element $c \in A_e$.
- (ii) the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by the fold \bar{F}_1 that identifies f_1 and f_2 is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_1 .
- (iii) if $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$ denotes the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ by an A1 move that makes the label of f_2 equal to $(a\alpha_e(c), e, b)$, then the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from $\bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$ by the fold \bar{F}_2 that identifies f_1^{-1} and g_2^{-1} is equivalent to \mathbf{B}'_2 .

Therefore we can assume that $\mathbf{B}_1 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_1$ (resp. $\mathbf{B}_2 = \bar{\mathbf{B}}_2$) and that $F_1 = \bar{F}_1$ (resp. $F_2 = \bar{F}_2$), see Fig. 36. Denote $\gamma := b^{-1}\omega_e(c)b \in A_{[w]}$ and $\gamma' := a^{-1}\alpha_e(c)a = \alpha_e(c) \in A_{[x]}$.




Figure 36: F_1 and F_2 are of type IIIA and F'_1 and F'_2 are of type IIA.

Since F_1 is good, w is exceptional and $\mathcal{P}_{w,1} = (T_{w,1}, P_{w,1})$ is non-critical of simple type. On the other hand, since F_2 is good, $B_x = 1$. Thus $B_g = 1$ for all $g \in \text{Star}(x, B)$. In particular, $B_{f_1} = B_{f_2} = 1$.

We first look at \mathbf{B}'_1 . It follows from Proposition 3.43 that $(T_{w,1} \oplus (\gamma), P_{w,1})$ cannot be of almost orbifold covering type. Thus, as F_1 is good,

$$\mathcal{P}'_{w,1} = (T_{w,1} \oplus (\gamma), P_{w,1})$$

is non-critical of simple type. Observe that the group of $(f')^{-1}$ is trivial (in \mathbf{B}'_1) and $(f')^{-1}$ violates condition (F2) of folded \mathbb{A} -graphs since the peripheral element γ lies in $B'_{w,1}$.

Let F'_1 denote the type IIA fold based on $(f')^{-1}$. As γ is part of a minimal generating tuple of $B'_{y,1}$ it follows that $b^{-1}\omega_e(A_e)b \cap B'_{y,1} = \langle \gamma \rangle$ and that $(f')^{-1}$ cannot be folded with any edge in $\text{Star}(w, B'_1) \cap E(B'_1)$. Thus F'_1 is tame elementary.

We now look at \mathbf{B}'_2 . Let F'_2 be the type IIA fold based on the edge f' . Note that $B'_{h,2} = 1$ for all $h \in \text{Star}(w, B'_2)$ since $B_h = 1$ for all $h \in \text{Star}(w, B)$. Thus F'_2 is tame elementary.

It is not hard to see that the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_1 by the fold F'_1 coincides with the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_2 by the fold F'_2 . Hence F'_1 is good if, and only if, F'_2 is good. Therefore (A) holds if F'_1 and F'_2 are bad and (B) occurs otherwise.

Remark 4.44. Observe that F'_2 (and hence F'_1) is good exactly when $(T_{w,1}, (\gamma) \oplus P_{w,1})$ is non-critical and of simple type. This follows from the fact that the resulting marked \mathbb{A} -graph cannot be a special almost orbifold cover with a good marking as the vertex x becomes a boundary vertex of a degenerate sub- \mathbb{A} -graph of orbifold type such that there is only one edge incident at x that has non trivial group, namely the edge f .

(D4) As F_1 and F_2 are good it follows that $B_y = B_z = 1$ where $y = \omega(f)$ and $z = \omega(g)$. This case is illustrated in Figure 37 in the case that $y = z$.

Let F'_1 (resp. F'_2) be the fold of type IIA based on g (resp. f) of \mathbf{B}'_1 (resp. \mathbf{B}'_2). Observe that both folds are tame because the corresponding peripheral elements γ'_f and γ'_g are part of a minimal generating set of $B'_{x,1} = B'_{x,2} = B_{x,1} = B_{x,2} \leq A_{[x]}$. Moreover, both are elementary because they satisfy condition (El.2). It is not hard to see that F'_1 and F'_2 are good (resp. bad) if and only if $y \neq z$ (resp. $y = z$), see Fig. 33.




Figure 37: F'_1 and F'_2 are bad tame elementary folds of type IIA.

(D5) $\mathbf{B} := \mathbf{B}_1 = \mathbf{B}_2$ and F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA with $f \neq g$ such that f and g can be folded in $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2$ by an elementary fold. Note that F_i is not tame after F_j is applied. Let F'_i denote the tame elementary fold that identifies f and g in \mathcal{B}'_i . Since F_1 and F_2 are good, $\omega(f)$ and $\omega(g)$ are either both peripheral with trivial group or both exceptional. We will give a complete argument for the case they are exceptional and distinct so that F'_i are of type IA.

The fact that f and g have the same label implies that the peripheral element γ'_{f-1} added by F_1 to the partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}_{\omega(f)}$ coincides with the peripheral element γ'_{g-1} added by F_2 to the partitioned tuple $\mathcal{P}_{\omega(g)}$. Therefore the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_1 by F'_1 coincides with the marked \mathbb{A} -graph that is obtained from \mathbf{B}'_2 by F'_2 . This implies that F'_1 is good if and only if F'_2 is good. The hole argument is illustrated in Figure 38.

Generic case. Assume that the conclusions of Lemmas 4.35 and 4.37 hold. Since F_1 and F_2 are good, the argument used in the generic case when one of the folds is bad shows that a fold F'_2 (resp. F'_1) that is essentially the same as F_2 (resp. F_1) can be applied to \mathbf{B}'_1 (resp. \mathbf{B}'_2) and F'_1 and F'_2 yield the same \mathbb{A} -graph \mathcal{B}'' , i.e. F_1 and F_2 commute.

Therefore to complete the proof it suffices to show that F'_1 is good if and only if F'_2 is good. This follows by inspecting the various cases. We will give a sample argument for the case F_1 and F_2 are of type IIA, and so F'_1 and F'_2 are also of type IIA. If $\omega(f) \neq \omega(g)$ then claim is trivial. Thus assume that $y = \omega(f) = \omega(g) = z$. As F_1 and F_2 are good, y is either exceptional or peripheral with trivial group. If x is exceptional then the claim is also trivial. If x is peripheral, then F_1 and F_2 turn x into a vertex of orbifold type. Consequently F'_1 and F'_2 do not induce markings on \mathcal{B}'' and therefore are bad.

5 Horizontal Heegaard splittings

Throughout this section we assume familiarity with horizontal Heegaard splittings of Seifert manifolds as introduced by Moriah and Schultens [MS].

Let M be an orientable Seifert 3-manifold over the base orbifold \mathcal{O} , let $\pi : M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ be the canonical map. Given a horizontal Heegaard splitting we obtain the following:




Figure 38: $\gamma' = \gamma'_{f-1} = \gamma'_{g-1}$.

1. a surface $\Sigma \subset M$ with a single boundary component, the regular neighborhood of this surface can be thought of as one of the handlebodies of the splitting.
2. An open disk $D \subset \mathcal{O}$ containing at most one cone point such that $\pi(\Sigma) = \mathcal{O} \setminus D$ and the map $\pi|_{\Sigma} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \setminus D$ is an orbifold cover.

It follows in particular that the map $\pi|_{\Sigma} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is an almost orbifold cover. Note that this is an almost orbifold cover of a very special type as $\pi^{-1}(D)$ contains no disks but consists of a single 1-sphere.

Theorem 5.1 (Theorem 1.11). *Let M be a non-small orientable Seifert 3-manifold with orientable base space and T be a tuple corresponding to a horizontal Heegaard splitting. Then T is irreducible iff the Heegaard splitting is irreducible.*

Proof. As reducible Heegaard splitting always define reducible generating tuples it suffices to show that the generating tuples corresponding to irreducible Heegaard splitting are irreducible. Thus we may assume that the horizontal Heegaard splitting under consideration is irreducible.

Let Σ and D be as above and let $T := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ a basis of the free group $\pi_1(\Sigma)$, thus

$$i_*(T) = (i_*(x_1), \dots, i_*(x_n))$$

is a generating set of $\pi_1(M)$ if $i : \Sigma \rightarrow M$ is the inclusion map. We need to show that $i_*(T)$ is irreducible. To do so it suffices to show that

$$\pi_* \circ i_*(T) = (\pi|_{\Sigma})_*(T)$$

is irreducible.

This claim follows from Theorem 1.9 once we have verified that the almost orbifold covering $\pi|_{\Sigma} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is special and that T is rigid.

The rigidity of T is trivial as a simple homology argument shows that the element of surfact group corresponding to the single boundary component of a surface is never part of a basis.

Let now $m = 1$ if D contains no cone point, otherwise let m be the order of the single cone point contained in D . Let m_1, \dots, m_k be the orders of the cone points in $\Sigma \setminus D$ and $d = \text{lcm}(m_1, \dots, m_k)$. It follows from the construction of horizontal Heegaard splittings that d is the degree of the almost orbifold covering $\pi|_\Sigma$, see chapter 4 of [Se]. The irreducibility of the Heegaard splitting moreover implies that $m > d$ unless \mathcal{O} is a surface, a case when the claim is trivial. This follows from [Se].

To see that $\pi|_\Sigma$ is special it remains to show that d does not divide m . If d divides m the $\pi|_\Sigma$ factors through a finite sheeted cover of \mathcal{O} which contradicts the assumption that $(\pi|_\Sigma)_*(T)$ is a generating tuple of $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$. Thus d divides m and the Theorem is proven. \square

Note that the proof actually implies that Heegaard splittings are irreducible. Thus we reprove Theorem 8.1 of [Se] in the case of non-small Seifert manifolds.

References

- [BF] M. Bestvina and M. Feighn, *Bounding the complexity of simplicial group actions on trees*, Invent. Math. **103**, 1991, 449–469.
- [Du] M. J. Dunwoody, *Folding sequences*, The Epstein Birthday Schrift, Geom. Topol. Monogr., **1** 1998, 139–158.
- [Dut] E. Dutra, *Nielsen equivalence in closed 2-orbifold groups*, preprint 2020, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.09326>.
- [EKS] A. Edmonds, R. Kulkarni and R. Stong, *Realizability of Branched Coverings of Surfaces* Trans. AMS **282**, 1984, 773–790.
- [FR] D. I. Fousse-Rabinovitch, *Über die Automorphismengruppen der freien Produkte, I'*, Mat. Sb. **8** 1940, 265–276.
- [G] N. D. Gilbert, *Presentations of the Automorphism Group of a Free Product*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, Volume s3-54, Issue 1, January 1987, Pages 115–140.
- [Gr] I. A. Grushko, *On the bases of a free product of groups*, Matematicheskii Sbornik **8** (1940), pp. 169–182.
- [KMW] I. Kapovich, A. Myasnikov and R. Weidmann, *Foldings, graphs of groups and the membership problem* to appear in IJAC.
- [KW1] I. Kapovich and R. Weidmann, *Freely indecomposable groups acting on hyperbolic spaces*, IJAC **14**, 2004, 115–171.
- [KW2] I. Kapovich and R. Weidmann, *Kleinian groups and the rank problem*, preprint 2004.
- [Lou] L. Louder, *Nielsen equivalence in closed surface groups*, preprint.
- [L] M. Lustig, *Nielsen equivalence and simple-homotopy type*, Proc. LMS **62**, 1991, 537–562.
- [LM1] M. Lustig and Y. Moriah, *Nielsen equivalence in Fuchsian groups and Seifert fibered spaces*, Topology **30**, 1991, 191–204.
- [LM2] M. Lustig and Y. Moriah, *Generating systems of groups and Reidemeister-Whitehead torsion*, J. Algebra **157**, 1993, 170–198.

- [LM3] Y. Moriah and Martin Lustig, *Nielsen Equivalence in Fuchsian groups*, preprint 2019, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.02759>
- [MS] Y. Moriah and J. Schultens, *Irreducible Heegaard splittings of Seifert fibered spaces are either vertical or horizontal*, *Topology* **37** (5), 1089–1112
- [PRZ] N. Peczynski, G. Rosenberger and H. Zieschang, *Über Erzeugende ebener diskontinuierlicher Gruppen*, *Inv. Math.* **29**, 1975, 161–180.
- [R1] G. Rosenberger, *Zum Rang und Isomorphieproblem für freie Produkte mit Amalgam*, Habilitationsschrift, Hamburg 1974.
- [R2] G. Rosenberger, *All generating pairs of all two-generator Fuchsian groups*, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **46**, 1986, no. 3, 198–204.
- [R3] G. Rosenberger, *Minimal generating systems for plane discontinuous groups and an equation in free groups*, *Proc. Group's Korea 1988*, 170–186. *Lecture Notes in Math.* vol. 1398, Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [Se] E. Sedgwick, *The irreducibility of Heegaard splittings of Seifert fibered spaces*, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **190** (1), 173–199
- [St] J.R. Stallings, *Topology of Finite Graphs*, *Invent. Math.* **71**, 1983, 551–565.
- [Wa] R. D. Wade, *Folding free-group automorphisms*, *Q. J. Math.* **65** (2014) 291–304.
- [W1] R. Weidmann, *The rank problem for sufficiently large Fuchsian groups*, *Proc. LMS* **95** (3), 2007, 609–652.
- [W2] R. Weidmann, *Generating tuples of free products*, *Bull. LMS* **39** (3), 2007, 393–403.
- [Zie] H. Zieschang, *Über die Nielsensche Kürzungsmethode in freien Produkten mit Amalgam*, *Invent. Math.* **10**, 1970, 4–37.