

PATH-HOMOTOPY IS EQUIVALENT TO \mathbb{R} -TREE REDUCTION

JEREMY BRAZAS, GREGORY R. CONNER, PAUL FABEL, AND CURTIS KENT

ABSTRACT. Suppose a path α factors through an \mathbb{R} -tree T as $\alpha = q \circ p$. Let r parameterize the unique geodesic in T joining the endpoints of p . Then we say that the path $\beta = q \circ r$ is obtained from α by *geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction*. Essentially, β is obtained from α by deleting one-dimensional back-tracking. In this paper, we show that any two homotopic paths are geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reductions of some single common path. Hence, the equivalence relation on paths generated by geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction is precisely path-homotopy. The common path is explicitly constructed and is necessarily space-filling in the image of a given path-homotopy.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose the non-constant path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ in a metric space factors through an \mathbb{R} -tree T as $\alpha = q \circ p$ for a path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ and a map $q : T \rightarrow X$. Let $r : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ parameterize the unique geodesic in T from $p(0)$ to $p(1)$. Then we say that the path $\beta = q \circ r$ is obtained from α by *geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction*. Certainly, if β is a geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction of α , then α and β are homotopic. In this paper, we show that any two homotopic paths are both \mathbb{R} -tree reductions of a single common path. Hence, one may delete “one-dimensional backtracking” from this common path to obtain either of the two homotopic paths.

Main Theorem. *If X is a topological space and $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are homotopic paths, then there exists a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that α and β are both geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reductions of γ .*

Typically, the path γ will be very complicated, as it (1) will be space-filling in the image of some chosen homotopy between α and β and (2) must pass through all of the points of both α and β in the same order that each of these paths does. Despite its complexity, the construction of γ from the pair α, β is entirely explicit. Our Main Theorem implies that the equivalence relation on paths generated by geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction coincides precisely with path-homotopy. This theorem also implies that the one-dimensional analogue of the path-homotopy relation (two paths are equivalent if they form a loop that factors through an \mathbb{R} -tree) is, in fact, *not* an equivalence relation on paths in the plane because it fails to be transitive.

Date: January 18, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 54F15, 55P10, 54F50, ; Secondary 55R65, 57M10, 20E08.

Key words and phrases. \mathbb{R} -tree, geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction, path-homotopy, dendrite, unique path lifting, covering map.

The third author gratefully acknowledges the generous support of University Primorska, Koper, Slovenia, May 2018.

Berestovskii-Plaut [1] construct, for every length space X , an action of a locally free group $\Gamma(X)$ on an \mathbb{R} -tree E with orbit space $X = E/\Gamma(X)$ and such that the quotient map $E \rightarrow X$ uniquely lifts all *rectifiable* paths rel. starting point. In a sequel paper, we characterize all orbits $X = E/G$ of \mathbb{R} -trees E for which the quotient map $E \rightarrow X$ uniquely lifts *all* paths rel. starting point. In stark contrast to Berestovskii-Plaut's result, we find that such group actions are rare. For instance, no such action exists if the closed unit disk embeds in X . These results are possible due to the following, which answers a question of Dydak [8, Problem 2.3].

Corollary 1.1. *If X is a first countable, locally path-connected, and simply connected space, E is a path-connected space, and $p : E \rightarrow X$ is a map, which lifts all paths uniquely rel. starting point, then p is a homeomorphism.*

In [3, Section 4], it is shown that if Dydak's Problem has an affirmative answer, then every map $p : E \rightarrow X$ that uniquely lifts all paths rel. starting point is a Serre fibration and, moreover, is a covering map if E and X are manifolds (of any dimension and with or without boundary). Hence, unique lifting of paths alone implies all other types of lifting.

Corollary 1.2. *If a map $p : M \rightarrow N$ of manifolds lifts all paths uniquely rel. starting point, then p is a covering map*

2. \mathbb{R} -TREE FACTORIZATION OF PATHS AND LOOPS

All topological spaces in this paper are assumed to be Hausdorff. For paths α and β in a space X , $\alpha\beta$ will denote path concatenation and $\bar{\alpha}$ will denote the reverse path. If (X, d) is a metric space, we let $\rho(\alpha, \beta) = \sup\{d(\alpha(t), \beta(t)) \mid t \in [0, 1]\}$ denote the sup-metric on the space of paths from $[0, 1]$ to X and recall that when (X, d) is complete, then so is its path space [7, 4.3.13]. We also require notation for a variety of relations on paths.

Definition 2.1. Let $\alpha : [a, b] \rightarrow X$, $\beta : [c, d] \rightarrow X$ be paths.

- (1) We say α is *equivalent* to β and write $\alpha \equiv \beta$ if $\alpha = \beta \circ h$ for some increasing homeomorphism $h : [a, b] \rightarrow [c, d]$. If h is linear, we may say that α is a *linear reparameterization* of β .
- (2) We say α and β are *Fréchet equivalent* and write $\alpha \approx \beta$ if $\alpha \circ f = \beta \circ g$ for non-decreasing continuous surjections $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [a, b]$ and $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [c, d]$.

Both \equiv and \approx are equivalence relations finer than the path-homotopy relation \simeq . See [5] for a proof of the transitivity of \approx . Recall that an \mathbb{R} -tree is a uniquely arcwise-connected, and locally arcwise connected geodesic metric space [2, 9]. A compact \mathbb{R} -tree is called a *dendrite* [10].

Definition 2.2. Let $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be paths in a topological space X .

- (1) We say that β is a *geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction* of α , and we write $\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$, if there is an \mathbb{R} -tree T , a path $p : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$, an injective path $r : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ with $p(i) = r(i)$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, and a map $f : T \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ p = \alpha$ and $f \circ r = \beta$.
- (2) We say that α and β are *\mathbb{R} -tree homotopic*, and we write $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$, if $\alpha\bar{\beta}$ is a loop that factors through an \mathbb{R} -tree, that is, if $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and if there exists an \mathbb{R} -tree T , a loop $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ and a map $f : T \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ \ell = \alpha\bar{\beta}$.

Note that

$$\alpha \equiv \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \simeq \beta$$

where the last implication holds since \mathbb{R} -trees are contractible. Also, if $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ where β is injective, then $\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$. Certainly, $\simeq_{\mathbb{R}}$ is reflexive and symmetric. However, the transitivity of $\simeq_{\mathbb{R}}$ is less clear. In a given space, transitivity of $\simeq_{\mathbb{R}}$ is equivalent to whether or not each path admits a unique (up to \equiv) “maximally reduced” geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction. One must be wary of this temptation as our main result implies that there exist some paths in the plane which fail to have unique maximally reduced representatives. We note some key properties of $\simeq_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\geq_{\mathbb{R}}$ that *do* hold.

Remark 2.3. If T_1 and T_2 are \mathbb{R} -trees, $f_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_1$ is an injective path, and $f_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow T_2$ is any path, then the pushout of f_1 and f_2 is an \mathbb{R} -tree. Indeed, this pushout is obtained by attaching the closure of each connected component of $T_1 \setminus f_1([0, 1])$ to T_2 at a point along the image of f_2 . This fact can be used to show the following.

- (1) $\geq_{\mathbb{R}}$ is transitive and is antisymmetric up to equivalence, that is, $\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ and $\beta \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \equiv \beta$. Hence, $\geq_{\mathbb{R}}$ induces a partial order on path-equivalence classes.
- (2) $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ if and only if α and β share a common geodesic \mathbb{R} -tree reduction, that is, if and only if there exists δ with $\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \delta$ and $\beta \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \delta$.

Lemma 2.4. *The following properties of \mathbb{R} -tree homotopy hold.*

- (1) If $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are paths such that $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ (resp. $\alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$) and $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is a map, then $f \circ \alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} f \circ \beta$ (resp. $f \circ \alpha \geq_{\mathbb{R}} f \circ \beta$).
- (2) If $\alpha_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_1$, $\alpha_2 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_2$, and $\alpha_1(1) = \alpha_2(0)$, then $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_1 \beta_2$.
- (3) If $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are paths and $\alpha \circ g_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta \circ g_2$ for non-decreasing continuous surjections $g_1, g_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, then $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$.
- (4) If $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are paths such that $\alpha_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are paths such that $\alpha_1 \approx \beta_1$ and $\alpha_2 \approx \beta_2$, then $\beta_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_2$.

Proof. (1) is clear. (2) holds since the one-point union of two \mathbb{R} -trees is an \mathbb{R} -tree. (3) Since $\alpha \circ g_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta \circ g_2$, there exists an \mathbb{R} -tree T , map $F : T \rightarrow X$, and loop $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ such that $F \circ \ell = (\alpha \circ g_1)(\overline{\beta \circ g_2})$. We may replace T with the dendrite $\ell([0, 1])$ and assume ℓ is surjective. Since X is assumed to be Hausdorff, $F(T)$ is a compact metric space [10, 8.17] and we may replace X with $F(T)$. Define a non-decreasing surjection $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}g_1(2t), & \text{if } t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\ 1 - \frac{1}{2}g_2(2 - 2t), & \text{if } t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \end{cases}$$

so that $F \circ \ell = (\alpha \overline{\beta}) \circ g$. Applying the Monotone-Light Factorization Theorem [6] to the map $F : T \rightarrow X$ of compact metric spaces, we have $F = F' \circ \pi$ for a monotone map $\pi : T \rightarrow T'$ and a light map $F' : T' \rightarrow X$. Since π is a monotone quotient map on a dendrite, T' is a dendrite [10, Exercise 10.52]. Since g is monotone, F' is light, and $F' \circ \pi \circ \ell = (\alpha \beta) \circ g$, the loop $\pi \circ \ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow T'$ is constant on the fibers

of g . Thus, there is a unique loop $\mu : [0, 1] \rightarrow T'$ such that $\pi \circ \ell = \mu \circ g$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{\ell} & T \\
 \downarrow g & & \swarrow \pi \\
 & & T' \\
 & \nearrow \mu & \searrow F' \\
 [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{\alpha\bar{\beta}} & X \\
 & & \downarrow F
 \end{array}$$

Since $F' \circ \mu \circ g = (\alpha\bar{\beta}) \circ g$ where g is surjective, we have $F' \circ \mu = \alpha\bar{\beta}$, proving $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$.

(4) Write $\alpha_1 \circ f_1 = \beta_1 \circ g_1$ and $\alpha_2 \circ f_2 = \beta_2 \circ g_2$ for non-decreasing continuous surjections $f_1, f_2, g_1, g_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Since $\alpha_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha_2$, there exists an \mathbb{R} -tree T , a map $F : T \rightarrow X$, and loop $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow T$ such that $F \circ \ell = \alpha_1 \bar{\alpha}_2$. Write $\ell = \mu_1 \bar{\mu}_2$ so that $F \circ \mu_i = \alpha_i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. If $\ell' = (\mu_1 \circ f_1) \overline{(\mu_2 \circ f_2)}$, then the factorization

$$F \circ \ell' = (\alpha_1 \circ f_1) \overline{(\alpha_2 \circ f_2)} = (\beta_1 \circ g_1) \overline{(\beta_2 \circ g_2)}$$

shows that $\beta_1 \circ g_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_2 \circ g_2$. Now, (3) implies $\beta_1 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta_2$. \square

3. CANTOR PATHS AND THEIR STAGGERING

Definition 3.1. An open set $U \subseteq (0, 1)$ is a *Cantor complement* if $[0, 1] \setminus U$ is homeomorphic to a Cantor set.

Note that an open set $U \subseteq (0, 1)$ is a Cantor complement if and only if U is dense in $[0, 1]$ and the set of connected components of U have the order type of \mathbb{Q} . It is necessarily the case that the connected components of a Cantor complement have pairwise-disjoint closures. Given a path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$, let $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ denote the set of connected components of the open set $\mathcal{O}(\alpha) = \{t \in [0, 1] \mid \alpha \text{ is locally constant at } t\}$. Note that distinct elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ have pairwise-disjoint closures and that α is a light map if and only if $\mathcal{O}(\alpha) = \emptyset$.

Definition 3.2. A non-constant path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is a *Cantor path* if $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ is a Cantor complement.

The standard ternary Cantor map $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ collapses the closure of each component of the complement of the ternary Cantor set to a point. Thus τ is a non-decreasing, surjective Cantor path. If α is a light path, then $\alpha \circ \tau$ is a Cantor path. A key concept in the proof of our main theorem is the following.

Definition 3.3. Let U_1, U_2 be proper open subsets of $(0, 1)$ such that for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\inf(U_i) = 0$, $\sup(U_i) = 1$, and such that the connected components of U_i have pairwise disjoint closures. We say the sets U_1 and U_2 are *staggered* if $U_1 \cup U_2 = (0, 1)$, or equivalently, if $\partial U_1 \cap \partial U_2 = \{0, 1\}$.

The next lemma, which has a straightforward proof, allows us to select connected components from staggered Cantor complements U_1 and U_2 so that the resulting collections have the order type of \mathbb{Z} while still having staggered unions.

Lemma 3.4. *Let U_1 and U_2 be staggered Cantor complements. Then for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ there exists a set of connected components \mathcal{W}_i of U_i such that, \mathcal{W}_i has the order type of \mathbb{Z} , $\inf(\bigcup \mathcal{W}_i) = 0$, $\sup(\bigcup \mathcal{W}_i) = 1$, and such that $\bigcup \mathcal{W}_1$ and $\bigcup \mathcal{W}_2$ are staggered.*

Lemma 3.5. *Let U be a Cantor complement. For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an increasing homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\rho(f, id_{[0,1]}) < \epsilon$ and such that U and $f(U)$ are staggered.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and \mathcal{U} be the set of connected components of U with the induced ordering. Since U is a Cantor complement, \mathcal{U} is densely ordered and we may find a bi-infinite sequence $I_n = (a_n, b_n) \in \mathcal{U}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\inf(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n) = 0$, $\sup(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n) = 1$, and such that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the segment $[b_n, a_{n+1}]$ has diameter less than $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, find $J_n = (c_n, d_n) \in \mathcal{U}$ with $J \subseteq (b_n, a_{n+1})$. We will define f by first setting its value on the closures of the intervals in the bi-infinite sequence

$$\cdots < I_{-2} < J_{-2} < I_{-1} < J_{-1} < I_0 < J_0 < I_1 < J_1 < I_2 < J_2 < \cdots .$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, choose a subdivision of $[a_n, b_n]$ as follows: find $a_n < D_{n-1} < A_n < B_n < C_n < b_n$ where the outer four segments $[a_n, D_{n-1}]$, $[D_{n-1}, A_n]$, $[B_n, C_n]$, and $[C_n, b_n]$ all have diameter less than $\frac{\epsilon}{3}$. Note that if $K_n = (A_n, B_n)$ and $L_n = (C_n, D_n)$, then the bi-infinite sequence

$$\cdots < K_{-2} < L_{-2} < K_{-1} < L_{-1} < K_0 < L_0 < K_1 < L_1 < K_2 < L_2 < \cdots$$

limits to 0 on the left and 1 on the right. Moreover, $K_n \subseteq I_n$ and $J_n \subseteq L_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We define f so that it maps $[a_n, b_n]$ to $[A_n, B_n]$ and $[c_n, d_n]$ to $[C_n, D_n]$ respectively by increasing linear maps. Moreover, since the sets I_n, J_n, K_n, L_n limit to 0 as $n \rightarrow -\infty$ and to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, this definition extends uniquely to an increasing homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which is piecewise-linear on $[a_{-n}, b_n]$ for all $n \geq 1$ (see Figure 1).




FIGURE 1. An illustration of part of the homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which maps $I_n \rightarrow K_n$ and $J_n \rightarrow L_n$ in a piecewise-linear fashion.

Our choices of the sizes of the intervals $[b_n, a_{n+1}]$ and subdivisions ensures that $\rho(f, id_{[0,1]}) < \epsilon$. Additionally, if $t \in (0, 1) \setminus U$, then $t \in [b_n, c_n] \cup [d_n, a_{n+1}]$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $[b_n, c_n] \cup [d_n, a_{n+1}] \subseteq L_n = f(J_n)$ where $J_n \in \mathcal{U}$, we have $t \in f(U)$. We conclude that $U \cup f(U) = (0, 1)$, i.e. U and $f(U)$ are staggered. \square

Definition 3.6. We say two Cantor paths $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are *staggered* if $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ are staggered.

Our final lemma of the section allows us to take two non-staggered Cantor paths and perturb one of them so that the resulting pair is staggered.

Lemma 3.7. *Given any two Cantor paths $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ and $\epsilon, \delta > 0$, there exist an increasing homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\rho(f, id_{[0,1]}) < \delta$, $\rho(\alpha, \alpha \circ f) < \epsilon$, and such that $\alpha \circ f$ and β are staggered.*

Proof. Let $U_1 = \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and $U_2 = \mathcal{O}(\beta)$ and note that $V = U_1 \cap U_2$ is also a Cantor complement. Find $0 < \delta' < \delta$ such that $|s - t| < \delta'$ implies $|\alpha(s) - \alpha(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. By Lemma 3.5, we may find an increasing homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $|f(t) - t| < \delta'$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $V \cup f(V) = (0, 1)$. Hence, $|\alpha(f(t)) - \alpha(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, which gives $\rho(f, id_{[0,1]}) \leq \delta' < \delta$ and $\rho(\alpha, \alpha \circ f) < \epsilon$. Also, note that $V \cup f^{-1}(V) = (0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\alpha \circ f) = f^{-1}(U_1)$. Thus

$$(0, 1) = V \cup f^{-1}(V) = (U_1 \cap U_2) \cup (f^{-1}(U_1) \cap f^{-1}(U_2)) \subseteq U_2 \cup \mathcal{O}(\alpha \circ f),$$

showing that $\alpha \circ f$ and β are staggered. \square

4. INSERTING INVERSE PAIRS INTO CANTOR PATHS

If \mathcal{U} is a collection of open intervals in $[0, 1]$ with disjoint closures, then a \mathcal{U} -*collapsing map* is a non-decreasing, continuous surjection $\mu : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which is constant on the closure of each $J \in \mathcal{U}$ and which is bijective on $[0, 1] \setminus \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{U}} \bar{J}$. Such maps may be constructed canonically using dyadic rational outputs and by enumerating \mathcal{U} by non-increasing length and the ordering in $[0, 1]$ (lexicographically). If a path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is not light and $k_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ -collapsing map, then there is a unique light path $\alpha^\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\alpha^\lambda \circ k_\alpha = \alpha$.

Definition 4.1. We call a given loop $\ell : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ an *inverse-pair loop* if there exists a path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\ell \equiv \alpha\bar{\alpha}$. More specifically,

- (1) if α is a Cantor path or has the form $\alpha \equiv \alpha_1\alpha_2$ for Cantor path α_1 and constant path α_2 , then, we call ℓ a *Cantor-inverse-pair loop* or *CIP-loop* (see Figure 2).
- (2) if α is light, we call ℓ a *light-inverse-pair loop* or *LIP-loop*.




FIGURE 2. A CIP-loop is an inverse pair loop which either has the form of an inverse pair $\alpha\bar{\alpha}$ of Cantor paths (above) or of the form $\alpha_1\bar{\alpha}_1$ for a Cantor path α_1 and constant path β (below).

Remark 4.2. If $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is a CIP-loop, then α is a Cantor path. Moreover, if $\alpha = \alpha^\lambda \circ k_\alpha$ for $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ -collapsing map $k_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ and light path $\alpha^\lambda : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$, then α^λ is a LIP-loop.

Definition 4.3. Let $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be Cantor paths and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{lc}(\alpha)$. We say that β is a \mathcal{U} -extension of α if

- (1) $\beta(t) = \alpha(t)$ for all $t \in [0, 1] \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{U}$,
- (2) for each $J \in \mathcal{U}$, $\beta|_J$ is a CIP-loop.

If β is a \mathcal{U} -extension of α for some subset $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \text{lc}(\alpha)$, we write $\alpha \leq_* \beta$.

Remark 4.4. If $\alpha \leq_* \beta$, then $\mathcal{O}(\beta) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(\alpha)$. In particular, if $J \in \text{lc}(\beta)$, then either $J \in \text{lc}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{U}$ or $J \subseteq K$ for some $K \in \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, the loop $\alpha \bar{\beta}$ factors through a dendrite in a highly structured way. In particular, there is a dendrite $D(\beta, \alpha)$ constructed by starting with a “base arc” B and attaching an arc to B for each element of \mathcal{U} . We have $F \circ (a\bar{b}) = \alpha \bar{\beta}$ where $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\beta, \alpha)$ is a monotone map onto B and where $b : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\beta, \alpha)$ maps $[0, 1] \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{U}$ into B and the closure of each element of \mathcal{U} onto the corresponding attached arc in $D(\beta, \alpha)$ by an inverse-pair loop. While $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ holds, the relation $\alpha \leq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ only holds in the trivial case where $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ (see the Appendix for more details).

Remark 4.5. The relation \leq_* on the set of paths in a space X is certainly reflexive and it is straightforward to check that \leq_* is antisymmetric. However, \leq_* is *not* transitive. Rather, \leq_* is a very fine relation that generates a partial order relation, which is strictly finer than $\leq_{\mathbb{R}}$.

If we have a sequence $\gamma_1 \leq_* \gamma_2 \leq_* \gamma_3 \leq_* \dots$ in a space X where, as one proceeds through the sequence, the added out-and-back loops have very quickly shrinking diameters, then $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ should converge uniformly to a path γ . Moreover, $\gamma_1 \bar{\gamma}_2$ factors through a dendrite, call it D_1 , as described in Remark 4.4. Since γ_{n+1} agrees with γ_n except on portions on which γ_{n+1} is a CIP-loop, we may recursively construct a dendrite D_n by attaching arcs to D_{n-1} so that $\gamma_j \bar{\gamma}_{n+1}$ factors through D_n for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In the limit, we find that there is a uniquely determined limit dendrite $D_\infty = \varprojlim_n D_n$ that $\gamma_n \bar{\gamma}$ factors through for all n . Hence, $\gamma \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The next lemma establishes this conclusion assuming the existence of the limit γ . As one can see from the above proof sketch, this result is fairly intuitive. However, a detailed proof requires careful bookkeeping of parameterizations of paths in inverse limits. We omit the details here and include them in the Appendix.

Lemma 4.6. *If $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of Cantor paths in a metric space (X, d) such that $\gamma_n \leq_* \gamma_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and such that $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly, then $\gamma_n \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

In the next section, we will be forming alternating sequences $\alpha_1 \leq_* \alpha'_1 \equiv \alpha_2 \leq_* \alpha'_2 \equiv \dots$ where the equivalences are given by small perturbations. The next lemma, which is proved using elementary real analysis, allows us to manage all of these perturbations simultaneously.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of increasing homeomorphisms $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\rho(f_n, \text{id}_{[0,1]}) \leq ar^n$ for some $a > 0$ and $|r| < 1$. If $g_n = f_n^{-1} \circ f_{n-1}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ f_2^{-1} \circ f_1^{-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to a continuous, non-decreasing surjection $g_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.*

Next, we combine the previous two lemmas.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\{\alpha'_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are sequences of Cantor paths in a metric space (X, d) , $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is a path, and $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of increasing homeomorphisms $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that the following hold:*

- (1) $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly,
- (2) $\alpha_n \leq_* \alpha'_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (3) $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha'_n \circ f_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (4) there exists $a > 0$ and $|r| < 1$ such that $\rho(f_n, id_{[0,1]}) \leq ar^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then $\alpha_n \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let $g_0 = id_{[0,1]}$ and $g_n = f_n^{-1} \circ f_{n-1}^{-1} \circ \dots \circ f_2^{-1} \circ f_1^{-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $f_n \circ g_n = g_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 4.7, $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to a continuous, non-decreasing surjection $g_\infty : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$.

Let $\gamma_1 = \alpha_1$ and for $n \geq 2$, set $\gamma_n = \alpha_n \circ g_{n-1}$. For the moment, fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha'_n \circ f_n$, we have

$$\gamma_{n+1} = \alpha_{n+1} \circ g_n = \alpha'_n \circ f_n \circ g_n = \alpha'_n \circ g_{n-1}.$$

By assumption, $\alpha_n \leq_* \alpha'_n$. Composing α_n and α'_n with the homeomorphism g_{n-1} gives $\gamma_n \leq_* \gamma_{n+1}$. Additionally, note that since $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma$ and $\{g_{n-1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow g_\infty$ uniformly, we have $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \{\alpha_n \circ g_{n-1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma \circ g_\infty$. It now follows from Lemma 4.6 that $\gamma_n \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma \circ g_\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\alpha_n \circ g_{n-1} \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma \circ g_\infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since we have Fréchet equivalences $\alpha_n \approx \alpha_n \circ g_{n-1}$ and $\gamma \approx \gamma \circ g_\infty$ it follows from Lemma 2.4 (4) that $\alpha_n \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

5. A PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

To begin, we fix Cantor-path parameterizations of planar line segments. Recall that $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the ternary Cantor map.

Definition 5.1. Given points x, y in the closed unit disk \mathbb{D}^2 , let $L_{x,y} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ be the path defined by $L_{x,y}(s) = \tau(s)(\frac{x+y}{2}) + (1 - \tau(s))x$.

Remark 5.2. If $x = y$, then $L_{x,y}$ is constant. If $x \neq y$, then $L_{x,y}$ is a Cantor path that parameterizes the line segment from x to $\frac{x+y}{2}$. Moreover, if $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{D}^2$ with midpoints $m_i = \frac{x_i + y_i}{2}$, then since the paths L_{x_1, y_1} and $\overline{L_{y_2, x_2}}$ are both parameterized using τ , their sup-distance is the maximum distance between the endpoints, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(L_{x_1, y_1}, \overline{L_{y_2, x_2}}) &\leq \max \{d(x_1, m_2), d(m_1, y_2)\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{d(x_2, y_2)}{2} + d(x_1, x_2), \frac{d(x_1, y_1)}{2} + d(y_1, y_2) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

(See Figure 3). In the case that $x = x_1 = x_2$ and $y = y_1 = y_2$, we have $\rho(L_{x,y}, \overline{L_{y,x}}) = \frac{1}{2}d(x, y)$.




FIGURE 3. Since L_{x_1, y_1} and $\overline{L_{y_2, x_2}}$ are both parameterized by τ , their metric distance is the maximum length between starting and ending points.

We attribute the next lemma especially to the third author. The main idea is to fix staggered Cantor paths $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ satisfying $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and modify both of them by inserting CIP-loops on a \mathbb{Z} -ordered sequence of elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ and $\text{lc}(\beta)$ respectively so that $\alpha \leq_* \alpha'$ and $\beta \leq_* \beta'$. Specifically, we construct α' from α by inserting a bi-infinite sequence of CIP-loops of the form $L_{x, y} \overline{L_{x, y}}$ or $(L_{x, y})c(\overline{L_{x, y}})$ (for constant path c) on certain elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha)$. We will construct β' from β in an analogous way. However, the two constructions are not symmetric. Rather, they must be done simultaneously in an “interlocking” fashion. In the end, the resulting paths α' and β' will have $2/3$ the sup-distance of the original paths. That one can insert non-constant portions into both paths and somehow shrink the distance between them is somewhat non-intuitive and is only possible because the paths are *staggered*.

Since the construction of α' and β' will involve an intricate arrangement of overlapping intervals, we employ the following notation: if $I \subseteq [0, 1]$ is an interval, then $\ell(I)$ and $r(I)$ will denote the left and right endpoints of I respectively.

Lemma 5.3 (Fabel’s Construction). *For staggered Cantor paths $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ such that $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, there exists Cantor paths $\alpha', \beta' : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ such that:*

- (1) $\alpha \leq_* \alpha'$ and $\rho(\alpha, \alpha') \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (2) $\beta \leq_* \beta'$ and $\rho(\beta, \beta') \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha, \beta)$,
- (3) $\rho(\alpha', \beta') \leq \frac{2}{3}\rho(\alpha, \beta)$.

Proof. Let $\delta = \rho(\alpha, \beta)$. By assumption, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ are staggered Cantor complements. By Lemma 3.4, we may select a set of connected components \mathcal{U}_1 of $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ and \mathcal{U}_2 of $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ such that for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, \mathcal{U}_i has the order type of \mathbb{Z} , $\inf(\bigcup \mathcal{U}_i) = 0$, $\sup(\bigcup \mathcal{U}_i) = 1$, and such that $\bigcup \mathcal{U}_1$ and $\bigcup \mathcal{U}_2$ are staggered. Index the elements of \mathcal{U}_1 as $\dots < A_{-2} < A_{-1} < A_0 < A_1 < A_2 < \dots$ and the elements of \mathcal{U}_2 as $\dots < C_{-2} < C_{-1} < C_0 < C_1 < C_2 < \dots$ so that C_n meets A_{n-1} and A_n . Set $w_n = \alpha(\overline{A_n})$ and $y_n = \beta(\overline{C_n})$

For the moment, fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ is a Cantor complement and α is uniformly continuous, we may find a sequence $B_{n,1} < B_{n,2} < \cdots < B_{n,k_n}$ in $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ of length $k_n \geq 2$, where each set $B_{n,j}$ is contained in $[r(A_n), \ell(A_{n+1})]$ and such that if I is a connected component of $[r(A_n), \ell(A_{n+1})] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k_n} B_{n,j}$, then $\text{diam}(\alpha(\bar{I})) < \frac{\delta}{6}$. Similarly, since $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ is a Cantor complement, we may find a sequence $D_{n,1} < D_{n,2} < \cdots < D_{n,m_n}$ in $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$ of length $m_n \geq 2$ where each $D_{n,j}$ is contained in $[r(C_{n-1}), \ell(C_n)]$ and such that if I is a connected component of $[r(C_{n-1}), \ell(C_n)] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_n} D_{n,j}$, then $\text{diam}(\beta(\bar{I})) < \frac{\delta}{6}$. Note that $D_{n,j} \subseteq A_n$ and $B_{n,j} \subseteq C_n$ holds whenever these sets are defined (See Figure 4).




FIGURE 4. The upper segment illustrates the selected sets A_n and $B_{n,j}$ on which α is constant. The lower segment illustrates the selected sets C_n and $D_{n,j}$ on which β is constant.

Set $x_{n,j} = \alpha(\overline{B_{n,j}})$ and $z_{n,j} = \beta(\overline{D_{n,j}})$ whenever these sets are defined. Additionally, let p_n be the midpoint of $[\ell(A_n), r(C_{n-1})]$, q_n be the midpoint of $[\ell(C_n), r(A_n)]$, $\eta_{n,j}$ be the midpoint of $B_{n,j}$, and $\theta_{n,j}$ be the midpoint of $D_{n,j}$.

To begin our definition of α' , we first set α' to agree with α on $\{0, 1\}$ and on $[r(A_n), \ell(A_{n+1})] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k_n} B_{n,j}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We complete the definition of α' piecewise by fixing $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and defining α' on $\overline{A_n}$ in three cases and $\overline{B_{n,j}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k_n$ in a fourth case. It may be helpful to note that

$$\overline{A_n} = [\ell(A_n), p_n] \cup [p_n, r(C_{n-1})] \cup [r(C_{n-1}), \ell(C_n)] \cup [\ell(C_n), q_n] \cup [q_n, r(A_n)]$$

(see Figure 5).

- (1) On $[\ell(A_n), \theta_{n,1}]$, we define α' to be the CIP-loop, which is the linear reparameterization of $L_{w_n, y_{n-1}}$ on $[\ell(A_n), p_n]$, the constant path at $\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}$ on $[p_n, \ell(D_{n,1})]$, and the linear reparameterization of $\overline{L_{w_n, y_{n-1}}}$ on $[\ell(D_{n,1}), \theta_{n,1}]$.
- (2) On $[\theta_{n,j}, \theta_{n,j+1}]$ (for each $1 \leq j \leq m_n - 1$), we define α' to be the CIP-loop, which is the linear reparameterization of $L_{w_n, z_{n,j}}$ on $[\theta_{n,j}, r(D_{n,j})]$, the constant path at $\frac{w_n + z_{n,j}}{2}$ on $[r(D_{n,j}), \ell(D_{n,j+1})]$, and the linear reparameterization of $\overline{L_{w_n, z_{n,j}}}$ on $[\ell(D_{n,j+1}), \theta_{n,j+1}]$.
- (3) On $[\theta_{n,m_n}, r(A_n)]$, we define α' to be the CIP-loop, which is the linear reparameterization of L_{w_n, y_n} on $[\theta_{n,m_n}, r(D_{n,m_n})]$, the constant path at $\frac{w_n + y_n}{2}$ on $[r(D_{n,m_n}), q_n]$, and the linear reparameterization of $\overline{L_{w_n, y_n}}$ on $[q_n, r(A_n)]$. This completes the definition of α' on $\overline{A_n}$.
- (4) Lastly, on $\overline{B_{n,j}}$, we define α' to be the linear reparameterization of the CIP-loop $L_{x_{n,j}, y_n} \overline{L_{x_{n,j}, y_n}}$.

This completes the definition of α' (compare Figures 5 and 6). Note that α' agrees with α everywhere except on a \mathbb{Z} -ordered sequence of elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ on which CIP-loops replace constant loops. Hence, it is clear that α' is a well-defined function. To begin our definition of β' , we first set β' to agree with β on $\{0, 1\}$ and on

$[r(C_{n-1}), \ell(C_n)] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_n} D_{n,j}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We complete the definition of β' piecewise by fixing $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and defining β' on $\overline{C_n}$ in five cases and $\overline{D_{n,j}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m_n$ in a sixth case.

- (1) On $[\ell(C_n), p_n]$, we define β' to be constant at y_n (this happens to agree with the value of β).
- (2) On $[p_n, \eta_{n,1}]$, we define β' to be CIP-loops, which is the linear reparameterization of L_{y_n, w_n} on $[p_n, r(A_n)]$, the constant path at $\frac{y_n + w_n}{2}$ on $[r(A_n), \ell(B_{n,1})]$, and $\overline{L_{y_n, w_n}}$ on $[\ell(B_{n,1}), \eta_{n,1}]$.
- (3) On $[\eta_{n,j}, \eta_{n,j+1}]$ (for each $1 \leq j \leq k_n - 1$), we define β' to be CIP-loops, which is the linear reparameterization of $L_{y_n, x_{n,j}}$ on $[\eta_{n,j}, r(B_{n,j})]$, the constant path at $\frac{y_n + x_{n,j}}{2}$ on $[r(B_{n,j}), \ell(B_{n,j+1})]$, and the linear reparameterization of $\overline{L_{y_n, x_{n,j}}}$ on $[\ell(B_{n,j+1}), \eta_{n,j+1}]$.
- (4) On $[\eta_{n,k_n}, p_{n+1}]$, we define β' to be the CIP-loop, which is the linear reparameterization of $L_{y_n, x_{n,k_n}}$ on $[\eta_{n,k_n}, r(B_{n,k_n})]$, the constant path at $\frac{y_n + x_{n,k_n}}{2}$ on $[r(B_{n,k_n}), \ell(A_{n+1})]$, and the linear reparameterization of $\overline{L_{y_n, x_{n,k_n}}}$ on $[\ell(A_{n+1}), p_{n+1}]$.
- (5) On $[p_{n+1}, r(C_n)]$, we define β' to be constant at y_n (this happens to agree with the value of β). This completes the definition of β' on $\overline{C_n}$.
- (6) On $\overline{D_{n,j}}$ (for each $1 \leq j \leq m_n$), we define β' to be the linear reparameterization of the CIP-loop $L_{z_{n,j}, w_n} \overline{L_{z_{n,j}, w_n}}$.

This completes the definition of β' , which is a well-defined function (see Figures 5 and 6).




FIGURE 5. The interlocking pattern that determines the structure of α' and β' . The triangles represent inserted inverse-pair loops and the trapezoids represent an inverse pair loop but with a constant path included in the middle.




FIGURE 6. A full “period” of the construction of α' and β' starting with $\ell(A_n)$ and ending with $\ell(A_{n+1})$. Starting and ending points are circled and the initial and terminal steps are indicated with arrows. The upper and lower curves represent α and β respectively where each subdivided segment has diameter less than $\frac{\delta}{6}$. The numbered paths trace out the trajectory of α' and the box-numbered paths trace out the corresponding trajectory of β' . When a number is positioned at a point, the path is constant at that point.

By construction, $\alpha'|_{(0,1)}$ is continuous. If U is a convex neighborhood of $\alpha(0) = \beta(0)$ in \mathbb{D}^2 , then we may find $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\alpha(A_n \cup C_n) \cup \beta(A_n \cup C_n) \subseteq U$ for all $n \leq N$. Let $t = \sup(A_N)$. Since the CIP-loops added to α on $[0, t]$ are contained in line segments with endpoints in $\alpha([0, t])$ and $\beta([0, t])$ respectively, it follows that $\alpha'([0, t]) \subseteq U$. Thus α' is continuous at 0. A symmetric argument shows that α' is continuous at 1. The construction of α' also ensures that distinct elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha')$ have disjoint closures. Hence, α' is a Cantor path. Additionally, since α' is constructed from α only by replacing constant loops with CIP-loops on elements of $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ (one on each $B_{n,j}$ and at least three on each A_n), we have $\alpha \leq_* \alpha'$. Moreover, if $\mu : \bar{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ is one of the added CIP-loops in the construction of α' , then the image of μ is the line segment connecting $\alpha(s)$ and $\frac{\alpha(s) + \beta(s)}{2}$ for some $s \in \bar{I}$. Thus $\rho(\alpha, \alpha') \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha, \beta)$. Since these arguments apply just as well for β' , we also conclude that β' is a Cantor path satisfying $\beta \leq_* \beta'$ and $\rho(\beta, \beta') \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha, \beta)$.

To complete the proof, we will show that $d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) \leq \frac{2\delta}{3}$. We begin by considering the case $s \in \overline{A_n}$.

- (1) On $[\ell(A_n), q_n]$, α' parameterizes the line from w_n to $\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}$ and β' is a corresponding parameterization of the line from $\frac{x_{n-1, k_n} + y_{n-1}}{2}$ to y_{n-1} . Thus if $s \in [\ell(A_n), q_n]$, Remark 5.2 gives us the first inequality in the following sequence:

$$\begin{aligned}
& d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) \\
\leq & \max \left\{ \frac{d(x_{n-1, k_n}, y_{n-1})}{2} + d(x_{n-1, k_n}, w_n), \frac{d(w_n, y_{n-1})}{2} \right\} \\
= & \max \left\{ \frac{d(\alpha(r(B_{n-1, k_n})), \beta(r(B_{n-1, k_n})))}{2} + d(x_{n-1, k_n}, w_n), \frac{d(\alpha(p_n), \beta(p_n))}{2} \right\} \\
< & \max \left\{ \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{6}, \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} \leq \frac{2\delta}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (2) On $[p_n, r(C_n)]$, α' is constant at $\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}$ and β' is constant at y_{n-1} . Therefore, if $s \in [p_n, r(C_n)]$, we have

$$d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) = \frac{d(w_n, y_{n-1})}{2} = \frac{d(\alpha(p_n), \beta(p_n))}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

- (3) On $[r(C_n), \ell(D_{n,1})]$, α' is constant at $\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}$ and β' agrees with β . Thus if $s \in [r(C_n), \ell(D_{n,1})]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) & \leq d(\alpha'(s), \beta(r(C_{n-1}))) + d(\beta(r(C_{n-1})), \beta'(s)) \\
& = d\left(\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}, y_{n-1}\right) + d(\beta(r(C_{n-1})), \beta(s)) \\
& = \frac{d(\alpha(p_n), \beta(p_n))}{2} + d(\beta(r(C_{n-1})), \beta(s)) \\
& < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{6} \leq \frac{2\delta}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

- (4) On $[\ell(D_{n,1}), \theta_{n,1}]$, α' parameterizes the line segment from $\frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}$ to w_n and β' parameterizes the line segment from $z_{n,1}$ to $\frac{z_{n,1} + w_n}{2}$. In this case, if $s \in [\ell(D_{n,1}), \theta_{n,1}]$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) & \leq \max \left\{ d\left(w_n, \frac{w_n + y_{n-1}}{2}\right), d\left(z_{n,1}, \frac{z_{n,1} + w_n}{2}\right) \right\} \\
& = \max \left\{ \frac{d(w_n, y_{n-1})}{2}, \frac{d(z_{n,1}, w_n)}{2} \right\} \\
& = \max \left\{ \frac{d(\alpha(p_n), \beta(p_n))}{2}, \frac{d(\alpha(\theta_{n,1}), \beta(\theta_{n,1}))}{2} \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{\delta}{2} < \frac{2\delta}{3}
\end{aligned}$$

- (5) On $[\theta_{n,1}, r(D_{n,1})]$, α' parameterizes the line segment from w_n to $\frac{z_{n,1} + w_n}{2}$ and β parameterizes the line segment from $\frac{z_{n,1} + w_n}{2}$ to $z_{n,1}$. Since these paths move along the same line segment, it follows that if $s \in [\theta_{n,1}, r(D_{n,1})]$, then

$$d(\alpha'(s), \beta'(s)) = \frac{d(w_n, z_{n,1})}{2} \leq \frac{d(\alpha(\theta_{n,1}), \beta(\theta_{n,1}))}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$$

As we proceed through the remainder of the intervals on which α' and β' are defined piecewise, every remaining case (all of which are illustrated in Figures 5 and 6) may be verified using an argument nearly identical to one of the above five cases. Hence, we omit the remainder of the details. We conclude that $\rho(\alpha', \beta') \leq \frac{2\delta}{3}$. \square

The construction given in the proof of Lemma 5.3 results in two Cantor paths α' and β' , which are not staggered. Hence, to iterate this construction, we must perturb one of these two paths so that they become staggered.

Lemma 5.4. *For given staggered Cantor paths $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ with $\alpha(i) = \beta(i)$ for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\delta = \rho(\alpha, \beta)$, there exists sequences of Cantor paths $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\alpha'_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, such that $\alpha_0 = \alpha$, $\beta_0 = \beta$ and such that for all $n \geq 0$,*

- (1) $\alpha_n \leq_* \alpha'_n$ and $\beta_n \leq_* \beta_{n+1}$,
- (2) α_n and β_n are staggered,
- (3) $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha'_n \circ f_n$ for some increasing homeomorphism $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\rho(f_n, id_{[0,1]}) < \frac{1}{2^n}$,
- (4) $\max\{\rho(\alpha'_n, \alpha_{n+1}), \rho(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}), \rho(\beta_n, \beta_{n+1}), \rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n)\} \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_0 = \alpha$, $\beta_0 = \beta$, and $\delta = \rho(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$. Suppose α_n and β_n are given staggered Cantor paths that satisfy $\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n$. Applying Lemma 5.3, find Cantor paths $\alpha'_n, \beta'_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ such that $\alpha_n \leq_* \alpha'_n$, $\beta_n \leq_* \beta'_n$, $\max\{\rho(\alpha_n, \alpha'_n), \rho(\beta_n, \beta'_n)\} \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n)$, and $\rho(\alpha'_n, \beta'_n) \leq \frac{2\delta}{3}$. By Lemma 3.7, there exists an increasing homeomorphism $f_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\rho(f_n, id_{[0,1]}) < \frac{1}{2^n}$, $\rho(\alpha'_n \circ f_n, \alpha'_n) < \frac{1}{12}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n)$, and such that $\alpha'_n \circ f_n$ and β'_n are staggered. Set $\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha'_n \circ f_n$ and $\beta_{n+1} = \beta'_n$. Then α_{n+1} and β_{n+1} are staggered Cantor paths and satisfy the following inequalities:

$$\rho(\alpha'_n, \alpha_{n+1}) < \frac{1}{12}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \frac{\delta}{12} \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{n+1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) &\leq \rho(\alpha_n, \alpha'_n) + \rho(\alpha'_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \\ &< \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) + \frac{1}{12}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \\ &< \frac{3}{4}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\rho(\beta_n, \beta_{n+1}) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \frac{3}{4}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{n+1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\alpha_{n+1}, \beta_{n+1}) &\leq \rho(\alpha_{n+1}, \alpha'_n) + \rho(\alpha'_n, \beta'_n) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{12}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) + \frac{2}{3}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \\ &= \frac{3}{4}\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the inductive construction of the desired sequences. \square

In the next two statements, we assume α, β are fixed staggered Cantor paths as given in the hypothesis of Lemma 5.4.

Proposition 5.5. *The sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ constructed in the proof of Lemma 5.4 both converge uniformly to a single path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$.*

Proof. Recall that $\delta = \rho(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$ is fixed. Since $\rho(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n+1}) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n$ for all $n \geq 0$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is Cauchy in the sup-metric and, therefore, converges uniformly to some path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$. Since the sequence $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfies the same inequality, $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ also converges uniformly to some path. Additionally, since $\rho(\alpha_n, \beta_n) \leq \delta \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^n$ for all $n \geq 0$, $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ must both converge uniformly to γ . \square

Lemma 5.6. *If $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ is the uniform limit of the sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ as given in the conclusion of Proposition 5.5, then $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$ and $\beta \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$.*

Proof. For given paths α and β , Lemma 5.4 gives sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\alpha'_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying a variety of relations and inequalities. Proposition 5.5 ensures $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ converge uniformly to a path γ . The sequences $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{\alpha'_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and the limit path γ satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 4.8. It follows that $\alpha_n \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$ for all $n \geq 0$. In particular, $\alpha = \alpha_0 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$. Similarly, we may apply Lemma 4.8 to the sequence $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in the case where $\beta_n = \beta'_n$ and $f_n = id$ for all $n \geq 0$ (or we could apply Lemma 4.6). Thus, $\beta = \beta_0 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma$. \square

Finally, we complete the proof of our main result.

Proof of Main Theorem. First, we prove a single case in \mathbb{D}^2 . Respectively, let a and b be the injective paths in \mathbb{D}^2 from $(1, 0)$ to $(-1, 0)$ that parameterize the upper and lower semicircles of S^1 respectively. Let $\tau : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the ternary Cantor map and note that $a \circ \tau$ and $b \circ \tau$ are Cantor paths. Set $b_0 = b \circ \tau$. By Lemma 3.7 (taking $\epsilon = 1$), there exists an increasing homeomorphism $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $a_0 = a \circ \tau \circ f$ and b_0 are staggered. Applying Lemma 5.6 to the pair of staggered Cantor paths a_0 and b_0 , we obtain the existence of a path $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^2$ such that $a_0 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} c$ and $b_0 \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} c$. Since $a \approx a_0$ and $b \approx b_0$, Lemma 2.4 (4) gives that $a \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} c$ and $b \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} c$. Since a and b are injective paths, it follows that $c \geq_{\mathbb{R}} a$ and $c \geq_{\mathbb{R}} b$.

In the general case, suppose $\alpha, \beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ are path homotopic. Find a map $f : \mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow X$ such that $f \circ a = \alpha$ and $f \circ b = \beta$. By Lemma 2.4 (1), the path $\gamma = f \circ c$ in X satisfies $\gamma \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha$ and $\gamma \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$. \square

Corollary 5.7. *The equivalence relation on the set of paths in a given topological space generated by $\geq_{\mathbb{R}}$ (and $\simeq_{\mathbb{R}}$) coincides with path-homotopy.*

If X is one-dimensional, then it is known that the \mathbb{R} -tree homotopy relation on the set of paths in X is transitive [4]. Since \mathbb{D}^2 contains simple closed curves (parameterizations of which cannot factor through an \mathbb{R} -tree), our main result implies the following.

Corollary 5.8. *If \mathbb{D}^2 embeds in X , then the \mathbb{R} -tree homotopy relation on the set of paths in X is not transitive.*

6. A SOLUTION TO DYDAK'S PROBLEM

We conclude with a proof of Corollary 1.1. First, we note the following lemma, which is proved using standard techniques from covering space theory.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $p : (E, e_0) \rightarrow (X, x_0)$ be a based map with unique lifting of paths rel. starting point and suppose T is an \mathbb{R} -tree. If $f : (T, t_0) \rightarrow (X, x_0)$ is a based map, then there exists a unique based map $\tilde{f} : (T, t_0) \rightarrow (E, e_0)$ such that $p \circ \tilde{f} = f$.*

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Let $p : E \rightarrow X$ be a map where X is first countable, locally path connected and simply connected and such that every path in X has a unique lift in E rel. starting point. Since X is path connected, p is surjective. Suppose that $p(e_1) = p(e_2) = x$ for $e_1, e_2 \in E$. Let $\tilde{\beta} : [0, 1] \rightarrow E$ be a path from e_1 to e_2 . Then $\beta = p \circ \tilde{\beta}$ is a loop based at x . Let $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ be the constant path at x . Since X is simply connected, $\alpha \simeq \beta$ and thus, by our Main Theorem, there exists a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that $\gamma \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \alpha$ and $\gamma \geq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$. Let $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma} : ([0, 1], 0) \rightarrow (E, e_1)$ be the lifts of α and γ respectively and note that $\tilde{\alpha}$ is constant at e_1 . Since $\alpha \tilde{\gamma}$ factors through an \mathbb{R} -tree, it follows from Lemma 6.1 that $\tilde{\alpha}(1) = \tilde{\gamma}(1)$ in E . Similarly, we have $\tilde{\beta}(1) = \tilde{\gamma}(1)$. Thus $e_1 = \tilde{\gamma}(1) = e_2$, proving that p is injective. Since X is first countable, it suffices to show $p^{-1} : X \rightarrow E$ preserves convergent sequences. If $\{x_n\} \rightarrow x$ is a convergent sequence in X , the hypotheses on X allow us to find a path $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ with $\alpha(1/n) = x_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha(0) = x$. There is one lift $\tilde{\alpha} : [0, 1] \rightarrow E$ for which $p \circ \tilde{\alpha} = \alpha$ and it satisfies $\tilde{\alpha}(1/n) = p^{-1}(x_n)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}(0) = p^{-1}(x)$. Since $\tilde{\alpha}$ is continuous, $\{p^{-1}(x_n)\} \rightarrow p^{-1}(x)$ in E . Thus p^{-1} is continuous. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] V.N. Berestovskii, C.P. Plaut, *Covering \mathbb{R} -trees, \mathbb{R} -free groups, and dendrites*, Advances in Math. **224** (2010), no. 5, 1765-1783.
- [2] M. Bestvina, *\mathbb{R} -trees in topology, geometry and group theory*, Handbook of Geometric Topology, edited by R. Daverman and R. Sher, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2002, 55-91.
- [3] J. Brazas, A. Mitra, *On maps with continuous path lifting*, Fund. Math. **261** (2023), 201-234.
- [4] J.W. Cannon, G.R. Conner, *On the fundamental groups of one-dimensional spaces*, Topology Appl. **153** (2006) 2648-2672.
- [5] M.L. Curtis, M.K. Fort, *The fundamental group of one-dimensional spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **10** (1959) 140-148.
- [6] S. Eilenberg, *Sur les transformations continues d'espaces métriques compacts*, Fund. Math. **22** (1954) 292-296.
- [7] R. Engelking, *General topology*, Heldermann Verlag Berlin, 1989.
- [8] J. Dydak, *Coverings and fundamental groups: a new approach*, Preprint. arXiv:1108.3253v1. 2011.
- [9] J. Mayer, L. Oversteegen, *A topological characterization of \mathbb{R} -trees*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **320** (1990) 395-415.
- [10] S.B. Nadler Jr., *Continuum theory*, M. Dekker, New York, Basel and Hong Kong, 1992.

7. APPENDIX: A PROOF OF LEMMA 4.6

To prove Lemma 4.6, we must first detail the structure of a single \mathcal{U} -extension. For the moment, suppose that $\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ is a given \mathcal{U} -extension of $\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ (where both are Cantor paths). Additionally, we fix


- (1) an $\text{lc}(\alpha)$ -collapsing map k_α and light path α^λ such that $\alpha^\lambda \circ k_\alpha = \alpha$,
- (2) an $\text{lc}(\beta)$ -collapsing map k_β and light path β^λ such that $\beta^\lambda \circ k_\beta = \beta$.

It follows from Remark 4.4 that there is a unique map $k_{\beta,\alpha} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $k_\alpha = k_{\beta,\alpha} \circ k_\beta$. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{k_\beta(J) \mid J \in \mathcal{U}\}$ be the collection of open intervals which are the images of the elements of \mathcal{U} . If $J \in \mathcal{U}$ and $(c, d) = k_\beta(J) \in \mathcal{V}$, then $\beta|_{\overline{J}}$ is a CIP-loop and $(\beta^\lambda)|_{[c,d]}$ is a LIP-loop. Thus we have equivalence $(\beta^\lambda)|_{[c,d]} \equiv b_J \overline{b_J}$ for a light path b_J . In particular, there exists $m \in (c, d)$ and a ‘‘tent map’’ $\tau_J : [c, d] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which (1) is an increasing homeomorphism $[c, m] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ on $[c, m]$, (2) a decreasing homeomorphism $[m, d] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ on $[m, d]$, and (3) satisfies the equality $(\beta^\lambda)|_{[c,d]} = b_J \circ \tau_J$.

Let \sim be the smallest equivalence relation on $[0, 1]$ satisfying the following: identify $s \sim t$ if there exists $J \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $s, t \in [c, d] = k_\beta(\overline{J})$ and $\tau_J(s) = \tau_J(t)$. Let $D(\beta, \alpha) = [0, 1]/\sim$ and $q : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\beta, \alpha)$ denote the quotient ‘‘folding’’ map.

Note that $D(\beta, \alpha)$ is constructed by folding each interval $[c, d] = k_\beta(\overline{J})$, $J \in \mathcal{U}$ ‘‘in half’’ according to the tent map τ_J . Hence, $D(\beta, \alpha)$ is a dendrite consisting of the ‘‘base arc’’ $B = q([0, 1] \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{V})$ and possibly infinitely many attached arcs. In particular, the arc $A_J = q([c, d])$ meets B at the point $q(\{c, d\})$ and has free-endpoint $q(m)$ (where m is defined as above).

The definition of \sim ensures that β^λ is constant on the fibers of q and, therefore, there is a unique map $F : D(\beta, \alpha) \rightarrow X$ such that $F \circ q = \beta^\lambda$. Recall that each fiber of k_β is contained in (and possibly equal to) a fiber of k_α . Moreover if $q(s) = q(t)$ for $s \neq t$, then $k_\beta^{-1}(s)$ and $k_\beta^{-1}(t)$ lie in the same fiber of k_α (the closure of some element of \mathcal{U}). Therefore, k_α is constant on the fibers of $q \circ k_\beta$ and there is a unique map $r : D(\beta, \alpha) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $k_\alpha = r \circ q \circ k_\beta$. In particular, r maps the base-arc B homeomorphically onto $[0, 1]$ and if $(c, d) = k_\beta(\overline{J})$ for $J \in \mathcal{U}$, then r maps the arc A_J to the point $k_{\beta,\alpha}([c, d]) = k_\alpha(\overline{J})$ in $[0, 1]$. It follows that r is a monotone map. Finally, since $r \circ q \circ k_\beta = k_\alpha = k_{\beta,\alpha} \circ k_\beta$ where k_β is surjective, we have $r \circ q = k_{\beta,\alpha}$. Overall, the following diagram on the left commutes. We address the diagram on the right in the next proposition.



Proposition 7.1. *The map $r : D(\beta, \alpha) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a retraction. Moreover, the unique section $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\beta, \alpha)$, which satisfies $r \circ \sigma = id$, parameterizes the base-arc B and satisfies $F \circ \sigma = \alpha^\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $C = [0, 1] \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{U}$ and note that the restrictions $q \circ k_\beta|_C : C \rightarrow B$ and $(k_\alpha)|_C : C \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are quotient maps that make the same identifications, namely they collapse intervals \bar{J} for $J \in \text{lc}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{U}$ and identify endpoints of intervals $J \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus, there exists a unique homeomorphism $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow B$ such that $\sigma \circ (k_\alpha)|_C = q \circ k_\beta|_C$ (see the right diagram above). Since $r \circ \sigma \circ (k_\alpha)|_C = r \circ q \circ k_\beta|_C = (k_\alpha)|_C$ where $(k_\alpha)|_C$ is surjective, we have $r \circ \sigma = id_{[0,1]}$. Overall, we have that r is a retraction whose section σ parameterizes B .

One can use the above diagram to confirm that $F \circ \sigma \circ (k_\alpha)|_C = \beta|_C$. By definition of β being a \mathcal{U} -extension of α , we have $\alpha|_C = \beta|_C$. Thus $F \circ \sigma \circ (k_\alpha)|_C = \alpha|_C = \alpha^\lambda \circ (k_\alpha)|_C$. Since $(k_\alpha)|_C$ is surjective, we have the desired equality $F \circ \sigma = \alpha^\lambda$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *If $\alpha \leq_* \beta$, then $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$ and $\alpha^\lambda \leq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta^\lambda$.*

Proof. Note that $\sigma \circ k_\alpha$ and $q \circ k_\beta$ are paths in the compact \mathbb{R} -tree $D(\beta, \alpha)$ with the same endpoints and which satisfy $F \circ (\sigma \circ k_\alpha) = \alpha$ and $F \circ (q \circ k_\beta) = \beta$. Thus $\alpha \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta$. Moreover, since $F \circ q = \beta^\lambda$ and $F \circ \sigma = \alpha^\lambda$ where σ is injective, we have $\alpha^\lambda \leq_{\mathbb{R}} \beta^\lambda$. \square


Again, we suppose that β is a \mathcal{U} -extension of α (where both are Cantor paths) and we reuse the above notation. However, now we suppose also that there exists a dendrite D , a map $H : D \rightarrow X$, and a surjective path $Q : [0, 1] \rightarrow D$ such that $H \circ Q = \alpha^\lambda$ (surjectivity of Q is not required for the following construction but appears naturally in our recursive application so we assume it). In particular, we use this data and the above construction of $D(\beta, \alpha)$ to uniquely determine a factorization of β^λ .

Let D' be the pushout of $Q : [0, 1] \rightarrow D$ and the section $\sigma : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\beta, \alpha)$. We have the following pushout square. Note that i is injective since σ is injective. Also, j is surjective since Q is surjective. All of the domains being compact ensures that i is an embedding and j is a quotient map. Observe that since $i(D)$ is a dendrite and $D' \setminus i(D) \cong D(\beta, \alpha) \setminus \sigma([0, 1])$ is a disjoint union of half-open arcs, D' is a dendrite.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{Q} & D \\ \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow i \\ D(\beta, \alpha) & \xrightarrow{j} & D' \end{array}$$


Since $H \circ Q = \alpha^\lambda = F \circ \sigma$, there exists a unique map $H' : D' \rightarrow X$ making the left diagram below commute. Set $Q' = j \circ q : [0, 1] \rightarrow D'$. Then $H' \circ Q' = H' \circ j \circ q = F \circ q = \beta^\lambda$. Additionally, since $r \circ \sigma = id_{[0,1]}$ the right diagram below shows that there exists a map $R : D' \rightarrow D$ such that $R \circ i = id_D$ and $R \circ j = Q \circ r$. Thus R is a retraction with section i . Additionally, note that R is monotone, since r is

monotone.



We also have $R \circ Q' = R \circ j \circ q = Q \circ r \circ q = Q \circ k_{\beta, \alpha}$ and $H' \circ i \circ Q = \alpha^\lambda$. Finally, note that the paths $i \circ Q \circ k_\alpha : [0, 1] \rightarrow D'$ and $Q' \circ k_\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow D'$ start and end at the same points and that $H' \circ i \circ Q \circ k_\alpha = \alpha$ and $H' \circ Q' \circ k_\beta = \beta$. This gives a factorization of the loop $\alpha\bar{\beta} : [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ through the dendrite D' . Overall, we conclude the following, which employs the notation in the construction of both $D(\beta, \alpha)$ and D' .

Lemma 7.3. *Let Cantor-path β be a \mathcal{U} -extension of another Cantor-path α and let k_α and k_β be collapsing maps for these paths respectively. Suppose there exists a dendrite D , a map $H : D \rightarrow X$, and a surjective path $Q : [0, 1] \rightarrow D$ such that $H \circ Q = \alpha^\lambda$. Then there exists a dendrite D' (constructed from the pushout square $i \circ Q = j \circ \sigma$), a map $Q' : [0, 1] \rightarrow D'$ defined as $Q' = j \circ q$, a monotone retraction $R : D' \rightarrow D$ with section i , and a map $H' : D' \rightarrow X$ such that the following diagram commutes*



Moreover, $(i \circ Q \circ k_\alpha)(\overline{Q' \circ k_\beta})$ is a well-defined loop in D' satisfying

$$\alpha\bar{\beta} = H' \circ ((i \circ Q \circ k_\alpha)(\overline{Q' \circ k_\beta})).$$

In the proof of Lemma 4.6, we iterate the above construction. To complete this proof, we require the also following elementary lemma.

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Since $\gamma_n \leq_* \gamma_{n+1}$, γ_{n+1} is a \mathcal{U}_n -extension of γ_n for some $\mathcal{U}_n \subseteq \text{lc}(\gamma_n)$. Before we inductively apply the construction from Lemma 7.3, we fix collapsing functions k_{γ_n} for the paths γ_n . We then have uniquely determined maps $k_{\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n} : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $k_{\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n} \circ k_{\gamma_{n+1}} = k_{\gamma_n}$ and light path γ_n^λ . To simplify notation in the inverse systems to come, we write k_n for k_{γ_n} and $K_{n+1, n}$ for $k_{\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n}$. Recall that since $\gamma_n \leq_* \gamma_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have a dendrite $D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n)$, which comes equipped with a corresponding folding

map $q_{n+1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n)$, retraction $r_{n+1,n} : D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n) \rightarrow [0, 1]$, and embedding $\sigma_{n,n+1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n)$ such that $r_{n+1,n} \circ q_{n+1} = k_{n+1,n}$ and $r_{n+1,n} \circ \sigma_{n,n+1} = id_{[0,1]}$.

To begin the recursion, set $D_1 = [0, 1]$, $H_1 = \gamma_1^\lambda$, and $Q_1 = id_{[0,1]}$ so that $H_1 \circ k_1 = \gamma_1$. Suppose that we have given dendrite D_n , map $H_n : D_n \rightarrow X$, and quotient map $Q_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow D_n$ such that $H_n \circ Q_n = \gamma_n^\lambda$. We apply the construction used in the proof of Lemma 7.3 to the case where γ_{n+1} is a \mathcal{U}_n -extension of γ_n . We obtain a dendrite D_{n+1} constructed as the pushout of embedding $\sigma_{n,n+1}$ and Q_n . This pushout construction yields a quotient map $j_{n+1} : D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n) \rightarrow D_{n+1}$, and an embedding $i_{n,n+1} : D_n \rightarrow D_{n+1}$ that satisfy that $j_{n+1} \circ \sigma_{n,n+1} = i_{n,n+1} \circ Q_n$ and $i_{n,n+1} \circ Q_n = j_{n+1} \circ \sigma_{n,n+1}$. We also obtain a map $H_{n+1} : D_{n+1} \rightarrow X$, a quotient map $Q_{n+1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow D_{n+1}$ defined as $Q_{n+1} = j_{n+1} \circ q_{n+1}$, and a retraction $R_{n+1,n} : D_{n+1} \rightarrow D_n$. These maps satisfy $H_{n+1} \circ Q_{n+1} = (\gamma_{n+1})^\lambda$, $R_{n+1,n} \circ Q_{n+1} = Q_n \circ k_{n+1,n}$, and $R_{n+1,n} \circ i_{n,n+1} = id_{D_n}$.

This recursion results in the following infinite diagram where the top three rows form inverse systems. In the n -th column, the vertical composition is γ_n .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
[0, 1] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \xrightarrow{id} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{id} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{id} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{id} & [0, 1] \\
\downarrow k_\infty & & & & \downarrow k_4 & & \downarrow k_3 & & \downarrow k_2 & & \downarrow k_1 \\
[0, 1] & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \xrightarrow{K_{5,4}} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{K_{4,3}} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{K_{3,2}} & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{K_{2,1}} & [0, 1] \\
\downarrow Q_\infty & & & & \downarrow Q_4 & & \downarrow Q_3 & & \downarrow Q_2 & & \downarrow Q_1 = id_{[0,1]} \\
D_\infty & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \xrightarrow{R_{5,4}} & D_4 & \xrightarrow{R_{4,3}} & D_3 & \xrightarrow{R_{3,2}} & D_2 & \xrightarrow{R_{2,1}} & D_1 = [0, 1] \\
& & & & \downarrow H_4 & & \downarrow H_3 & & \downarrow H_2 & & \downarrow H_1 = \gamma_1^\lambda \\
& & \cdots & & X & & X & & X & & X
\end{array}$$

The inverse limit of the top row may be identified with $[0, 1]$ so that the projection maps are also the identity. Since the bonding maps in the second row are non-decreasing continuous surjections, the inverse limit $\varprojlim_n ([0, 1], K_{n+1,n})$ may also be identified with $[0, 1]$ and the bonding maps $K_n : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are also non-decreasing continuous surjections. We let $k_\infty = (\varprojlim_n k_n) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be the inverse limit of the morphisms connecting the first two rows.

In the third row, we have an inverse sequence where the bonding maps $R_{n+1,n}$ are monotone retractions of dendrites. Since any inverse limit of dendrites with monotone bonding maps is a dendrite [10, Theorem 10.36], the inverse limit $D_\infty = \varprojlim_n (D_n, R_{n+1,n})$ is a dendrite and the n -th projection $R_n : D_\infty \rightarrow D_n$ is also a retraction. For $m' \geq m$, let $i_{m,m'} : D_m \rightarrow D_{m'}$ and $R_{m',m} : D_{m'} \rightarrow D_m$ be the respective composition of the sections $i_{n,n+1}$ and retractions $R_{n+1,n}$ (and the identity if $m = m'$). For fixed n , the maps $i_{n,m}$, $m \geq n$ induce a unique map $i_n : D_n \rightarrow D_\infty$ such that $R_m \circ i_n = i_{n,m}$. The case $m = n$ shows $R_n \circ i_n = id_{D_n}$. Finally, let $Q_\infty = \varprojlim_n Q_n$ be the inverse limit of the maps connecting the second

and third rows. Then the following diagram commutes for all $n \geq 1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{id} & [0, 1] \\
 \downarrow k_\infty & & \downarrow k_n \\
 [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{K_n} & [0, 1] \\
 \downarrow Q_\infty & & \downarrow Q_n \\
 D_\infty & \xrightarrow{R_n} & D_n \\
 \downarrow \exists H_\infty & & \downarrow H_n \\
 X & & X
 \end{array}
 \begin{array}{l}
 \nearrow \gamma \\
 \searrow \gamma_n \\
 \nearrow \gamma_n^\lambda
 \end{array}$$

We include γ in the above diagram to indicate that we intend to show that γ is constant on the fibers of $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty$ and therefore induces a unique map $H_\infty : D_\infty \rightarrow X$ such that $H_\infty \circ Q_\infty \circ k_\infty = \gamma$. First, we pause to verify that k_∞ and Q_∞ are surjective. In the top two rows, 0 and 1 are identified in the inverse limit with $(0, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $(1, 1, 1, \dots)$ respectively. Since k_∞ is continuous and maps $k_\infty(0) = (k_n(0)) = (0) = 0$ and $k_\infty(1) = (k_n(1)) = (1) = 1$, the connectedness of $[0, 1]$ ensures that k_∞ is surjective.

To check that Q_∞ is surjective, we first show that $i_n(D_n) \subseteq \text{Im}(Q_\infty)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $d_n \in D_n$, we have that $i_n(d_n) = (d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots)$ so that $d_k = i_{n,k}(d_n)$ for $k > n$, and $d_k = R_{n,k}(d_n)$ for $k < n$. Fix $t_n \in [0, 1]$ with $Q_n(t_n) = d_n$. For $k < n$, recursively define $t_{k-1} = K_{k,k-1}(t_k)$. Since $Q_{k-1} \circ K_{k,k-1} = R_{k,k-1} \circ Q_k$, it follows that $Q_k(t_k) = d_k$ for all $1 \leq k < n$. For $k \geq n$, recursively choose points $t_{k+1} \in q_{k+1}^{-1}(\sigma_{k,k+1}(t_k))$ (see the diagram below to trace these choices).

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{Q_n} & D_n \\
 & & \downarrow \sigma_{n,n+1} & & \downarrow i_{n,n+1} \\
 & & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{q_{n+1}} & D(\gamma_{n+1}, \gamma_n) \xrightarrow{j_{n+1}} & D_{n+1} \\
 & & \downarrow \sigma_{n+1,n+2} & \searrow Q_{n+1} & \downarrow i_{n+1,n+2} \\
 & & [0, 1] & \xrightarrow{q_{n+2}} & D(\gamma_{n+2}, \gamma_{n+1}) \xrightarrow{j_{n+2}} & D_{n+2} \\
 & & \downarrow \sigma_{n+2,n+3} & \searrow Q_{n+2} & \downarrow i_{n+2,n+3} \\
 \dots & & \dots & & \dots & \dots
 \end{array}$$

From this choice, we have for every $k \geq n$ that

$$Q_{k+1}(t_{k+1}) = j_{k+1} \circ q_{k+1}(t_{k+1}) = j_{k+1}(\sigma_{k,k+1}(t_k)) = i_{k,k+1} \circ Q_k(t_k)$$

and so, by induction, we have $Q_k(t_k) = d_k$ for all $k \geq n$. It follows that $Q_\infty(t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots) = i_n(d_n)$, proving that $i_n(D_n) \subseteq \text{Im}(Q_\infty)$. Now, consider an arbitrary element $x = (d_1, d_2, d_3, \dots) \in D_\infty$. We have $x_n = (d_1, \dots, d_{n-1}, d_n, i_{n,n+1}(d_n), i_{n,n+2}(d_n), \dots) \in i_n(D_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since D_∞ is topologized as a subspace of $\prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} D_n$, we have $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow x$ in D_∞ . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, find $t_n \in [0, 1]$ such that $Q_\infty(t_n) = x_n$. Since $[0, 1]$ is compact, we may find a subsequence $\{t_{n_m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\{t_{n_m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow t$

for some $t \in [0, 1]$. Since $\{Q_\infty(t_{n_m})\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} = \{x_{n_m}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow x$ and $\{Q_\infty(t_{n_m})\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow Q_\infty(t)$, it follows that $Q_\infty(t) = x$. Thus Q_∞ is surjective.

Knowing that $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty$ is surjective, we now check that γ is constant on each fiber of $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty$. Suppose $a, b \in [0, 1]$ such that $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty(a) = Q_\infty \circ k_\infty(b)$. Then $Q_n \circ k_n(a) = Q_n \circ k_n(b)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Applying H_n gives

$$\gamma_n(a) = H_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n(a) = H_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n(b) = \gamma_n(b)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\{\gamma_n\} \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly, we have $\{\gamma_n(a)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma(a)$ and $\{\gamma_n(b)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \gamma(b)$ but since these sequences in X are equal, it follows that $\gamma(a) = \gamma(b)$. This completes the check and so we conclude that the desired map H_∞ exists.

With the existence of H_∞ confirmed, we fix $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and check that the equality $H_m = H_\infty \circ i_m$ holds. Since $\{H_n \circ R_n \circ Q_\infty \circ k_\infty\} = \{\gamma_n\} \rightarrow \gamma = H_\infty \circ Q_\infty \circ k_\infty$ uniformly where $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty$, we have that $\{H_n \circ R_n\} \rightarrow H_\infty$ uniformly. Recalling that m is fixed, we have $\{H_n \circ R_n \circ i_m\}_{n > m} \rightarrow H_\infty \circ i_m$ uniformly. However, $\{H_n \circ R_n \circ i_m\}_{n > m} = \{H_n \circ i_{m,n}\}_{n > m} = \{H_m\}_{n > m}$ is the constant sequence at H_m . Thus $H_m = H_\infty \circ i_m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

For $t \in \{0, 1\}$, set $x_{n,t} = Q_n \circ k_{\gamma_n}(t)$. Since $R_{n+1,n}(x_{n+1,t}) = x_{n,t}$, we have $Q_\infty \circ K_\infty(t) = (x_{n,t})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. However, recall that our inductive construction ensures that $i_{n,m}(x_{n,t}) = x_{m,t}$ whenever $m > n$. Thus in the limit, we also have $i_m(x_{m,t}) = (x_{n,t})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. We conclude that $Q_\infty \circ k_\infty(t) = i_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n(t)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \{0, 1\}$. Therefore, if we set $g_{n,1} = Q_\infty \circ K_\infty$ and $g_{n,2} = i_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n$, the concatenation $g_{n,1} \overline{g_{n,2}}$ is a well-defined loop in D_∞ . Moreover, $H_\infty \circ g_{n,1} = H_\infty \circ Q_\infty \circ K_\infty = \gamma$ and $H_\infty \circ g_{n,2} = H_\infty \circ i_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n = H_n \circ Q_n \circ k_n = \gamma_n$. Thus $H_\infty \circ (g_{n,1} \overline{g_{n,2}}) = \gamma \overline{\gamma_n}$, proving $\gamma \simeq_{\mathbb{R}} \gamma_n$. \square