

On spherical Deligne complexes of type D_n

Jingyin Huang

June 13, 2024

Abstract

Let Δ be the Artin complex of the Artin group of type D_n . This complex is also called the spherical Deligne complex of type D_n . We show certain types of 6-cycles in the 1-skeleton of Δ either have a center, which is a vertex adjacent to each vertex of the 6-cycle, or a quasi-center, which is a vertex adjacent to three of the alternating vertices of the 6-cycle. This will be a key ingredient in proving $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture for several classes of Artin groups in a companion article.

As a consequence, we also deduce that certain 2-dimensional relative Artin complex inside the D_n -type Artin complex, endowed with the induced Moussong metric, is CAT(1).

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation

The *Artin group* (or Artin-Tits group) with generating set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$, denoted by A_S , is a group with the following presentation:

$$A_S = \langle s_1, \dots, s_n \mid \underbrace{s_i s_j s_i \cdots}_{m_{ij}} = \underbrace{s_j s_i s_j \cdots}_{m_{ij}} \rangle$$

where $i \neq j$ and m_{ij} is either an integer ≥ 2 or ∞ . When $m_{ij} = \infty$, it means there is no relation between s_i and s_j . The associated *Coxeter group*, denoted by W_S , is the quotient of A_S with extra relation $s_i^2 = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. An Artin group is *spherical* if the associated Coxeter group is finite. For example, the braid group on n -strand is a spherical Artin group, with the associated Coxeter group being the symmetry group on n letters.

Classical examples of Coxeter groups come from taking a geodesic triangle in $\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{E}^2$ or \mathbb{H}^2 with its angles being π divided by an integer ≥ 2 , and considering the group generated by reflections along the three sides of the triangle. Geometrically, this leads to a tiling of $\mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{E}^2$ or \mathbb{H}^2 by geodesic triangles. The underlying simplicial complex of this tiling is called the *Coxeter complex*, which encodes fundamental combinatorial and geometric properties of Coxeter groups and can be defined for all Coxeter groups (even outside the classical cases) in a purely group theoretical way as follows. Given $s \in S$, let $W_{\hat{s}}$ be the subgroup of W generated by $S \setminus \{s\}$. Then vertices of the Coxeter complex are in 1-1 correspondence with left cosets of form $\{gW_{\hat{s}}\}_{g \in W_S, s \in S}$, and a collection of vertices span a simplex if the corresponding collection of left cosets has a non-empty common intersection.

For an Artin group A_S , there is an analogues complex, called the *Artin complex* and was defined in [CD95a], whose vertices correspond to left cosets $\{gA_{\hat{s}}\}_{g \in A_S, s \in S}$, and simplices are defined in the same way as before. We say an Artin complex is *spherical* if the associated Artin group is spherical. In a Coxeter complex, each codimensional one face is contained in exactly two top-dimensional simplices (corresponding to the generators having order two); however, in an Artin complex, each codimensional one face is contained in finitely many top-dimensional simplices (corresponding to the generators having order ∞). In general, the geometry of Artin complexes is much more intricate.

While Artin groups and Coxeter groups have similar presentations, our knowledge of Artin groups is much more sparse compared to the Coxeter groups side. Actually, very basic questions on Artin groups remain widely open [GP12a].

Artin groups arise as fundamental groups of certain complex hyperplane arrangement complements, and a central conjecture in the study of Artin groups, due to Arnol'd, Brieskorn, Pham and Thom, predicts that these arrangement complements are $K(\pi, 1)$ -spaces for Artin groups. We refer to the survey article for more details [Par14a]. The $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture is also widely open. Deligne settled this conjecture for spherical Artin groups [Del72], where spherical Artin complexes play a key role in his work, so these complexes are also called the *spherical Deligne complexes* by other authors.

Charney and Davis [CD95b] proved that if we know the Artin complexes associated with *spherical* Artin groups are CAT(1) with respect to a naturally defined metric, then the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture holds true for *all* Artin groups. Thus, it is of great interest to understand the geometry of spherical Artin complexes. However, there are no good methods of showing CAT(1) in higher dimensional complexes. To circumvent this difficulty, we exploit different notions of curvature in simplicial complexes and proposed a strategy in [Hua23] of reducing the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture for Artin groups to understanding short cycles in the 1-skeleton of spherical Artin complexes. In particular, to treat fairly general families of Artin groups, we need to understand how cycles of length ≤ 6 in spherical Artin complexes can be filled in the 2-skeleton.

In a previous article [Hua23], we were able to understand the minimal filling of all 4-cycles in spherical Artin complexes; they follow a very simple pattern:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose A_S is an irreducible spherical Artin group. Then any embedded 4-cycles in the associated Artin complex can be filled in one of the following two ways in Figure 1, one with two 2-simplices, and another with four 2-simplices.*




Figure 1: Filling 4-cycles.

However, the method in [Hua23] completely breaks down for filling longer cycles. The goal of this article is to develop new methods to fill 6-cycles in Artin complexes associated with the type D_n Artin groups, which will be used as important ingredients in a companion article [Hua24] to settle new cases of $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjectures. This companion article also contains results on filling 6-cycles in other types of spherical Artin complexes. However, we separate the case D_n here as the method used in this case is of a different flavor compared to other cases.




Figure 2: Dynkin diagram of type D_n .

1.2 Main results

Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of the Artin group of type D_n ; see Figure 2, with the generating set $S = \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$. Recall that Λ encodes the presentation of A_S in the following way: vertices

of Λ are in one to one correspondence with generators of A_S ; δ_i and δ_j are adjacent in Λ if there is a relation of the form $\delta_i\delta_j\delta_i = \delta_j\delta_i\delta_j$; and δ_i and δ_j are not adjacent if δ_i and δ_j commute. Let Δ_Λ be the Artin complex of type D_n , i.e. the Artin complex associated with the D_n -type Artin group. We assume $n \geq 3$. Then Δ_Λ is simply-connected, hence each 6-cycle in the 1-skeleton can be filled by a union of triangles in the 2-skeleton, though a priori the filling could be quite complicated. Our goal is to prove that, similar to Theorem 1.1, for certain types of 6-cycles in Δ_Λ , it is possible to construct fillings of them with a very simple combinatorial pattern.

A vertex of Δ_Λ is of type $\hat{\delta}_i$ if it corresponds to a left coset of form $gA_{\hat{\delta}_i}$. Due to the limited symmetry of the Dynkin diagram of type D_n , the types of vertices in a 6-cycle encode subtle geometric information about this 6-cycle, and the combinatorial structure of minimal filling of 6-cycles is very sensitive to the types of its vertices.

It is natural to focus our attention on 6-cycles in Δ_Λ that are embedded and *induced*, i.e., if two vertices of the 6-cycle are not adjacent in the 6-cycle, then they are not adjacent in Δ_Λ ; otherwise we are reduced to Theorem 1.1. A *center* of an n -cycle in Δ_Λ is a vertex that is adjacent to each vertex of this cycle. Theorem 1.1 can be reformulated as each embedded and induced 4-cycle in Δ_Λ has a center. It is natural to ask whether the same holds for 6-cycles. While the answer is no in general, we identify the following classes of 6-cycles that do have a center.

Theorem 1.2. (=Theorem 3.4) *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n with vertex set as in Figure 3. Then any 6-cycle ω in the Artin complex Δ_Λ with its vertices alternating between types $\hat{\delta}_1$ and $\hat{\delta}_3$ has a center of type $\hat{\delta}_2$.*

A conjecture of Charney and Davis asserts that the D_n -type Δ_Λ endowed with the Moussong metric is CAT(1) [CD95b, Cha04]. Theorem 1.2 has the following consequence, providing positive evidence towards this conjecture by showing a non-trivial cobounded subcomplex is CAT(1).

Corollary 1.3. (=Corollary 3.5) *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n . Let $\Delta' \subset \Delta_\Lambda$ be the full subcomplex of Δ_Λ spanned by vertices whose types are in $\{\hat{\delta}_1, \hat{\delta}_2, \hat{\delta}_3\}$. Then Δ' with the induced Moussong metric is CAT(1).*

The $n = 3$ case of this corollary is the main theorem of Charney [Cha04].

An unexpected ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.2 is a result by Lyndon and Schützenberger [LS62] in the 1960s on solving certain types of equations on free groups.

Now we handle more general 6-cycles. A vertex y is a *quasi-center* for a 6-cycle with consecutive vertices $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}}$ in Δ_Λ , if there exists $i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ such that y is adjacent to each of $\{x_i, x_{i+2}, x_{i+4}\}$. A quasi-center of a 6-cycle breaks up the 6-cycle into three 4-cycles. In view of Theorem 1.1, we are done with producing a filling if we are able to find a quasi-center, and such filling is often optimal in an appropriate sense.

In general, there are 6-cycles in Δ_Λ that do not have a quasi-center. However, for studying the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture, we only need to deal with a particular kind of 6-cycles, called zigzag 6-cycles. We postpone the somewhat technical definition of zigzag 6-cycles to Definition 7.1, and simply mention that conjecturally all the zigzag 6-cycles have a quasi-center (this is a reformulation of a conjecture of Haettel, see Section 7), and this enables us to produce fillings that are efficient enough for application to the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture. Cycles in Theorem 1.2 are the simplest type of zigzag 6-cycles. We are able to handle more complicated zigzag 6-cycles when $n = 4$.

Theorem 1.4. (=Theorem 4.1) *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_4 with a chosen leaf vertex c . Given a 6-cycle ω in the Artin complex Δ_Λ with its vertices alternating between having type \hat{c} and not having type \hat{c} . Then there exists a quasi-center of ω that is adjacent to each of the type \hat{c} vertices of ω .*

Corollary 1.5. (=Corollary 7.3) *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n with $n = 3, 4$. Then any zigzag 6-cycle ω in Δ_Λ has a quasi-center that is adjacent to each of the local max vertices of ω .*

Corollary 1.5 will be used as a key ingredient in [Hua24] to answer a question of J. McCammond on the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture of Artin groups with a complete bipartite Dynkin diagram. Theorem 1.2 will be used as a key ingredient in [Hua24] to settle the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture for some hyperbolic type Artin groups.

1.3 Discussion of proofs

Let Λ be as in Figure 2. Let $\Delta_\Lambda = \Delta_S$ be the type D_n Artin complex. Given a 6-cycle ω in Δ_Λ with consecutive vertices $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}}$ such that x_i has type $\hat{\delta}_{f(i)}$ where $f : \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$, the information of this 6-cycle corresponds to the following equation:

$$w_1 w_2 \cdots w_6 = 1, \tag{1.6}$$

where $w_i \in A_i$ and A_i is the subgroup generated by $S \setminus \{\delta_{f(i)}\}$. Producing a minimal filling of this 6-cycle corresponds to describing the solution sets of this equation in a particular way.

To prove both Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.4, we first try to establish a coarser “a priori estimation” to bound the complexity of each term of (1.6), or bound the complexity of other combinatorial information of (1.6). Then we carry out a fine combinatorial analysis to obtain the desired statement.

The idea to establish a priori estimation is to use projections/retractions in A_S and Δ_S . Think of (1.6) as a loop in the Cayley graph of A_S , such that each term of the equation corresponds to a subpath of the loop that is contained in a left A_i -coset. Suppose the first term w_1 corresponds to the identity coset A_1 in A_S , and there is a (not necessarily group theoretic) retraction $r : A_S \rightarrow A_1$ such that the r -images of other cosets are “small enough” in A_1 and can be computed very explicitly, then we will gain control of the term w_1 . There are several kinds of retraction $r : A_S \rightarrow A_1$ defined in the literature, either using non-positive curvature, or Garside structure, or some other group theoretic structure [BM00, Alt98, GP12b, CP14, BP23]. One advantage of the retraction in [GP12b, CP14, BP23, God23] is that it is easier to carry out a very explicit computation of the retraction image. However, the retraction image of other cosets in A_{ab} is not always small enough, so sometimes such retraction does not give useful information.

In the case of Theorem 1.2, it turns out that either the above retraction is enough to give enough information to solve the equation (1.6) (see Proposition 3.1), or we carry out a finer analysis as follows. Recall that the type D_n Artin group can be written as a semi-direct product of a braid group and a free group; see, e.g., [All02, CPC05]. So solving an equation like (1.6) can be converted to finding an explicit set of solutions for certain equations in free groups. We showed that in the case that the retraction method does not work, one can convert (1.6) into an equation of form $x^M = y^N z^P$ in a finitely generated free group for $M, N, P \geq 2$, whose solution must be the obvious one by work of Lyndon and Schützenberger [LS62]; or (1.6) reduces to a somewhat degenerate equation with only four terms, and the method in our previous work [Hua23] applies.

We have difficulty proving Theorem 1.4 using similar methods, due to the fact that converted version of (1.6) involves term in both the free group and its automorphism group, which is much harder to solve. Alternatively, besides the interpretation of type D_n -Artin groups as subgroups of $\text{Aut}(F_n)$ [BB07] as in the previous paragraph, they can also be interpreted as orbifold braid groups [All02] and subgroups of mapping class groups of surfaces [PV96, CPC05, Sor20]. We use the last interpretation: in the special case $n = 4$ it was shown by Soroko [Sor20] that A_S is isomorphic to the pure mapping class groups of a surface \mathcal{S} which is the torus with two punctures and one boundary component. Using this, we can realize certain types of 6-cycles in the Artin complex Δ_S as 6-cycles in the arc complex of \mathcal{S} . We caution the reader that the desired property we want for 6-cycles in Δ_S , is not true for general 6-cycles in arc complexes, as well as curve complexes (it actually fails terribly for arc complexes [Web20]). This does not mean the property we want to prove is not true, as we only need to deal with specific types of 6-cycles in the arc complex.

Given a vertex $x \in \Delta_S$, as a starting point, we can invoke either the subsurface projection [MM00] or the Hatcher flow [Hat91] to define a map from a suitable subcomplex Δ_S to the link of x in Δ_S . This gives us some control over each term in (1.6). The control is much weaker than what we want, which is not surprising because of the discussion in the previous paragraph. Though this gives a somewhat useful a priori estimation.

The majority of the proof is to strengthen this control to the form we want, by using the finer combinatorial properties of these arcs to show that if some of these 6-arcs have complicated intersections, then it will force other arcs to have relatively few intersections.

1.4 Speculation for filling more general n -cycles in Δ_S

We end the introduction by formulating a conjecture on what should be the structure of minimal filling of more general n -cycles in more general spherical Artin complexes (regardless of whether we need these cycles in the proof of the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture or not), based on the evidence we have from the previous results, from [AS83, Cha04, Hae21, Hua23, Hua24] and from an unpublished work of Crisp and McCammond on lattices of cut curves (which is explained in [Hae21]). Let A_S be an irreducible spherical Artin group. Let Δ_S be the associated Artin complex. The *type sequence* of an n -cycle in Δ_S , is defined to be the sequence of types of consecutive vertices in this n -cycle. It is natural to ask, given an n -cycle ω in Δ_S , before we prove anything, how would we even guess what could be the possible combinatorial structure of a minimal filling disk for ω in the 2-skeleton of Δ_S . To this end, we propose the following principle/conjecture.

Let C_S be the associated Coxeter complex, with the natural action of W_S . A *wall* of C_S is the fix point set of a reflection of W_S . Topologically, C_S is homeomorphic to a sphere, and a wall is homeomorphic to a codimension 1 sphere. So the complement of each wall has two connected components, called the *open halfspaces* associated with this wall. An n -cycle ω is *admissible* if all the n -cycles in C_S with the same type sequence as ω are contained in some open halfspaces. For example, any 4-cycle in Δ_S is admissible, and any zigzag 6-cycle in a type D_n Artin complex is admissible.

Conjecture 1.7. *For any admissible n -cycle ω of Δ_S , there is a companion n -cycle ω' in C_S with the same type sequence as ω such that the minimal disk filling ω in the 2-skeleton of Δ_S is no more complicated than the minimal disk filling ω' in the 2-skeleton of C_S .*

1.5 Structure of the article

In Section 2 we collect some preliminaries. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3. In Section 4, Section 5 and Section 6, we prove Theorem 3.4. In Section 7, we deduce Corollary 1.5 and discuss some ending remarks.

1.6 Acknowledgment

We thank Mladen Bestvina, Nathan Broaddus, Piotr Przytycki, and Nick Salter for teaching the author many things about arcs and curves on surfaces and for helpful and inspiring conversations. We thank Ruth Charney and Mike Davis for their helpful conversation on Artin groups and spherical Deligne complexes. We thank Thomas Haettel for explaining to the author his conjecture (Conjecture 7.5), which has been a source of inspiration. This article takes considerable influence from Charney's article [Cha04], which we acknowledge with pleasure.

The author is partially supported by a Sloan fellowship and NSF DMS-2305411. The author thanks the Centre de Recherches Mathématiques in Montreal for the hospitality where part of the work was done.

Contents

1 Introduction

1

2	Preliminary	6
3	Six-cycles of type $(\hat{\delta}_1, \hat{\delta}_2)$	10
4	A remark on 5-cycles and 6-cycles in the D_4 Artin complex	16
5	Six-cycles of type I in the D_4 complex	17
6	Six-cycles of type II in the D_4 complex	36
7	Ending remarks	46

2 Preliminary

2.1 Artin groups and Coxeter groups

We use A_S to denote the Artin group with generating set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$. Recall that the associated Dynkin diagram Λ of A_S is a simplicial graph with edge labeling such that its vertex set is S , moreover,

1. s_i and s_j are joined by an edge labeled by m_{ij} , if $\underbrace{s_i s_j s_i \cdots}_{m_{ij}} = \underbrace{s_j s_i s_j \cdots}_{m_{ij}}$ and $4 \leq m_{ij} < \infty$;
2. s_i and s_j are joined by an edge without any label if $s_i s_j s_i = s_j s_i s_j$;
3. s_i and s_j are joined by an edge labeled by ∞ if there are no relations between s_i and s_j in the standard presentation.

It follows from the definition of Dynkin diagram that if two vertices in the diagram are not adjacent, then the associated generators commute.

We will also use A_Λ to denote A_S . For $S' \subset S$, we use $A_{S'}$ to denote the subgroup of A_S generated by S' . Then $A_{S'}$ is also an Artin group [vdL83]. We use W_S to denote the Coxeter group associated with A_S . For $S' \subset S$, we define $W_{S'}$ in a similar way.

2.2 Davis complexes

By a cell, we always mean a closed cell unless otherwise specified.

Definition 2.1 (Davis complex). Given a Coxeter group W_S , let \mathcal{P} be the poset of left cosets of spherical standard parabolic subgroups in W_S (with respect to inclusion) and let $b\Sigma_S$ be the geometric realization of this poset (i.e. $b\Sigma_S$ is a simplicial complex whose simplices correspond to chains in \mathcal{P}). Now we modify the cell structure on $b\Sigma_S$ to define a new complex Σ_S , called the *Davis complex*. The cells in Σ_S are induced subcomplexes of $b\Sigma_S$ spanned by a given vertex v and all other vertices which are $\leq v$ (note that vertices of $b\Sigma_S$ correspond to elements in \mathcal{P} , hence inherit the partial order).

Suppose W_S is finite with n generators. Then there is a canonical faithful orthogonal action of W_S on the Euclidean space \mathbb{E}^n . Take a point in \mathbb{E}^n with trivial stabilizer, then the convex hull of the orbit of this point under the W_S action (with its natural cell structure) is isomorphic to Σ_S . In such case, we call Σ_S a *Coxeter cell*. In general Davis complex is a union of Coxeter cells.

The 1-skeleton of Σ_S is the unoriented Cayley graph of W_S (i.e. we start with the usual Cayley graph and identify the double edges arising from s_i^2 as single edges), and Σ_S can be constructed from the unoriented Cayley graph by filling Coxeter cells in a natural way. Each edge of Σ_S is labeled by a generator of W_S . We endow $\Sigma_S^{(1)}$ with the path metric with edge length 1.

A *reflection* of W_S is a conjugate of one of its generators. There is a natural action of W_S on $b\Sigma_\Gamma$ by simplicial automorphisms. The fix point set H of a reflection r is a subcomplex of $b\Sigma_\Gamma$ (also viewed as a subset of Σ_Γ), which is called a *wall*. Then $\Sigma_\Gamma \setminus H$ has exactly two connected components, exchanged by the action of r . Two vertices of Σ_Γ are *separated* by a wall H if they are in different connected components of $\Sigma_\Gamma \setminus H$. The distance between any two vertices with respect to the path metric on $\Sigma_S^{(1)}$ is the number of walls separating these two vertices. A wall is *dual* to an edge if the wall and the edge have nonempty intersection. Two edges are *parallel* if they are dual to the same wall.

If $S' \subset S$ is an induced subgraph, then $W_{S'} \rightarrow W_S$ induces an embedding $\Sigma_{S'} \rightarrow \Sigma_S$. The image of this embedding and their left translations are called *standard subcomplexes* of type S' . There is a one to one correspondence between standard subcomplexes of type S' in Σ_S and left cosets of $W_{S'}$ in W_S .

Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4 below are standard, see e.g. [Bou02] or [Dav12], also [DS87]. We will use d to denote the path metric on the 1-skeleton of Σ_Γ , with each edge having length 1. Lemma 2.2 describes nearest point projection into the vertex set of a standard subcomplex.

Lemma 2.2. *Let F be a standard subcomplex of Σ_Γ and let $x \in \Sigma_S$ be a vertex. Then there exists a unique vertex $x_F \in F$ such that $d(x, x_F) \leq d(x, y)$ for any vertex $y \in F$, where d denotes the path metric on the 1-skeleton of Σ_S . The vertex x_F is called the projection of x to F , and is denoted $\text{Proj}_F(x)$. Moreover, let $\text{Vert } F$ be the vertex set of a face F of Σ_S . Let E be another face of Σ_S . Then $\text{Proj}_E(\text{Vert } F) = \text{Vert } E'$ for some face $E' \subset E$. In this case we write $E' = \text{Proj}_E(F)$.*

Definition 2.3. Let F be a fact of Σ_S . Lemma 2.2 gives a map $\pi : \text{Vert } \Sigma_S \rightarrow \text{Vert } F$ which extends to a retraction $\Pi_F : \Sigma_S \rightarrow F$ as follows. Note that for each face E of Σ_S , $\pi(\text{Vert } E)$ is the vertex set of a face $E' \subset F$. Then we extend π to a map π' from the vertex set of $b\Sigma_S$ to the vertex set of bF , by sending the barycenter of E to the barycenter of E' . As π' map vertices in a simplex to vertices in a simplex, it extends linearly to a map $\Pi_F : b\Sigma_S \cong \Sigma_S \rightarrow bF \cong F$.

Now we consider the properties of nearest point sets between two faces.

Lemma 2.4. *Let E and F be faces of Σ_S . Define*

$$X = \{x \in \text{Vert } E \mid d(x, \text{Vert } F) = d(\text{Vert } E, \text{Vert } F)\}$$

and

$$Y = \{y \in \text{Vert } F \mid d(y, \text{Vert } E) = d(\text{Vert } E, \text{Vert } F)\}.$$

Then

1. there are faces $E' \subset E$ and $F' \subset F$ such that $X = \text{Vert } E'$ and $Y = \text{Vert } F'$;
2. $\text{Proj}_E(\text{Vert } F) = X$ and $\text{Proj}_F(\text{Vert } E) = Y$;
3. $\text{Proj}_E|_{\text{Vert } F'}$ and $\text{Proj}_F|_{\text{Vert } E'}$ gives a bijection and its inverse between E' and F' ;
4. if $\mathcal{W}(E')$ is the collection of walls dual to an edge in E' , then $\mathcal{W}(E') = \mathcal{W}(F') = \mathcal{W}(E) \cap \mathcal{W}(F)$;
5. if $\mathcal{W}(E) = \mathcal{W}(F)$, then $E = E'$ and $F = F'$.

In the situation of this lemma we will write $E' = \text{Proj}_E(F)$.

In the situation of Lemma 2.4 (5), we will say E and F are *parallel*. In this case, the bijection between $\text{Vert } E$ and $\text{Vert } F$ given by $\text{Proj}_E|_{\text{Vert } F}$ and $\text{Proj}_F|_{\text{Vert } E}$ are called *parallel translation* between E and F .

Definition 2.5. Parallel faces F and F' of Σ_S are *adjacent* if $F \neq F'$ and if they are contained in a face F_0 with $\dim(F_0) = \dim(F) + 1$.

Definition 2.6. Let \mathcal{Q}_S be the collection of all possible intersection of walls in Σ_S . Given an element $B \in \mathcal{Q}_S$, we say a face F of Σ_S is *dual* to B if $F \cap B$ is the barycenter of F . Note that two faces dual to the same element in \mathcal{Q}_S are parallel.

Let $B \in \mathcal{Q}_S$. Let F and F' be two adjacent parallel faces of Σ_S that are dual to B . An *elementary B -segment*, or an (F, F') -*elementary B -segment* is a minimal positive path from a vertex $x \in F$ to $x' = p(x) \in F'$, where $p : F \rightarrow F'$ is parallel translation.

2.3 Oriented Davis complexes and Salvetti complexes

Let \mathcal{P} be the poset of faces of Σ_S (under containment), and let V be the vertex set of Σ_S . We now define the *oriented Davis complex* $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ as follows. Consider the set of pairs $(F, v) \in \mathcal{P} \times V$. Define an equivalence relation \sim on this set by

$$(F, v) \sim (F, v') \iff F = F' \text{ and } \text{Proj}_F(v') = \text{Proj}_F(v).$$

Denote the equivalence class of (F, v') by $[F, v']$. Note that each equivalence class $[F, v']$ contains a unique representative of the form (F, v) , with $v \in \text{Vert } F$. The *oriented Davis complex* $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is defined as the regular CW complex given by taking $\Sigma_S \times V$ (i.e., a disjoint union of copies of Σ_S) and then identifying faces $F \times v$ and $F \times v'$ whenever $[F, v] = [F, v']$, i.e.,

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_S = (\Sigma_S \times V) / \sim . \tag{2.7}$$

For example, for each edge F of Σ_S with endpoints v_0 and v_1 , we get two 1-cells $[F, v_0]$ and $[F, v_1]$ of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ glued together along their endpoints $[v_0, v_0]$ and $[v_1, v_1]$. So, the 0-skeleton of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is equal to the 0-skeleton of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ while its 1-skeleton is formed from the 1-skeleton of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ by doubling each edge. There is a natural map $\pi : \widehat{\Sigma}_S \rightarrow \Sigma_S$ defined by ignoring the second coordinate.

The definition of oriented Davis complex traced back to work of Salvetti [Sal87], so it is also called Salvetti complex by many other authors. The naming ‘‘oriented Davis complex’’ comes from an article of J. McCammond [McC17], clarifying the relation between Salvetti’s work and Davis complex, which suits better for our latter discussion. We will reserve the term ‘‘Salvetti complex’’ for a quotient of the oriented Davis complex.

Each edge of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ has a natural orientation, namely, if $F = \{v_0, v_1\}$ is an edge of Σ_S , then $[F, v_0]$ is oriented so that $[v_0, v_0]$ is its initial vertex and $[v_1, v_1]$ is its terminal vertex. An edge path in the $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is *positive* if each of its edges is positively oriented.

Definition 2.8. As the 1-skeleton of Σ_S can be identified with the unoriented Cayley graph of W_S , each edge of Σ_S is labeled by an element in the generating set S . We pull back the edge labeling from Σ_S to $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ via the map $\pi : \widehat{\Sigma}_S \rightarrow \Sigma_S$. For a subset E in Σ_S or $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$, we define $\text{Supp}(E)$ to be the collection of labels of edges in E . Let u be an edge path in $\Sigma^{(1)}$ or a positive path in $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$. Then reading off labels of edges of u gives a word in the free monoid generated by S , which we denote by $\text{wd}(u)$. If u is an arbitrary edge path in $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$, then when an edge travels opposite to its orientation, we read off the inverse of the associated label. Then $\text{wd}(u)$ gives a word in the free group on S .

For each subcomplex Y of Σ_S , we write $\widehat{Y} = p^{-1}(Y)$ and call \widehat{Y} the subcomplex of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ associated with Y . A *standard subcomplex* of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is a subcomplex of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ associated with a standard subcomplex of Σ_S . In other words, if $F \subset \Sigma_S$ is a standard subcomplex, then \widehat{F} is the union of faces of form $E \times v$ in $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ with $E \subset F$ and v ranging over vertices in Σ_S .

Lemma 2.9. *Let E be a face of Σ_S and let F be a standard subcomplex of Σ_S . If $[E, v_1] = [E, v_2]$, then $[\text{Proj}_F(E), v_1] = [\text{Proj}_F(E), v_2]$.*

Proof. Note that $[E, v_1] = [E, v_2]$ if and only if for each wall H with $H \cap E \neq \emptyset$, v_1 and v_2 are in the same side of H . Thus for each wall H dual to $\text{Proj}_F(E)$, v_1 and v_2 are in the same side of H . Now the lemma follows. \square

We will be make use of the following important construction of Godelle and Pairs in [GP12b].

Definition 2.10. Let F be a face in Σ_S . Then there is a retraction map $\Pi_{\widehat{F}} : \widehat{\Sigma}_S \rightarrow \widehat{F}$ defined as follows. Recall that $\widehat{\Sigma}_S = (\Sigma_S \times V) / \sim$. For each $v \in V$, let $(\Sigma_S)_v$ be the union of all faces in $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ of form $E \times v$ with E ranging over faces of Σ_S . By Definition 2.3, there is a retraction $(\Pi_F)_v : (\Sigma_S)_v \rightarrow F \times v$ for each $v \in V$. It follows from Lemma 2.9 that these maps $\{(\Pi_F)_v\}_{v \in V}$ are compatible in the intersection of their domains. Thus they fit together to define a retraction $\Pi_{\widehat{F}} : \widehat{\Sigma}_S \rightarrow \widehat{F}$.

The following is a direct consequence of the definition.

Lemma 2.11. *Take standard subcomplexes $E, F \subset \Sigma_S$. Then $\Pi_{\widehat{F}}(\widehat{E}) = \widehat{\Pi_F(E)}$.*

The action of W_S on Σ_S gives a free action of W_S on Σ_S , whose quotient complex is denoted by Sal_S . The fundamental group of Sal_S is A_S and its 2-skeleton is the presentation complex of A_S , see e.g. [Par14b]. The fundamental group of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is the *pure Artin subgroup* of A_S , i.e. the kernel of $A_S \rightarrow W_S$, as $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is a regular cover of Sal_S corresponding such a subgroup.

2.4 Artin complexes and Coxeter complexes

Let A_S be an Artin group with generating set S and Dynkin diagram Λ . Let W_S (or W_Λ) be the associated Coxeter group. Recalled that the *Artin complex*, introduced in [CD95a] and further studied in [GP12b, CMV20], defined as follows. For each $s \in S$, let $A_{\hat{s}}$ be the standard parabolic subgroup generated by $S \setminus \{s\}$. Let Δ_S be the simplicial complex whose vertex set is corresponding to left cosets of $\{A_{\hat{s}}\}_{s \in S}$. Moreover, a collection of vertices span a simplex if the associated cosets have nonempty common intersection. Then the complex Δ_S is called the *Artin complex* associated with A_S . We will also write Δ_Λ for Artin complex. It follows from [GP12b, Proposition 4.5] that Δ_S is a flag complex.

The Artin complex is an analogue of *Coxeter complex* in the setting of Artin group. The definition of a Coxeter complex C_S (or C_Λ) of a Coxeter group W_S is almost identical to Artin complex, except one replaces $A_{\hat{s}}$ by $W_{\hat{s}}$, which is the standard parabolic subgroup of W_S generated by $S \setminus \{s\}$.

Each vertex of C_S or Δ_S corresponding a left coset of $W_{\hat{s}}$ or $A_{\hat{s}}$ has a *type*, which is defined to be $\hat{s} = S \setminus \{s\}$. The *type* of each face of C_S or Δ_S is defined to be the subset of S which is the intersection of the types of the vertices of the face. In particular, the type of each top-dimensional simplex is the empty set.

We record the following description of the Artin complex Δ_S in terms of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$, which will be used later.

Remark 2.12. Let X be the universal cover of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$. A *lift* of a standard subcomplex in $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ is a connected component of the inverse image of this subcomplex under the map $X \rightarrow \widehat{\Sigma}_S$. Vertices of Δ_S are in 1-1 correspondence with lifts standard subcomplexes of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$ of type \hat{s} for some $s \in S$. A collection of vertices span a simplex if their associated lifts have non-trivial common intersection.

We need to following procedure of interpreting a cycle in a Artin complex as a sequence of words in the associated Artin groups.

Definition 2.13. Suppose $\Delta = \Delta_\Lambda$ is the Artin complex of the Artin group A_Λ with Dynkin diagram Λ and generating set S . A *chamber* in Δ is a top-dimensional simplex in Δ . There is a 1-1 correspondence between chambers in Δ and elements in A_Λ . Let $\{x_n\}_{i=1}^4$ be consecutive

vertices of an n -cycle ω in Δ and suppose x_i has type \hat{a}_i with $a_i \in \Lambda$. For each edge of ω , take a chamber of Δ containing this edge. We name these chambers by $\{\Theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with Θ_1 containing the edge $\overline{x_1x_2}$. Each Θ_i gives an element $g_i \in A_\Lambda$. Then for $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, $g_i = g_{i-1}w_i$ for $w_i \in A_{\hat{a}_i}$ (recall that $A_{\hat{a}_i}$ is defined to be $A_{S \setminus \{a_i\}}$). Thus $w_1w_2 \cdots w_n = 1$. The word $w_1 \cdots w_n$ depends on the choice of $\{\Theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$. A different choice would lead to a word of form $u_1 \cdots u_n$ such that there exist elements $q_i \in A_{S \setminus \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}}$ such that $u_i = q_{i-1}^{-1}w_iq_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. In this case we will say the words $u_1 \cdots u_n$ and $w_1 \cdots w_n$ are equivalent.

2.5 Relative Artin complexes

We recall the following notion from [Hua23].

Definition 2.14. Let A_S be an Artin group with Dynkin diagram Λ . Let $S' \subset S$. The (S, S') -relative Artin complex $\Delta_{S, S'}$ is defined to be the induced subcomplex of the Artin complex Δ_S of A_S spanned by vertices of type \hat{s} with $s \in S'$. In other words, vertices of $\Delta_{S, S'}$ correspond to left cosets of $\{A_{\hat{s}}\}_{s \in S'}$, and a collection of vertices span a simplex if the associated cosets have nonempty common intersection.

Let Λ' be the induced subgraphs of S spanned by S' . Then we will also refer an (S, S') -relative Artin complex as (Λ, Λ') -relative Artin complex, and denote it by $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$.

The links of vertices in relative Artin complexes can be computed via the following simple observation [Hua23, Lemma 6.4].

Lemma 2.15. *Let Δ be the (Λ, Λ') -relative Artin complex, and let $v \in \Delta$ be a vertex of type \hat{s} with $s \in \Lambda'$. Let Λ_s and Λ'_s be the induced subgraph of Λ and Λ' respectively spanned all the vertices which are not s . Then the following are true.*

1. *There is a type-preserving isomorphism between $\text{lk}(v, \Delta)$ and the (Λ_s, Λ'_s) -relative Artin complex.*
2. *Let I_s be the union of connected components of Λ_s that contain at least one component of Λ'_s . Then $\Lambda'_s \subset I_s$ and there is a type-preserving isomorphism between $\text{lk}(v, \Delta)$ and the (I_s, Λ'_s) -relative Artin complex.*
3. *Let $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be the connected components of I_s . Then $\text{lk}(v, \Delta) = K_1 * \cdots * K_k$ where K_i is the induced subcomplex of $\text{lk}(v, \Delta)$ spanned by vertices of type \hat{t} with $t \in I_i$.*

Definition 2.16. Let Λ be a Dynkin diagram which is a tree, with its vertex set S . Let Z be a simplicial complex of type S . Let X be the 1-skeleton of Z with its vertex types as explained above. We say Z satisfies the *labeled 4-wheel condition* if for any induced 4-cycle in X with consecutive vertices being $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^4$ and their types being $\{\hat{s}_i\}_{i=1}^4$, there exists a vertex $x \in X$ adjacent to each of x_i such that the type \hat{s} of x satisfies that s is in the smallest subtree of Λ' containing all of $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^4$.

Theorem 2.17. ([Hua23, Proposition 2.8]) *Suppose A_S is an irreducible spherical Artin group. Then Δ_S satisfies the labeled 4-wheel condition.*

3 Six-cycles of type $(\hat{\delta}_1, \hat{\delta}_2)$

The goal of this section is to prove weakly flagness for certain relative Artin complexes associated to Artin groups of type D_n , see Theorem 3.4.

3.1 A criterion for filling certain 6-cycles

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose Λ is an irreducible spherical Dynkin diagram. Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be a linear subgraph of type A_3 with its consecutive vertices being $\{t_1, t_2, t_3\}$. Let V be the vertex set of the relative Artin complex $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$. Take vertices $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^3$ in V of type \hat{t}_1 and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^3$ of type \hat{t}_2 . Suppose y_i is adjacent to both x_i and x_{i+1} . Let ω be the 6-cycle $x_1y_1x_2y_2x_3y_3$ in $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$, and let $\pi : \Delta_{\Lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\Lambda}$ be the map induced by quotienting Δ_{Λ} by the action of the pure Artin group. If $\pi(\omega)$ is not a single edge in Δ_{Λ} , then ω has a center of type \hat{t}_3 .*

Proof. It suffices to show $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ is adjacent in $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$ to a common vertex z in V . Indeed, if z is of type \hat{t}_3 , then we are done by Theorem 2.17. If z is of type \hat{t}_2 , then we take z' to be a vertex of type \hat{t}_3 which is adjacent to z . By Lemma 2.15, z' is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, reducing to the previous case.

We assume $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ is pairwise distinct, so is $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, otherwise the proposition reduces to Theorem 2.17. We only prove (1) as (2) is similar. Let ω and π be as defined before. Then we can identify the Coxeter complex \mathcal{C}_{Λ} as the dual of Σ_{Λ} . Suppose $\bar{x}_i = \pi(x_i)$ and $C_{\bar{x}_i}$ be the top-dimensional cell in Σ_{Λ} dual to \bar{x}_i . Let $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_i}$ be the associated standard subcomplex of $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\Lambda}$. Similarly, we define $\bar{y}_i, C_{\bar{y}_i}$ and $\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_i}$. Let $w = w_1u_1w_2u_2w_3u_3$ be the word arising from the 6-cycle ω as in Definition 2.13. As $w = \text{Id}$, we know w gives a null-homotopic loop $P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3$ in $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\Lambda}$, with $P_i \subset \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_i}$ and $Q_i \subset \widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_i}$ for each i .

Recall that the support of a subset of Σ_{Λ} or $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\Lambda}$ is defined in Definition 2.8. We claim it suffices to show P_1 is homotopic rel endpoints in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$ to a concatenation of three paths $P_{11}P_{12}P_{13}$ with $t_1, t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(P_{11} \cup P_{13})$ and $t_1, t_3 \notin \text{Supp}(P_{12})$. Indeed, $P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3$ lifts to a loop $\widetilde{P}_1\widetilde{Q}_1\widetilde{P}_2\widetilde{Q}_2\widetilde{P}_3\widetilde{Q}_3$ in the universal cover Θ of $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\Lambda}$. At the same time, $P_{11}P_{12}P_{13}$ lifts to a path $\widetilde{P}_{11}\widetilde{P}_{12}\widetilde{P}_{13}$ sharing the same starting point and endpoint of \widetilde{P}_1 . As P_{1j} is contained in a standard subcomplex of type \hat{t}_2 for $j = 1, 3$, and P_{12} is contained in a standard subcomplex of type \hat{t}_3 . By Remark 2.12, we know the loop $\widetilde{P}_{11}\widetilde{P}_{12}\widetilde{P}_{13}(\widetilde{P}_1)^{-1}$ gives a 4-cycle $x_{11}x_{12}x_{13}x_1$ in Δ_{Λ} , with x_{1j} being of type \hat{t}_2 for $j = 1, 3$ and x_{12} being of type \hat{t}_3 . For $j = 1, 3$, \widetilde{P}_{1j} and \widetilde{Q}_j are contained in a common standard subcomplex of Θ of type \hat{t}_2 . Thus $x_{11} = y_1$ and $x_{13} = y_3$ by Remark 2.12. As y_3 is adjacent to both x_3 and x_{12} , by Lemma 2.15 (3) applying to $\text{lk}(y_3, \Delta_{\Lambda})$, we know x_{12} is adjacent to x_3 in Δ_{Λ} , hence also in $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$. Similarly by y_1 is adjacent to both x_2 and x_{12} , we know that x_{12} is adjacent to x_2 . So x_{12} is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$.

Note that $\pi(\omega)$ is bipartite between type \hat{t}_1 vertices and \hat{t}_2 vertices. Thus $\pi(\omega)$ can not contain any 3-cycle, which leaves us the following cases to consider.

Case 1: $\pi(\omega)$ is two edges. There are two subcases. First we consider $\pi(\omega)$ has two type \hat{t}_1 vertices and one type \hat{t}_2 vertex. We can assume without loss of generality that $\{\bar{x}_1, \bar{y}_1, \bar{x}_2\}$ are pairwise distinct, $\bar{y}_2 = \bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_3$ and $\bar{x}_3 = \bar{x}_1$. By Lemma 3.2 below, $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_2}}(C_{\bar{x}_1}) \subset C_{\bar{y}_1} \cap C_{\bar{x}_2}$. Moreover, as $C_{\bar{y}_1} \cap C_{\bar{x}_2} \neq \emptyset$, we know $\Pi_{C_{\bar{y}_1}}(C_{\bar{x}_2}) = C_{\bar{y}_1} \cap C_{\bar{x}_2}$. Thus by Lemma 2.11, these statements hold with C replaced by \widehat{C} . Consider $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3)$, which is null-homotopic in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$. Note that

$$\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(P_1Q_1) \cup \Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(Q_2P_3Q_3) \subset \widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2},$$

and $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(P_2) = P_2$. Thus P_2 is homotopic rel endpoints in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$ to a path in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$. This implies $y_1 = y_2$, which contradicts our assumption in the beginning. The case when $\pi(\omega)$ has two type \hat{t}_2 vertices and one type \hat{t}_1 vertex is similar - we deduce two of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ are identical, leading to a contradiction. Thus this case is ruled out.

Case 2: $\pi(\omega)$ is three edges sharing a common vertex \bar{x} . Then either $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2 = \bar{x}_3$, or $\bar{x} = \bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_2 = \bar{y}_3$. We will only treat the former case as the latter is similar. By Lemma 3.2 below, $\Pi_{C_{\bar{y}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_i}) \subset C_{\bar{y}_1} \cap C_{\bar{x}_1}$ for $i = 2, 3$. By Lemma 2.11, the same statement holds with C replaced by \widehat{C} . Consider $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}}(P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3)$, which is null-homotopic in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}$. Note that

$$\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(P_1) \cup \Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}}(P_2Q_2P_3Q_3) \subset \widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1},$$

and $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}}(Q_1) = Q_1$. Thus Q_1 is homotopic rel endpoints in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}$ to a path in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$, which implies that $x_1 = x_2$, contradiction. Thus this case is ruled out.

Case 3: $\pi(\omega)$ is a path with three edges. We assume without loss of generality that $\bar{x}_1\bar{y}_1\bar{x}_2\bar{y}_2$ is a path with three edges, and $\bar{x}_3 = \bar{x}_2, \bar{y}_3 = \bar{y}_1$. By Lemma 3.2,

1. $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_1}) = C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_1}$;
2. $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{x}_2}) \subset C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_1}$;
3. either $t_3 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$ or $t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$.

By Lemma 2.11, the above three items hold true if we replace C by \widehat{C} . Consider $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3)$, which is null-homotopic in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$. Note that $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(Q_1P_2) \subset \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}$, hence $t_1, t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(Q_1P_2))$. Similarly, $t_1, t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(P_3Q_3))$.

- If $t_3 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$, then $t_1, t_3 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(Q_2))$. Thus assumption of the claim before Case 1 is satisfied and we are done.
- If $t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$, then $t_1, t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}}(Q_2))$. Then P_1 is homotopic rel endpoints in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$ to a path in $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1} \cap \widehat{C}_{\bar{y}_1}$, which implies $y_1 = y_3$, contradiction.

Case 4: $\pi(\omega)$ is made of four or five edges. If $\pi(\omega)$ is made of four edges, as $\pi(\omega)$ can not contain 3-cycle, it is an embedded 4-cycle of type $\hat{t}_1\hat{t}_2\hat{t}_1\hat{t}_2$ in C_Λ . However, Theorem 2.17 implies that any 4-cycle in Δ_Λ of type $\hat{t}_1\hat{t}_2\hat{t}_1\hat{t}_2$ is degenerate. As there is an embedding $C_\Lambda \rightarrow \Delta_\Lambda$ preserving type of vertices, we know $\pi(\omega)$ is a degenerate 4-cycle. Thus the case that $\pi(\omega)$ is made of four edges is ruled out. If $\pi(\omega)$ is made of five edges, then it is an embedded 4-cycle together with an additional edge glued to one vertex of this 4-cycle. By the same argument as before, the 4-cycle must be degenerate.

Case 5: $\pi(\omega)$ is made of six edges. Then $\pi(\omega)$ is an embedded 6-cycle. By Lemma 3.2,

- $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_1}) = C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_1}$ and $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_3}) = C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_3}$;
- $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{x}_2}) \subset C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_1}$ and $\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{x}_3}) \subset C_{\bar{x}_1} \cap C_{\bar{y}_3}$;
- either $t_3 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$ or $t_2 \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_{\bar{x}_1}}(C_{\bar{y}_2}))$.

We still consider the projection of $P_1Q_1P_2Q_2P_3Q_3$ to $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$, and the discussion is identical to Case 3. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let Σ be the Davis complex of a finite Coxeter group generated by $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$. We label edges of Σ by elements in S . Let $\{s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}\}$ be three generators such that they generates a Coxeter group of type A_3 , and s_i, s_{i+2} commute.*

Let $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be four pairwise distinct faces of Σ such that

1. C_1 and C_3 are of type \hat{s}_i , and C_2 and C_4 are of type \hat{s}_{i+1} ;
2. $C_i \cap C_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Then the following are true:

1. $\Pi_{C_1}(C_3) \subset C_1 \cap C_2$, and $\Pi_{C_2}(C_4) \subset C_2 \cap C_3$;
2. either $s_{i+2} \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_1}(C_4))$ or $s_{i+1} \notin \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_1}(C_4))$.

Proof. In the following proof, we will write $S_1 \perp S_2$ for subsets $S_1, S_2 \subset S$ if $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ and each element in S_1 commutes with every element in S_2 .

For (1), we only prove the first part, as the second part is similar. Let u be a geodesic path in the 1-skeleton of Σ connecting a vertex in C_1 and a vertex in C_3 such that $\text{length}(u) = d(C_1, C_3)$. As u leaves C_1 , $s_i \in \text{Supp}(u)$. Given a subset S' of S , an *irreducible component* of S' is a maximal subset S'' of S' such that $W_{S''}$ is irreducible. Let I be an irreducible component of $\text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_1}(C_3))$ which is not contained in $\text{Supp}(C_2)$. Then $s_{i+1} \in I$. Note that both C_1 and C_3 have non-empty intersection with C_2 , then we can apply [Hua23, Lemma 5.8 (2)] to deduce $\text{Supp}(u) \perp I$. As $s_i \in \text{Supp}(u)$, this is a contradiction. So $\text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_1}(C_3)) \subset \text{Supp}(C_2)$. We also know $\Pi_{C_1}(C_3)$ is a face of Σ that contains a vertex in $C_1 \cap C_2$ by [Hua23, Lemma 5.8 (1)]. Then (1) follows.

We prove two claims before going to (2). Define a word w in the free monoid on S has property (*) if w is a concatenation of w_1 and w_2 such that $s_{i+1} \notin \text{Supp}(w_1)$ and $s_i \notin \text{Supp}(w_2)$. The first claim is that if two reduced words w and w' represent the same element of W_Λ and w has property (*), then w' has property (*). To see the claim, we only need to consider the special case when w' is obtained from w by applying a single relation of W_Γ of form $s_j s_{j'} \cdots = s_{j'} s_j \cdots$. If s_j and $s_{j'}$ commute, then either $s_i \notin \{s_j, s_{j'}\}$ or $s_{i+1} \notin \{s_j, s_{j'}\}$. By enlarging or shrinking w_1 , we can assume the subword $s_j s_{j'}$ is contained in one of w_1 or w_2 and the rest is clear. Now we assume s_j and $s_{j'}$ do not commute. It only matters when the left side $w = s_j s_{j'} \cdots$ of the relator do not appear as a subword of w_1 as well as w_2 . If w_1 contains the first two letters of w , then we can enlarge w_1 so that w is a subword of w_1 . If w_1 only contains the first letter of w , then w_2 contains the last two letters of w and we can enlarge w_2 so that it contains w as a subword.

The second claim is that there is an edge path u from a vertex in C_1 to a vertex in C_4 such that $\text{length}(u) = d(C_1, C_4)$ and $\text{wd}(u)$ satisfies property (*) ($\text{wd}(u)$ is defined in Definition 2.8). To see this, consider an edge path $\bar{u} = \bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_2$ from a vertex in C_1 to a vertex in C_4 such that $\bar{u}_1 \subset C_2$ and $\bar{u}_2 \subset C_3$. Such \bar{u} always exists. Let $\bar{w} = \text{wd}(\bar{u})$ and $\bar{w}_i = \text{wd}(\bar{u}_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then \bar{w} satisfies property (*). By the deletion condition for Coxeter groups, we can assume \bar{w} is a reduced word, while maintaining property (*). This means we replace \bar{u} by a geodesic path (still denote \bar{u}) connecting the endpoints of \bar{u} . Let e be the first edge of \bar{u} such that e is parallel to an edge in C_1 . We write $\bar{u} = \bar{u}' e \bar{u}''$. Let \hat{u} be the image of \bar{u}' under the reflection along the hyperplane dual to e . Then $\text{wd}(\hat{u}) = \text{wd}(\bar{u}')$. We replace \bar{u} by $\hat{u} \bar{u}''$ (still denoted by \bar{u}), which is still an edge path from a vertex of C_1 to a vertex of C_4 . This has the effect of removing a letter from \bar{w} , thus the new \bar{w} still has property (*). Repeating this procedure will produce a geodesic edge path u from a vertex of C_1 to a vertex of C_4 such that no edges of u is parallel to an edge in C_1 or an edge in C_4 , thus $\text{length}(u) = d(C_1, C_4)$. By construction, $\text{wd}(u)$ satisfies condition (*), which proves the claim.

Now we argue by contradiction that $s_{i+1}, s_{i+2} \in \text{Supp}(\Pi_{C_1}(C_4))$. Let u be as in the second claim with starting point $x \in C_1$ and endpoint $y \in C_4$. Let e_j be the edge containing x labeled by s_j for $j = i + 1, i + 2$. Let F be the 2-face spanned by e_{i+1} and e_{i+2} . Let B be the element in \mathcal{Q}_S dual to F (see Definition 2.6). As $\Pi_{C_1}(C_4)$ is a face of C_1 , $F \subset \Pi_{C_1}(C_4)$. By [Hua23, Lemma 5.4], there exists a geodesic path u' such that

1. u' and u have the same endpoints;
2. $u' = f_1 f_2 \cdots f_k$ where each f_i is an elementary B -segment (see Definition 2.6).

As $\text{wd}(f_1)$ must start with s_i and $W_{s_i, s_{i+1}, s_{i+2}}$ is a Coxeter group of type A_3 , we know $\text{wd}(f_1) = s_i s_{i+1} s_{i+2}$. As $\text{wd}(u')$ satisfies condition (*) by the first claim, we know $s_i \notin \text{Supp}(f_i)$ for $i \geq 2$. Let F_i be the face parallel to F containing the endpoint of f_i . Then $\text{Supp}(F_1) = \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$. If the label of the initial edge of f_2 does not commute with at least one of $\{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$, then $s_i \in \text{Supp}(f_2)$, which is a contradiction. Thus we have $\text{Supp}(f_2) \perp \{s_i, s_{i+1}\}$. Thus $\text{Supp}(F_2) = \text{Supp}(F_1)$. Repeating this argument, we know $\text{Supp}(F_k) = \text{Supp}(F_1)$. This is a contradiction as $F_k \subset C_4$, but $s_{i+1} \notin \text{Supp}(C_4)$ by the first assumption of the lemma. \square

3.2 The D_n -type case

We first review the process of treating D_n as a semi-direct product of a free group F_{n-1} of rank $n-1$ and an n -strand braid group, through the braid monodromy representation of the braid group into $\text{Aut}(F_{n-1})$ [CPC05]. Let $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ be generators of Artin group $A(D_n)$ of type D_n as in Figure 3. Let $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\}$ be generators of Artin group $A(A_{n-1})$ of type A_{n-1} as in Figure 3. Let $\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1}\}$ be generators of a free group F_{n-1} of rank $n-1$.




Figure 3: Dynkin diagram of type D_n and A_{n-1} .

Following [CPC05, Section 2], define a homomorphism $\rho : A_{n-1} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(F_{n-1})$ by:

$$\rho(\alpha_1) : \begin{cases} \beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_1 \\ \beta_i \rightarrow \beta_1^{-1} \beta_i & i \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

and, for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$\rho(\alpha_i) : \begin{cases} \beta_{i-1} \rightarrow \beta_i \\ \beta_i \rightarrow \beta_i \beta_{i-1}^{-1} \beta_i \\ \beta_j \rightarrow \beta_j & j \neq i, i-1. \end{cases}$$

Define $\varphi : \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\} \rightarrow F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$ by

$$\begin{cases} \varphi(\delta_1) = \beta_1 \alpha_1 \\ \varphi(\delta_i) = \alpha_{i-1} & 2 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Define $\phi : \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1}\} \cup \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}\} \rightarrow A(D_n)$ by

$$\begin{cases} \phi(\beta_i) = \delta_{i+1} \delta_i \cdots \delta_3 \delta_1 \delta_2^{-1} \delta_3^{-1} \cdots \delta_i^{-1} \delta_{i+1}^{-1} & 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \phi(\alpha_i) = \delta_{i+1} & 1 \leq i \leq n-1. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 3.3 ([CPC05]). *The map φ extends to an isomorphism from $A(D_n)$ to $F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$. The map ϕ extends to an isomorphism from $F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$ to $A(D_n)$. The maps φ and ϕ are inverses of each other.*

Theorem 3.4. *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n with vertex set $S = \{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as in Figure 3. Given a 6-cycle ω with its vertices alternating between type $\hat{\delta}_1$ and $\hat{\delta}_3$. Then ω has a center of type $\hat{\delta}_2$.*

Proof. Let consecutive vertices of ω be $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3$ such that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^3$ are of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^3$ are of type $\hat{\delta}_3$. We assume ω is an embedded 6-cycle, otherwise the theorem reduces to Theorem 2.17. Let $w = w_1 u_1 w_2 u_2 w_3 u_3$ be the word arising from the 6-cycle ω as in Definition 2.13. Then for each i , $w_i \in A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$ and $u_i \in A_{\hat{\delta}_3}$. As $A_{\hat{\delta}_3} = A_{\delta_1} \oplus A_{\delta_2} \oplus A_{\{\delta_4, \delta_5, \dots, \delta_n\}}$, we know each u_i can be written as a product two commuting elements, one of them is a power of δ_1 , another belongs to $A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$. Thus up to passing to an equivalent word as in the sense of Definition 2.13, we can assume $w = w_1 \delta_1^{k_1} w_2 \delta_1^{k_2} w_3 \delta_1^{k_3}$. As $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ is pairwise distinct, $k_i \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$.

Through the isomorphism between $A(D_n)$ and $F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$ as in Proposition 3.3, we view w_i and δ_1 as elements in $F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$. Each element in $F_{n-1} \rtimes_{\rho} A(A_{n-1})$ can be

uniquely written as $a \cdot b$ with $a \in F_{n-1}$ and $b \in A(\widehat{A}_{n-1})$. Then $w_i = 1 \cdot w_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\delta_1 = \beta_1 \cdot \alpha_1$. From

$$w_1 \delta_1^{k_1} w_2 = \delta_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \delta_1^{-k_2},$$

we know that

$$w_1 (\beta_1 \alpha_1)^{k_1} w_2 = (\beta_1 \alpha_1)^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} (\beta_1 \alpha_1)^{-k_2}.$$

As β_1 and α_1 commute (by looking at their image in $A(D_n)$),

$$(w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1})^{k_1} \cdot w_1 \alpha_1^{k_1} w_2 = \beta_1^{-k_3} (\alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \beta_1 w_3 \alpha_1^{k_3})^{-k_2} \cdot \alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \alpha_1^{-k_2}.$$

Note that $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1}$ and $\alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \beta_1 w_3 \alpha_1^{k_3}$ are non-trivial words in F_{n-1} , and the following equation holds true in F_{n-1} :

$$(w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1})^{k_1} = \beta_1^{-k_3} (\alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \beta_1 w_3 \alpha_1^{k_3})^{-k_2}.$$

By a result of Lyndon and Schützenberger [LS62], at least one of the following two possibilities happen:

1. there exists $1 \leq i \leq 3$ such that $|k_i| = 1$;
2. both $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1}$ and $\alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \beta_1 w_3 \alpha_1^{k_3}$ are nonzero powers of β_1 .

First suppose the first possibility happens. We assume without loss of generality that $|k_1| = 1$. Let $P_1 Q_1 P_2 Q_2 P_3 Q_3$ be the path as in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 3.1 corresponding to $w_1 \delta_1^{k_1} w_2 \delta_1^{k_2} w_3 \delta_1^{k_3}$. Then Q_1 is a single edge labeled by $\hat{\delta}_1$. Let $\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$ and $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$ be as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Then starting from a vertex of $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1}$, crossing an edge labeled by $\hat{\delta}_1$ corresponding to Q_1 , leading us to a vertex of $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$. This means $\widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_1} \neq \widehat{C}_{\bar{x}_2}$. In particular $\bar{x}_1 \neq \bar{x}_2$. Then we are done by Proposition 3.1.

Now we consider the second possibility, namely both $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1}$ and $\alpha_1^{-k_3} w_3^{-1} \beta_1 w_3 \alpha_1^{k_3}$ are nonzero powers of β_1 . We first remind some facts about parabolic subgroups as follows. For each standard parabolic subgroup $A_{S'}$ of A_S , let $\Delta_{S'}$ be its Garside element, and let $c_{S'}$ be the smallest positive power of $\Delta_{S'}$ that is contained in the center of $A_{S'}$. If $P = g A_{S'} g^{-1}$ is a parabolic subgroup of A_S , we define $c_P = g c_{S'} g^{-1}$. By [Cum19, Lemma 33], for $X, Y \subset S$, $g^{-1} A_X g = g^{-1} A_Y g$ if and only if $g^{-1} C_X g = c_Y$, in particular, if $g A_{S'} g^{-1} = g_1 A_{S'} g_1^{-1}$, then $g c_{S'} g^{-1} = g_1 c_{S'} g_1^{-1}$, hence c_P is well-defined.

As $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1}$ is a primitive element in F_{n-1} , $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1} = \beta_1^{\pm 1}$. Let P be the smallest parabolic subgroup of $A(D_n)$ containing β_1 , whose existence is guaranteed by [CGGMW19]. Note that P is also the smallest parabolic subgroup of $A(D_n)$ containing β^{-1} . As $\beta = \delta_1 \delta_2^{-1}$, P is contained in the standard parabolic subgroup P_{12} generated by δ_1 and δ_2 . As P_{12} is abelian, we deduce from [BP23] that $P = P_{12}$. The minimality of P implies that $w_1 P_{12} w^{-1} = P_{12}$. By [Cum19, Lemma 33], $w_1 c_P w^{-1} = c_P$. Now let P' be the smallest parabolic subgroup of w_1 . Then $P' \subset A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$. Moreover, by the same argument as before, $c_P c_{P'} c_P^{-1} = c_{P'}$. As $c_{P'} \in A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$ and $c_P \in A_{\hat{\delta}_3}$, by [Hua23, Proposition 8.7], there exists $g \in A_{\hat{\delta}_1} \cap A_{\hat{\delta}_3}$ and $s \in \{\delta_1, \delta_3\}$ such that

$$g c_P g^{-1} \in A_s \quad \text{and} \quad g c_{P'} g^{-1} \in A_s.$$

If $s = \delta_1$, then $c_P \in g^{-1} A_{\hat{\delta}_1} g = A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$. On the other hand, however, this is impossible as $c_P = \delta_1 \delta_2$. If $s = \delta_3$, then $c_{P'} \in g^{-1} A_{\hat{\delta}_3} g = A_{\hat{\delta}_3}$. By [God03, Proposition 2.1], $w_1 \in P' \subset A_{\hat{\delta}_3}$. Thus $w_1 \in A_{\hat{\delta}_3} \cap A_{\hat{\delta}_1}$, which implies that $y_1 = y_3$, contradicting our assumption that $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ are pairwise distinct. In summary $w_1 \beta_1 w_1^{-1}$ can not be a nonzero power of β_1 . This finishes the proof. \square

We record the following curious consequence of Theorem 3.4, Theorem 2.17 and [Gol23, Theorem 5.2].

Corollary 3.5. *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n with vertex set S . Let $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda$ be the linear subgraph spanned by $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\}$ in Figure 3. Then $\Delta_{\Lambda, \Lambda'}$ with induced Moussong metric from Δ_{Λ} is CAT(1).*

4 A remark on 5-cycles and 6-cycles in the D_4 Artin complex

In Section 4, Section 5 and Section 6, we will prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_4 with a chosen leaf vertex c . Given a 6-cycle ω in the Artin complex Δ_Λ with its vertices alternating between having type \hat{c} and not having type \hat{c} . Then there exists a quasi-center of ω which is adjacent to each of the type \hat{c} vertices of ω .*

Definition 4.2. Let ω be an embedded 6-cycle in Δ_Λ with consecutive vertices being $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^5$. We say ω is of *type I* if $\{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$ are of type \hat{a} and $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$ are of type \hat{c} . We say ω is of *type II* if $\{x_0, x_4\}$ are of type \hat{a} , $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$ are of type \hat{c} and x_2 is of type \hat{b} . Suppose ω is either of type I or type II. We define ω satisfies property $(*)$ if there exists a vertex z of type \hat{a} or \hat{b} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose all type I and type II 6-cycles in the D_4 type Artin complex have property $(*)$. Then Theorem 4.1 holds.*

Proof. Let ω be a 6-cycle as in Theorem 4.1 with consecutive vertices $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}}$. Suppose x_1, x_3 and x_5 are of type \hat{c} . If x_2 is of type \hat{d} , then let x'_2 a vertex of type \hat{a} which is adjacent to x_2 . By Lemma 2.15 (3), x'_2 is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3\}$. Thus up to possible replacement, we can assume x_2, x_4, x_6 are of type either \hat{b} or \hat{a} . Now Theorem 4.1 follows by the symmetry of the Dynkin diagram. \square

Thus to prove Theorem 4.1, it suffices to prove type I cycles has property $(*)$, which is Proposition 5.29 and type II cycles has property $(*)$, which is Corollary 6.2.

In the rest of this section, we collect several observations for preparation of the proof of Proposition 5.29 and Corollary 6.2. Throughout this section, Λ will be the Dynkin diagram of type D_4 with its vertex set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ such that $\{a, b, c\}$ are leaf vertices.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be consecutive vertices of an embedded 4-cycle in Δ_Λ such that the type of each vertex in the cycle belongs to $\{\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}\}$. Suppose $\text{Type}(x_1) = \text{Type}(x_3)$; and $\text{Type}(x_2), \text{Type}(x_3), \text{Type}(x_4)$ are mutually distinct. Then x_2 and x_4 are adjacent.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.17, either x_2 and x_4 are adjacent; or x_1 and x_3 are adjacent, which is impossible as adjacent vertices have different types; or there exists a vertex z in Δ_Λ such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$. As adjacent vertices have different types, we now z has type \hat{d} . Now x_2 and x_4 are adjacent by considering $\text{lk}(z, \Delta_\Lambda)$ and applying Lemma 2.15 (3). \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let ω be an embedded cycle of type II in Δ_Λ , where Λ is of type D_4 . Then at least one of the following is true:*

1. *there exists an edge path with consecutive vertices x_1, y_1, y_2, y_3, x_3 in $\text{lk}(x_2, \Delta_\Lambda)$ such that y_1 and y_3 are of type \hat{a} and y_2 is of type \hat{c} ;*
2. *there exists a vertex $y \in \Delta_\Lambda$ of type \hat{a} such that y is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$.*

Proof. Let Σ_Λ be the Davis complex. Then we can identify the Coxeter complex C_Λ as the dual to Σ_Λ . Let \bar{x}_i be the image of x_i under the map $\Delta_\Lambda \rightarrow C_\Lambda$, and let C_i be the top-dimensional cell in Σ_Λ dual to \bar{x}_i . Let \hat{C}_i be the associated standard subcomplex of $\hat{\Sigma}_\Lambda$. Let $w = w_0 w_1 w_2 w_3 w_4 w_5$ be the word arising from the 6-cycle ω as in Definition 2.13. As $w = \text{Id}$, we know w gives a null-homotopic loop $P = P_0 P_1 P_2 P_3 P_4 P_5$ in $\hat{\Sigma}_\Lambda$, with $P_i \subset \hat{C}_i$ for each i .

It suffices to show either $w_2 = u_1 v_1 v_2 v_3 u_3$ where $u_1, v_2, u_3 \in A_{a,d}$ and $v_1, v_3 \in A_{c,d}$, which corresponds to Case 1 of the lemma; or $w_2 = u_1 u_2 u_3$ with $u_1, u_3 \in A_{a,d}$ and $u_2 \in A_{c,d}$, which corresponds to Case 2 of the lemma. Here $A_{a,d}$ means the standard parabolic subgroups generated by a and d .

We consider $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_2}(P)$ and let $P'_i = \Pi_{\widehat{C}_2}(P_i)$. Note that $P'_2 = P_2$. Let w'_i be the word we read off from the path P'_i . As P is null-homotopic in $\widehat{\Sigma}_\Lambda$, we know $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_2}(P)$ is null-homotopic in \widehat{C}_2 . Thus $w'_0 w'_1 w'_2 w'_3 w'_4 w'_5$ represents the trivial element. Then

$$w_2 = (w'_1)^{-1} (w'_0)^{-1} (w'_5)^{-1} (w'_4)^{-1} (w'_3)^{-1}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 2.11, $\Pi_{\widehat{C}_2}(\widehat{C}_i) = \widehat{C}_2 \cap \widehat{C}_i$ for $i = 1, 3$. Thus $w'_i \in A_{a,d}$ for $i = 1, 3$. As \bar{x}_2 is of type \hat{b} in C_Λ , the antipodal point of \bar{x}_2 in C_Λ is also of type \hat{b} by the geometry of Coxeter group of type D_4 . Thus none of \bar{x}_i is antipodal to \bar{x}_2 in C_Λ for $0 \leq i \leq 5$. Thus none of C_i ($i \neq 2$) is parallel to C_2 . Thus $\Pi_{C_2}(C_i)$ is a face of C_i of dimension ≤ 2 . This for $i = 0, 4, 5$, either $w'_i \in A_{a,d}$ or $w'_i \in A_{c,d}$ or $w'_i \in A_{a,c}$. In each of the case, we can rewrite $(w'_1)^{-1} (w'_0)^{-1}$ as $u_1 v_1$ with $u_1 \in A_{a,d}$ and $v_1 \in A_{c,d}$, using that a and c commute. Note that we do allow u_1 and v_1 to be the trivial element. Similarly, we can rewrite $(w'_4)^{-1} (w'_3)^{-1}$ as $v_3 u_3$ with $u_3 \in A_{a,d}$ and $v_3 \in A_{c,d}$. If $w'_5 \in A_{a,d}$, then we are in Case 1 of the lemma. If $w'_5 \in A_{c,d}$, then $v_1 (w'_5)^{-1} v_3 \in A_{c,d}$ and we are in Case 2 of the lemma. If $w'_5 \in A_{a,c}$, then we write $(w'_5)^{-1} = c^* a^*$, absorbing the c^* into v_1 so v_1 is still in $A_{c,d}$ and define $v_2 = a^*$, leading to Case 1 of the lemma. \square

Note that the two possibilities in Lemma 4.5 are not mutually exclusive. The next lemma can be proved in the same way as Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.6. *Let ω be an embedded cycle of 5-cycle in Δ_Λ with its consecutive vertices being $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^4$. Suppose x_0 has type \hat{b} , x_1 and x_3 have type \hat{a} , and x_2 and x_4 have type \hat{c} . Then at least one of the following is true:*

1. *there exists an edge path with consecutive vertices x_4, y_1, y_2, x_1 in $\text{lk}(x_0, \Delta_\Lambda)$ such that y_1 is of type \hat{a} and y_2 is of type \hat{c} ;*
2. *x_4 and x_1 are adjacent.*

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose every type I embedded 6-cycle in Δ_Λ satisfies property (*) with Λ being type D_4 . Let ω be an embedded 5-cycle as in Lemma 4.6. Then either x_4 and x_1 are adjacent, or x_0 is adjacent to each x_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$.*

Proof. We will show if x_4 and x_1 are not adjacent, then x_0 is adjacent to each x_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. By Lemma 4.6, we know there exists an edge path with consecutive vertices x_1, y_1, y_2, x_4 in $\text{lk}(x_0, \Delta_\Lambda)$ such that y_1 is of type \hat{c} and y_2 is of type \hat{a} . As the 6-cycle $x_1, y_1, y_2, x_4, x_3, x_2$ satisfies property (*), there is a vertex z of type \hat{a} or \hat{b} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{y_1, x_4, x_2\}$. We first consider the case when z has type \hat{a} . Consider the 4-cycle y_1, x_0, x_4, z of vertex type $\hat{c}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{a}$. As $y_1 \neq x_4$ (otherwise x_1 and x_4 are adjacent), this 4-cycle is embedded. Thus by Lemma 4.4, x_0 is adjacent to z . Now we consider the 4-cycle x_0, x_1, x_2, z of type $\hat{b}, \hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{a}$. As $x_1 \neq z$ (otherwise x_1 and x_4 are adjacent), this 4-cycle is embedded. Then by Lemma 4.4, x_0 is adjacent to x_2 . By applying Lemma 4.4 to the embedded 4-cycle $x_0 x_2 x_4 x_3$, we know x_0 and x_3 are adjacent. Now we consider the case when z has type \hat{b} . Consider the 4-cycle x_1, y_1, z, x_2 of type $\hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}$. If $y_1 = x_2$, then x_0 is adjacent to x_2 and we conclude that x_0 is adjacent to each x_i with $1 \leq i \leq 4$ as before. If $y_1 \neq x_2$, then Lemma 4.4, z is adjacent to x_1 . Now consider the 4-cycle x_0, x_1, z, x_4 of type $\hat{b}, \hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}$. If $x_0 = z$, then x_0 is adjacent to x_2 , hence x_0 is adjacent to x_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. If $x_0 \neq z$, then Lemma 4.4, x_1 is adjacent to x_4 , which is ruled out by our assumption. \square

5 Six-cycles of type I in the D_4 complex

Throughout this section, Λ is the Dynkin diagram of type D_4 with its vertex set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ such that $\{a, b, c\}$ are leaf vertices. The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 5.29, which asserts that each 6-cycle of type I in Δ_Λ has property (*).

5.1 Artin group of type D_4 as a mapping class group

Let \mathcal{S} be the surface with genus 1 with two punctures p_a and p_c and one boundary component, as in Figure 4 (I). Let $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$ be the pure mapping class group of \mathcal{S} . Sometimes we will also think p_a and p_c as marked points rather than punctures. By [Sor20, Corollary 9], the Artin group A_Λ is isomorphic to $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$, where a, b, c, d correspond to the Dehn twists along simple closed curves a, b, c, d in Figure 4 (I) (we slightly abuse the notation and use a for both a generator of A_Λ and a curve on \mathcal{S}). Take $z_a \neq z_c \in \partial\mathcal{S}$. Let τ_a (resp. τ_c) be the arc from p_a to z_a (resp. p_c to z_c) as in Figure 4 (I).




Figure 4: Surfaces associated to D_4 .

Lemma 5.1. *The group $A_\Lambda \cong \text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$ acts transitively on the set Ω_a of homotopy classes of simple arcs (rel endpoints) in \mathcal{S} from p_a to z_a . Moreover, the stabilizer of τ_a (i.e. the collection of mapping classes in $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$ preserving τ_a up to homotopy rel endpoints) is $A_{\hat{a}}$, i.e. the subgroup of A generated by vertices in $\Lambda \setminus \{a\}$.*

Hence there is a 1-1 correspondence between left cosets of $A_{\hat{a}}$ in A_Λ and elements in \mathcal{A} . More precisely, for each element in Ω_a , the collection of all mapping classes in A_Λ sending τ_a to this element is a left coset of $A_{\hat{a}}$.

The same statement holds if we replace Ω_a and τ_a by Ω_c and τ_c .

Proof. For any simple arc in \mathcal{S} from p_a to z_a , if we cut \mathcal{S} open along this arc, the resulting surface is a torus with one boundary component and one puncture. Thus the transitivity of $A_\Lambda \curvearrowright \Omega_a$ follows from the change of coordinate principle (cf. [FM11, Chapter 1.3]). If a mapping class preserves τ_a up to homotopy rel endpoints, then we can find a representative in the class fixing τ_a pointwise (as homotopy between two arcs rel endpoints can be improved to isotopy, and this isotopy can be extended to an isotopy on \mathcal{S} , see [FM11, Chapter 1.2.7]). We scissor \mathcal{S} along τ_a to obtain the surface \mathcal{S}_a in Figure 4 (II). The previous discussion gives a homomorphism $\text{Stab}_{\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})}([\tau_a]) \rightarrow \text{PMod}(\mathcal{S}_a)$, which is injective. As $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S}_a)$ is generated by the Dehn twists around curves b, c, d in Figure 4 (II) and it is isomorphic to the subgroup $A_{\hat{a}}$ of A_Λ generated by $\{b, c, d\}$ ([Sor20, Corollary 11]), this gives a lifting monomorphism $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S}_a) \rightarrow \text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$, whose image is $A_{\hat{a}}$, and is contained in $\text{Stab}_{\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})}([\tau_a])$. Thus the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Under the correspondence of Lemma 5.1, the two cosets $gA_{\hat{a}}$ and $hA_{\hat{c}}$ have non-empty intersection if and only if the corresponding two homotopy classes of arcs have disjoint representatives.*

Proof. Take $[\tau_1] \in \Omega_a$ and $[\tau_2] \in \Omega_c$ such that these two homotopy classes are represented by disjoint simple arcs τ_1 and τ_2 . If we scissor \mathcal{S} along τ_1 and τ_2 , then we obtain a torus with one boundary component. Thus by the change of coordinate principle, there is a homeomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ fixing the boundary and the punctures pointwise such that $\phi(\tau_a) = \tau_1$ and $\phi(\tau_c) = \tau_2$. Thus $[\tau_1]$ corresponds to the coset $[\phi]A_{\hat{a}}$, and $[\tau_2]$ corresponds to the coset $[\phi]A_{\hat{c}}$. These two cosets have non-empty intersection as $A_{\hat{a}} \cap A_{\hat{c}} \neq \emptyset$. For the only if direction, if $gA_{\hat{a}} \cap hA_{\hat{c}} \neq \emptyset$, then we can assume $g = h$. Then the corresponding two arcs are the images of $\{\tau_a, \tau_c\}$ under $g = h$, hence are disjoint. \square

Lemma 5.3. Take $[\tau_1], [\tau_2] \in \Omega_c$. Let x_1, x_2 be the associated vertices in Δ_Λ . Let δ denotes the Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$. Then

1. if $[\tau_2] = \delta^n[\tau_1]$ for $n \neq 0$, then x_1 and x_2 can not be adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} ;
2. if there exists $[\tau'_2] \in \Omega_c$ such that $[\tau'_2] = \delta^n[\tau_1]$ some n and there are more than one elements in Ω_a containing representatives that are disjoint from both τ_1 and τ'_2 , then x_1 and x_2 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} if and only if they are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .

Proof. For Assertion 1, if x_1 and x_2 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} , then Lemma 5.2 implies that there is $[\tau_3] \in \Omega_a$ such that $\tau_3 \cap \tau_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2$. By our assumption on τ_1 and τ_2 , z_a and p_a are not in the same connected component of $\mathcal{S} \setminus (\tau_1 \cup \tau_2)$, this is a contradiction.

For Assertion 2, let $x'_2 \in \Delta_\Lambda$ be the vertex of type \hat{c} associated with $[\tau'_2]$. Then there are two different vertices of type \hat{c} that are adjacent to both x_1 and x'_2 . By Theorem 2.17, there is a vertex $y_{\hat{d}}$ of type \hat{d} which is adjacent to each of x_1 and x'_2 . Let $y_{\hat{b}}$ and $y_{\hat{a}}$ be some vertices of type \hat{b} and \hat{a} respectively that are adjacent to $t_{\hat{d}}$. Then by Lemma 2.15, $\{x_1, y_{\hat{d}}, y_{\hat{b}}, y_{\hat{a}}\}$ and $\{x'_2, y_{\hat{d}}, y_{\hat{b}}, y_{\hat{a}}\}$ form vertex sets of two simplices in Δ_Λ . Thus if x_1 corresponds to a coset of form $gA_{\hat{c}}$, then x'_2 corresponds to a coset of form $gc^m A_{\hat{c}}$. Hence x_2 corresponds to a coset of form $\delta^n gc^m A_{\hat{c}} = g\delta^n c^m A_{\hat{c}}$. Up to a left translation, we can assume x_1 corresponds to the identity coset $A_{\hat{c}}$, and x_2 corresponding to the coset $\delta^n c^m A_{\hat{c}}$ where δ is the Garside element of A_Λ . By considering the automorphism of A_Λ which exchanges b and a and fixes other generators and noting that this automorphism fix $\delta^n c^m A_{\hat{c}}$ setwise, we know there is a left $A_{\hat{b}}$ -coset having nonempty intersection with both $A_{\hat{c}}$ and $\delta^n c^m A_{\hat{c}}$ if and only if there is a left $A_{\hat{a}}$ -coset having nonempty intersection with $A_{\hat{c}}$ and $\delta^n c^m A_{\hat{c}}$. \square

5.2 A relative Artin complex as a complex of arcs

Let Δ_0 be the relative Artin complex $\Delta_{\Lambda, \{a, b, c\}}$. Note that the action of the center Z_{A_Λ} on Δ is free, hence the same holds true for the action $Z_{A_\Lambda} \curvearrowright \Delta_0$. Let $\bar{\Delta}_0$ be the quotient of this action, together with the covering map $\pi_Z : \Delta_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}_0$. As the action of Z_{A_Λ} preserves the types of vertices in Δ , each vertex in $\bar{\Delta}_0$ has a well-defined type, either \hat{a} or \hat{b} or \hat{c} .

Let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ be a torus with three punctures $\{\bar{p}_a, \bar{p}_b, \bar{p}_c\}$, identified with the interior of \mathcal{S} . This gives a surjective homomorphism $h : \text{PMod}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \text{PMod}(\bar{\mathcal{S}})$. The kernel of h is exactly the center of $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S})$, where the center is generated by $(abcd)^3$ under the isomorphism $\text{PMod}(\mathcal{S}) \cong A_\Lambda$ (see [Sor20, Corollary 9]). Let $\bar{A}_\Lambda \cong \text{PMod}(\bar{\mathcal{S}})$ be the central quotient of A_Λ . Let $\{\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}\}$ be the image of the generators of A_Λ in \bar{A}_Λ . Let $\bar{A}_{\hat{a}}$ (resp. $\bar{A}_{\hat{b}}, \bar{A}_{\hat{c}}$) be the image of $A_{\hat{a}}$ (resp. $A_{\hat{b}}, A_{\hat{c}}$) under the quotient. Let \bar{a} be the simply closed curve on $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ corresponding to a in \mathcal{S} . Similarly we define $\bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{\tau}_a, \bar{\tau}_b, \bar{\tau}_c$. See Figure 4 (III). Then under the identification $\bar{A}_\Lambda \cong \text{PMod}(\bar{\mathcal{S}})$, the generators $\{\bar{a}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}\}$ corresponds to Dehn twists along the respective curves in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$. Let $\bar{\Omega}_a$ be the set of homotopy classes of simple arcs (rel endpoints) in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ connecting two endpoints of $\bar{\tau}_a$. Similarly we define $\bar{\Omega}_b$ and $\bar{\Omega}_c$.

Definition 5.4. Let $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ be the following 2-dimensional simplicial complex. The vertices of $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ are in 1-1 correspondence with elements in $\bar{\Omega}_a \sqcup \bar{\Omega}_b \sqcup \bar{\Omega}_c$. Two vertices are joined by an edge if they belong to different subsets of the partition $\bar{\Omega}_a \sqcup \bar{\Omega}_b \sqcup \bar{\Omega}_c$, and the corresponding two homotopy classes have representatives which are disjoint except at their endpoints. A 3-cycle in the 1-skeleton span a 2-face, if the concatenation of the associated three arcs form a homotopically non-trivial simple closed loop in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ which is defined to be the torus obtained from $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ by adding back its punctures.

By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we know that $\bar{A}_\Lambda \cong \text{PMod}(\bar{\mathcal{S}})$ acts transitively on $\bar{\Omega}_a$, with the stabilizer of $\bar{\tau}_a$ be the subgroup $\bar{A}_{\hat{a}}$ generated by $\{\bar{b}, \bar{c}, \bar{d}\}$. This

gives a 1-1 correspondence between vertices of type \hat{a} in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$, and elements in $\bar{\Omega}_a$. By considering vertices of other types, we obtain a bijection Θ between the vertex set of $\bar{\Delta}_0$ and the vertex set of $\bar{\Delta}'_0$.

Lemma 5.5. *The bijection Θ extends to a simplicial isomorphism $\Theta : \bar{\Delta}_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}'_0$.*

Proof. By a similar argument as in Lemma 5.2, we know Θ extends to an isomorphism on the 1-skeleton. Let T be the torus obtained from $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ by filling back its punctures. Note that the 2-face F in $\bar{\Delta}_0$ with its vertices being the identity cosets $\bar{A}_{\hat{a}}, \bar{A}_{\hat{b}}, \bar{A}_{\hat{c}}$ corresponds to three arcs $\bar{\tau}_a, \bar{\tau}_b, \bar{\tau}_c$ in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ whose concatenation is a homotopically non-trivial simple closed loop in T , hence gives a 2-face in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. As any 2-face F' in $\bar{\Delta}_0$ is a translate of F , thus the vertex set of F' corresponds to three arcs whose concatenation is the image of the loop in the previous sentence under a homeomorphism. Thus F' corresponds to a 2-face in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. Conversely, given $[\tau_1] \in \bar{\Omega}_a$, $[\tau_2] \in \bar{\Omega}_b$ and $[\tau_3] \in \bar{\Omega}_c$ such that the concatenation of τ_1, τ_2, τ_3 is a homotopically non-trivial simple closed loop in T . Note that T with any homotopically non-trivial simple closed loop in T removed is always an open annulus. Thus there is a homeomorphism ϕ of T fixing $\{\bar{p}_a, \bar{p}_b, \bar{p}_c\}$ pointwise such that $\phi(\tau_a) = \bar{\tau}_1$, $\phi(\tau_b) = \bar{\tau}_2$ and $\phi(\tau_c) = \bar{\tau}_3$. Thus $\{[\tau_1], [\tau_2], [\tau_3]\}$ corresponds to $\{[\phi]\bar{A}_{\hat{a}}, [\phi]\bar{A}_{\hat{b}}, [\phi]\bar{A}_{\hat{c}}\}$, which spans a 2-face in $\bar{\Delta}_0$. \square

As Δ_0 is simply-connected ([Hua23, Lemma 6.2]), the fundamental group of $\bar{\Delta}_0 \cong \bar{\Delta}'_0$ is \mathbb{Z} . Now we display an explicit generating cycle for the fundamental group of $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. A 3-cycle in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ is *degenerate* if it does not span a 2-face in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$.

Lemma 5.6. *Let x be a vertex of a degenerate 3-cycle ω in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. Then $[\omega]$ represents a generator in $\pi_1(x, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$.*

Proof. Given $[\gamma_a], [\gamma'_a] \in \bar{\Omega}_a$, $[\gamma_b], [\gamma'_b] \in \bar{\Omega}_b$ and $[\gamma_c], [\gamma'_c] \in \bar{\Omega}_c$, such that the concatenation of $\gamma_a, \gamma_b, \gamma_c$ and the concatenation of $\gamma'_a, \gamma'_b, \gamma'_c$ form two homotopically trivial loops in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}'$. There exists a self-homeomorphism f of $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ preserving the punctures pointwise such that $f(\gamma_a) = \gamma'_a$, $f(\gamma_b) = \gamma'_b$ and $f(\gamma_c) = \gamma'_c$. So \bar{A}_Λ acts transitively on the set of degenerate 3-cycles in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. So it suffices to prove the lemma for one specific degenerate 3-cycle.

Let δ and $\delta_{\hat{a}}$ be the Garside element of A_Λ and $A_{\hat{a}}$ respectively. Then $\delta = (abcd)^3$ and $\delta = \delta_{\hat{a}} \cdot adc \cdot bda$. Recall that there is a 1-1 correspondence between top-dimensional simplices in Δ_Λ and elements in A_Λ . Let K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 be the top-dimensional simplices in Δ_Λ corresponding to identity, Δ_{bcd} , $\Delta_{bcd} \cdot adc$ and Δ_Λ respectively. Then $K_1 \cap K_2$ contains a vertex x_1 of type \hat{a} represented by the identity left coset $A_{\hat{a}}$, $K_2 \cap K_3$ contains a vertex x_2 of type \hat{b} represented by $\Delta_{bcd} \cdot A_{\hat{b}}$, and $K_3 \cap K_4$ contains a vertex x_3 of type \hat{c} represented by $\Delta_{bcd} \cdot adc \cdot A_{\hat{c}}$. Let x_4 be the vertex of type \hat{a} in K_4 . Then x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 forms an edge path P in Δ_Λ . As the action of the Garside element of A_Λ brings K_1 to K_4 , and it preserves type of vertices, this action also brings x_1 to x_4 . Thus the path P projects a 3-cycle in $\bar{\Delta}'_0 \cong \bar{\Delta}_0$ which is a generator of the fundamental group. This 3-cycle must be degenerate. \square

5.3 6-cycles in terms of 6-arcs

Let ω be an embedded 6-cycle of type I or II in Δ_Λ with consecutive vertices being $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^5$. Let $\{[\tau_i]\}_{i=0}^5$ be the homotopy classes of arcs in \mathcal{S} associated with the vertices of ω - more precisely, if x_i is of type \hat{a} or \hat{c} , then we use Lemma 5.1; if x_i is of type \hat{b} , then we use Lemma 5.5 to obtain a class $[\bar{\tau}] \in \bar{\Omega}_b$ corresponding to the image \bar{x}_i of x_i under $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}_0$, and $[\bar{\tau}]$ gives a homotopy class of arcs $[\tau]$ from p_a to p_c as $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ is identified with the interior of \mathcal{S} . We take a representative τ_i from each class, and assume the intersection number between any two of the six representatives are minimized (this is possible by putting a complete hyperbolic metric with geodesic boundary on \mathcal{S} , and considering geodesic representatives). By Lemma 5.1, Lemma 5.5 and our choice, we have:

Lemma 5.7. *Under the above assumption, $\tau_i \cap \tau_{i+1} = \emptyset$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$.*

We scissor \mathcal{S} along τ_0 to obtain the surface \mathcal{S}_0 , see Figure 4 (II). The arc τ_a of \mathcal{S} gives two subsegments in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$, which we denote by $\overline{z'p_a}$ and $\overline{p_az'}$. There is a homeomorphism $\phi : \overline{z'p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z'p_a}$ sending z to z' so that we can obtain \mathcal{S} back from \mathcal{S}_0 by gluing $\overline{z'p_a}$ and $\overline{z'p_a}$ along ϕ . Define π_0 to be the arc $\overline{z'p_a} \cup \overline{z'p_a}$ in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$.

For $i = 1, 5$, $\tau_i \subset \mathcal{S}$ gives a simple arc on \mathcal{S}_0 from p_a to z_c , which we still denoted by τ_i . For $i = 2, 3, 4$, as τ_i might intersect τ_a multiple times, τ_i gives a disjoint union of simple arcs on \mathcal{S}_0 . We will still denote the disjoint union of these simple arcs by τ_i , and each connected component of τ_i is called a *trace* of τ_i . Note that if $\tau_3 \subset \mathcal{S}_0$ is not connected, then it must contain a trace going from p_a to a point in π_0 , and possible more than one traces starting and ending in π_0 .

Definition 5.8. A π_0 -trace of τ_i is a trace with endpoints in π_0 . Let \mathcal{S}'_0 be the torus with boundary component obtained by filling the puncture p_c in \mathcal{S}_0 . A trace γ with two endpoints x, y in the boundary is *boundary parallel* in \mathcal{S}_0 (resp. \mathcal{S}'_0), if this trace and an arc α in the boundary together bound a disk in \mathcal{S}_0 (resp. \mathcal{S}'_0). Note that there are two arcs in \mathcal{S}_0 or \mathcal{S}'_0 from x to y ; if γ is a π_0 -trace, then one such arc contains z_c , and another does not. A π_0 -trace is *c-boundary-parallel* (resp. *a-boundary-parallel*) in \mathcal{S}_0 if it bound a disk in \mathcal{S}_0 together with an arc on the boundary passing through z_c (resp. not passing through z_c). A *good trace* in \mathcal{S}_0 is a π_0 -trace that is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 .

Similarly, for $i \neq 0$ and x_i of type \hat{a} or \hat{c} , we can scissor \mathcal{S} along τ_i to obtain \mathcal{S}_i . The arc τ_i gives two subarcs in $\partial\mathcal{S}_i$, whose union is denoted by π_i . We can repeat the above discussion for traces of τ_j in \mathcal{S}_i , for $j \neq i$. Moreover, we define boundary parallel and good trace in \mathcal{S}_i , as well as the surface \mathcal{S}'_i , in a similar way.

Lemma 5.9. *Given four arcs $\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3$ in \mathcal{S} in minimal position such that adjacent arcs have trivial intersection. Suppose $[\tau_1], [\tau_3] \in \Omega_c$ and $[\tau_0] \in \Omega_a$.*

1. *If τ_2 goes from p_a to z_a , then each trace of τ_2 is not a-boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 , and it is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . Moreover, each π_0 -trace of τ_3 is not a-boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 .*
2. *If τ_2 goes from p_a to p_c , then each π_0 -trace of τ_2 is not a-boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 , and it is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . Moreover, each π_0 -trace of τ_3 is not a-boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 .*

Proof. We only prove Assertion 1, as Assertion 2 is similar. Let $i = 2$ or 3. Take a trace τ of τ_i from x to y with $\{x, y\} \subset \pi_0$ such that τ is a-boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . We also view τ as an arc τ' in \mathcal{S} going from $x' \in \tau_0$ to $y' \in \tau_0$. Then in \mathcal{S} , τ' and the subsegment $\overline{x'y'}$ of τ_0 bound a disk D in \mathcal{S} . If $\{x, y\} \subset \overline{z'p_a}$ or $\{x, y\} \subset \overline{z'p_a}$, then the interior of the disk D does not contain p_a , hence τ' and τ_0 form a bigon, which contradicts our assumption that τ_i and τ_0 have minimal intersection. It remains to consider the case x and y are in the interior of $\overline{z'p_a}$ and $\overline{z'p_a}$ respectively, in which case p_a is contained in the interior of the disk D . We can also assume τ is among all such boundary parallel traces such that the pair $\{x', y'\}$ is closest to p_a in τ_0 . Suppose x' is closer to p_a than y' . Let $\tau'' \neq \tau$ be the subsegment of τ_i starting at x' until it hits τ_0 at x'' (it is possible that $x'' = p_a$). Note that the interior of τ'' is disjoint from the boundary of the disk D , we have $\tau'' \subset D$ because of orientation consideration. Then τ'' and τ_0 bound a disk $D' \subset D$. Our choice of $\{x', y'\}$ implies that p_a is not in the interior of D' , thus we reach a contradiction as before. This shows that each π_0 -trace of τ_2 or τ_3 is not a-boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 .

Now we show each trace of τ_2 is not a-boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 and it is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . Suppose by contradiction that there is a trace τ of τ_2 such that τ and a sub-arc of π_0 bound a disk $D \subset \mathcal{S}_0$ with puncture p_c in D . Note that τ_1 is a simple arc in \mathcal{S}_0 from p_c in D to z_c outside D . However, $\tau_1 \cap (\tau_0 \cup \tau_2) = \emptyset$, in particular, τ_1 disjoint from the boundary of D . This is a contradiction. Thus each trace of τ_2 is not a-boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . If τ is boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 , then by previous discussion, the only possibility left is that τ and a sub-arc $\gamma \subset \partial\mathcal{S}_0$ with $z_c \in \gamma$ bound a disk $D' \subset \mathcal{S}_0$; moreover, p_c is outside D' (if $p_c \in D'$, then τ is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0). However, this is impossible as τ_1 is an arc from p_c to z_c avoiding τ . \square

Suppose ω is of type I or II. Take $i = 2, 3$ or 4 . Let $\tau, \tau' \subset \mathcal{S}_0$ be two traces from τ_i such that they connect two points on $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$. We say τ and τ' are *parallel* if $\tau \cap \tau' = \emptyset$ and τ, τ' together with two arcs on $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ bound a disk $D \subset \mathcal{S}_0$, with possibly the puncture p_c in D . Now assuming τ and τ' are parallel. We define points $\xi \in \partial\tau$ and $\xi' \in \partial\tau'$ are *aligned*, if ξ and ξ' are contained in the same component of $\partial D \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_0$. A subset A of \mathcal{S}_0 is *squeezed* by τ and τ' if A is contained in the interior of the disk D .

Lemma 5.10. *Given four arcs $\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3$ in \mathcal{S} in minimal position such that adjacent arcs have trivial intersection. Suppose $[\tau_0], [\tau_2] \in \Omega_a$ and $[\tau_1], [\tau_3] \in \Omega_c$. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_2 has more than one traces on \mathcal{S}_0 , and all traces of τ_2 are good. Then at least one of the following hold:*

1. *there is a good trace S_3 of τ_3 in \mathcal{S}_0 such that $S_3 \cap \tau_1 = \emptyset$, and the two endpoints of S_3 are in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$;*
2. *there are traces S_3, R_3 of τ_3 in \mathcal{S}_0 such that $(S_3 \cup R_3) \cap \tau_1 = \{p_c\}$; S_3 is a good trace with its endpoints in the same component of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$; and R_3 is a trace from p_c to a point $x \in \pi_0$ with x and the endpoints of S_3 in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$;*
3. *there are traces S_3, R_3 of τ_3 in \mathcal{S}_0 such that $(S_3 \cup R_3) \cap \tau_1 = \{p_c, z_c\}$; S_3 goes from z_c to $x' \in \pi_0$ such that S_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 ; and R_3 goes from p_c to $x \in \pi_0$ such that x and x' are in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$.*




Figure 5: Proof of Lemma 5.10.

Proof. As there can be at most three different parallel classes of non-boundary-parallel traces that are mutually disjoint in a torus with one boundary component, and we assume all traces of τ_2 are good, we know there are at most three different parallel classes of τ_2 .

Case 0: p_c is squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_2 . See Figure 5 (I) for the following discussion. Let α_1 and α_{-1} be the two “innermost” parallel traces of τ_2 that squeezes p_c , i.e. there does not exist any other traces of τ_2 which is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} . As $\tau_1 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$, we know τ_1

is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} . As the arcs $\overline{z_c z}$ and $\overline{z_c z'}$ in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ have empty intersection with τ_2 except possibly at $\{z, z'\}$, these two arcs (with $\{z, z'\}$ removed) are squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} . Exactly one of $\{z, z'\}$ is contained in a trace T' of τ_2 . If $T' \cap \alpha_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, -1$, then T' is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} , contradiction. So we can assume without loss of generality that $T' = \alpha_1$ and $z \in \alpha_1$. Let $\xi_i^\pm = \partial\alpha_i$. We assume ξ_1^+ and ξ_{-1}^+ are aligned. Let D be the component of $\mathcal{S}'_0 \setminus \tau_2$ that contains p_c . Then D is an open disk, its closure \bar{D} in \mathcal{S}'_0 is a closed disk, and ∂D is made of α_1, α_{-1} , and two arcs in \mathcal{S}_0 which are γ_1 going from ξ_1^+ to ξ_{-1}^+ (passing through z_c and z') and $\gamma_2 = \overline{\xi_1^- \xi_{-1}^-}$. Note that p_a is not contained in the interior of γ_2 , otherwise the trace of π_2 containing p_a is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} , contradicting the ‘‘innermost’’ assumption.

Suppose γ_2 and $\overline{z' \xi_{-1}^+}$ are in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$. Let R_3 be the trace of τ_3 starting from p_c . As R_3 and τ_1 are two arcs from a point p_c inside D to some point in ∂D , $R_3 \cap \tau_1 = \{p_c\}$ as τ_1 and τ_3 have minimal intersection. As $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, R_3 either ends in an interior point of $\overline{z' \xi_{-1}^+}$ or an interior point of γ_2 .

If R_3 ends in $\overline{z' \xi_{-1}^+}$ at point x , then x is identified with $x' \in \pi_0$ in different side of p_a via the homeomorphism $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$. As $\xi_1^- \neq \xi_1^+$, we know $x' \notin \gamma_2$. Let S_3 be the trace of τ_3 containing x' . Then S_3 is contained in a component C of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_2$ different from D . As a point in ∂C is either in a trace of τ_2 , or in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$, we deduce from $S_3 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ and $\partial C \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \pi_0$ that two endpoints of S_3 are contained in π_0 .

Now we show S_3 is a good trace. It suffices to show S_3 not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . If S_3 and an arc $A \subset \partial\mathcal{S}'_0$ bound a disk D' in \mathcal{S}'_0 , then any trace of τ_2 has empty intersection with D' except at $S_3 \cap A$, otherwise τ_2 will contain a trace which is boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 , contradiction. It follows that $D' \subset C$. In particular, $p_c \notin D'$ and $A \subset \pi_0$, thus S_3 is a -boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . This contradicts Lemma 5.9. Hence S_3 is good.

As $\tau_1 \subset D$, we know $S_3 \cap \tau_1 = \emptyset$. Then we are in Lemma 5.10 (1) or (2) depending whether the two endpoints of S_3 are in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$ or not.

If R_3 ends at $x \in \gamma_2$, then x is identified via ϕ to a point $x' \in \overline{z' p_a}$. Note that $x' \notin \overline{z' \xi_{-1}^+}$. Thus the trace S_3 of τ_3 containing x' lies in a component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_2$ which is different from D , and we can finish the argument as before.

It remains to consider the situation that γ_2 and $\overline{z' \xi_{-1}^+}$ are in the same side of $p_a \in \pi_0$. Let R_3 as before. Similarly in all cases the next trace S_3 of τ_3 is contained in a component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_3$ which is different from D . Then we finish as before.

Case 1: there is only one parallel class of traces of τ_2 . Because of Case 0, we assume p_c is not squeezed by two traces of τ_2 . See Figure 5 (II) for the following discussion. Order the traces of τ_2 as $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^k$ such that for each $1 < i_0 < k$, all of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=i_0+1}^k$ are in one side of α_{i_0} in the sense that $\{\partial\alpha_i\}_{i=i_0+1}^k$ is contained in the same component of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial\alpha_{i_0}$, and all of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{i_0-1}$ are in one side of α_{i_0} . Let $\xi_i^\pm = \partial\alpha_i$, and we assume $\{\xi_i^+\}_{i=1}^k$ are aligned in the sense defined before Lemma 5.10. Hence $\{\xi_i^-\}_{i=1}^k$ are also aligned. We assume without loss of generality that ξ_1^\pm is closest to z_c in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ among $\{\xi_i^\pm\}_{i=1}^k$.

Note that in \mathcal{S} , τ_2 starts at z_a , and possibly hits the interior of τ_0 several times before it ends at p_a . Thus the $2k$ points in $\{\xi_i^\pm\}_{i=1}^k$ must contain one point which is either z or z' , one point which is p_a , $(k-1)$ points in the interior of $\overline{z p_a}$, and $(k-1)$ points in the interior of $\overline{z' p_a}$ which is the image of the previous $(k-1)$ points under the homeomorphism $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$. As we were assuming that ξ_1^\pm is closest to z_c , one of ξ_1^\pm , say ξ_1^+ , must be one of $\{z, z'\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $\xi_1^+ = z$. As all the α_i 's are parallel to each other, the $2k$ points $\{\xi_i^+\}_{i=1}^k$ must be ordered as $\{\xi_1^+, \dots, \xi_k^+, \xi_k^-, \dots, \xi_1^-\}$ in the interval π_0 . Thus $p_a = \xi_k^-$. Let A be the only annulus region of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^k \alpha_i)$. Then $p_c \in A$, and $\partial A \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_0$ has two components, the first one γ_1 is the arc from ξ_k^+ to $\xi_k^- = p_a$, and the second one γ_2 is the arc from ξ_1^+ to ξ_1^- (passing through z_c and z').

As $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, we know the trace R_3 of τ_3 starting at p_c must end in an interior point of $\overline{\xi_k^+ \xi_k^-}$ or $\overline{z' \xi_1^-}$. If R_3 ends in an interior point of $\overline{z' \xi_1^-}$, then this point is identified with an interior

point of $\overline{\xi_1^+ \xi_2^+}$ via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$. As $\tau_3 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ and the intersection of τ_3 and τ_1 is minimal, the next trace of τ_3 , denoted by S_3 , is squeezed by α_1 and α_2 , ending in an interior point of $\overline{\xi_1^- \xi_2^-}$. In particular S_3 is a good trace and the two endpoints of S_3 are in different sides of p_a in π_0 . As τ_1 is an arc in \mathcal{S}_0 which is disjoint from all traces of τ_2 , we have $\tau_1 \subset A$. However, $S_3 \cap A = \emptyset$. Thus $\tau_1 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$ and we are in case 1 in the statement of Lemma 5.10. Then case R_3 ends in $\overline{\xi_k^+ \xi_k^-}$ is similar.

Case 2: there are exactly two parallel classes of traces of τ_2 . Again we assume p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_2 . Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be the two parallel classes of traces. Note that for each α_i , the two endpoints of $\alpha_{i'}$ with $i' \neq i$ are contained in the same component of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial \alpha_i$; and the two endpoints of any β_j are contained in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial \alpha_i$. Let $\xi_i^\pm = \partial \alpha_i$ and $\eta_j^\pm = \partial \beta_j$. Then we can order α_i and β_j such that their boundary points in $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$ is as in Figure 5 (III) (see also Figure 5 (IV)) - here we are assuming without loss of generality that $z \in \alpha_1$. The collection of boundary points of all α_i and β_j contains $\{z, p_a\}$, with the remaining $2(m+n-1)$ paired up via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$. A counting argument implies that $\xi_n^- = p_a$. This implies in particular that $n > 1$, otherwise τ_2 only has a single trace α_1 going from z to p_a .

Note that components $\mathcal{S}'_0 \setminus \tau_2$ are all disks. There is a unique component D whose boundary have two α traces and two β traces. More precisely, ∂D is made of $\alpha_1, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \beta_m$, and 4 arcs in $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$ as follows: γ_1 goes from η_1^- to z (via z' and z_c), $\gamma_2 = \overline{\xi_n^+ \eta_1^+}$, $\gamma_3 = \overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ and $\gamma_4 = \overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$. By our assumption on p_c , we know $p_c \in D$. Let R_3 be the trace of τ_3 containing p_c . By a similar argument as before, we know $R_3 \cap \tau_1 = \{p_c\}$. As $\tau_1 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, R_3 ends on an interior point x of either $\overline{z' \eta_1^-}$, or γ_2 , or γ_3 , or γ_4 . If x is in $\overline{z' \eta_1^-}$ or γ_3 , then $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ identifies x with another point x' which is squeezed by two α traces (this uses that $n > 1$). Thus the trace S_3 of τ_3 starting at x' is squeezed by two α traces, in particular S_3 is a good. By Figure 5 (III), the two endpoints of S_3 are in two different sides of p_a , thus we are in Lemma 5.10 (1). It remains to consider the case $x \in \gamma_2$ or γ_4 .

Note that ϕ identifies γ_2 and γ_4 if and only if $n-1 = m$. Thus if $n-1 \neq m$, then ϕ identify x with a point x' which is either squeezed by two α traces, or squeezed by β traces, and similar as before by taking S_3 to the trace starting at x' we are in Lemma 5.10 (1). Now assume $n-1 = m$. We first look at the case $x \in \gamma_2$. Then $x' \in \gamma_4$. Let T be the trace of τ_3 containing x' . Then $T \subset D \cup \partial D$. The possibilities of the endpoint x'' of T are (1) $x'' = z_c$; (2) $x'' \in \overline{z' \eta_1^-}$; (3) $x'' \in \gamma_4$; (4) $x'' \in \gamma_3$; (5) $x'' \in \gamma_2$. If (1) happens, then the minimal intersection assumption of τ_1 and τ_3 implies that $T \cap \tau_1 = \{z_c\}$, and we are in Lemma 5.10 (3) by taking $T = S_3$. If (2) or (4) happens, then we are reduced to the previous paragraph. If (3) happens, then $T \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$, hence T and γ_4 bound a disk D' in \mathcal{S}'_0 . As $\gamma_3 \subset \pi_0$, Lemma 5.9 imply that $p_c \in D'$. However, this is impossible as $T \cap R_3 = \emptyset$. If (5) happens, then we look at the next trace of τ_3 and repeat the previous discussion, and we are done after finitely many steps. The case $x \in \gamma_4$ is similar.

Case 3: there are exactly three parallel classes of traces of τ_2 . Suppose as before that p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_2 . Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and $\{\gamma_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^r$ be the parallel classes. Suppose $\partial \alpha_i = \xi_i^\pm$, $\partial \beta_j = \eta_j^\pm$ and $\partial \gamma_\ell = \zeta_\ell^\pm$. We assume without loss of generality that $z \in \alpha_1$, and assume the traces and their boundaries are arranged in Figure 5 (V) and (VI). A counting argument implies that $\xi_n^- = p_a$, and a similar argument as before implies that $n > 1$. Let D be the connected component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_2$ that contains p_c . Then ∂D is made of α_1, γ_1 and β_m , together with the following three arcs on $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$: θ_1 going from ζ_1^- to z via z' and z_c , $\theta_2 = \overline{\eta_m^+ \zeta_1^+}$ and $\theta_3 = \overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$. Let R_3 be the trace of τ_3 starting at p_c and ending at x . Then x is an interior point of either $\overline{z' \zeta_1^-}$, or θ_2 , or θ_3 . If $x \in \overline{z' \zeta_1^-}$, then we can argue as in Case 2, using $n > 1$.

Assume $x \in \theta_2$ or θ_3 . Note that $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ identifies θ_2 and θ_3 if and only if $n-1 = r$, in which case η_m^+ and η_m^- are identified. This contradicts that τ_2 is a simple arc in \mathcal{S} . Thus $n-1 \neq r$. Let x' be the point which is identified with x via ϕ , and let S_3 be the trace of τ_3 containing x' . Then S_3 and τ_1 are contained in different components of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_2$. Similar to previous cases, S_3 is a good trace. As $\partial S_3 \subset \pi_0$, we are either in Lemma 5.10 (1) or Lemma 5.10 (2). \square

Corollary 5.11. *Suppose ω is of type I or II. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_3 has a trace S_3 satisfying at least one of the cases of Lemma 5.10. Then in each cases of Lemma 5.10, there exists a trace S_4 of τ_4 such that one of the following holds:*

1. S_4 is good, and S_3 and S_4 are not parallel;
2. S_4 is good, S_3 and S_4 are parallel and p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and S_4 ;
3. S_4 is c -boundary-parallel in S'_0 .

Proof. Suppose Case 3 does not happen. Then Lemma 5.9 implies that all traces of τ_4 are good. Suppose Case 1 does not happen. As $S_4 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, we can assume all traces of τ_4 are parallel to S_3 . As x_4 is of type \hat{a} , one trace of τ_4 , denoted τ , contains one of $\{z, z'\}$ (see Figure 4 (II)). One trace of τ_4 , denoted τ' , contains p_a .

In Case (1) of Lemma 5.10, as two endpoints of τ (or τ') are in the same component of $\partial S_0 \setminus S_3$, we know $\tau \neq \tau'$ and S_3 is squeezed by τ and τ' . Thus p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and one of $\{\tau, \tau'\}$. In Case (2) of Lemma 5.10, suppose without loss of generality that $\partial S_3 = \{y, y'\} \subset \overline{z'p_a}$. Then $x \in \overline{zp_a}$ (x is defined in Lemma 5.10 (2)). If p_c is not squeezed by τ' and S_3 , then we are done. Otherwise, R_3 is squeezed by τ' and S_3 as $R_3 \cap (\tau' \cup S_3) = \emptyset$. Let C be the component of $\partial S_0 \setminus \partial S_3$ that contains p_a . Then the two endpoints of τ' are contained in the same component of $C \setminus \{x\}$. As one endpoint of τ (which is either z or z') and $\partial\tau'$ are contained in different components of $C \setminus \{x\}$, we know x , hence R_3 and p_c , are squeezed by τ and τ' . Moreover, τ is squeezed by S_3 and τ' . Thus p_c is not squeezed by τ and S_3 . Case (3) of Lemma 5.10 can be treated similarly. \square

5.4 Big points on the cycle ω

Let ω be a 6-cycle of type I or II. We define the 6-cycle ω is *big* at x_i , if x_{i-1} and x_{i+1} are not adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{d} in Δ_Λ , otherwise ω is *small* at x_i . A simple arc in S_0 is *good*, if it starts and ends at two different points in ∂S_0 , and it is not boundary parallel in the surface S'_0 defined in Definition 5.8.

Lemma 5.12. *Consider an embedded edge path in Δ_Λ with consecutive vertices x_1, x_0, x_5 with x_1 and x_5 having type \hat{c} and x_0 having type \hat{a} . Let τ_1, τ_0, τ_5 be the associated arcs in \mathcal{S} . Suppose the trace of τ_1 and τ_5 in S_0 satisfy one of the following conditions. Then x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{d} in Δ_Λ .*

1. There is a good arc $\alpha \subset S_0$ such that $\alpha \cap \tau_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 5$.
2. The arcs τ_1 and τ_5 fit together to form a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve on S_0 which is not homotopic to ∂S_0 .
3. There are two good arcs $\alpha \neq \alpha'$ of S_0 such that $\partial\alpha \cup \partial\alpha'$ gives four distinct points on ∂S_0 , α and α' are parallel, $\tau_1 \cap \alpha \subset \{z_c\}$, $\tau_5 \cap \alpha' \subset \{z_c\}$ and p_c is not squeezed by α and α' .
4. There is a good arc $\alpha \subset S_0$ such that $\alpha \cap \tau_i \subset \{z_c\}$ for $i = 1, 5$.

Proof. For Assertion 1, we claim that in \mathcal{S} , there are infinitely many homotopy classes of arcs from p_a to z_a such that each class contain a representative that is disjoint from $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$. This claim and Lemma 5.2 imply there are infinitely many vertices of type \hat{a} which are adjacent to both x_1 and x_5 in Δ_Λ , and Assertion 1 now follows from Theorem 2.17. It remains to show the claim.

We first arrange α such that its two endpoints are contained a small open interval $I \subset \partial S_0$ containing z_c with $I \cap \pi_0 = \emptyset$, lying in different components of $I \setminus \{z_c\}$. To see this, we scissor S_0 along α to obtain an annulus A_0 punctured at p_c . Then z_c is contained one boundary component C of A_0 , and τ_1 and τ_5 are simple arcs of A_0 from p_c to z_c . Thus we can take α starting at a

point on C very close to z_c , going around A_0 (and staying close to C) once, and ending at a point on C very close to z_c , but on different side. We still have $\alpha \cap \tau_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 5$. This new choice of α can also be viewed as an arc on \mathcal{S} connecting two points on the boundary, such that $\alpha \cap (\tau_1 \cup \tau_5) = \emptyset$ and z_a and z_c are in different components of $\partial\mathcal{S} \setminus \alpha$. We scissor \mathcal{S} along α to obtain the annulus A with two punctures p_a and p_c . Note that z_a and z_c are contained in different boundary components of A , and τ_1 and τ_5 are simple arcs in A from p_c to z_c . As there is one simple arc, namely τ_0 , goes from p_a to z_a avoiding $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$, then there are infinitely many isotopy classes of simple arcs in A traveling from p_a to z_a avoiding $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$, by taking τ_0 and applying powers of Dehn twist along the boundary component of A containing z_a . Thus the claim is proved.

Assertion 2 follows from Assertion 1 as one can find a good arc as in Assertion 1 under the assumption of Assertion 2.

For Assertion 3, if z_c is squeezed by α and α' , then $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$ gives a simple closed curve on \mathcal{S}_0 which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ and we are reduced to Assertion 2. If $z_c \notin (\alpha \cup \alpha')$ and z_c is not squeezed by α and α' , then we can find a normal open neighborhood N of α in \mathcal{S}_0 with $\alpha' \subset N$ and $p_c, z_c \notin N$. As $\tau_1 \cap \alpha = \emptyset$ and $\partial\tau_1 \cap N = \emptyset$, up to homotopy we can assume $\tau_1 \cap N = \emptyset$. Hence $\tau_1 \cap \alpha' = \emptyset$. As $\tau_5 \cap \alpha' = \emptyset$, we are reduced to Assertion 1.

It remains to treat the situation that $z_c \in (\alpha \cup \alpha')$. Assume without loss of generality that $z_c \in \alpha'$. By the argument in the previous paragraph, we can assume $\tau_1 \cap \alpha' = \{z_c\}$. We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along α' to obtain a punctured annulus B_0 , in which we have two copies of α' inside two boundary components of B_0 , which are denoted by $(\alpha')^+$ and $(\alpha')^-$. Similarly we define $z_c^+ \in (\alpha')^+$ and $z_c^- \in (\alpha')^-$. Then τ_i for $i = 1, 5$ can be viewed as a simple arc in B_0 with starting point p_c and endpoint being either z_c^+ or z_c^- . If τ_1 and τ_5 in B_0 have the same endpoint, then we are reduced to Assertion 1; if τ_1 and τ_5 in B_0 have different endpoints, then we are reduced to Assertion 2.

Assertion 4 is similar to Assertion 3, and it is left to the reader. \square

Corollary 5.13. *Suppose ω is of type I. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose at least one of τ_2 and τ_4 contains a trace that is boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . Then ω is small at x_0 .*

Proof. Suppose exactly one of τ_2 and τ_4 , say τ_2 , enjoys the property that all traces are good. We first consider the situation that τ_2 has multiple traces. Then let S_3 be as in Lemma 5.10. Let S_4 be a trace of τ_4 that is boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . By Lemma 5.9, there is an arc $\gamma \subset \partial\mathcal{S}_0$ with $z_c \in \gamma$ such that S_4 and γ bound a punctured disk $D \subset \mathcal{S}_0$ with p_c inside. As γ_5 is a simple arc from p_c to z_c avoiding S_4 , we know $\gamma_5 \subset D$. As $S_3 \cap S_4 = \emptyset$ and S_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 , we know S_3 and γ_5 are in different components of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus S_4$. In particular $\gamma_5 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$. On the other hand, $\gamma_1 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$. By possibly perturbing one endpoint of S_3 by a small amount, we can use Lemma 5.12 (1) to conclude that ω is small at x_0 .

Now we consider the situation that τ_2 has a single trace. Let S_4, γ, D be as before. Note that τ_2 and S_4 are in minimal position in \mathcal{S}'_0 , otherwise they form a bigon in \mathcal{S}'_0 with the puncture p_c inside the bigon, which is impossible as a trace of τ_3 must start from p_c and end in a point in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ without intersecting the bigon because we are assuming $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. As S_4 is isotopic to γ in \mathcal{S}'_0 rel endpoints, the number of intersection points between S_4 and τ_2 is equal to the number of intersection points between γ and τ_2 .

Next we analyze the position of γ and S_4 . Note that τ_4 must contain a trace S'_4 that contains one of $\{z, z'\}$. As $\{z, z'\} \subset D$, we know S'_4 is inside D if $S'_4 \neq S_4$, which implies S'_4 is c -boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . Thus up to replacing S_4 by S'_4 , we can assume S_4 contains one of $\{z, z'\}$. If S_4 contains z , then the other endpoint x' of S_4 is contained in $\overline{z'p_a}$, otherwise $\overline{z'p_a} \subset \gamma \subset D$ and x' is identified via $\phi : \overline{zp_a} \rightarrow \overline{z'p_a}$ to a point $x'' \in \overline{zp_a}$, which is not possible as the trace of τ_4 containing x'' will be trapped in D and have nowhere to go given that it must be c -boundary-parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 but not a -boundary-parallel. Similarly, if S_4 contains z' , then the other endpoint of S_4 is contained in $\overline{zp_a}$.

First we consider the case $z \in S_4$ and $z \in \tau_2$. We claim that $\tau_2 \cap S_4$ does not contain a point in the interior of τ_2 . Assume by contradiction that such a point exists. Let w' be the point in τ_2 after z that is in $S_4 \cap \tau_2$, and let τ_2' be the subarc of τ_2 from z to w' . Then $\tau_2' \cap D = \{z, w'\}$, otherwise $\tau_2' \subset D$, hence the minimal position between τ_2 and τ_4 means that τ_2' and part of S_4 form a bigon with p_c inside, contradicting that τ_3 has a trace from p_c to a point in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ avoiding $\tau_2 \cup \tau_4$. Let w'' be the next point of τ_2 after w' that is in $S_4 \cap \tau_2$ (note that w'' exists as τ_2 does not end in the interior of D). Let τ_2'' be the subarc of τ_2 from w' to w'' . As τ_2'' is outside D , by minimal position between τ_2 and τ_4 , we know $\tau_2'' \subset D$. We reach a contradiction by using the bigon argument. The claim follows. This claim implies that $\tau_5 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$, then ω is small at x_0 by $\tau_1 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ and Lemma 5.12 (1).

Second we consider the case $z \in S_4$ and $z' \in \tau_2$. We claim $S_4 \cap \tau_2$ has one point in the interior of τ_2 . Indeed, $S_4 \cap \tau_2$ has at least one point in the interior of τ_2 , otherwise $\tau_0 = \tau_2$. Note that $S_4 \cap \tau_2$ cut τ_2 into subarcs. If $S_4 \cap \tau_2$ has at least two points in the interior of τ_2 , then there are at least three such subarcs of τ_2 . Let τ_2', τ_2'' and τ_2''' be the first three subarcs, starting from $z' \in \tau_2' \subset \tau_2$. Note that p_c and z_c are in different components of $D \setminus \tau_2'$, otherwise using $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$ we can conclude that $\tau_3 = \tau_5$. As $\tau_2' \subset D$, we know τ_2'' is outside D excepts its endpoints, and $\tau_2''' \subset D$. As τ_2 does not end in an interior point of D , we can reach a contradiction by considering the bigon between τ_2''' and a subarc of S_4 , indeed, the trace of τ_3 containing p_c is trapped in this bigon, and it can not end at any point in \mathcal{S}_0 except p_a , which is impossible. Thus the claim is proved. It follows that $\tau_5 \cap \tau_2$ is exactly one point. We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along τ_2 to obtain a punctured annulus A_0 , with z_c in one boundary component C of A_0 . As $\tau_5 \subset D$, we know the trajectory of τ_5 in A_0 first goes from $z_c \in C$ to another point in C , then jump to another boundary component and travel to p_c via a simple arc. On the other hand, τ_1 is a simple arc from z_c to p_c in A_0 . Thus $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$ gives a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve on \mathcal{S}_0 which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$. Hence ω is small at x_0 by Lemma 5.12 (2).

The remaining two cases ($z' \in S_4$ and $z' \in \tau_2$, and $z' \in S_4$ and $z \in \tau_2$) follow by symmetry. This finishes the discussion when τ_2 has a single trace.

Suppose for $i = 2, 4$, τ_i contains at least one trace τ_i' which is not good. Then we deduce as before that for $i = 2, 4$, τ_i' and an arc $\gamma_i \subset \partial\mathcal{S}_0$ containing z_c bound a punctured disk D_i with p_c inside. Moreover, $\tau_1 \subset D_2$ and $\tau_5 \subset D_4$. Note that $\tau_2' \cap \tau_4'$ is at most one point in their interior, otherwise they form a bigon containing p_c due to the minimal intersection of τ_2 and τ_4 , which is impossible as p_c is connected to a point in \mathcal{S}_0 without touching $\tau_2' \cup \tau_4'$ by our $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$ assumption. It follows that τ_2' and τ_5 has at most one interior intersection point, however, one interior intersection point is impossible as this would imply $p_c \notin D_2$. Thus $\tau_2' \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$. This implies that τ_1 and τ_5 are isotopic rel endpoints in \mathcal{S}_0 , contradicting that the 6-cycle ω is embedded. \square

5.5 Filling type I 6-cycles

The goal of this subsection is prove Proposition 5.29.

Lemma 5.14. *Suppose ω is of type I. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_3 has a trace S_3 satisfying at least one of the cases of Lemma 5.10. Assume in additional that the 6-cycle ω is big at x_0 . Then p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_4 .*

Proof. By Corollary 5.13, all traces of τ_4 in \mathcal{S}_0 are good. We argue by contradiction and assume T_4 and T_4' are two parallel traces of τ_4 that squeeze p_c . As τ_5 is a simple arc in \mathcal{S}_0 from p_c to z_c and $\tau_5 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$, we know τ_5 is squeezed by T_4 and T_4' . Let S_3 be as in Lemma 5.10. Then $S_3 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$. If S_3 is not squeezed by T_4 and T_4' , then S_3 and τ_5 are contained in different components of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus (T_4 \cup T_4')$. Thus $S_3 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$, moreover, as $z_c \notin S_3$, we are in Lemma 5.10 (1) or (2). Thus $\tau_1 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$ by Lemma 5.10. By Lemma 5.12 (1), ω is small at x_0 , contradiction. It remains to consider the case when S_3 is squeezed by T_4 and T_4' . Then S_3 is parallel to T_4 and T_4' . It follows that either p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and T_4 , or p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and T_4' .

As $\tau_1 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$ by Lemma 5.10 and $\tau_5 \cap (T_4 \cup T'_4) = \emptyset$, we deduce from Lemma 5.12 (3) that ω is small at x_0 , contradiction. \square

Lemma 5.15. *Suppose ω is of type I or II. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_3 has a trace S_3 satisfying at least one of the cases of Lemma 5.10. If there is a trace S_4 of τ_4 parallel to S_3 such that p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and S_4 , then ω is small at x_0 .*

Proof. As $S_4 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$, and $S_3 \cap \tau_1 \subset \{z_c\}$, we are done by Lemma 5.12 (3). \square

Lemma 5.16. *Suppose ω is of type I. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_3 has a trace S_3 satisfying at least one of the cases of Lemma 5.10. Assume in addition that the 6-cycle ω is big at x_0 . Then in each case of Lemma 5.10, p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and a trace of τ_4 which is parallel to S_3 .*

Proof. By Corollary 5.13, all traces of τ_2 and τ_4 are good. By contradiction we assume p_c is squeezed by S_3 and a trace of T_4 of τ_4 . Note that not all traces of τ_4 are parallel to S_3 , otherwise by Corollary 5.11, there is a trace S_4 of τ_4 parallel to S_3 such that p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and S_4 . This and Lemma 5.15 lead to a contradiction.

Recall that one of z and z' is contained in a trace of τ_4 . We assume without loss of generality that z is contained in a trace T'_4 of τ_4 . Let P_{T_4} be the collection all traces of τ_4 that are parallel to T_4 . Similarly we define $P_{T'_4}$. Then p_c is squeezed by S_3 and any member of P_{T_4} (otherwise we will have a contradiction with Lemma 5.14). So we are free to replace by T_4 by any other member of P_{T_4} , and the following holds.

Claim 5.17. All boundary points of elements in P_{T_4} are contained in the same component of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial\mathcal{S}_3$, and any trace of τ_4 not in P_{T_4} has its two boundary points in different components of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial\mathcal{S}_3$. Moreover, p_c and S_3 are in the same component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_4$.

Claim 5.18. The point z_c is not squeezed by S_3 and a member of P_{T_4} . Moreover, $z_c \notin S_3$, hence S_3 is in Lemma 5.10 (1) or (2).

Proof. We argue by contradiction and assume either $z_c \in S_3$, or z_c is squeezed by S_3 and a member T of P_{T_4} . Let τ'_5 be a simple arc from p_c to z_c which is squeezed by S_3 and T (except possibly at z_c). Take a trace T' of τ_4 which is not parallel to T . As $T' \cap (T \cup S_3) = \emptyset$, we know T' and $\tau'_5 \setminus \{z_c\}$ are in different components of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus (S_3 \cup T)$. In particular, $\tau'_5 \cap (T \cup T') = \emptyset$. We also have $\tau_5 \cap (T \cup T') = \emptyset$. If we scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along $(T \cup T')$, we obtain a disk D puncture at p_c . In D there is only one homotopy class of arcs from p_c to $z_c \in \partial D$. Thus we can assume $\tau_5 = \tau'_5$. In particular, $\tau_5 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$. On the other hand $\tau_1 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$ by Lemma 5.10. Then Lemma 5.12 (4) implies that ω is not big at x_0 , contradiction. \square

Claim 5.19. T'_4 is not parallel to S_3 . In particular, $z \notin T_4$ and $z' \notin T_4$.

Proof. We argue by contradiction and assume T'_4 is parallel to S_3 . Then $P_{T_4} = P_{T'_4}$. We repeat the discussion in Lemma 5.10 with τ_2 replaced by τ_4 . By Lemma 5.14, the boundaries of traces of τ_4 are as in Figure 5 (III) or (V), where ξ_i^\pm is the boundary of an element in $P_{T'_4}$. Let x and x' be two endpoints of S_3 . By Claim 5.17 and Claim 5.18, if we are in Figure 5 (III), then up to exchanging x and x' , either $x \in \xi_n^+ \eta_1^+$ and $x' \in \eta_m^+ \xi_n^-$, or $x \in \xi_1^- \eta_m^-$ and $x' \in z' \eta_1^-$. In the former case, S_3 must belong to Lemma 5.10 (2). Let R_3 be as in Lemma 5.10 (2). As p_c is squeezed by S_3 and T , where $T \in P_{T'_4}$ goes from ξ_n^+ to ξ_n^- , and $R_3 \cap (T \cup S_3) = \emptyset$, we know that R_3 is squeezed by S_3 and T . As x is aligned with ξ_n^+ and x' is aligned with ξ_n^- , we know R_3 ends in a point in $\xi_n^+ \eta_1^+ \cup \eta_m^+ \xi_n^-$. Thus the endpoint of R_3 and $\partial\mathcal{S}_3$ are contained in the same side of p_a , contradicting Lemma 5.10 (2). In the latter case, let $T' \in P_{T'_4}$ be the trace going from ξ_1^+ to ξ_1^- , we still know p_c is squeezed by T' and S_3 . As x' is aligned with ξ_1^+ and x is aligned with ξ_1^- , we know z_c is also squeezed by T' and S_3 , contradicting Claim 5.18. If we are in Figure 5 (V), either $x \in \xi_n^+ \eta_1^+$ and $x' \in \zeta_r^+ \xi_n^-$, or $x \in \xi_1^- \eta_m^-$ and $x' \in z' \zeta_1^-$. This can be treated as before. \square

Claim 5.20. There exists a trace S'_3 of τ_3 between two points in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ such that S'_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 (see Definition 5.8), S'_3 is not parallel to S_3 , and $S'_3 \cap \tau_5 \subset \{z_c\}$.

Proof. We repeat the discussion of Lemma 5.10 with τ_2 replaced by τ_4 . If τ_4 has exactly two parallel families of traces, then by Lemma 5.14, the boundaries of traces of τ_4 is as in Figure 5 (III), where η_j^\pm is the boundary of an element in P_{T_4} and ξ_i^\pm is the boundary of an element in $P_{T'_4}$. By Claim 5.17 and Claim 5.18, S_3 either goes from an interior point of $\overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ to an interior point of $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$, or from a point in $\overline{\eta_1^+ \xi_n^+}$ to a point in $\overline{z' \eta_1^-}$. In each of the cases, one endpoint of S_3 is identified via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ to a point which is squeezed by two elements in $P_{T'_4}$ (recall that $n > 1$ in Figure 5 (III)). Thus S_3 is followed by another trace S'_3 of τ_3 that is squeezed by two elements of $P_{T'_4}$. In particular, S'_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . Recall that $\tau_4 \cap (\tau_3 \cup \tau_5) = \emptyset$. As p_c (hence τ_5) and S_3 are in the same component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_4$ (Claim 5.17), we know τ_5 and S'_3 are in different components of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_4$. Thus $\tau_5 \cap S'_3 = \emptyset$. Claim 5.19 implies that S'_3 and S_3 are not parallel.

Now we assume τ_4 has three parallel families of traces, then by Lemma 5.14, the boundaries of traces of τ_4 is as in Figure 5 (V), where ξ_i^\pm is the boundary of an element in $P_{T'_4}$. There are two subcases to consider. For the first subcase, suppose ζ_ℓ^\pm is the boundary of an element in P_{T_4} . By Claim 5.17 and Claim 5.18, S_3 goes from a point in $\overline{\zeta_1^+ \eta_m^+}$ to a point in $\overline{z' \zeta_1^-}$. The rest of the argument is the same as the previous graph. For the second subcase, suppose η_j^\pm is the boundary of an element in P_{T_4} . By Claim 5.17 and Claim 5.18, S_3 goes from an interior point of $\overline{\eta_m^+ \zeta_1^+}$ to an interior point of $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$. Let m, n, r be as in Case 3 of the proof of Lemma 5.10 and recall that $n - 1 \neq r$. Then either y is identified via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ to a point between ξ_1^- and ξ_n^- , or y' is identified via ϕ to a point between ζ_1^+ and ζ_r^+ (this uses $n > 1$). Thus S_3 is followed by a trace of τ_3 which is squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_4 that are not parallel to S_3 , and we can finish in the same way as the previous paragraph. \square




Figure 6: Proof of Lemma 5.16

Claim 5.21. The two endpoints of T_4 are contained in different components of $\pi_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$. The same statement holds for S_3 .

Proof. The T_4 case follows from Claim 5.19, Lemma 5.14 and Figure 5 (III) (V). The S_3 case follows by looking at each cases in the proof of Claim 5.20. \square

Claim 5.22. The point z_c and $\partial\mathcal{S}_3$ are in different components of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$.

Proof. By Claim 5.20, $\tau_5 \cap (T_4 \cup S'_3) \subset \{z_c\}$. As S'_3 is not parallel to T_4 , $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus (T_4 \cup S'_3)$ is an open disk with puncture p_c . Thus T_4 and S'_3 completely determine τ_5 , and up to a homeomorphism we can assume they are as in Figure 6 (I). As S_3 satisfies Lemma 5.10 (1) or (2), $\tau_1 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$. Thus $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$ forms a simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}_0 which is homotopically non-trivial, and not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$. The claim now follows from Lemma 5.12 (2). \square

As z_c and ∂S_3 are in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$, up to a homeomorphism, we can assume we are in Figure 6 (II). As in Claim 5.22, τ_5 is determined by T_4 and S'_3 .

Claim 5.23. If τ_2 has a trace γ which is not parallel to S_3 , then ω is small at x_0 .

Proof. We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along $(S_3 \cup S'_3)$ to obtain a closed disk D with a puncture p_c , see Figure 6 (III). Let $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be four corner arcs in Figure 6 (III). By Claim 5.22 and Claim 5.18, z_c must be in either γ_1 and γ_2 and it lies below the endpoints of T_4 . Assume without loss of generality that $z_c \in \gamma_2$. As before, τ_5 is completely determined by T_4 and S'_3 , hence τ_5 is as in Figure 6 (III). As $\gamma \cap (S_3 \cup S'_3) = \emptyset$, γ is a good trace in \mathcal{S}_0 , and γ is not parallel to S_3 , we know γ starts in an interior point x of γ_1 or γ_2 , and ends in an interior x' of γ_3 or γ_4 . Let τ'_1 be the dashed arc from p_c to z_c in Figure 6 (III), and let τ''_1 be the union of the dashed arc from p_c to y , and the dashed arc from y' to z_c . We assume y and y' are identified if we glued sides of D to form \mathcal{S}_0 , so τ'_1 and τ''_1 actually give an arc in \mathcal{S}_0 . We claim up to an isotopy, γ has empty intersection with one of τ'_1 and τ''_1 . Assuming this claim, noting that τ_1 is characterized (up to isotopy) as the arc having empty intersection with γ and S_3 , thus $\tau_1 = \tau'_1$ or τ''_1 up to isotopy, and $\tau_1 \cup \tau_5$ forms a simple closed curve on \mathcal{S}_0 satisfying the requirement of Lemma 5.12 (2), implying ω is small at x_0 .

It remains to prove the claim. If x is above T_4 , then the claim is clear. If x is contained or below T_4 , then the claim reduces to showing that $\gamma \cap T_4$ is either empty or equal to $\{x\}$. If this is not the case, then γ forms a bigon with T_4 , with the puncture p_c insider the bigon. Let R_3 be the trace of τ_3 containing p_c . As $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$, we know $R_3 \cap (\gamma \cup T_4) = \emptyset$. It follows that R_3 is contained in the interior of \mathcal{S}_0 . Since we assume $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, R_3 ends on a point in \mathcal{S}_0 . This is a contradiction. \square

The only possibility left is that all traces of τ_2 are parallel to S_3 . Let S'_2 be the trace of τ_2 containing p_a , and let S_2 be the trace of τ_2 containing one of $\{z, z'\}$.

Claim 5.24. Suppose all traces of τ_2 are parallel to S_3 . Then $S'_2 \neq S_2$ and p_c is squeezed by S'_2 and S_2 .

Proof. From now on, we choose T_4 such that there are no other traces of τ_4 which is squeezed by T_4 and S_3 . Claim 5.21 and Claim 5.22 still hold with such choice. By Claim 5.21, $\{z, z'\}$ and p_a are in different sides of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial S_3$. As S'_2 and S_2 are parallel to S_3 , $\partial S'_2$ and ∂S_2 are in different sides of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial S_3$. Thus $S'_2 \neq S_2$, and S_3 is squeezed by S'_2 and S_2 .

Now suppose τ_4 has two parallel families of traces. Thus we assume we are in Case 2 of the proof of Lemma 5.10, with the role of τ_2 in Lemma 5.10 replaced by τ_4 . We will use the same notation as in Lemma 5.10, see Figure 5 (III). By our choice of T_4 , either $\partial T_4 = \eta_m^\pm$ or $\partial T_4 = \eta_1^\pm$. Note that S_3 must go from an interior point of $\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-$ to an interior point of $\xi_1^- \eta_m^-$, as the other possibility - S_3 going from a point in $\eta_1^+ \xi_n^+$ to a point in $z' \eta_1^-$ (see the proof of Claim 5.20), is ruled out by Claim 5.22. It follows that $\partial T_4 = \eta_m^\pm$. Then ∂T_4 and p_a are in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial S_3$. As $p_a \in \partial S'_2$ and S'_2 and S_3 are parallel, we know ∂T_4 and $\partial S'_2$ are in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial S_3$. As each of T_4 and S'_2 is parallel and disjoint from S_3 , we know $S'_2 \cap T_4 = \emptyset$, and S_3 is squeezed by S'_2 and T_4 .

We show Claim 5.24 holds that if $\partial S_2 \cap \partial T_4 = \emptyset$ and ∂S_2 is contained in the same component of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$. To see this, first we show $S_2 \cap T_4 = \emptyset$. Indeed, if we scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along S_3 to obtain an annulus A_0 with its boundary components C^+ and C^- , then one of $\{T_4, S_2\}$ has its endpoints in C^+ , another one has endpoints in C^- . Thus the only way for T_4 and S_2 to intersect, is that they form a bigon with p_c inside. However, this is impossible as the trace of S_3 starting at p_c is trapped in the interior of this bigon (as $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$), hence this trace can not reach a point in $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$, contradicting that $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Thus $S_2 \cap T_4 = \emptyset$. Claim 5.22 and Claim 5.21 imply that $\{z, z_c, z'\}$ and ∂S_3 are in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$. As S_2 contains one of $\{z, z'\}$, ∂S_2 and ∂S_3 are in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$. This together with $S_2 \cap T_4 = \emptyset$ imply that S_3 is squeezed by S_2 and T_4 . As p_c is squeezed by S_3 and T_4 , p_c is squeezed by S'_2 and S_2 .

If $\partial S_2 \cap \partial T_4 \neq \emptyset$, then we can deduce Claim 5.24 by a similar argument.

It remains to consider $\partial S_2 \cap \partial T_4 = \emptyset$ and the two endpoints of S_2 are contained in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$. We refer to Figure 6 (IV) for the following discussion. Let $\partial S_2 = \{x, x'\}$ and suppose $x \in \{z, z'\}$. Then x' is squeezed by S_3 and T_4 . By looking at the annulus A_0 defined before, we know S_2 and T_4 intersect at exactly one point, denoted x'' . Note that S_2, T_4 and part of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$ together bound two triangular regions with apex x'' (see the two shaded regions in Figure 6 (IV)). Let D (resp. D') be the triangular region containing x (resp. x'). If p_c is not squeezed by S'_2 and S_2 , then $p_c \in D'$. In the rest of the proof, we will assume $p_c \in D'$ and deduce a contradiction.

Let $\{y, y'\} = \partial S_3$. By previous discussion, we assume $y \in \overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ and $y' \in \overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$. Let L be the trace of S_3 containing p_c . As $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$, L ends at a point w in $D' \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$. There are two possibilities of the location of $\eta_m^\pm = \partial T_4$ to consider.

Suppose $\eta_m^+ \in D$ and $\eta_m^- \in D'$. Then w is an interior point of $\overline{\eta_m^- y'}$. Note that the arc $D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$ goes from $\overline{\eta_m^+}$ to x , passing all the η^+ and ξ^+ points. As $n > 1$ in Figure 5 (III), the points in the interval $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$ (in particular w) are identified via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ to points which are contained in $D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$. We define *the trace of τ_3 following (L, w)* to be the trace of τ_3 containing w' , where w' is identified to w via ϕ . As $\tau_3 \cap (S_2 \cup T_4) = \emptyset$, the trace of S_3 following (L, w) is trapped in D . The only way this could happen is $z_c \in D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$ and this trace ends at z_c , however, this contradicts the existence of S_3 .

Suppose $\eta_m^- \in D$ and $\eta_m^+ \in D'$. Then w is an interior point of $\overline{\eta_m^+ y}$. By the argument in the first paragraph of the proof of Claim 5.20, the traces L_1 and L_2 of τ_3 following (S_3, y) and (L, w) respectively are squeezed by two elements of P_{T_4} . Note that in $\overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ we have x' sitting between w and y . As $\tau_2 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, the trace of τ_2 following (S_2, x') is squeezed by L_1 and L_2 , contradicting that all traces of τ_2 are parallel to S_3 .

Assume τ_4 has three parallel families of traces. We use the same notation as Case 3 of proof of Lemma 5.10, with τ_2 replaced by τ_4 . By the proof of Claim 5.20, either S_3 goes from a point in $\overline{\zeta_1^+ \eta_m^+}$ to a point in $\overline{z' \zeta_1^-}$, or S_3 goes from a point of $\overline{\eta_m^+ \zeta_1^+}$ to a point of $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$. However, the former can be ruled out by Claim 5.22. Let $\{y, y'\} = \partial S_3$. Up to exchange the role of y and y' , we have $y \in \overline{\eta_m^+ \zeta_1^+}$, $y' \in \overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$, $n - 1 \neq r$ and $\partial T_4 = \eta_m^\pm$. We can repeat the previous argument, until we reach the case $\partial S_2 \cap \partial T_4 = \emptyset$ and the two endpoints of S_2 are contained in different components of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial T_4$. Let D, D', L be defined as before.

Suppose $\eta_m^+ \in D$ and $\eta_m^- \in D'$. Then w is an interior point of $\overline{\eta_m^- y'}$. The the arc $D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$ goes from $\overline{\eta_m^+}$ to x , passing all the η^+ and ξ^+ points. If $n - 1 > r$, then the points in the interval $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$ (in particular w) are identified via $\phi : \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$ to points which are contained in $D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$, and we deduce a contradiction as before. If $n - 1 < r$, as $n > 1$, interior points $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$ are identified via to points which are squeezed by two of $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^r$ (as defined in Lemma 5.10 Case 3). Then the traces L_1 and L_2 of τ_3 following (S_3, y') and (L, w) respectively are squeezed by two elements of $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^r$. In $\overline{\xi_1^- \eta_m^-}$ we have x' sitting between w and y . As $\tau_2 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, the trace of τ_2 following (S_2, x') is squeezed by L_1 and L_2 , contradicting that all traces of τ_2 are parallel to S_3 .

Suppose $\eta_m^- \in D$ and $\eta_m^+ \in D'$. If $n - 1 > r$, then we conclude in the same way as the case of τ_4 having two parallel families. If $n - 1 < r$, then the points in the interval $\overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ (in particular w) are identified via ϕ to points which are contained in $D \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_0$, and we reach a contradiction as before. \square

If we apply Lemma 5.14 with the role of τ_4 replaced by τ_2 , we know p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_2 , which contradicts Claim 5.24. This finishes the proof. \square

Let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ be the three punctured torus defined in Section 5.1. Let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}'$ be $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ with its punctures filled in. For an arc $\tau \in \mathcal{S}$, let $\bar{\tau}$ be the associated arc in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$.

Corollary 5.25. *Suppose ω is of type I. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_3 has a trace S_3 satisfying at least one of the cases of Lemma 5.10. Assume in addition that the 6-cycle ω is big at x_0 . Then there exists a simple arc τ in \mathcal{S} from p_a to p_c such that*

1. τ has empty intersection with τ_i for $i = 1, 0, 5, 4$ except at endpoints;

2. the concatenation of $\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_1, \bar{\tau}_0$ gives homotopically non-trivial loop on S' , moreover, the same holds true for $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_5)$ and $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_5, \bar{\tau}_4)$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.13, all traces of τ_2 and τ_4 are good. Note that S_3 is not parallel to a trace of τ_4 , otherwise ω is small at x_0 by Lemma 5.15 and Lemma 5.16. In particular, as $S_3 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$, τ_4 can not have three parallel families of traces.




Figure 7: The thickened arcs are possibilities of τ_5 .

Suppose τ_4 has two parallel families of traces. Let T and T' be two traces of τ_4 that are not parallel, and let P_T be the traces of τ_4 that are parallel to T . Similarly we define $P_{T'}$. As S_3 is not parallel to T , components of $S_0 \setminus (S_3 \cup P_T)$ are (possibly once punctured) open disks. Let D be the component of $S_0 \setminus (S_3 \cup P_T)$ containing p_c . By Lemma 5.14, D is also the only component of $S_0 \setminus (S_3 \cup P_T)$ such that $\partial D \cap \partial S_0$ has four connected components, denoted $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^4$. Suppose $z_c \in \gamma_1$. We scissor S_0 along S_3 to obtain a punctured annulus A_0 , with each of its boundary components contain a copy of S_3 . Let C^+ be the boundary component of A_0 containing z_c . Then τ_1 is a simple arc in A_0 from p_c to $z_c \in C^+$. Each arc of P_T connects two boundary components of A_0 , and up to homeomorphism, we can assume they are vertical arcs as in Figure 7. Let $\{\gamma_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be components in $\partial D \cap \partial S_0$ as in Figure 7. As T' is not parallel to T and S_3 , $T' \subset D \cup \partial D$. Thus either T' goes from a point in γ_1 to a point in γ_3 , or from a point in γ_2 to a point in γ_4 . Once we know the endpoints of T' , this is enough to determine T' up to two different possibilities, depending on the position of p_c relative to T' . We refer to Figure 7 for possibilities of T' in A_0 . Note that T' and P_T completely determine τ_5 , as τ_5 is disjoint from them. By Lemma 5.12 (1) or (2), if ω is big at x_0 , Figure 7 (IV) is the only possibility. Let γ'_1 be the subarc of γ_1 between z_c and an endpoint of S_3^+ . By the discussion in Case 2 of Lemma 5.10 (with role of τ_2 replaced by τ_4), z_c is not squeezed by parallel traces of τ_4 . So each trace of $P_{T'}$ gives a simple arc in A_0 starting in an interior point of γ'_1 , and ending in a point in γ_3 . Let D' be component of $S_0 \setminus (P_T \cup P_{T'} \cup S_3)$ containing p_c . We also view D' as a subset of A_0 . As p_c is not squeezed by two traces in $P_{T'}$ by Lemma 5.14, we know $\partial D' \cap \gamma_3$ is a non-trivial subarc of

γ_3 , and $\partial D' \cap \gamma_3$ corresponds to the arc $\overline{\eta_m^+ \xi_n^-}$ in Figure 5 (III). Hence $p_a \in \partial D' \cap \gamma_3$, and there is a simple arc τ in D' from p_c to p_a . One readily verifies that τ satisfies the desired properties (note that the case of $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_5, \bar{\tau}_4)$ follows from that one of P_T and $P_{T'}$ contain at least two traces, as in Case 2 of Lemma 5.10).

If τ_4 only has one parallel class of traces, then let D be the component of $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus (S_3 \cup \tau_4)$ that contains p_c . By the discussion in Case 1 of Lemma 5.10, $p_a \in \partial D$. Let τ be a simple arc in D from p_c to p_a . See Figure 7 (VII). Then it satisfies all the desired properties. \square

Lemma 5.26. *Suppose ω has type I and ω is big at x_0 . Suppose τ_2 has a single trace on \mathcal{S}_0 , and τ_4 has multiple traces on \mathcal{S}_0 . Then there is a simple arc τ'_1 on \mathcal{S}_0 from p_c to z_c such that $\tau_2 \cap \tau'_1 = \emptyset$, and at least one of the three cases of Lemma 5.10 holds with τ_1 replaced by τ'_1 .*

Proof. As ω is big at x_0 , all traces of τ_2 and τ_4 in \mathcal{S}_0 are good by Corollary 5.13. We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along τ_2 to obtain a punctured torus A_0 . Let C^+ and C^- be the two boundary components of A_0 . We assume without loss of generality that $z_c \in C^+$ and $\overline{z p_a} \subset C^+$. Then $\overline{z' p_a} \subset C^-$. As $\tau_2 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, each trace of τ_3 gives a simple arc in A_0 . The conclusion of the lemma is clear when there is a trace of τ_3 traveling from a point in C^+ to a point in C^- . It remains to consider the case that no traces of τ_3 travel from a point in C^+ to a point in C^- . We will show this is not possible by deducing a contradiction. As τ_4 has multiple traces which are all good, we apply Lemma 5.10 with the role of τ_2 played by τ_4 , and let S_3 be a trace of τ_3 satisfying the conclusion of Lemma 5.10, with τ_1 replaced by τ_5 . As the two endpoints of S_3 are in the same component of A_0 , and S_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 , we know S_3 and τ_2 are parallel. Applying Lemma 5.16 with the role of τ_4 replaced by τ_2 , we know p_c is not squeezed by S_3 and τ_2 . Applying Lemma 5.15 with the role of τ_4 replaced by τ_2 , we know ω is small at x_0 , contradiction. \square

A type I 6-cycle ω has a *good* point at x_0 , if ω is big at x_0 and at least one of the following is true:

1. both τ_2 and τ_4 have multiple traces on \mathcal{S}_0 ;
2. one of $\{\tau_2, \tau_4\}$, say τ_4 , has multiple traces on \mathcal{S}_0 , however, the other one, say τ_2 only has unique trace on \mathcal{S}_0 ; moreover, after the replacement in Lemma 5.26, the new 6-cycle ω' obtained by replacing x_1 by x'_1 is still big at x_0 ;
3. exactly one of $\{\tau_2, \tau_4\}$ has multiple traces on \mathcal{S}_0 ; moreover, ω is small at both x_1 and x_5 .

Corollary 5.27. *Suppose ω has type I with a good point at x_0 . Then ω has property (*).*

Proof. We can assume $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, otherwise ω already satisfies property (*). Let $\bar{\Delta}_0$ be as in Section 5.2. If we are in Case 1, by Lemma 5.10 and Corollary 5.25, there is a vertex \bar{z} of type \hat{b} which is adjacent to each of $\{\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_5, \bar{x}_4\}$ in $\bar{\Delta}_0$, where \bar{x}_i denotes the image of x_i under $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}_0$. Moreover, Corollary 5.25 implies that each of the 3-cycles $\bar{z}\bar{x}_1\bar{x}_0$, $\bar{z}\bar{x}_0\bar{x}_5$, $\bar{z}\bar{x}_5\bar{x}_4$ bound a 2-face. Thus there is a lift z of \bar{z} in $\Delta_0 \subset \Delta_\Lambda$ such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_0, x_5, x_4\}$. Similarly, if we exchange the role of τ_2 and τ_4 , we know there is a vertex z' of type \hat{b} which is adjacent to each of $\{x_5, x_0, x_1, x_2\}$. Note that $z = z'$, otherwise the 4-cycle $x_1 z x_5 z'$ would be embedded and Theorem 2.17 implies that there is a vertex y of type \hat{d} adjacent to each of $\{x_1, z, x_5, z'\}$, contradicting that ω is big at x_0 . Now we consider the 4-cycle $x_2 x_3 x_4 z$ with vertex types being $\hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{a}, \hat{b}$. As this 4-cycle is embedded, Lemma 4.4 implies that z is adjacent to x_3 . Thus z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, and ω has property (*).

If we are in Case 2, we apply the previous argument to ω' , namely, by Lemma 5.10 and Corollary 5.25, there is a vertex z of type \hat{b} which is adjacent to each of $\{x'_1, x_0, x_5, x_4\}$, and there is a vertex z' of type \hat{b} which is adjacent to each of $\{x_5, x_0, x'_1, x_2\}$. As ω' is big at x_0 , $z = z'$ by the same argument as before, and we deduce as before that z is adjacent to each of x'_1, x_3, x_5 . As z is adjacent to each of x_0 and x_2 , by considering the embedded 4-cycle $z x_0 x_1 x_2$ and applying Lemma 4.4, we know z is adjacent to x_1 , as desired.

Suppose we are in Case 3. Assume without loss of generality that τ_2 has multiple traces on \mathcal{S}_0 and τ_4 has single trace on \mathcal{S}_0 . We claim $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. As ω is small at x_1 , there are infinitely many vertices of type \hat{c} that are adjacent to both x_0 and x_2 . Thus in \mathcal{S}_0 there are infinitely many homotopy classes of simple arcs from p_c to z_c such that each class has a representative with empty intersection with τ_2 . As ω is big at x_0 , by Corollary 5.13, all traces of τ_2 and τ_4 in \mathcal{S}_0 are good. Thus among all the cases in Lemma 5.10, the only possibility for τ_2 is that τ_2 has only one parallel class of traces, moreover, p_c is not squeezed by any two traces of τ_2 . By the proof of Lemma 5.10, there exists a trace S_3 of τ_3 such that S_3 is squeezed by two traces of τ_2 . As all traces of τ_2 are parallel to S_3 and p_c is not squeezed by any two traces of τ_2 , there is an open tubular neighborhood N of the submanifold S_3 in \mathcal{S}_0 bounded by α_1 and α_n , where α_1 and α_n are as in Case 1 of the proof of Lemma 5.10. As τ_4 has single trace, it gives an simple arc in \mathcal{S}_0 from one of $\{z, z'\}$ to p_a . As none of $\{z, z', p_a\}$ is squeezed by two traces of τ_2 , and $\tau_4 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$, so we can homotopy τ_4 outside N , which implies the claim.

We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along τ_4 to obtain a punctured annulus A_0 . As $\tau_2 \cap (\tau_0 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$ and $\tau_5 \cap (\tau_0 \cap \tau_4) = \emptyset$ except possibly at endpoints, we know the trajectory of each of τ_2 and τ_5 in A_0 is a simple arc from p_c to a point in ∂A_0 . Using the topology of punctured annulus, we can replace τ_5 by another simple arc τ'_5 in A_0 from p_c to z_c such that $\tau'_5 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$. Then τ'_5 also gives a simple arc in \mathcal{S}_0 such that $\tau'_5 \cap (\tau_0 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$. This means that there exists a vertex $z \in \Delta_\Lambda$ of type \hat{c} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. Assume $z \notin \{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, otherwise ω readily has property (*). Applying Theorem 2.17 to embedded 4-cycles $zx_0x_1x_2$, $zx_2x_3x_4$ and $zx_4x_5x_0$, we know that for $i = 1, 3, 5$, there exists vertex x'_i of type \hat{d} such that x'_i is adjacent to each of $\{z, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}\}$. Apply Theorem 3.4 to the 6-cycle $x_0x'_1x_2x'_3x_4x'_5$ inside $\Delta_{\Lambda, \{a, d, b\}}$ to deduce that there is a vertex z' of type \hat{b} such that z' is adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. Applying Lemma 4.4 to the 4-cycles $z'x_0x_1x_2$, $z'x_2x_3x_4$ and $z'x_4x_5x_0$, we know z' is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$. \square

Lemma 5.28. *Let $\tau_0, \tau_5, \tau_4, \tau_3$ be four arcs in \mathcal{S} corresponding to consecutive vertices x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3 in an edge path in Δ_Λ such that the vertices have type $\hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{a}, \hat{c}$ respectively. Suppose the following are true:*

1. $\tau_0 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints and τ_4 is a good trace in \mathcal{S}_0 ;
2. $\tau_3 \cap \tau_0$ has exactly one interior intersection point;
3. a subarc of τ_0 containing z_a , a subarc of τ_3 containing z_c and one of the two arcs in $\partial\mathcal{S}$ from z_a to z_c bound a disk in \mathcal{S} .

Then there is a vertex of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3\}$.




Figure 8: Proof of Lemma 5.28.

Proof. By Assumption 2, τ_3 has two traces in \mathcal{S}_0 , one of them, denoted by τ_{31} , contains p_c , and another trace τ_{32} contains z_c . Let $x \in \mathcal{S}_0$ be the other endpoint of τ_{31} . Then x is identified to $x' \in \pi_0$ via $\phi : \overline{zp_a} \rightarrow \overline{z'p_a}$, and τ_{32} goes from x' to z_c . We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along τ_4 to obtain a punctured torus A_0 (by Assumption 1). Let C^+ and C^- be the two boundary components of A_0 . Assume without loss of generality that $z_c \in C^+$. First we consider the case $x \in \overline{zp_a}$, see figure 8 (I). Then $x' \in \overline{z'p_a}$. Then the trajectory of τ_{31} in A_0 goes from p_c to $x \in C^+$. Assumption 3 implies that τ_{32} and a subarc of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial\tau_4$, we know $\tau_{32} \cap \tau_4 \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. The remaining case is that $x \in \overline{z'p_a}$. Then $x' \in \overline{zp_a}$. Assumption 3 implies that $\overline{x'z}$, τ_{32} and $\overline{zz_c}$ bound a disk in \mathcal{S}_0 . Up to a homeomorphism of A_0 fixing the boundary, we can assume the trajectories of τ_5 and τ_{31} are in Figure 8 (II). Let τ be the arc in Figure 8 (II) from p_c to p_a^- (which is the copy of p_a in C^-) in A_0 . Let $\bar{\tau}$ be the image of τ under $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{S}}$. Note that the concatenation of $\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_5$, the concatenation of $\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_5, \bar{\tau}_4$ and the concatenation of $\bar{\tau}, \bar{\tau}_4, \bar{\tau}_3$ give three homotopically non-trivial simple loops in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ (which is defined to be $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ with punctures added back to the surface). Thus in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$, there exists a vertex \bar{z} of type \hat{b} represented by $\bar{\tau}$ satisfying that the 3-cycle $\bar{z}, \bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_5$, the 3-cycle $\bar{z}, \bar{x}_5, \bar{x}_4$ and the 3-cycle $\bar{z}, \bar{x}_4, \bar{x}_3$ are all non-degenerate. Then a lift of \bar{z} in Δ_0 will satisfy the desired properties in the lemma. \square

Proposition 5.29. *Suppose ω is a 6-cycle of type I in Δ_Λ . Then there exists a vertex $z \in \Delta_\Lambda$ of type \hat{b} or \hat{a} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$.*

Proof. If ω is small at x_0, x_2 and x_4 , then for $i = 0, 2, 4$, there exists x'_i of type \hat{d} such that x'_i is adjacent to each of x_{i-1} and x_{i+1} . We apply Theorem 3.4 to the 6-cycle $x'_0x_1x'_2x_3x'_4x_5$ in $\Delta_{\Lambda, \{c, d, b\}}$ to find a vertex z of type \hat{b} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$.

Now we assume ω is big at one of $\{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. Suppose without loss of generality that ω is big at x_0 . If ω is good at x_0 , then we are done by Corollary 5.27. Now assume ω is not good at x_0 . We claim ω is small at least one of $\{x_1, x_5\}$. We will show if ω is big at x_1 , then τ_2 has multiple traces in \mathcal{S}_0 . Indeed, in this case Theorem 2.17 implies that there is a unique vertex of type \hat{c} which is adjacent to both x_0 and x_2 , and this implies $[\tau_1]$ is the only homotopy class of simple arcs from p_c to z_c in \mathcal{S}_0 that has a representative which is disjoint from all traces of τ_2 in \mathcal{S}_0 . This is only possible when τ_2 has multiple traces as all traces of τ_2 in \mathcal{S}_0 are good by Corollary 5.13 and our assumption that ω is big at x_0 . Similarly, if ω is big at x_5 , then τ_4 has multiple traces in \mathcal{S}_0 . Thus the claim follows.

Case 1: ω is small at both x_1 and x_5 . If ω is small at x_3 , then by the argument in the last paragraph of the proof of Corollary 5.27, ω has property (*). Now assume ω is big at x_3 . As ω is not good at x_0 , we know τ_2 and τ_4 have single trace in \mathcal{S}_0 . We claim that $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3$ has at most one interior intersection point, and in the case when $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, assumption (3) of Lemma 5.28 is satisfied. To see this, we scissor \mathcal{S} along τ_2 to obtain \mathcal{S}_2 . As ω is big at x_3 , by the argument in the previous paragraph, $[\tau_3]$ is the only homotopy class of simple arcs in \mathcal{S}_2 from p_c to z_c which has a representative avoiding all traces of τ_4 in \mathcal{S}_2 . Let K be the component of $\mathcal{S}_2 \setminus \tau_4$ containing p_c . Then K must be a punctured disk. As $\tau_0 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$ except at endpoints and $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$, we know τ_0 is a simple arc in $K \cup \partial K$ from one of $\{z, z'\}$ in ∂K to $p_a \in \partial K$, and τ_3 is a simple arc in K from p_c to $z_c \in \partial K$. As K is a punctured disk, we know that either $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$; or $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3$ has exactly one point. In the latter case, a subarc of τ_3 containing one of $\{z, z'\}$, a subarc of τ_0 containing z_c , and one of $\overline{zz_c}$ or $\overline{z'z_c}$ bound a disk in $K \cup \partial K$. Thus the claim is proved.

If $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, then ω readily satisfies property (*). If $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3$ is exactly one point, then applying Lemma 5.28 twice, to $\{\tau_0, \tau_5, \tau_4, \tau_3\}$, and to $\{\tau_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3\}$, we find a vertex z of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3\}$, and a vertex z' of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_1, x_2, x_2\}$. Note that $z = z'$, otherwise Lemma 4.4 applying to the 4-cycle x_0zx_3z' implies that x_0 and x_3 are adjacent, contradicting $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Thus ω has property (*).

The above argument implies the following claim. The “more generally” part follows from the first part of the claim, by possibly applying a symmetry of the Dynkin diagram.

Claim 5.30. Suppose ω has type I. If ω is small at x_1, x_5 and big at x_0 , then ω has property (*). More generally, if there are three consecutive vertices $\{x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ of ω such that ω is small at x_{i-1}, x_{i+1} and ω is big at x_i , then ω has property (*).

Case 2: ω is big at exactly one of $\{x_1, x_5\}$. As ω is not good at x_0 , up to symmetry, we can assume ω is big at x_1 and small at x_5 , τ_2 has multiple traces in \mathcal{S}_0 and τ_4 has single trace in \mathcal{S}_0 . Moreover, up to replacing x_5 by x'_5 and ω by $\omega' = x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x'_5$, we can assume ω' is small at both x_5 and x_0 , though still big at x_1 . We also assume ω' is embedded, otherwise ω has property (*). If ω' is small at x_2 . Then we can use the claim above to x_0, x_1 and x_2 , to see that ω' has property (*), hence ω satisfies property (*) by Lemma 5.31 below.

Now we assume ω' is big at x_2 . If ω' is good at x_2 , then ω' satisfies property (*) by Corollary 5.27, which implies ω has property (*) by the same argument as before. If ω' is not good at x_2 , as ω' is already big at x_1 , we must have ω' small at x_3 , τ_4 has single trace in \mathcal{S}_2 , and τ_0 has multiple traces in \mathcal{S}_2 . Moreover, we can replace x_3 by x'_3 and ω' by $\omega'' = x_0x_1x_2x'_3x_4x'_5$ so that ω'' is small at x'_3, x_2 . By previous discussion, ω'' is small at x_0 and big at x_1 . Now we apply the claim at the end of Case 1 to ω'' at x_0, x_1 and x_2 , implying ω'' has property (*). By applying Lemma 5.31 twice, we know ω' and ω both has property (*). \square

Lemma 5.31. Suppose ω is a 6-cycle of type I. Let x'_5 be a vertex of type \hat{c} that is adjacent to both x_0 and x_4 , and let ω' be an embedded 6-cycle obtained from ω by replacing x_5 by x'_5 . If ω' has property (*), then ω has property (*).

Proof. There are two cases to consider. If there is a vertex z of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x'_5\}$, then by applying Lemma 4.4 to $zx'_5x_0x_1$, $zx_1x_2x_3$ and $zx_3x_4x'_5$, we know z is adjacent to $\{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. By applying Lemma 4.4 to $zx_0x_5x_4$, $zx_4x_3x_2$ and $zx_2x_1x_0$, we know z is adjacent to $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, implying ω has property (*).

Suppose there is a vertex z of type \hat{a} adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x'_5\}$. First we suppose $z \notin \{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. Then by applying Theorem 2.17 to $zx_1x_0x'_5$, $zx'_5x_4x_3$ and $zx_3x_2x_1$, we know for $i = 0, 2, 4$, there is a vertex y_i of type \hat{d} such that y_0 is adjacent to x_1 and x'_5 , y_2 is adjacent to x_1 and x_3 , and y_4 is adjacent to x_3 and x'_5 . Applying Theorem 3.4 to the 6-cycle $x'_5y_0x_1y_2x_3y_4$ in $\Delta_{\Lambda, \{c, d, b\}}$, we know there is a vertex z' of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, reducing to the previous case. It remains to consider $z \in \{x_0, x_2, x_4\}$. If $z = x_0$ or x_4 , then ω readily has property (*). If $z = x_2$, then x'_5 is adjacent to each of x_0, x_2, x_4 . We assume $x'_5 \notin \{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, otherwise ω readily has property (*). Then we use the same argument as the last paragraph of the proof of Corollary 5.27 to deduce that ω has property (*). \square

6 Six-cycles of type II in the D_4 complex

Throughout this section, Λ is the Dynkin diagram of type D_4 with its vertex set $\{a, b, c, d\}$ such that $\{a, b, c\}$ are leaf vertices. The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Proposition 6.1. Suppose ω is an embedded 6-cycle in Δ_Λ of type II. Suppose x_0 and x_3 are not adjacent in Δ_Λ . Then either x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to common vertex of type \hat{b} , or ω has property (*).

Proof. We consider the trace of τ_2 in \mathcal{S}_0 . If τ_2 has a π_0 -trace which is not good, then we are done by Corollary 6.6. If τ_2 has a π_0 -trace and all π_0 -traces of τ_2 are good, then we are done by Corollary 6.6 and Lemma 6.13. It remains to consider the case that τ_2 does not have any π_0 -traces, i.e. τ_2 has unique trace on \mathcal{S}_0 . If all traces of τ_4 in \mathcal{S}_0 are good and τ_4 has at least two traces, then proposition follows from Lemma 6.9 below; if τ_4 only has a single trace in \mathcal{S}_0 and it is a good trace, then the proposition follows from Lemma 6.12 below; if τ_4 has a trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is not good, then the proposition follows from Lemma 6.14 below. This finishes the proof. \square

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose ω is a 6-cycle in Δ_Λ of type II. Then ω has property (*).*

Proof. If x_0 and x_3 are adjacent in Δ_Λ , then ω has property (*). Now we assume x_0 and x_3 are not adjacent. By Proposition 6.1 and symmetry, we know either x_3 and x_5 are adjacent to common vertex of type \hat{b} , or ω has property (*). This together with Proposition 6.1 imply that either ω has property (*), or x_5, x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex x'_4 of type \hat{b} and x_5, x_1 are adjacent to a common vertex x'_0 of type \hat{b} . In the latter case, by applying Proposition 5.29 to the 6-cycle $x'_0x_1x_2x_3x'_4x_5$ and noting the symmetry of the Dynkin diagram, we know there is a vertex of type \hat{b} or \hat{a} that is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, and property (*) follows. \square

In the rest of this section, we prove Corollary 6.6, Lemma 6.13, Lemma 6.9, Lemma 6.12 and Lemma 6.14. We start with several preparatory lemmas for Corollary 6.6.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3 are of type $\hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}$ respectively in Δ such that x_i and x_{i+1} are adjacent in Δ . Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=0}^3$ be the associated arcs in \mathcal{S} . We define \mathcal{S}_0 as before. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Assume τ_2 has at least two π_0 traces and all π_0 traces of τ_2 are good. Then the conclusion of Lemma 5.10 holds true.*

Proof. As in \mathcal{S} the arc τ_2 travels from p_c to p_a , we know that in \mathcal{S}_0 , τ_2 has exactly one trace τ'_2 which goes from p_c to a point in π_0 . All other traces of τ_2 are π_0 -traces, which are good traces by assumption. There are at most three parallel classes of good traces of τ_2 . Given a trace τ'_3 of τ_3 with one endpoint being $x \in \pi_0$, we define *the trace after* (τ'_3, x) to be the trace of τ_3 containing x' , where x' and x are identified via $\phi : \overline{zp_a} \rightarrow \overline{z'p_a}$. Let R_2 be the trace of τ_2 containing p_c and denote the other endpoint of R_2 by θ .




Figure 9: Proof of Lemma 6.3

Suppose we are in Case 0 of the proof of Lemma 5.10, i.e. p_c is squeezed by two parallel π_0 -traces of τ_2 . We use the same notation as in Lemma 5.10. The difference with Lemma 5.10 is that $z = \xi_1^+$ is no longer true. Instead, $\overline{\xi_1^+}$ and θ are identified via ϕ . Moreover, R_2 is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} . If R_3 ends in $\overline{\xi_1^- \xi_{-1}^-}$ or $\overline{\theta \xi_{-1}^+}$, then we argue in the same way as in Lemma 5.10.

Now we assume R_3 ends in $\overline{z'\theta}$ at point x , then x is identified with $x' \in \overline{z\xi_1^+}$ via ϕ . Let R'_3 be the trace after (R_3, x) . If R'_3 ends in a point $x'' \in \overline{\xi_1^- \xi_{-1}^-}$ or $\overline{\theta \xi_{-1}^+}$, then we apply the argument in Lemma 5.10 to the trace after (R'_3, x'') . We now show $x'' \notin \overline{z\xi_1^+}$. If $x'' \in \overline{z\xi_1^+}$, then Lemma 5.9

implies that R'_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}_0 . As $\tau_3 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$, R'_3 is squeezed by α_1 and α_{-1} , thus R'_3 and a subarc of $\overline{z\xi_1^+}$ bound a disk with p_c inside, which contradicts that $R'_3 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$.

The only possibility left for x'' is $x'' \in \overline{z'\xi_{-1}^+}$ or $x'' = z_c$. We will show this is impossible. See Figure 9 (I). As $R'_3 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$, we know x'' is closer to z_c than x . Moreover, $\overline{R'_3}$ and a subarc of $\overline{\xi_{-1}^+\xi_1^+}$ bound a disk D with $p_c \notin D$. Then x'' is identified via ϕ to $x''' \in \overline{z\xi_1^+}$ such that x''' is closer to z_c than x' . Let R''_3 be the trace after (R'_3, x'') . As $R''_3 \cap R'_3 = \emptyset$, we know $R''_3 \subset D$, and R''_3 ends in a point x'''' in $\overline{z'\theta}$ which is closer to z_c than x'' . Repeating this process, we know τ_3 is made of sequence of traces with endpoints closer and closer to z_c , until it eventually ends in z_c . This implies that in \mathcal{S} , τ_3 can be obtained from τ_1 by applying a non-zero power of the Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$, see Figure 9 (I'). As this Dehn twist corresponds to the Garside element in A_Λ , we have a contradiction with that x_1 and x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b}_2 by Lemma 5.3.

It remains to consider that R_3 ends in $\overline{z'\xi_1^+}$ at point x . As $\overline{R'_3} \cap (R_3 \cup R_2) = \emptyset$, we know R'_3 is contained in the disk bounded by R_3 , R_2 and a subarc of $\overline{\theta\xi_1^+}$. By a similar argument as in the previous paragraph, we deduce that τ_3 and τ_1 differ by a non-zero power of Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$. Thus R_3 can not end in $\overline{z'\theta}$.

If p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_3 and τ_3 only has one parallel class of π_0 -traces, then we use a similar argument as in Case 1 of the proof of Lemma 5.10, combined with the argument in the previous paragraphs. See Figure 9 (II) for an adjusted picture.

Suppose p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_3 and τ_3 has two parallel classes of π_0 -traces. We will use the same notation as in Case 2 of Lemma 5.10, and see Figure 9 (III) and (IV) for the adjusted pictures. Note that $z \neq \xi_1^+$, and we modify the definition of γ_1 (in the proof of Lemma 5.10) accordingly so it goes from η_1^- to $\overline{\xi_1^+}$ (via θ, z', z_c and z). We still have $n > 1$. Note that R_3 ends on an interior point x of either $\overline{\xi_1^+z}$, or $\overline{z'\theta}$, or $\overline{\theta\eta_1^-}$, or γ_2 , or γ_3 , or γ_4 . If either $x \in \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_3 \cup \gamma_4$ or $n - 1 \neq m$, then we can either argue as in the previous paragraphs, or as in Case 2 of Lemma 5.10. Now we assume $x \in \gamma_2$ and $n - 1 = m$. Then ϕ identifies x with $x' \in \gamma_4$. Let T be the trace of τ_3 containing x' . Then $T \subset D \cup \partial D$, where D is defined as in Case 2 of Lemma 5.10. The possibilities of the other endpoint x'' of T are (0) $x'' \in \overline{z'\theta}$; (1) $x'' = z_c$ or $x'' \in \overline{\xi_1^+z}$; (2) $x'' \in \overline{\theta\eta_1^-}$; (3) $x'' \in \gamma_4$; (4) $x'' \in \gamma_3$; (5) $x'' \in \gamma_2$. These are similar to Case 2 of Lemma 5.10 except (0) and (5). If (5) happens, then $T \cap \tau_1 = \emptyset$ as $T \cap R_2 = \emptyset$, as desired. Suppose (0) happens. Then T and α_1 are parallel. We define an auxiliary arc, S , which is an arc in $D \cup \partial D$ from x' to z_c that is disjoint from R_2 . Let T' be the trace after (T, x'') . Then T' is squeezed by T and α_1 . Thus either T' goes from a point in $\overline{\xi_1^+z}$ to a point in γ_4 , in which case $T' \cap \tau_1 = \emptyset$ and we are done; or T' goes from a point in $\overline{\xi_1^+z}$ to either z_c or a point in $\overline{z'x''}$, in which case the argument before implies that τ_3 (viewed as an arc in \mathcal{S}) is obtained from τ'_3 by applying a nonzero power of Dehn twists along $\partial\mathcal{S}$, where τ'_3 is the concatenation of R_3 and S . Now we show the latter case is impossible. As $\tau_1 \cup \tau'_3$ gives a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}' which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}'$ (recall that \mathcal{S}' is obtained from \mathcal{S} by filling back all the punctures), we know there are infinitely many elements in Ω_a which have representatives that are disjoint from both τ_1 and τ'_3 . Let x'_3 be the vertex of type \hat{a} in Δ_Λ associated with $[\tau'_3]$. Then there are infinitely many different vertices of type \hat{a} in Δ_Λ that are adjacent to both x_1 and x'_3 . By Lemma 5.3, we know x_1 and x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} if and only if they are adjacent to common vertex of type \hat{a} . However, by definition of τ_1 and τ_3 , there does not exist an arc in \mathcal{S} from z_a to p_a avoiding both τ_1 and τ_3 , contradiction.

The case p_c is not squeezed by two parallel traces of τ_3 and τ_3 has three parallel classes of π_0 -traces is similar to Lemma 5.10, see Figure 9 (V) and (VI) for adjustments. \square

Lemma 6.4. *Given a cycle ω of type II. Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=0}^5$ be the associated arcs in \mathcal{S} . We define \mathcal{S}_0 as before. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose at least one of the following holds:*

1. τ_4 has a trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is not good, and τ_2 has at least one π_0 trace in \mathcal{S}_0 ;

2. τ_2 has at least one π_0 trace, and τ_2 has a π_0 trace which is not good.

Then ω is small at x_0 .

Proof. We start with Assertion 1. The case when all π_0 -traces of τ_2 are good and there are at least two of them is identical to the first paragraph of the proof of Corollary 5.13, except we use Lemma 6.3 to obtain S_3 instead of Lemma 5.10. The case that τ_2 has exactly one π_0 -trace τ_2' which is good, is similar to the argument in Corollary 5.13, except we will work with τ_2' instead of τ_2 , and τ_2' starts in a point in the interior of either $\overline{z p_a}$ or $\overline{z' p_a}$, and ends at p_a (in particular one of $\{z, z'\}$ is in τ_2' is no longer true, but this is harmless). The case τ_2 has a π_0 -trace which is not good is identical to the last paragraph of the proof of Corollary 5.13.

For Assertion 2, up to a symmetry, we can assume x_4 has type \hat{b} and x_2 has type \hat{c} (types of other vertices remain unchanged), and in Assertion 2 we assume τ_4 has a π_0 -trace which is not good. Again if τ_2 has a trace which is not good, or all traces of τ_2 are good and τ_2 has at least two traces, then we can argue in the same way as in Corollary 5.13. Suppose τ_2 has exactly one trace which is good. Let S_4 be a π_0 -trace of τ_4 which is not good. Up to exchange z and z' , we can assume one endpoint of S_4 is contained in the interior $\overline{z p_a}$, and another endpoint is contained in $\overline{z' p_a} \setminus \{z'\}$. Indeed, if ∂S_4 are contained in the interior of one of $\overline{z p_a}$ or $\overline{z' p_a}$, then Lemma 5.9 implies that S_4 and an arc $\gamma \subset \partial \mathcal{S}_0$ with $z_c \in \gamma$ bound a punctured disk D , and we can find the desired trace of τ_4 in D . Given such choice of S_4 , the argument in the proof of Corollary 5.13 goes through. \square

Lemma 6.5. *Let ω be a cycle of type II with its consecutive vertices being $\{x_i\}_{i=0}^5$. Let $\{\tau_i\}_{i=0}^5$ be the associated arcs in \mathcal{S} . We define \mathcal{S}_0 as before. Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Assume τ_2 has exactly one π_0 trace which is a good trace. Assume all traces of τ_4 are good, and τ_4 has at least two traces. Then x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .*

Proof. By Lemma 5.10, there is a trace S_3 of τ_3 with $\partial S_3 \subset \partial \mathcal{S}_0$ such that $\tau_5 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$ and S_3 is not boundary parallel in \mathcal{S}'_0 . Let τ_2' be the trace of τ_2 containing p_c , and let τ_2'' be the good π_0 trace of τ_2 . Assume without loss of generality that τ_2' goes from p_c to $x \in \overline{z p_a}$, and τ_2'' goes from $x' \in \overline{z' p_a}$ to p_a , where x and x' are identified via $\phi: \overline{z p_a} \rightarrow \overline{z' p_a}$.

If τ_2'' is not parallel to S_3 , then up to a homeomorphism, we can assume τ_2'' and S_3 give a pair of generators of the fundamental group of the torus obtained by smashing $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$ to a point and fill in back p_c . As $\tau_5 \cap S_3 \subset \{z_c\}$ and $\tau_1 \cap \tau_2'' = \emptyset$, we can always find an arc τ in \mathcal{S}_0 from p_c to p_a such that $\tau \cap \tau_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 5$ except at endpoints, moreover, the concatenation τ, τ_0, τ_i gives a homotopically non-trivial simple loop in \mathcal{S}' for $i = 1, 5$. See Figure 10 (I) (we allow $z_c \in S_3$). The dashed arc indicates the choice of τ - it can end different points in \mathcal{S}_0 . Thus x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .

Suppose τ_2'' is parallel to S_3 . If p_c is not squeezed by τ_2'' and S_3 , then we are in (2) by the argument in Lemma 5.15 (with τ_2 and τ_4 exchanged), there is a vertex x'_0 of type \hat{d} adjacent to each of x_1 and x_3 . Now the lemma follows by considering any vertex x''_0 of type \hat{b} in Δ_Λ adjacent to x'_0 and applying Lemma 2.15 (3) at $\text{lk}(x''_0, \Delta_\Lambda)$. So we assume p_c is squeezed by τ_2'' and S_3 . Then τ_2' is also squeezed by τ_2'' and S_3 . If z_c is not squeezed by τ_2'' and S_3 and $z_c \notin S_3$, then $\tau_1 \cap (\tau_2' \cup \tau_2'') = \emptyset$ implies that there are two possibilities of τ_1 (see the two dashed arcs in Figure 10 (II)). In each case a subarc of τ_1 , a subarc of S_3 and a subarc of $\partial \mathcal{S}_0$ bound a disk. As $\tau_5 \cap S_3 = \emptyset$, τ_1 and τ_5 satisfy Lemma 5.12 (2). Thus ω is small at x_0 and the lemma follows.

If z_c is squeezed by τ_2'' and S_3 , then either $\partial S_3 \subset \overline{z p_a}$ or $\partial S_3 \subset \overline{z' p_a}$. Let R_3 be as in Lemma 5.10 (2). If $\partial S_3 \subset \overline{z p_a}$, then R_3 ends in $\overline{z' p_a}$. As $\tau_5 \cap (R_3 \cup S_3) = \emptyset$, we know R_3 and S_3 determine τ_5 up to two choices. We refer to Figure 10 (III), the four gray curves are τ_2'', τ_2', S_3 and R_3 . The arc labeled 5, and the dotted arc, are the two possibilities of τ_5 ; and the dashed arc labeled 1, and the dotted arc, are the two possibilities of τ_1 . If one of τ_1 and τ_5 is the dotted arc, then ω is small at x_0 by Lemma 5.12 (2). If τ_i is the arc labeled by i for $i = 1, 5$, then we define τ to be thickened arc in Figure 10 (III) from p_c to p_a . The concatenation of τ_5, τ_0, τ , and the concatenation of τ_1, τ_0, τ descend to two homotopically non-trivial simple loops on \mathcal{S}' . Thus x_1

and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} . The case $\partial S_3 \subset \overline{z'p_a}$ is similar, see Figure 10 (IV).




Figure 10: Proof of Lemma 6.5

The remaining case is $z_c \in S_3$. Figure 10 still apply to this case, except that we need to move z_c so it coincident with one endpoint of S_3 . The possibilities of τ_1 are as before. To analyze the possibilities of τ_5 , we scissor S_0 along S_3 to obtained a punctured annulus A'_0 with boundary components C^+ and C^- . Assume without loss of generality that $p_a \in C^-$. Then R_3 ends in C^- and $\partial\tau_2'' \subset C^-$. Note that z_c gives $z_c^+ \in C^+$ and $z_c^- \in C^-$. Thus the trajectory of τ_5 in A'_0 either goes from p_c to z_c^+ or from p_c to z_c^- . In the former case, there are infinite many possible homotopy classes of τ_5 , however, in each case τ_1 and τ_5 satisfy Lemma 5.12 (2); in the latter case, there are only two possible homotopy classes of τ_5 as $\tau_5 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$, and we are reduced to the previous paragraph. \square

Corollary 6.6. *Given a cycle ω of type II in the Artin complex Δ_Λ . Suppose $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$ and τ_2 has at least one π_0 -trace. Suppose one of the follow holds:*

1. *one of τ_2 or τ_4 has a π_0 -trace which is not good;*
2. *all π_0 -traces of τ_2 and τ_4 are good, and one of τ_2 and τ_4 has at least two traces.*

Then x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .

Proof. The first part of the corollary follows from Lemma 6.4. For the second part, if τ_2 has exactly one π_0 -trace, then the corollary follows from Lemma 6.5. Now assume τ_2 has more than one π_0 -traces. By Lemma 6.3, we are in a position to apply Corollary 5.11. If we are in Corollary 5.11 (1), then x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} by the argument in the second paragraph of the proof of Lemma 6.5. If we are in Corollary 5.11 (2), then ω is small at x_0 by Lemma 5.15 and Lemma 6.3. Corollary 5.11 (3) is ruled out by assumption. \square

Lemma 6.7. *Suppose ω is of type II, and $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose $\tau_2 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$. Then one of the following holds:*

1. *x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .*
2. *ω satisfies property (*).*

Proof. We claim that up to replacing x_4 by x'_4 of type \hat{a} adjacent to both x_3 and x_5 , we can assume $\tau_2 \cap \tau'_4 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, where τ'_4 is an arc corresponding to x'_4 . To see this, we consider \mathcal{S}_5 , which is obtained from \mathcal{S} by scissoring along τ_5 . If τ_3 has a trace τ'_3 on \mathcal{S}_5 which is not good, then τ'_3 and a part of $\partial\mathcal{S}_5$ bound a disk D' with $\tau_4 \subset D'$. As $\tau_2 \cap (\tau_3 \cup \tau_5) = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, τ_2 is trapped in D' . Thus $\tau_4 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Now we assume all traces of τ_3 are good in \mathcal{S}_5 . Then the component K of $\mathcal{S}_5 \setminus \tau_3$ that contains p_a is either a punctured disk or a punctured annulus. Note that $(\tau_4 \cup \tau_2) \subset K$ except at endpoints. If K is punctured disk, then $\tau_4 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ (except at endpoints), as they have the same starting point p_a but end at different points in ∂K . If K is a punctured annulus A_0 , then we can replace τ_4 by an arc τ'_4 from p_a to p_c so that $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints.

Similarly, up to replacing x_0 by x'_0 of type \hat{a} adjacent to both x_1 and x_5 , we can assume $\tau_2 \cap \tau'_0 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, where τ'_0 is an arc corresponding to x'_0 .

Let $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ be as Definition 5.4. Note that $\bar{\tau}_1, \bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\tau}'_0$ gives a 3-cycle in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$, which we denote by $120'$. Similarly we define the 3-cycle $520'$ in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. Recall that $120'$ is degenerate, if it does not bound a 2-face. If both $120'$ and $520'$ are non-degenerate, then the $\bar{\tau}_2$ vertex in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ lifts under the covering $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}_0 \cong \bar{\Delta}'_0$ to a vertex of type \hat{b} in $\Delta_0 \subset \Delta_\Lambda$ which is adjacent to both x_1 and x_5 . Suppose exactly one of $120'$ and $520'$, say $120'$, is a non-degenerate triangle. Then up to a homeomorphism, we can assume the arcs τ_1, τ_2, τ'_0 in \mathcal{S} are as in Figure 11 (I). As $\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\tau}'_0, \bar{\tau}_5$ bound a disk in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$, we know $\bar{\tau}_2$ and $\bar{\tau}_0$ determines the homotopy class of $\bar{\tau}_5$ (rel endpoints) up to two choices. Each choice of $\bar{\tau}_5$ determines τ_5 up to powers of Dehn twists along $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$, however, the extra constraint $\tau'_0 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$ implies that each choice of $\bar{\tau}_5$ determine a choice of τ_5 . Thus τ_2 and τ'_0 determine τ_5 up to two choices, as in Figure 11 (I). After scissoring \mathcal{S} along τ_0 , we see that τ_1 and τ_5 satisfy Lemma 5.12 (2). Hence x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} . It remains to consider the case that both 120 and 520 are degenerate.

Now we can look at 3-cycles $4'25$ and $4'32$ in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$, defined in the same fashion as before. If both 3-cycles are non-degenerate, then by considering the lift of the 2-face in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ filling $4'32$ under the covering map $\Delta_0 \rightarrow \bar{\Delta}'_0$, we know x_2 and x_4 are adjacent in Δ_Λ . Similarly, x_2 and x_5 are adjacent. Thus x_0, x_1, x_2, x_5 form a 4-cycle in Δ_Λ . By Lemma 4.4, x_2 is adjacent to x_0 . Thus x_2 is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$ and we are in Lemma 6.7 (2). If exactly one of $4'25$ and $4'32$ is non-degenerate, then exactly one of the 3-cycles $520', 120', 4'25, 4'32$ is non-degenerate. By Lemma 5.6, each of these 3-cycles gives a generator in the fundamental group $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ if it is degenerate, and gives trivial element in the same group if it is non-degenerate. However, the image $\bar{\omega}$ of ω in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ gives a trivial element in $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$, which leads to a contradiction. The remaining case is that all of the 3-cycles $520', 120', 4'25, 4'32$ in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ are degenerate, but this can be ruled out by Lemma 6.8 below. \square




Figure 11: Some pictures.

Lemma 6.8. *Suppose ω is type II. Assume $\tau_2 \cap \tau_0 = \emptyset$, $\tau_2 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$ and $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Then it can not happen that all the 3-cycles $520, 120, 425, 432$ in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ are degenerate.*

Proof. As the 3-cycle 520 in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ is degenerate, we know the homotopy class of $\bar{\tau}_5$ is determined by $\bar{\tau}_2$ and $\bar{\tau}_0$ up to two choices. Similar $\bar{\tau}_1$ is determined by $\bar{\tau}_2$ and $\bar{\tau}_0$ up to two choices. If $\bar{\tau}_1$

is homotopic rel endpoints in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ to $\bar{\tau}_5$, then τ_1 and τ_5 differ by a power of Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$. However, this is impossible by Lemma 5.3 as x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex x_0 of type \hat{a} . Thus $\bar{\tau}_5$ and $\bar{\tau}_1$ are not homotopic rel endpoints in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$. Thus up to a homeomorphism, we can assume we are in Figure 11 (II). In particular, $\bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\tau}_5$ bound a disk with \bar{p}_a inside.

By Lemma 5.6, each of the 3-cycle 520 and the 3-cycle 120 give a generator in $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$. We claim these two generators are of the same sign. If this is not true, then the 4-cycle in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ with vertices represented by $\bar{\tau}_1, \bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\tau}_5, \bar{\tau}_0$ is null-homotopic in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. We denote this 4-cycle by 1250. Thus any lift of 1250 to Δ_0 gives a 4-cycle. We consider a particular lift $\omega' \subset \Delta_0$ of 1250 such that the vertex $\bar{\tau}_1$ lifts to the vertex $x_1 \in \Delta_0$ represented by τ_1 . As the path $x_1 \rightarrow x_0 \rightarrow x_5$ in Δ_0 maps the path $\bar{\tau}_1 \rightarrow \bar{\tau}_0 \rightarrow \bar{\tau}_5$ in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$, we know that in ω' , $\bar{\tau}_i$ lifts to x_i for $i = 0, 5$. Let y be the lift of $\bar{\tau}_2$ in ω' . By [Hua23, Proposition 2.8] applying to the 4-cycle ω' in Δ_Λ , we know there exists $z \in \Delta_\Lambda$ of type \hat{d} such that z is adjacent to each of x_1, x_0, x_5, y . This implies that y is adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_1, x_5\}$ in Δ_0 . Thus there exists \bar{y} in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ such that $\bar{y}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_1$ form a non-degenerate 3-cycle, and $\bar{y}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_5$ form a non-degenerate 3-cycle. Thus the arc $\bar{\gamma}$ in $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ associated with $\bar{y} \in \bar{\Delta}'_0$ is disjoint from $\bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_1, \bar{\tau}_5$ except at endpoints, moreover the concatenation of $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_1$ and the concatenation of $\bar{\gamma}, \bar{\tau}_0, \bar{\tau}_5$ gives two homotopically non-trivial loop in the torus $\bar{\mathcal{S}}'$. However, this is impossible as $\bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\tau}_5$ bound a disk with \bar{p}_a inside.

Similarly, the 3-cycle 520 and the 3-cycle 524 give generators of the same sign in $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$; and the 3-cycle 524 and the 3-cycle 324 give generators of the same sign in $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$. This implies that the image of ω in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$ is not homotopically trivial - it represents 4 times a generator in $\pi_1(\bar{\tau}_2, \bar{\Delta}'_0)$, a contradiction. \square

Lemma 6.9. *Suppose ω is of type II, and $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. Suppose τ_2 has a unique trace in \mathcal{S}_0 , all traces of τ_4 are good, and τ_4 has at least two traces. Then one of the following holds true:*

1. ω satisfies property (*);
2. x_1 and x_5 is adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} .

Proof. First we show $\tau_5 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ except possibly at endpoints. As τ_4 has at least two traces, Lemma 5.10 holds true with τ_1 replaced by τ_5 . We scissor \mathcal{S}_0 along S_3 to obtain a punctured annulus A_0 . As $\tau_5 \cap (\tau_0 \cup S_3) = \emptyset$ and $\tau_2 \cap (\tau_0 \cup S_3) = \emptyset$ except possibly at endpoints, we know the trajectory of τ_5 or τ_2 in A_0 is an arc from p_c to a point on ∂A_0 . If τ_5 and τ_2 end in different components of ∂A_0 , then $\tau_5 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. If τ_5 and τ_2 end in the same component, say C , of ∂A_0 , then either $z_c \in S_3$, or z_c and p_a are in the same component of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \partial S_3$. It follows that the trajectory of R_3 (as defined in Lemma 5.10) in A_0 ends in C as well. As $\tau_5 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$ and $\tau_2 \cap R_3 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, we know $\tau_2 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Now the lemma follows from Lemma 6.7. \square

Lemma 6.10. *Suppose ω is of type II, $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, and τ_4 has a unique trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is good. Assume $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4$ has an interior intersection point. Suppose*

1. either τ_2 has unique trace in \mathcal{S}_0 ;
2. or τ_2 has two traces in \mathcal{S}_0 and we are not in the situation that τ_2 has a unique π_4 -trace in \mathcal{S}_4 which is a good trace in \mathcal{S}_4 .

Then there is a vertex of type \hat{b} adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3\}$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.28, it suffices to prove that $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3$ has exactly one interior intersection point. Moreover, a subarc of τ_0 containing z_a , a subarc of τ_3 containing z_c and one of the two arcs in $\partial\mathcal{S}$ from z_a to z_c bound a disk in \mathcal{S} .

As $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4$ has an interior intersection point, τ_2 has at least one π_4 -trace in \mathcal{S}_4 . Let τ_g be the union of all π_4 -traces of τ_2 , and let K be the component of $\mathcal{S}_4 \setminus \tau_g$ that contains the puncture $p_c \in \mathcal{S}_4$. As $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_4 \cup \tau_2) = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, we know $\tau_3 \subset K$ except at endpoints. In

particular, $z_c \in K$. As $(\overline{z z_c} \cup \overline{z' z'_c}) \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$, we know $\{z, z'\} \subset K$. Let τ'_0 be the subarc of τ_0 starting from one of $\{z, z'\}$ until it hits τ_2 the first time. Let τ''_0 be the remaining subarc of τ_0 . Since we assume τ_2 has at most two traces in \mathcal{S}_0 , either $\tau'_0 = \tau_0$, or $\tau'_0 \neq \tau_0$ and $\tau''_0 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Note that $\tau'_0 \subset K$ except at endpoints. Also K is either a punctured disk or a punctured annulus.

We first consider the case $\tau_0 = \tau'_0$. If K is a punctured disk, then the claim is clear. If K is a punctured annulus, then all π_4 -traces of τ_2 are good and they in the same parallel class. Thus the pattern of $\tau_2 \cap \partial \mathcal{S}_4$ is indicated in Figure 9 (II). Let R_2 be the trace of τ_2 containing p_c and ending at θ . Let C^+ and C^- be two boundary components of K . Then θ and z_c are in the same component, say C^+ , of ∂K by Figure 9 (II). As $\tau_3 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints and they end in C^+ , we know R_2 determines τ_3 up to two choices. As $\{z, z'\} \in C^+$, we know τ'_0 starts from a point in C^+ . If τ_2 has more than one good π_4 -traces, then $p_a \in C^-$. If τ_2 has exactly one good π_4 -trace, then p_a gives $p_a^+ \in C^+$ and $p_a^- \in C^-$. If τ'_0 ends in C^- , then the claim follows from $\tau'_0 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ (except at endpoints). If τ'_0 ends in C^+ , then τ_2 has exactly one good π_4 trace, and τ'_0 goes from one of $\{z, z'\}$ to p_a^+ . In this case, then only possibility for $\tau'_0 \cap \tau_3$ to have more than one interior intersection point is as in Figure 11 (III). However, this can be ruled out since τ'_0 is not a good trace in \mathcal{S}_4 , hence τ_4 is not a good trace in \mathcal{S}_0 , contradiction.

If $\tau_0 \neq \tau'_0$, then by the same argument in the previous paragraph, we know the conclusion of the lemma still holds, if τ''_0 is not in K . This happens when $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_g$ has more than one components. However, $\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \tau_g$ has only one components if and only if τ_2 has a unique π_4 in \mathcal{S}_4 which is a good trace in \mathcal{S}_4 . Thus the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 6.11. *Suppose ω is of type II. If there is a vertex z of type \hat{b} in Δ_Λ which is adjacent to each of $\{x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3\}$. Then ω has property (*).*

Proof. We consider the 5-cycle ω' with consecutive vertices $\{x_0, z, x_3, x_2, x_1\}$, of type $\{\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}\}$. We can assume ω' is embedded, otherwise $z = x_2$ and x_2 is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$, hence property (*) follows. By Proposition 5.29 and Lemma 4.7 applied to ω' (while the statement of Lemma 4.7 is for cycles with vertex type $\hat{b}, \hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{a}, \hat{c}$, up to a symmetry of the Dynkin diagram Λ , it also applies to cycles with vertex type $\hat{a}, \hat{c}, \hat{b}, \hat{c}, \hat{b}$), either x_1 and z are adjacent, which implies z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x_5\}$ and property (*) follows, or x_2 is adjacent to x_5 and property (*) follows. \square

Lemma 6.12. *Suppose ω is of type II. Suppose τ_2 has a unique trace in \mathcal{S}_0 and τ_4 has a unique trace which is good. Then property (*) holds for ω .*

Proof. If $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, then ω readily has property (*). Now we assume $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$. If τ_2 and τ_4 have an interior intersection point, then the lemma follows from Lemma 6.10 and Lemma 6.11. Now we assume $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4$ except at endpoints.

We consider the 3-cycles 432 and 120 in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. If at least one of them is non-degenerate, then ω has property (*). Indeed, by symmetry we assume 120 is non-degenerate. Then x_2 and x_0 are adjacent. By applying Proposition 5.29 and Lemma 4.7 to the 5-cycle x_2, x_0, x_5, x_4, x_3 , we know either x_0 and x_3 are adjacent, which is ruled out by our assumption, or x_2 is adjacent to x_5 , and property (*) follows.

It remains to consider that both 432 and 120 are degenerate. First we claim up to replacing x_5 by a vertex x'_5 of type \hat{c} adjacent to both x_0 and x_4 , we can assume the associated arc τ'_5 in \mathcal{S} satisfies that $\tau'_5 \cap \tau_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. For this, we consider \mathcal{S}_0 and scissor it along τ_4 . As τ_4 gives a single good trace in \mathcal{S}_0 , we obtain a punctured annulus A_0 with two components C^+ and C^- . The point p_a gives $p_a^+ \in C^+$ and $p_a^- \in C^-$. As $\tau_2 \cap (\tau_0 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$, and $\tau_5 \cap (\tau_0 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$, we know the trajectories of τ_2 and τ_5 go from p_c to one of the boundary components of A_0 . More precisely, if we assume without loss of generality that $z_c \in C^+$, then τ_5 ends in z_c and τ_2 ends in either p_a^+ or p_a^- . If τ_2 and τ_5 end in different boundary components of A_0 , then we already have $\tau_2 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. If they ends at the same boundary component of A_0 , then there is an arc τ'_5 in A_0 from p_c to z_c avoiding τ_2 . Thus the claim is proved.

By Lemma 6.8, it is impossible that each of 210, 5'20, 5'24 and 324 gives degenerate 3-cycle in $\bar{\Delta}'_0$. The case when exactly three of these four 3-cycles are degenerate is ruled out by Lemma 5.6. Thus the only possibility left is that both 5'20 and 5'24 are non-degenerate. As 120 is degenerate and 5'20 is non-degenerate, by the third paragraph of the proof of Lemma 6.7, x_1 and x'_5 are adjacent to a common vertex x'_0 of type \hat{b} . By symmetry, we know x'_5 and x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex x'_4 of type \hat{b} . As the Dynkin diagram Λ has symmetries inducing arbitrary permutations of $\{a, b, c\}$, we can apply Proposition 5.29 to the 6-cycle $x'_0x_1x_2x_3x'_4x'_5$ and deduce that there is a vertex z of type \hat{a} or \hat{b} such that z is adjacent to each of $\{x_1, x_3, x'_5\}$. Thus the 6-cycle $x_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x'_5$ has property (*). By Lemma 5.31, ω has property (*). \square

Lemma 6.13. *Suppose ω is of type II, $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$, and τ_4 has a unique trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is good. If τ_2 has a unique π_0 -trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is good, then ω has property (*).*

Proof. The case $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4 = \emptyset$ follows by applying Lemma 6.12 with the role of $\{x_0, x_1\}$ and $\{x_4, x_3\}$ exchanged. Now suppose $\tau_2 \cap \tau_4$ has at least one interior intersection point. It suffices to consider the case that τ_2 has a unique π_4 -trace in \mathcal{S}_4 which is good, otherwise we are done by Lemma 6.10 and Lemma 6.11.

Let R_2 be the trace of τ_2 in \mathcal{S}_4 containing p_c , and let S_2 be the other trace of τ_2 . We scissor \mathcal{S}_4 along S_2 to obtain an annulus A_0 , with two boundary components C^+ and C^- . We assume without loss of generality that R_2 ends on $\theta \in \overline{z'p_a} \subset C^+$. Then $z, z_c \in C^+$. Let p_a^+ and p_a^- be the copy of p_a in C^+ and C^- respectively. Note that there are two homotopy classes of arcs (rel endpoints) in A_0 from p_c to z_c that have representatives disjoint from R_2 . We choose a representative from each class and denote them γ and β . Assume without loss of generality that γ, R_2 and $\overline{z_c\theta} \subset C^+$ bound a disk D . As $\tau_3 \cap (\tau_2 \cup \tau_4) = \emptyset$ except at endpoints, we can assume either $\tau_3 = \gamma$ or $\tau_3 = \beta$. By a similar argument, we also know that there are only two homotopy classes of arcs (rel endpoints) in \mathcal{S} from z_c to p_c which contain representatives avoiding both τ_0 and τ_2 . Thus τ_0 and τ_2 determine $[\tau_1]$ up to two choices.

By our assumption, τ_0 has a single trace in \mathcal{S}_4 which is good. Moreover, τ_0 and τ_2 have exactly one interior intersection point.

Case 1: τ_0 and S_2 have an interior intersection point. Let θ' be the endpoint of S_2 that is identified with θ via ϕ . Then $\tau_0 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$. Suppose $\tau_3 = \gamma$. If $z \in \tau_0$, then $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 = \emptyset$, otherwise τ_0 will enter the disk D . As $\tau_0 \cap \partial\mathcal{S}_4 = \{z', p_a\}$ and $\tau_0 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$, we know τ_0 will exit D at another point, contradicting the minimal position assumption. If $z' \in \tau_0$, then by a similar argument we know the assumptions of Lemma 5.28 are satisfied. Then ω has property (*) by Lemma 6.11.

Now we assume $\tau_3 = \beta$. Suppose in A_0 , τ_0 goes from one of $\{z, z'\}$ and first hits C^+ . As τ_0 does not bound a (possibly punctured) disk with a subarc of $\partial\mathcal{S}_4$ in \mathcal{S}_4 , up to a homeomorphism, we are either in Figure 12 (I) or Figure 12 (II). We only discuss the case $z' \in \tau_0$, as the other case is similar. Recall that up to homotopy, τ_1 must be one of the two arcs in \mathcal{S} from z_c to p_c avoiding τ_0 and τ_2 . Suppose we are in Figure 12 (I). In Figure 12 (I'), we display the less obvious possibility of τ_1 when $z' \in \tau_0$, following the arcs labeled by 1, and noting that $\overline{p_a\theta'}$ and $\overline{p_a\theta}$ are identified, and $\overline{\theta'z}$ and $\overline{\theta z'}$ are identified. Note that both possibilities of τ_1 will have empty intersection with τ_3 (except at endpoints), moreover $\tau_1 \cup \tau_3$ forms a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}' (which is obtained from \mathcal{S}' by filling back the punctures) which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}'$. Thus there is an arc in \mathcal{S} from p_a to z_a that is disjoint from both τ_1 and τ_3 , implying x_1 and x_3 is adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} in Δ_Λ . Then ω has property (*) by Proposition 5.29. Now suppose we are in Figure 12 (II). Assume $z' \in \tau_0$ (the case $z \in \tau_0$ is similar and easier). In Figure 12 (II'), we display the less obvious possibility of τ_1 . Let τ'_1 be the arc obtained by apply a Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$ to τ_1 - this has the effect of replace the end of τ_1 by the dashed part as displayed in Figure 12 (II). Note that there are infinitely many homotopy classes of arcs from z' to p_a which has representatives avoiding $(\tau'_1 \cup \tau_3)$. Thus by Lemma 5.3 (2), either x_1 and x_3 are not adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} , which rules out this case, or x_1 and x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} , and we finish as before. For the other choice




Figure 12: Proof of Lemma 6.13

of τ_1 , $\tau_1 \cup \tau_3$ forms a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}' which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}'$, and we finish as before.

Suppose in A_0 , τ_0 goes from one of $\{z, z'\}$ and first hits C^- . Then up to a homeomorphism, we are in Figure 12 (III). In this case, $\tau_1 \cup \tau_3$ forms a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}' which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}'$ (see Figure 12 (III') for the less obvious possibility of τ_1 in the case $z' \in \tau_0$), and we finish as before.

Case 2: τ_0 and R_2 have one interior intersection point. Then $\tau_0 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Up to a homeomorphism, we are in either Figure 12 (IV), (V), (VI), (VII) or (VIII). Note that (VII) is ruled out as the π_0 -trace of τ_2 on \mathcal{S}_0 is a good trace, and (VI) is ruled out as the τ_0 gives a good π_0 trace in \mathcal{S}_4 . We will only discuss the case $z \in \tau_0$ as the case $z' \in \tau_0$ is similar. We will only discuss (IV) and (V) as (VIII) follows from a similar argument. If we are in Figure 12 (IV) (resp. (V)), then the two possibilities of τ_1 are displayed in Figure 12 (IV') and (IV'') (resp. (V') and (V'')). In Figure 12 (IV') and (V''), τ_1 and τ_3 give a homotopically non-trivial simple closed curve in \mathcal{S}' which is not homotopic to $\partial\mathcal{S}'$, and we finish as before. In Figure 12 (IV''), τ_1 and γ differ by a power of Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$. By considering τ_1, γ, τ_3 , Lemma 5.3 (2) implies that either x_1 and x_3 are not adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} , or x_1 and x_3 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{a} , and we finish as before. In Figure 12 (V'), τ_1 and τ_3 differ by a Dehn twist along $\partial\mathcal{S}$, however, this is impossible by Lemma 5.3. \square

Lemma 6.14. *Suppose ω has type II and $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$ in \mathcal{S} . Suppose τ_4 has a trace in \mathcal{S}_0 which is not good. Suppose $\tau_2 \cap \tau_0 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints. Then one of the following holds true:*

1. x_1 and x_5 are adjacent to a common vertex of type \hat{b} ;
2. ω satisfies condition (*).

Proof. We first claim $\tau_2 \cap \tau_5 = \emptyset$. Take a trace of τ'_4 of τ_4 which is not good. Lemma 5.9 implies that τ'_4 and a subarc of $\partial\mathcal{S}_0$ bound a punctured disk D with $p_c \in D$. Then $\tau_5 \subset D$. As in Corollary 5.13 we assume without loss of generality that τ'_4 goes from z to a point $x \in \overline{z'p_a}$. If τ_2 stays inside D , then the claim follows. If τ_2 goes out of D , then it can not reenter again, as once it reenters, then it can not end in the interior of D , and it can not end in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \cap \partial D$ except at p_a (this uses that $\tau_2 \cap \tau_0 = \emptyset$ except at endpoints), hence it forms a bigon with τ'_4 . We must have p_c inside this bigon as τ_2 and τ_4 are in minimal position. However, this is a contradiction, as $\tau_0 \cap \tau_3 \neq \emptyset$ implies that a trace of τ_3 goes from p_c to a point in $\partial\mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \{p_a\}$ avoiding $\tau_2 \cup \tau_4$. As τ_2 can not reenter, the claim is proved. We are done by Lemma 6.7. \square

7 Ending remarks

In this last section, we explain in general what are the types of 6-cycles we need to handle in proving $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture, and conjecture that all of these 6-cycles has a quasi-center, Conjecture 7.2. We also explain the relationship between Conjecture 7.2 and a conjecture of Haettel, see Conjecture 7.5. We also deduce that these conjectures are true for type D_n Artin groups with $n = 3, 4$.

Definition 7.1. Let Λ be the Dynkin diagram of type D_n with its vertices as in Figure 3. Let Δ_Λ be the associated Artin complex. We define a partial order on the set of types of vertices in Δ_Λ by declaring that

- $\{\hat{\delta}_1, \hat{\delta}_2\} < \hat{\delta}_3 < \hat{\delta}_4 < \dots < \hat{\delta}_n$,
- $\hat{\delta}_1$ and $\hat{\delta}_2$ are not comparable.

A 6-cycle ω in Δ_Λ with consecutive vertices $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}}$ is *admissible* if the types of x_i and x_{i+1} are comparable for each i . We say x_i is a local max if the types of x_{i-1} and x_{i+1} are less than the type of x_i . Similarly we define local min vertex of ω . A *zigzag* 6-cycle in Δ_Λ is an admissible 6-cycle in Δ_Λ whose vertices alternate between local max and local min.

Conjecture 7.2. *Suppose ω is a zigzag 6-cycle in the type D_n Artin complex Δ_Λ . Then ω has a quasi-center which is adjacent to each of the local max vertices of ω .*

Corollary 7.3. *This conjecture holds when $n = 3, 4$.*

Proof. We will only treat $n = 4$ case, as the $n = 3$ case is much easier and follows from the same argument.

Let the 6-cycle ω be $y_1x_1y_2x_2y_3x_3$ where for each i , x_i is a local min and y_i is a local max. By Lemma 2.15 (3), up to replacing x_i by a different vertex, we can assume without loss of generality that each x_i has type $\hat{\delta}_1$ or $\hat{\delta}_2$. Then each y_i has type $\hat{\delta}_3$ or $\hat{\delta}_4$.

The case when each y_i has type $\hat{\delta}_3$. Note that if x_i and x_{i+1} do not have the same type, then they are adjacent in Δ_Λ by looking at the link of a type $\hat{\delta}_3$ vertex in Δ_Λ and applying Lemma 2.15 (3). If $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ do not have the same type, then up to rotation of indices, we can assume x_1 and x_3 have the same type, but their type is different from that of x_2 . Then x_1 and x_2 are adjacent in Δ_Λ , and x_2 and x_3 are adjacent in Δ_Λ . By Lemma 4.4, x_2 and y_1 are adjacent. Hence x_2 is a quasi-center of ω . It remains to consider that all x_i have the same type, in which case we are done by Theorem 3.4.

The case that each y_i has type $\hat{\delta}_4$ follows from Theorem 4.1 (where δ_4 plays the role of c in Theorem 4.1).

Now suppose two of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, say y_1 and y_2 , has type $\hat{\delta}_4$, but y_3 has type $\hat{\delta}_3$. Let y'_3 be an vertex of type $\hat{\delta}_4$ that is adjacent to y_3 . We can assume $y'_3 \neq y_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, indeed, if $y'_3 = y_1$, then y_3 and y_1 are adjacent, and Lemma 2.15 applied to $\text{lk}(y_3, \Delta_\Lambda)$ implies that y_1 and x_2 are adjacent, hence x_2 is a quasi-center of ω ; a similar argument applies if $y'_3 = y_2$. By Theorem 3.4, there is a vertex z of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ or $\hat{\delta}_2$ such that z is adjacent to each of $\{y_1, y_2, y'_3\}$. If $z = x_2$ or x_3 , then z is a quasi-center of ω . Thus we assume $z \neq x_i$ for $i = 2, 3$. Then $y'_3x_3y_1z$ and $y'_3x_2y_2z$ give two embedded 4-cycles. By Theorem 2.17, there exist vertices x'_2, x'_3 of type $\hat{\delta}_3$ such that x'_3 is adjacent to each of $\{y'_3, x_3, y_1, z\}$ and x'_2 is adjacent to each of $\{y'_3, x_2, y_2, z\}$. Consider the 6-cycle $x_3x'_3z x'_2x_2y_3$. By previous discussion, there is a vertex z' of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ or $\hat{\delta}_2$ such that z' is adjacent to each of $\{x'_3, x'_2, y_3\}$. By applying Lemma 2.15 (3) to $\text{lk}(x'_3, \Delta)$, we know z' is adjacent to y_1 . Similarly z' is adjacent to y_2 . Thus z' is a quasi-center of ω .

The remaining case is that one of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, say y_1 , has type $\hat{\delta}_4$, and the other two have type $\hat{\delta}_3$. We define y'_3 as in the previous paragraph. By the previous paragraph, there is a vertex z of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ or $\hat{\delta}_2$ such that z is adjacent to each of $\{y_1, y_2, y'_3\}$. Similarly, we can assume $y'_3 \neq y_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $z \neq x_i$ for $i = 2, 3$. We define x'_3 as before. By considering the 6-cycle $x_3x'_3zy_2x_2y_3$, we know there is a vertex z' of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ or $\hat{\delta}_2$ such that z' is adjacent to each of $\{y_3, x'_3, y_2\}$. We know z' is adjacent to y_1 by the same argument as in the previous paragraph. Thus z' is a quasi-center of ω . \square

Conjecture 7.2 is a reformulation of a conjecture of Haettel as follows.

Definition 7.4. Suppose A_Λ is an Artin group whose Dynkin diagram Λ is of type D_n with its vertex set as in Figure 3. Let $\Delta = \Delta_\Lambda$ be the associated Artin complex. We subdivide each edge of Δ connecting a vertex of type $\hat{\delta}_1$ and a vertex of type $\hat{\delta}_2$. We say the middle point of such edge is of type m . Cut each top dimensional simplex in Δ into two simplices along the codimensional 1 simplex spanned by vertices of type m and $\{\delta_i\}_{i=3}^n$. This gives a new simplicial complex, which we denoted by Δ' . Define a map t from the vertex set $V\Delta'$ of Δ' to $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ by sending vertices of type $\hat{\delta}_1, \hat{\delta}_2$ to 1, vertices of type m to 2, vertices of type $\hat{\delta}_i$ to i for $i \geq 3$. Define a relation $<$ on $V\Delta'$ as follows. For $x, y \in V\Delta'$, $x < y$ if x and y are adjacent and $t(x) < t(y)$. The simplicial complex Δ' , together with the relation $<$ on its vertex set, is called the (δ_1, δ_2) -subdivision of Δ_Λ .

Conjecture 7.5 (Haettel). *Suppose Λ is of type D_n . The vertex set V of the (δ_1, δ_2) -subdivision Δ' of Δ_Λ , endowed with the partial order in Definition 7.4, is downward flag in the following sense: if three elements $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \subset V$ satisfy that each pair of them has a lower bound in V , then there is a common lower of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ in V .*

Lemma 7.6. *If Conjecture 7.2 holds, then Conjecture 7.5 holds.*

Proof. Let V and $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ be as in Conjecture 7.5. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$, let x_i be a lower bound of y_{i-1} and y_i . We can assume without loss of generality that $t(x_i) = 1$ for each i . If $t(y_i) \neq 2$ for each i , then $y_1x_1y_2x_2y_3x_3$ gives a zigzag 6-cycle in Δ_Λ , and we are done by Conjecture 7.2.

If $t(y_i) = 2$, then x_i and x_{i+1} are adjacent in Δ_Λ . Thus if at least two of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ satisfy $t(y_i) = 2$, then we reduce analyze 4-cycles in Δ_Λ , and it is not hard to deduce from Theorem 2.17 that $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ has a common lower bound.

It remains to consider exactly one of $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, say y_1 , satisfies $t(y_1) = 2$. Let y'_1 be a vertex with $t(y'_1) = 3$ such that y'_1 and y_1 are adjacent in Δ' . By apply the previous discussion to the 6-cycle $y'_1x_1y_2x_2y_3x_3$, we know $\{y'_1, y_2, y_3\}$ has a common lower bound $z \in V$. We can assume without loss of generality that $t(z) = 1$. We will assume x_3 and z are not adjacent in Δ_Λ , otherwise $\{x_3, z\}$ has a common upper bound y'_3 with $t(y'_3) = 2$, and by applying the previous paragraph to $\{y_1, y_2, y'_3\}$, we know $\{y_1, y_2, y'_3\}$ has a lower bound, hence $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ has a lower bound. Similarly, we assume x_1 and z are not adjacent in Δ_Λ . We will assume $y'_1 \neq y_3$, otherwise x_1 is a common lower bound for $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ in V . Similarly, we assume $y'_1 \neq y_2$.

We claim y'_1 is adjacent to y_3 in Δ_Λ . By applying Theorem 2.17 to the 4-cycle $x_3y'_1zy_3$, we know that either y'_1 and y_3 are adjacent in Δ_Λ , or there is a vertex w of type $\hat{\delta}_i$ which is adjacent to each of $\{x_3, y'_1, z, y_3\}$. As the type of w is different from the types of each of $\{x_3, y'_1, z, y_3\}$, Theorem 2.17 implies that δ_i is contained in the subsegment of Λ between δ_3 and δ_k where y_3 has type $\hat{\delta}_k$. Then Lemma 2.15 implies that y'_1 and y_3 are adjacent in Δ_Λ , as desired. This claim implies that $y_3 \geq y'_1 \geq x_1$, thus x_1 is a common lower bound for $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$, as desired. \square

Corollary 7.7. *Conjecture 7.5 holds when $n = 3, 4$.*

References

- [All02] Daniel Allcock. Braid pictures for artin groups. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 354(9):3455–3474, 2002.
- [Alt98] Joseph A Altobelli. The word problem for Artin groups of FC type. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 129(1):1–22, 1998.
- [AS83] Kenneth I Appel and Paul E Schupp. Artin groups and infinite coxeter groups. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 72(2):201–220, 1983.
- [BB07] Valerij G Bardakov and Paolo Bellingeri. Representations of braid groups and generalisations. *arXiv preprint math/0703692*, 2007.
- [BM00] Thomas Brady and Jonathan P. McCammond. Three-generator Artin groups of large type are biautomatic. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 151(1):1–9, 2000.
- [Bou02] Nicolas Bourbaki. Lie groups and lie algebras. chapters 4–6. translated from the 1968 french original by andrew pressley. *elements of mathematics*, 2002.
- [BP23] Martín Blufstein and Luis Paris. Parabolic subgroups inside parabolic subgroups of artin groups. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 151(04):1519–1526, 2023.
- [CD95a] Ruth Charney and Michael W. Davis. The $K(\pi, 1)$ -problem for hyperplane complements associated to infinite reflection groups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8(3):597–627, 1995.
- [CD95b] Ruth Charney and Michael W. Davis. The $K(\pi, 1)$ -problem for hyperplane complements associated to infinite reflection groups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8(3):597–627, 1995.

- [CGGMW19] María Cumplido, Volker Gebhardt, Juan González-Meneses, and Bert Wiest. On parabolic subgroups of artin–tits groups of spherical type. *Advances in Mathematics*, 352:572–610, 2019.
- [Cha04] Ruth Charney. The deligne complex for the four-strand braid group. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 356(10):3881–3897, 2004.
- [CMV20] María Cumplido, Alexandre Martin, and Nicolas Vaskou. Parabolic subgroups of large-type artin groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02693*, 2020.
- [CP14] Ruth Charney and Luis Paris. Convexity of parabolic subgroups in artin groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.7634*, 2014.
- [CPC05] John Crisp, Luis Paris, and A Cohen. Artin groups of type b and d. *Advances in Geometry*, 5(4), 2005.
- [Cum19] María Cumplido. On the minimal positive standardizer of a parabolic subgroup of an artin–tits group. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 49:337–359, 2019.
- [Dav12] Michael Davis. The geometry and topology of coxeter groups.(lms-32). In *The Geometry and Topology of Coxeter Groups.(LMS-32)*. Princeton University Press, 2012.
- [Del72] Pierre Deligne. Les immeubles des groupes de tresses généralisés. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 17(4):273–302, 1972.
- [DS87] Andreas WM Dress and Rudolf Scharlau. Gated sets in metric spaces. *Aequationes mathematicae*, 34:112–120, 1987.
- [FM11] Benson Farb and Dan Margalit. *A primer on mapping class groups (pms-49)*, volume 41. Princeton university press, 2011.
- [God03] Eddy Godelle. Normalisateur et groupe d’artin de type sphérique. *Journal of Algebra*, 269(1):263–274, 2003.
- [God23] Eddy Godelle. On parabolic subgroups of artin-tits groups. *Journal of Algebra*, 632:520–534, 2023.
- [Gol23] Katherine Goldman. CAT(0) and cubulated shephard groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10883*, 2023.
- [GP12a] Eddy Godelle and Luis Paris. Basic questions on Artin-Tits groups. In *Configuration spaces*, volume 14 of *CRM Series*, pages 299–311. Ed. Norm., Pisa, 2012.
- [GP12b] Eddy Godelle and Luis Paris. $K(\pi, 1)$ and word problems for infinite type artin–tits groups, and applications to virtual braid groups. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 272(3):1339–1364, 2012.
- [Hae21] Thomas Haettel. Lattices, injective metrics and the $K(\pi, 1)$ conjecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07891*, 2021.
- [Hat91] Allen Hatcher. On triangulations of surfaces. *Topology and its Applications*, 40(2):189–194, 1991.
- [Hua23] Jingyin Huang. Labeled four cycles and the $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture for artin groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16847*, 2023.
- [Hua24] Jingyin Huang. Cycles in spherical Deligne complexes and application to $K(\pi, 1)$ -conjecture for Artin groups. *preprint*, 2024.

- [LS62] R. C. Lyndon and M. P. Schützenberger. The equation $a^M = b^N c^P$ in a free group. *Michigan Math. J.*, 9:289–298, 1962.
- [McC17] Jon McCammond. The mysterious geometry of artin groups. *Winter Braids Lecture Notes*, 4:1–30, 2017.
- [MM00] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky. Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 10(4):902–974, 2000.
- [Par14a] Luis Paris. $K(\pi, 1)$ conjecture for artin groups. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 23, pages 361–415, 2014.
- [Par14b] Luis Paris. $K(\pi, 1)$ conjecture for Artin groups. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 23(2):361–415, 2014.
- [PV96] Bernard Perron and Jean-Pierre Vannier. Groupe de monodromie géométrique des singularités simples. *Mathematische Annalen*, 306:231–245, 1996.
- [Sal87] Mario Salvetti. Topology of the complement of real hyperplanes in \mathbb{C}^n . *Invent. math.*, 88(3):603–618, 1987.
- [Sor20] Ignat Soroko. Linearity of some low-complexity mapping class groups. In *Forum Mathematicum*, volume 32, pages 279–286. De Gruyter, 2020.
- [vdL83] Harm van der Lek. *The homotopy type of complex hyperplane complements*. 1983.
- [Web20] Richard CH Webb. Contractible, hyperbolic but non-CAT (0) complexes. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 30:1439–1463, 2020.