

POSITIVITY FOR QUANTUM CLUSTER ALGEBRAS FROM ORBIFOLDS

MIN HUANG

ABSTRACT. Let (S, M, U) be a marked orbifold with or without punctures and let \mathcal{A}_v be a quantum cluster algebra from (S, M, U) with arbitrary coefficients and quantization. We provide combinatorial formulas for quantum Laurent expansion of quantum cluster variables of \mathcal{A}_v concerning an arbitrary quantum seed. Consequently, the positivity for the quantum cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_v is proved.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminary and some notation	5
2.1. Poset and partition bijection	5
2.2. Cluster algebra	6
2.3. Quantum cluster algebra	7
2.4. (Quantum) Cluster algebras from orbifolds	8
2.5. Orbifold morphism and canonical polygon	12
2.6. Snake graph and perfect matching	13
2.7. Complete (T^o, γ) -path	14
3. An isomorphism of quantum cluster algebras	16
4. Three lattices associated with tagged arcs	18
4.1. $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$	18
4.2. $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$	18
4.3. $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$	21
5. Valuation maps	26
5.1. Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$	26
5.2. Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$	28
5.3. Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$	30
6. Expansion formulas and the positivity	36
6.1. Expansion formula for ordinary arcs.	36
6.2. Expansion formula for one end tagged notched arcs.	38
6.3. Expansion formula for two ends tagged notched arcs.	39
7. Partition bijection between perfect matchings	42
7.1. Polygon case	42
7.2. General case	51
8. Partition bijection between triangles	57
8.1. Once-puncture polygon case	57

8.2. General case	58
Notation	60
9. Partition bijection between lattices \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}'	61
10. Compatibility of the partition bijections and the lattice structures	69
11. Two equivalent relations in \mathcal{L} .	78
12. Proof for the expansion formulas	84
12.1. Proofs of Theorems 6.5, 6.9	87
12.2. Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p \neq q$	87
12.3. Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p = q$	91
12.4. Proof of Proposition 12.18.	92
References	96

1. INTRODUCTION

Cluster algebras are commutative algebras introduced by Fomin-Zelevinsky [18] around the year 2000. Quantum cluster algebras were later introduced by Berenstein-Zelevinsky, [3]. The theory of cluster algebras is related to numerous other fields, including Lie theory, representation theory of algebras, dynamical systems, Teichmüller theory, combinatorics, number theory, topology, and mathematical physics.

A cluster algebra is a subalgebra of a rational function field with a distinguished set of generators, called cluster variables. Different cluster variables are related by an iterated procedure, called mutation. Cluster variables are rational functions by construction. In [18], Fomin and Zelevinsky proved that they are Laurent polynomials of initial cluster variables, known as the Laurent phenomenon. Laurent polynomials were proven to have non-negative coefficients, known as positivity, see [29, 21].

Berenstein-Zelevinsky [3] proved that the Laurent phenomenon has a quantum version in the quantum setting. The cluster variables are quantum Laurent polynomials of initial ones. The coefficients, were conjectured to be in $\mathbb{N}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$, known as positivity conjecture for quantum cluster algebras, where q is the quantum parameter. Kimura and Qin [28] proved the positivity conjecture for the acyclic skew-symmetric quantum cluster algebras, and Davison [11] proved this conjecture for the skew-symmetric case. The author [23] proved the case for quantum cluster algebras from unpunctured orbifolds. There is no noteworthy work performed for skew-symmetrizable cases in general.

The original motivation of Fomin and Zelevinsky was to provide a combinatorial characterization of the (dual) canonical bases in quantum groups (see [31, 27]) and the total positivity in algebraic groups. They conjectured that the cluster structure should serve as an algebraic framework for the study of the “dual canonical bases” in various coordinate rings and their q -deformations. In Particular, they conjectured all cluster monomials belong to the dual canonical bases. This was recently proved in [26, 39, 40]. Generally, it can be very difficult to write the dual canonical bases explicitly. From this point of view, finding an

explicit (quantum) Laurent expansion formula for (quantum) cluster monomials represents a noteworthy step in research in cluster theory.

Finding an explicit formula for cluster variables attracted a lot of attention. The Caldero-Chapoton map or cluster character is a way to provide the expansion formula in terms of Euler-Poincaré characteristics, see [4, 5, 6, 20, 36, 37, 38, 12, 25, 7]. Rupel [42] generalized the Caldero-Chapoton map to the quantum case. However, since Euler-Poincaré can be negative, the positivity of the coefficients is not immediately implied. Extensive research has been conducted in the other direction on (quantum) cluster algebras from surfaces, introduced by Fomin-Shapiro-Thurston [16]. The expansion formula is well-studied by Musiker, Schiffler, Thomas, Williams, et al. in a series of studies, see [44, 43, 33, 34, 45]. Rupel [41] gave the explicit quantum Laurent expansion formula for the quantum cluster algebras of type A . Canakci-Lampe [8] gave an explicit quantum Laurent expansion formula for the quantum cluster algebras of type A and of the Kronecker type. The author [22, 23] provided an expansion formula for quantum cluster algebras from unpunctured surfaces (orbifolds). Berenstein-Retakh [2] deals with a fully noncommutative version of cluster algebras arising from surfaces.

(Quantum) cluster algebras from orbifolds are an essential class of (quantum) cluster algebras. Almost all skew-symmetrizable (quantum) cluster algebras of finite mutation type are in this class, see [14]. Using the unfolding method, the positivity for cluster algebras from orbifolds can be deduced from the positivity for the cluster algebras from surfaces, see [14]. However, the unfolding method does not provide any information on the q -coefficients. Thus, we do not know the quantum Laurent expansion formula for quantum cluster algebras from orbifolds, even that is known for quantum cluster algebras from surfaces. The study solves the positivity conjecture for such a class of quantum cluster algebras by giving an expansion formula of any quantum cluster variable for any quantum cluster. We would generalize the methods in [24] from the commutative case to the quantum case.

The study is organized as follows. Sections 2 are devoted to preliminaries. In Subsection 2.1, we recall the key tool partition bijection which is defined in [22] and give a criterion for two partition bijections are inverse to each other, Proposition 2.6. Subsections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 are preliminaries on (quantum) cluster algebras and (quantum) cluster algebras from orbifolds. In Subsection 2.5, we recall orbifold morphism and canonical polygon defined in [2]. Subsections 2.6, 2.7 are preliminaries on some heart combinatoric notations, snake graphs, perfect matchings, and complete (T^o, γ) -path.

In Section 3, for an orbifold Σ , we generalize the result in [34] and show that changing the tags at a puncture p gives an isomorphism between two quantum cluster algebras from Σ , see Proposition 3.2. To give a Laurent expansion formula for any quantum cluster variables concerning any cluster, by Proposition 3.2, it suffices to restrict to three cases, see Remark 3.3.

In Sections 4 and 5, given an ideal triangulation T^o , we introduce three classes of lattices for ordinary arcs, one end tagged arcs and two ends tagged arcs, and construct valuation

maps on them. These lattices are the index sets for the Laurent expansion formulas and the valuation maps provide the powers of the quantum parameter.

The main results in this paper are given in Section 6. To be precise, we provide Laurent expansion formulas in Theorems 6.5, 6.9, 6.14 and the positivity for this class of quantum cluster algebras, Theorem 6.15.

We prove Theorems 6.5, 6.9, 6.14 in Section 12. Our strategy is the following: for a given tagged arc β , $\beta^{(q)}$ or $\beta^{(p,q)}$, we first show that the expansion formulas given in Theorems 6.5, 6.9, 6.14 do not depend on the choice of ideal triangulations. Since any two ideal triangulations are connected by a sequence of flips, it suffices to show the expansion formulas given in Theorems 6.5, 6.9, 6.14 are invariant concerning two ideal triangulations related by a flip, see Theorem 12.10. We then show that the expansion formulas hold for a specially chosen ideal triangulation, see Propositions 12.13, 12.14, 12.17, 12.18 and 12.24.

Sections 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 are devoted to the proof of Theorem 12.10. The naive idea is the following: for any ideal triangulation T^o and a non-self-folded arc α , denote $T'^o = \mu_\alpha(T^o)$ and by $LP(T^o)$ the Laurent expansion formula concerning T^o for a given tagged arc β , $\beta^{(q)}$ or $\beta^{(p,q)}$. For each term X in $LP(T^o)$, assume that the index of the quantum cluster variable X_α in X is $n(X)$. By the exchange formula of quantum cluster variables, we have X is the sum of $2^{n(X)}$ terms in $LP(T'^o)$ if $n(X) \geq 0$ and the sum of X with $2^{-n(X)} - 1$ terms in $LP(T^o)$ is one term in $LP(T'^o)$ if $n(X) < 0$. This allows us to give a partition bijection between the terms of $LP(T^o)$ and $LP(T'^o)$, accordingly, we have a partition bijection between the index sets. We realize this in Section 9. Sections 7 and 8 are preliminaries to give the partition bijection in Section 9. We prove in 10 that has a nice compatible property with the lattice structures in Section 4. In Section 11, we deal with the powers of the quantum parameter and coefficients under the partition bijection.

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Prof. Arkady Berenstein, Prof. Vladimir Retakh and Dr. Eugen Rogozinnikov for inspirit discussion. This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.12101617).

2. PRELIMINARY AND SOME NOTATION

2.1. Poset and partition bijection.

2.1.1. *Poset.* Herein, we recall some notation in poset.

Definition 2.1. A binary relation \leq is a *partial order* on a set \mathcal{P} if it satisfies the following properties.

- (1) (reflexivity) $P \leq P$ for all $P \in \mathcal{P}$;
- (2) (antisymmetry) $P \leq Q$ and $Q \leq P$ imply $P = Q$;
- (3) (transitivity) $P \leq Q$ and $Q \leq R$ imply $P \leq R$.

Denote $P \geq Q$ if $Q \leq P$. A *poset* is a set with a partial order.

We say that a poset \mathcal{P} is *connected* if for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$ there exists a sequence of elements $P_0 = P, P_1, \dots, P_s = Q$ such that $P_i \leq P_{i+1}$ if i is even and $P_i \geq P_{i+1}$ if i is odd.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{P} be a poset. For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that Q *covers* P if $P < Q$ and there is no other element R such that $P < R < Q$.

2.1.2. *Partition bijection.*

Definition 2.3. Let \mathcal{P} be a finite set.

- (1) A *partition* of \mathcal{P} is a finite collection of subsets $\mathcal{P}_i, i \in I$ such that $\cup_{i \in I} \mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_i \cap \mathcal{P}_j = \emptyset$ for any different $i, j \in I$.
- (2) Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'$ be finite subsets. A *partition bijection* from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' is a bijection from some partition of \mathcal{P} to some partition of \mathcal{P}' , denoted by $\varphi : \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}'$.
- (3) Let $\varphi : \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}'$ and $\varphi' : \mathcal{P}' \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}$ be two partition bijections. We say that φ and φ' are *inverse* to each other if they are inverse to each other as bijective maps.

Example 2.4. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{x, y, x^{-2}y^2, x^{-2}yz, x^{-2}zy, x^{-2}z^2\}$ and $\mathcal{P}' = \{x'^{-1}y, x'^{-1}z, y, x'^2\}$. Then $\{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{x^{-2}y^2, x^{-2}yz, x^{-2}zy, x^{-2}z^2\}\}$ is a partition of \mathcal{P} and $\{\{x'^{-1}y, x'^{-1}z\}, \{y\}, \{x'^2\}\}$ is a partition of \mathcal{P}' .

One see that $\{x\} \rightarrow \{x'^{-1}y, x'^{-1}z\}$, $\{y\} \rightarrow \{y\}$ and $\{x^{-2}y^2, x^{-2}yz, x^{-2}zy, x^{-2}z^2\} \rightarrow \{x'^2\}$ give a partition bijection from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' .

Remark 2.5. Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'$ be finite sets. From Definition 2.3, to give a partition bijection from \mathcal{P} to \mathcal{P}' is equivalent to associating each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ with a non-empty subset $\varphi(P) \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that the following conditions hold.

- (i) For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}$, we have either $\varphi(P) \cap \varphi(Q) = \emptyset$ or $\varphi(P) = \varphi(Q)$;
- (ii) $\bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \varphi(P) = \mathcal{P}'$.

We will frequently use this equivalence definition throughout this paper. The following result is useful to judge if two given partition bijections are inverse to each other.

Proposition 2.6. Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}'$ be finite sets. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}'$ and $\varphi' : \mathcal{P}' \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}$ be two partition bijections. Then φ and φ' are inverse to each other is equivalent to the following condition: for any $P \in \mathcal{P}, P' \in \mathcal{P}'$ we have $P' \in \varphi(P)$ if and only if $P \in \varphi'(P')$.

Proof. The necessity is clear. Now we prove the sufficiency. As $\varphi : \mathcal{P} \xrightarrow{\text{par}} \mathcal{P}'$ is a partition bijection, φ gives a bijection between the partition $\bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \{Q \mid \varphi(Q) = \varphi(P)\}$ of \mathcal{P} and the partition $\bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \varphi(P)$ of \mathcal{P}' . Similarly, φ' gives a bijection between the partition $\bigsqcup_{P' \in \mathcal{P}'} \{Q' \mid \varphi'(Q') = \varphi'(P')\}$ of \mathcal{P}' and the partition $\bigsqcup_{P' \in \mathcal{P}'} \varphi'(P')$ of \mathcal{P} . According to the condition, for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $P' \in \varphi(P)$ we have $\{Q \mid \varphi(Q) = \varphi(P)\} = \varphi'(P')$. Thus the partitions $\bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \{Q \mid \varphi(Q) = \varphi(P)\}$ and $\bigsqcup_{P' \in \mathcal{P}'} \varphi'(P')$ of \mathcal{P} coincide. Similarly, the partitions $\bigsqcup_{P' \in \mathcal{P}'} \{Q' \mid \varphi'(Q') = \varphi'(P')\}$ and $\bigsqcup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \varphi(P)$ of \mathcal{P}' coincide. The result follows. \square

2.2. Cluster algebra. In this subsection, we recall the definitions of cluster algebra and geometric type cluster algebra in [18]. Throughout, for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote by $[a]_+ = \max\{0, a\}$. Given a vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $\mathbf{a}_+ = ([a_1]_+, \dots, [a_k]_+)$ and denote by $\mathbf{a}_- = (-\mathbf{a})_+$.

A triple $(\mathbb{P}, \oplus, \cdot)$ is called a *semifield* if (\mathbb{P}, \cdot) is an abelian multiplicative group and (\mathbb{P}, \oplus) is a commutative semigroup such that “ \oplus ” is distributive with respect to “ \cdot ”. A *tropical semifield* $\text{trop}(u_1, \dots, u_l)$ is a semifield freely generated by u_1, \dots, u_l as abelian groups with \oplus defined by $\prod_j u_j^{a_j} \oplus \prod_j u_j^{b_j} = \prod_j u_j^{\min(a_j, b_j)}$. Let $(\mathbb{P}, \oplus, \cdot)$ be a semifield. The group ring $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$ will be used as *ground ring*. Give an integer n , let \mathcal{F} be the rational functions field in n independent variables, with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{P}$.

Definition 2.7. A seed t in \mathcal{F} consists a triple $(x(t), y(t), B(t))$, where

- $x(t) = \{x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t)\}$ such that \mathcal{F} is freely generated by $x(t)$ over $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{P}$.
- $y(t) = \{y_1(t), \dots, y_n(t)\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}$.
- $B(t) = (b_{ij})$ is an $n \times n$ skew-symmetrizable integer matrix.

Definition 2.8. Given a seed t in \mathcal{F} , for any $k \in [1, n]$, we define the *mutation* of t at the k -th direction to be the new seed $t' = \mu_k(t) = (x(t'), y(t'), B(t'))$, where

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \bullet \quad x_i(t') = \begin{cases} x_i(t), & \text{if } i \neq k, \\ \frac{y_k(t) \prod x_i(t)^{[b_{ik}]_+} + \prod x_i(t)^{[-b_{ik}]_+}}{(y_k(t) \oplus 1)x_k(t)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ & \bullet \quad y_i(t') = \begin{cases} y_k^{-1}(t), & \text{if } i = k, \\ y_i(t) y_k(t)^{[b_{ki}]_+} (1 \oplus y_k(t))^{-b_{ki}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ & \bullet \quad B(t') = (b'_{ij}) \text{ is determined by } B(t) = (b_{ij}): \end{aligned}$$

$$b'_{ij} = \begin{cases} -b_{ij}, & \text{if } i = k \text{ or } j = k, \\ b_{ij} + [b_{ik}]_+ [b_{kj}]_+ - [-b_{ik}]_+ [-b_{kj}]_+, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 2.9. A *cluster algebra* \mathcal{A} (of rank n) over \mathbb{P} is defined by the following steps.

- (1) Choose an initial seed $t_0 = (x(t_0), y(t_0), B(t_0))$.
- (2) Get all the seeds t which are obtained from t_0 by iterated mutations at directions $k \in [1, n]$.
- (3) Define $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}[x_i(t)]_{t, i \in [1, n]}$.
- (4) $x(t)$ is called a *cluster* for any t .

- (5) $x_i(t)$ is called a *cluster variable* for any $i \in [1, n]$ and t .
- (6) A monomial in $x(t)$ is called a *cluster monomial* for any t .
- (7) $y(t)$ is called a *coefficient tuple* for any t .
- (8) $B(t)$ is called an *exchange matrix* for any t .

In particular, when $\mathbb{P} = \text{Trop}(u_1, \dots, u_l)$, we say that \mathcal{A} is of *geometric type*.

In case $\mathbb{P} = \text{Trop}(u_1, \dots, u_l)$, denote by $m = n + l$. For a seed t in \mathcal{F} , $y_j(t) = \prod u_i^{c_{ij}}$ for some integers c_{ij} . Thus we can write t as $\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{B}(t)$, where

- (1) $\tilde{x}(t) = \{x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), x_{n+1}(t) = u_1, \dots, x_m(t) = u_l\}$.
- (2) $\tilde{B}(t) = (b_{ij})$ is an $m \times n$ with $b_{ij} = c_{i-n, j}$ for $i \in [n+1, m]$.

Under this convention, the mutation of t at direction k is $t' = \mu_k(t) = (\tilde{x}(t'), \tilde{B}(t'))$, where

(1)

$$x_i(t') = \begin{cases} x_i(t), & \text{if } i \neq k, \\ \frac{\prod x_i(t)^{[b_{ik}]_+} + \prod x_i(t)^{[-b_{ik}]_+}}{x_k(t)}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) $\tilde{B}(t') = (b'_{ij})$ is determined by $\tilde{B}(t) = (b_{ij})$:

$$b'_{ij} = \begin{cases} -b_{ij}, & \text{if } i = k \text{ or } j = k, \\ b_{ij} + [b_{ik}]_+ [b_{kj}]_+ - [-b_{ik}]_+ [-b_{kj}]_+, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2.3. Quantum cluster algebra. In this subsection, we recall the definition of quantum cluster algebra in [3].

Fix two integers $n \leq m$. Let \tilde{B} be an $m \times n$ integer matrix. Let Λ be an $m \times m$ skew-symmetric integer matrix. We call (\tilde{B}, Λ) *compatible* if $\tilde{B}^T \Lambda = (D \ 0)$ for some diagonal matrix D with positive entries, where \tilde{B}^T is the transpose of \tilde{B} . Note that in this case, the upper $n \times n$ submatrix of \tilde{B} is skew-symmetrizable and \tilde{B} is full rank.

Definition 2.10. Let v be the quantum parameter.

- (1) A *quantum seed* t consists a compatible pair $(\tilde{B}(t), \Lambda(t))$ and a collection of indeterminate $X_i(t), i \in [1, m]$, called *quantum cluster variables*, $\tilde{B}(t)$ is called *extended exchange matrix*, $\Lambda(t)$ is called *quantum commutative matrix*.
- (2) Let $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ be the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^m and $X(t)^{\mathbf{e}_i} = X_i(t)$. Define the corresponding *quantum torus* $\mathcal{T}(t)$ to be the algebra which is freely generated by $X(t)^{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ as $\mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}]$ -module, with multiplication on these elements defined by

$$X(t)^{\mathbf{a}} X(t)^{\mathbf{b}} = v^{\Lambda(t)(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})} X(t)^{\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}},$$

where $\Lambda(t)(\cdot, \cdot)$ means the bilinear form on \mathbb{Z}^m such that

$$\Lambda(t)(\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{e}_j) = \Lambda(t)_{ij}.$$

Definition 2.11. For any $k \in [1, n]$, we define the *mutation* of t at the k -th direction to be the new seed $t' = \mu_k(t) = ((X_i(t')_{i \in [1, m]}), \tilde{B}(t'), \Lambda(t'))$, where

- (1) $X_i(t') = X_i(t)$ for $i \neq k$,
- (2) $X_k(t') = X(t)^{-\mathbf{e}_k + \sum_i [b_{ik}]_+ \mathbf{e}_i} + X(t)^{-\mathbf{e}_k + \sum_i [-b_{ik}]_+ \mathbf{e}_i}$.

(3) $\tilde{B}(t') = (b'_{ij})$ is determined by $\tilde{B}(t) = (b_{ij})$ such that

$$b'_{ij} = \begin{cases} -b_{ij}, & \text{if } i = k \text{ or } j = k, \\ b_{ij} + [b_{ik}]_+ [b_{kj}]_+ - [-b_{ik}]_+ [-b_{kj}]_+, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(4) $\Lambda(t')$ is skew-symmetric and satisfies:

$$\Lambda(t')_{ij} = \begin{cases} \Lambda(t)_{ij}, & \text{if } i, j \neq k, \\ \Lambda(t)(\mathbf{e}_i, -\mathbf{e}_k + \sum_l [b_{lk}]_+ \mathbf{e}_l), & \text{if } i \neq k = j, \end{cases}$$

One see that $(\tilde{B}(t'), \Lambda(t'))$ is compatible since $\tilde{B}^T(t)\Lambda(t) = \tilde{B}^T(t')\Lambda(t')$. The quantum torus $\mathcal{T}(t')$ for the new seed t' can be defined similarly.

Definition 2.12. A *quantum cluster algebra* \mathcal{A}_v is defined by the following steps.

- (1) Choose an initial seed $t_0 = ((X_1, \dots, X_m), \tilde{B}, \Lambda)$.
- (2) Get all the seeds t are obtained from t_0 by iterated mutations at directions $k \in [1, n]$.
- (3) Define $\mathcal{A}_v = \mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}] \langle X_i(t) \rangle_{t, i \in [1, m]}$.
- (4) X_{n+1}, \dots, X_m are called *frozen variables* or *coefficients*.
- (5) A quantum cluster variable in t is called a *quantum cluster variable* of \mathcal{A}_v .
- (6) $X(t)^{\mathbf{a}}$ for some t and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ is called a *quantum cluster monomial*.

Note that by specializing v to 1, we get a commutative cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v|_{v=1}$.

Theorem 2.13. (*Quantum Laurent Phenomenon*, [3]) Let \mathcal{A}_v be a quantum cluster algebra and t be a seed. For any quantum cluster variable X , we have $X \in \mathcal{T}(t)$.

Conjecture 2.14. (*Positivity Conjecture*, [3]) Let \mathcal{A}_v be a quantum cluster algebra and t be a seed. For any quantum cluster variable X of \mathcal{A}_v ,

$$X \in \mathbb{N}[v^{\pm 1}] \langle X(t)^{\mathbf{a}} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^m \rangle.$$

Remark 2.15. The positivity conjecture was proved by Davison [11] for the skew-symmetric case and by the author for the unpunctured orbifold case [23].

2.4. (Quantum) Cluster algebras from orbifolds. In this subsection, we recall some combinatorial notation from orbifolds, please refer to [16, 14, 15] for more details.

Let S be a connected oriented Riemann orbifold with boundary. Fix a non-empty set M of marked points in the closure of S with at least one marked point on each boundary component. Fix a finite set U in the interior of S such that $U \cap M = \emptyset$. We call the triple (S, M, U) an *orbifold*. Marked points in the interior of S are called *punctures*. The points in U are called *orbifold points*. Each orbifold point in U comes with a weight $\frac{1}{2}$ or 2. Throughout this paper, we assume that U contains no orbifold point with weight 2.

Definition 2.16. [14, 15] An arc β in (S, M, U) is a curve in S considered up to relative isotopy (of $S \setminus (M \cup U)$) modulo endpoints such that

- one of the following holds:
 - either both endpoints of β belong to M (and then β is called an *ordinary arc*)

- or one endpoint belongs to M and another belongs to U (then β is called a *pending arc*);
- β has no self-intersections, except that its endpoints may coincide;
- except for the endpoints, β and $M \cup U \cup \partial S$ are disjoint;
- β does not cut out a monogon not containing points of M ;
- β is not homotopic to a boundary segment.

If γ is an arc incident to a puncture p , denote by $l_p(\gamma)$ the loop based on another endpoint of γ and encloses γ .

An *oriented arc* $\vec{\beta}$ is an arc β with an orientation. Denote by $s(\vec{\beta})$ and $t(\vec{\beta})$ the starting point and ending point, respectively, of $\vec{\beta}$.

Note that we do not allow both endpoints of β to be in U .

Definition 2.17. [14, 15] Two arcs β and β' are *compatible* if the following hold:

- they do not intersect in the interior of S ;
- if both β and β' are pending arcs, then the endpoints of β and β' that are orbifold points do not coincide (i.e., two pending arcs may share a marked point, but not an orbifold point).

Definition 2.18. [16, 14, 15] An *ideal triangulation* of (S, M, U) is a maximal collection of distinct pairwise compatible arcs.

The arcs of an ideal triangulation cut S into triangles. See Fig. 1 for a list of possible ideal triangles.




FIGURE 1. List of possible ideal triangles

A triangle with two arcs folded is called a *self-folded triangle*. The folded arc is called the *radius*. Let T° be an ideal triangulation of (S, M, U) . If α is not the radius of some self-folded triangles, then there is a unique arc $\alpha' \neq \alpha$ such that $(T^\circ \setminus \{\alpha\}) \cup \{\alpha'\}$ is an ideal triangulation. Denote $\mu_\alpha(T^\circ) = (T^\circ \setminus \{\alpha\}) \cup \{\alpha'\}$ and we call $\mu_\alpha(T^\circ)$ is the *flip* of T° at α and α' is obtained from T° by flip at α .

Lemma 2.19. For each puncture p , let T_1 and T_2 be ideal triangulations without self-folded triangles enclose p . Then there exists a sequence of ideal triangulations $T_1 = T^0, T^1, \dots, T^n = T_2$ without self-folded triangles enclose p such that T^i and T^{i+1} are related by a flip for all $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$.

Proof. By [16, Proposition 3.8], T_1 and T_2 are connected by a sequence of flips. We may assume that there exists a sequence of ideal triangulations $T_1 = \hat{T}^0, \hat{T}^1, \dots, \hat{T}^m = T_2$ without self-folded triangles enclose p such that \hat{T}^i and \hat{T}^{i+1} are related by a flip for all $i = 0, \dots, m - 1$. We prove the result by induction on the number N of the loops in $\bigcup_{i=0}^m \hat{T}^i$ enclosed only

p . If $N = 0$ then we are done. Assume $N > 1$ and $l_p \in \hat{T}_\ell \cap \hat{T}_{\ell'}$ is a loop enclosing only p such that $\ell < \ell'$, $l_p \notin \hat{T}^i$ for $0 \leq i < \ell$, $l_p \in \hat{T}^i$ for $\ell \leq i \leq \ell'$ and $l_p \notin \hat{T}_{\ell'+1}$. Then l_p is in some self-folded triangle in \hat{T}^i for $\ell \leq i \leq \ell'$. Denote by γ the radius. Thus $\gamma \in \hat{T}_{\ell-1} \cap \hat{T}_{\ell'+1}$. Cutting along γ , we obtain a new orbifold \tilde{S} . γ becomes to two boundary arcs γ^\pm in \tilde{S} . Since $\gamma \in \hat{T}_{\ell-1} \cap \hat{T}_{\ell'+1}$, we have $(\hat{T}_{\ell-1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$ and $(\hat{T}_{\ell'+1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$ are two triangulations of \tilde{S} . By [16, Proposition 3.8], $(\hat{T}_{\ell-1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$ and $(\hat{T}_{\ell'+1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$ are connected by a sequence of flips. Assume that $\tilde{T}_1 = (\hat{T}_{\ell-1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$, $\tilde{T}_2, \dots, \tilde{T}_{m'} = (\hat{T}_{\ell'+1} \setminus \{\gamma\}) \cup \{\gamma^\pm\}$ is a sequence of ideal triangulations of \tilde{S} such that \tilde{T}_{i+1} and \tilde{T}_i are related by a flip for $1 \leq i \leq m' - 1$. For each $1 \leq i \leq m' - 1$, let $\bar{T}_i = (\tilde{T}_i \setminus \{\gamma^\pm\}) \cup \{\gamma\}$. Then \bar{T}_i is an ideal triangulation of S and \bar{T}_i, \bar{T}_{i+1} are related by a flip, and $\bar{T}_1 = \hat{T}_{\ell-1}, \bar{T}_{m'} = \hat{T}_{\ell'+1}$. Consider the flip sequence $\hat{T}^0 = T_1, \dots, \hat{T}_{\ell-1} = \bar{T}_1, \bar{T}_2, \dots, \bar{T}_{m'} = \hat{T}_{\ell'+1}, \dots, \hat{T}_m = T_2$. We have the number of the loops in $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \hat{T}^i \cup \bigcup_{i=\ell+1}^m \hat{T}^i \cup \bigcup_{i=0}^{m'} \bar{T}^i$ enclosed only p is strictly than N . Then the result is followed by induction. \square

The following lemma is similar to Lemma 2.19.

Lemma 2.20. *For punctures p and q , let T_1 and T_2 be ideal triangulations without self-folded triangles enclosing p or q . Then there exists a sequence of ideal triangulations $T_1 = T^0, T^1, \dots, T^n = T_2$ without self-folded triangles enclosing p or q such that T^i and T^{i+1} are related by a flip for all $i = 0, \dots, n - 1$.*

Definition 2.21. [16, Definition 7.1] (Tagged arc) Each arc β in (S, M, U) has two ends obtained by arbitrarily cutting β into three pieces, then throwing out the middle one. We think of the two ends as locations near the endpoints to be used for labeling (“tagging”) an arc. A tagged arc is an ordinary arc in which each end has been tagged in one of two ways, plain or notched, so that the following conditions are satisfied:

- the arc does not cut out a once-punctured monogon;
- an endpoint lying on the boundary is tagged plain;
- ends of a pending arc being orbifold points are always tagged plain; and
- both ends of a loop are tagged in the same way.

Definition 2.22. [16, Definition 7.4] (Compatibility of tagged arcs) Two tagged arcs β and β' are called *compatible* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- The untagged versions of β and β' are compatible;
- If the untagged versions of β and β' are different, and β and β' share an endpoint a , then the ends of β and β' connecting to a must be tagged in the same way;
- If the untagged versions of β and β' coincide, then at least one end of β must be tagged in the same way as the corresponding end of β' .

Definition 2.23. [16, 14, 15] A *tagged triangulation* of (S, M, U) is a maximal collection of distinct pairwise compatible tagged arcs.

Definition 2.24. Let o be an orbifold point. For a tagged pending arc β connecting a marked point i and o , denote by $sl(\beta)$ the tagged loop at i around o which tagged the same with β at i . We call $sl(\beta)$ the *special loop* associated with β . See Fig. 2.





FIGURE 2. Special loop

Note that special loop is not an arc in $\Sigma = (S, M, U)$.

Throughout this paper, the notation γ , $\gamma^{(q)}$ and $\gamma^{(p,q)}$ respectively mean the following three cases,

- (i) γ is an ordinary arc or a pending arc starting from p and ending at q ;
- (ii) $\gamma^{(p)}$ is the tagged arc with underlying arc γ and tagged notched at q ;
- (iii) $\gamma^{(p,q)}$ is the tagged arc with underlying arc γ and tagged notched at p, q .

In particular, if $p = q$ then $\gamma^{(p)} = \gamma^{(p,q)}$.



For any ideal triangulation T^o , replace all the loops $l_p(\gamma)$ in self-folded triangles enclose puncture p with radius γ by $\gamma^{(p)}$, we obtain a tagged triangulation T , we call T the tagged triangulation corresponding to T^o .

Conversely, for any tagged triangulation T , first replace all pairs of tagged arcs of the form $\gamma, \gamma^{(p)}$ by $\gamma, l_p(\gamma)$ and then replace $\gamma^{(p)}$ and $\gamma^{(p,q)}$ by γ , we obtain an ideal triangulation, denoted by $l(T)$.

If γ is a pending arc which incident an orbifold point o , denote by $l(\gamma)$ the loop cutting out a monogon enclosing o and radius γ , then the *crossing number* $N(\gamma, \gamma')$ of γ with γ' is the minimum of the numbers of crossings of arcs α and α' , where α is isotopic to $l(\gamma)$ and α' is isotopic to γ' . Note that $N(\gamma, \gamma') \neq N(\gamma', \gamma)$ generally if one is an ordinary arc and another is a pending arc.

For $\tau \in T$, denote by $w(\tau)$ the weight of τ .

For two non-boundary non-self-folded arcs τ, τ' in an ideal triangulation T^o and a non-self-folded triangle Δ in T^o , define

$$b_{\tau\tau'}^{T^o, \Delta} = \begin{cases} w(\tau'), & \text{if } \tau, \tau' \text{ are sides of } \Delta \text{ and } \tau' \text{ following } \tau \text{ in the clockwise order,} \\ -w(\tau'), & \text{if } \tau, \tau' \text{ are sides of } \Delta \text{ and } \tau \text{ following } \tau' \text{ in the clockwise order,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $b_{\tau\tau'}^{T^o} = \sum_{\Delta} b_{\tau\tau'}^{T^o, \Delta}$, where Δ runs over all non-self-folded triangle Δ in T^o . Denote by $l(\tau)$ the loop encloses τ if τ is a self-fold arc and τ otherwise. For any two non-boundary arcs $\tau, \tau' \in T^o$, define $b_{\tau\tau'}^{T^o, \Delta} = b_{l(\tau)l(\tau')}^{T^o, \Delta}$.

We say the matrix $B^{T^o} = (b_{\tau, \tau'}^{T^o})$ the *signed adjacency matrix* of T , see [14, 15]. Then B^{T^o} is a skew-symmetrizable matrix. In fact, let $D^{T^o} = \text{diag}(w(\tau))_{\tau \in T^o}$, then $D^{T^o} B^{T^o}$ is skew-symmetric.

For any non-self-folded $\tau \in T^o$, we have $B^{\mu_\tau(T^o)} = \mu_\tau(B^{T^o})$.

Definition 2.25. Let (S, M, U) be an orbifold.

- (1) We say that a cluster algebra \mathcal{A} is *coming from* (S, M, U) if there exists a tagged triangulation T such that B^T is an exchange matrix of \mathcal{A} .
- (2) We say that a quantum cluster algebra \mathcal{A}_v is *coming from* (S, M, U) if the specialized cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v|_{v=1}$ is coming from (S, M, U) .

Proposition 2.26. [16, 14, 3] Let \mathcal{A}_v be a quantum cluster algebra from $\Sigma = (S, M, U)$.

- (1) If Σ is not a closed surface with one puncture, then there are bijections

$$\{\text{Tagged arcs in } \Sigma\} \rightarrow \{\text{Quantum cluster variables of } \mathcal{A}_v\}, \gamma \mapsto X_\gamma.$$

$$\{\text{Tagged triangulation of } \Sigma\} \rightarrow \{\text{Quantum clusters of } \mathcal{A}\}, T \mapsto X_T.$$

- (2) If Σ is a closed surface with exactly one puncture, then there are bijections

$$\{\text{Ordinary arcs in } \Sigma\} \rightarrow \{\text{Quantum cluster variables of } \mathcal{A}\}, \gamma \mapsto X_\gamma.$$

$$\{\text{Ideal triangulation of } \Sigma\} \rightarrow \{\text{Quantum clusters of } \mathcal{A}\}, T \mapsto X_T.$$

2.5. Orbifold morphism and canonical polygon.

Definition 2.27. [2, Definition 3.5] For two orbifolds (S, M, U) and (S', M', U') , we say that a continuous map $f : S \rightarrow S'$ is a *morphism* if

- $f^{-1}(M' \cup U') \subseteq M \cup U$ and $f(U) \subseteq U'$;
- For each point $p \in S \setminus I^f$, there exists a neighborhood S_p of p in S such that the restriction of f to S_p is injective, where $I^f := f^{-1}(U') \setminus U$;
- For each point $p \in I^f$, there exists a neighborhood S_p of p in S such that the restriction of f to S_p is a two-fold cover of $f(S_p)$ ramified at p .

Theorem 2.28. [2, Theorem 3.21] Let T^o be a triangulation of (S, M, U) . Then for each r -gon $Q = (\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_r)$ in (S, M, U) , there exists an n -gon $P = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n) \in (T_0(Q, T^o))^n$ for some $n \geq r$, a triangulation Δ of P_n (the n -gon), and an order-preserving embedding $\iota : [r] \hookrightarrow [n]$ such that:

- (a) $\gamma_{ij} \in T_0(Q, T^o)$ if and only if $(i, j) \in \Delta$;
- (b) $\gamma'_k = \gamma_{\iota(k), \iota(k+)}$ for all $k \in [r]$ (i.e., Q is a “sub-polygon” of P).

In particular, if $Q = (\gamma, \bar{\gamma})$ is the digon formed by an arc γ and its inverse, then we call the polygon $P_{T^o}(\gamma)$ the *canonical polygon* of γ with respect to T^o .

Example 2.29. In Figure 3, the left picture is an annulus with one marked point on each boundary and triangulation $\{1, 2\}$. The arc γ crosses through triangles $(1, 3, 2)$, $(2, 4, 1)$, $(1, 3, 2)$ and $(2, 4, 1)$ consecutively. Thus the canonical polygon for γ is as shown in the right picture.





FIGURE 3. Canonical polygon

2.6. Snake graph and perfect matching. We first recall the definition of an abstract snake graph [9]. A tile is considered as a graph with four vertices and four edges in the obvious way. Throughout this paper, we denote by $N(G)$ (resp. $S(G), W(G), E(G)$) the north (resp. south, west, east) edge of a tile G .




Definition 2.30. [9] A *snake graph* G is a connected graph consisting of a finite sequence of tiles G_1, G_2, \dots, G_c with $c \geq 1$, such that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, c - 1$

- (i) G_i and G_{i+1} share exactly one edge which is either the north edge of G_i and the south edge of G_{i+1} or the east edge of G_i and the west edge of G_{i+1} .
- (ii) G_i and G_j have no edge in common whenever $|i - j| \geq 2$.
- (iii) G_i and G_j are disjoint whenever $|i - j| \geq 3$.

Let H be a graph. In this paper, we denote by $edge(H)$ the edge set of H .

Definition 2.31. ([34, Definition 4.6]) A *perfect matching* of a graph G is a subset P of the edges of G such that each vertex of G is incident to exactly one edge of P . Denote by $\mathcal{P}(G)$ the set of all perfect matchings of G .

Definition 2.32. ([35, 22, 23]) Let P be a perfect matching of a snake graph G . We say that P can *twist* on a tile G_i if there are two edges of G_i in P . The perfect matching obtained by replacing the two edges with the remaining two edges of G_i is called the *twist* of P at G_i , denoted by $\mu_{G_i}(P)$.



Definition 2.33. For a perfect matching P , we call an edge in P τ -mutable if it is an edge of some tile with diagonal labeled τ that P can twist on.

Next, we recall the construction of the snake graph $G_{T,\gamma}$ and its perfect matching. For more details, see [34, Section 4], [9].

Let T^o be an ideal triangulation and γ be a curve connecting two marked points. Let p_0 be the starting point of γ , and let p_{c+1} be its endpoint. Assume that γ crosses T^o at p_1, \dots, p_c sequentially.

Let τ_{i_j} be the arc in T^o containing p_j . Let Δ_{j-1} and Δ_j be the two ideal triangles in T on either side of τ_{i_j} .

For each p_j , we associate a *tile* G_j as follows. Define Δ_1^j and Δ_2^j to be two triangles with edges labeled as in Δ_{j-1} and Δ_j , further, the orientations of Δ_1^j and Δ_2^j both agree with those of Δ_{j-1} and Δ_j if j is odd; the orientations of Δ_1^j and Δ_2^j both disagree with those of Δ_{j-1} and Δ_j otherwise. We glue Δ_1^j and Δ_2^j at the edge labeled τ_{i_j} , so that the orientations of Δ_1^j and Δ_2^j both either agree or disagree with those of Δ_{j-1} and Δ_j . We say the edge labeled τ_{i_j} the *diagonal* of G_j .

The two arcs τ_{i_j} and $\tau_{i_{j+1}}$ form two edges of the triangle Δ_j . Denote the third edge of Δ_j by $\tau_{[\gamma_j]}$. After gluing the tiles $G(p_j)$ and $G(p_{j+1})$ at the edge labeled $\tau_{[\gamma_j]}$ for $1 \leq j < d-1$ step by step, we obtain a graph, denote as $\overline{G_{T^o,\gamma}}$. Let $G_{T^o,\gamma}$ be the graph obtained from $\overline{G_{T^o,\gamma}}$ by removing the diagonal of each tile.

In particular, when $\gamma \in T$, let $G_{T^o,\gamma}$ be the graph with one only edge labeled γ .

Denote

$$\text{rel}(G_i, T^o) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the orientations of } G_i \text{ and } T^o \text{ coincide,} \\ -1, & \text{if the orientations of } G_i \text{ and } T^o \text{ are different.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 2.34. ([34, Definition 4.7]) Let a_1 and a_2 be the two edges of $G_{T^o,\gamma}$ which lie in the counterclockwise direction from the diagonal of G_1 . Then the *minimal matching* P_- is defined as the unique matching which contains only boundary edges and does not contain edges a_1 or a_2 . The *maximal matching* P_+ is the other matching with only boundary edges.

Lemma 2.35. [22, Lemma 2.4] *Let a be an edge of the tile G_j . If a is in the maximal/minimal perfect matching of $G_{T,\gamma}$, then a lies in the counterclockwise/clockwise direction from the diagonal of G_j when j is odd and lies in the clockwise/counterclockwise direction from the diagonal of G_j when j is even.*

2.7. Complete (T^o, γ) -path. Let T^o be an ideal triangulation and γ be an arc. Choose an orientation of γ , assume that $\vec{\gamma}$ crosses T^o at p_1, \dots, p_c sequentially. Denote $p_0 = s(\vec{\gamma})$ and $p_{c+1} = t(\vec{\gamma})$. Suppose that $p_j \in \tau_{i_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$.

Definition 2.36. [33, 43] A sequences of oriented arcs $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$ is called a *complete (T^o, γ) -path* if the following axioms hold:

3. AN ISOMORPHISM OF QUANTUM CLUSTER ALGEBRAS

Let Σ be an orbifold and $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ be a quantum cluster algebra from Σ . For any puncture q and tagged arc β , denote by $\beta^{(q)}$ the tagged arc obtained from β by changing the tags at q . Let T be a tagged triangulation of Σ . Denote by $T^{(q)} = \{\beta^{(q)} \mid \beta \in T\}$. Then $T^{(q)}$ is a tagged triangulation and $B(T) = B(T^{(q)})$. Suppose that the extended exchange matrix and the quantum commutative matrix of $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ at T are $\tilde{B}(T) = \begin{pmatrix} B(T) \\ C(T) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\Lambda(T)$, respectively. Assume that Σ is not a closed surface with exactly one puncture, let $\mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}$ be the quantum cluster algebra from Σ such that the extended exchange matrix and quantum commutative matrix at $T^{(q)}$ are $\tilde{B}(T)$ and $\Lambda(T)$, respectively.

By Proposition 2.26, for any tagged arc β , denote by X_β and $X_\beta^{(q)}$ the quantum cluster variables of $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}(\Sigma)$, respectively corresponding to β . Then we have the following proposition. Denote by X_{n+1}, \dots, X_m the frozen quantum cluster variables of $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$, denote by $X_{n+1}^{(q)}, \dots, X_m^{(q)}$ the frozen quantum cluster variables of $\mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}(\Sigma)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let T be a tagged triangulation and q be a puncture. For any tagged arc $\beta \in T$, we have $\mu_{\beta^{(q)}}(T^{(q)}) = (\mu_\beta(T))^{(q)}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mu_\beta(T) = (T \setminus \{\beta\}) \cup \{\beta'\}$ for some tagged arc β' . Then for any $\alpha \in T \setminus \{\beta\}$ we have β' is compatible with α , by [17, Remark 5.13], $\beta'^{(q)}$ is compatible with $\alpha^{(q)}$. It follows that $\mu_{\beta^{(q)}}(T^{(q)}) = (\mu_\beta(T))^{(q)}$. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that Σ is not a closed surface with exactly one puncture. Then there is a $\mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra isomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}(\Sigma)$ which satisfies*

- (1) $\sigma(X_\beta) = X_{\beta^{(q)}}^{(q)}$ for all tagged arc β .
- (2) σ preserves mutations.

Proof. For any tagged triangulation T' , denote by $\tilde{B}^{(q)}(T')$ and $\Lambda^{(q)}(T')$ the extended exchange matrix and quantum commutative matrix, respectively of $\mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}(\Sigma)$ at T' , denote by $\mathcal{T}(T')$ and $\mathcal{T}^{(q)}(T')$ the quantum torus at T' for $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{A}_v^{(q)}(\Sigma)$, respectively. Then we have $\tilde{B}^{(q)}(T^{(q)}) = \tilde{B}(T)$ and $\Lambda^{(q)}(T^{(q)}) = \Lambda(T)$, moreover, for any $\beta \in T$, the column (resp. row) of $\tilde{B}(T)$ which is indexed by X_β equals the column (resp. row) of $\tilde{B}^{(q)}(T^{(q)})$ which is indexed by $X_{\beta^{(q)}}$; for any $i \in \{n+1, \dots, m\}$ the row of $\tilde{B}(T)$ which is indexed by X_β equals the row of $\tilde{B}^{(q)}(T^{(q)})$ which is indexed by $X_{\beta^{(q)}}$. It is also true for the quantum commutative matrices $\Lambda(T)$ and $\Lambda^{(q)}(T^{(q)})$.

Clearly, we have a $\mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra isomorphism of quantum torus

$$\sigma : \mathcal{T}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{(q)}(T^{(q)}), X_\alpha \mapsto X_{\alpha^{(q)}}^{(q)}.$$

For any $\beta \in T$, suppose that $\mu_\beta(T) = (T \setminus \{\beta\}) \cup \{\beta'\}$ for some tagged arc β' . As $\tilde{B}^{(q)}(T^{(q)}) = \tilde{B}(T)$, by Lemma 3.1 we have $\sigma(X_{\beta'}) = X_{\beta'^{(q)}}$, moreover, we have

$$\tilde{B}^{(q)}(\mu_{\beta^{(q)}}T^{(q)}) = \mu_{X_{\beta^{(q)}}^{(q)}}(B^{(q)}(T^{(q)})) = \mu_{X_\beta}(B(T)) = B(\mu_\beta T).$$

Similarly, we have $\Lambda^{(q)}(\mu_{\beta^{(q)}}T^{(q)}) = \Lambda(\mu_\beta T)$.

Therefore, σ induces a $\mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra isomorphism of quantum torus

$$\sigma : \mathcal{T}(\mu_\tau T) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{(q)}(\mu_{\tau(q)} T^{(q)}), X_\alpha \mapsto X_{\alpha^{(q)}}.$$

As Σ is not a closed surface with exactly one puncture, any two tagged triangulations of Σ are connected by a sequence of flips. By induction we see that for any tagged triangulation T' , σ induces a $\mathbb{Z}[v^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra isomorphism of quantum torus

$$\sigma : \mathcal{T}(T') \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{(q)}(T'^{(q)}), X_\alpha \mapsto X_{\alpha^{(q)}}.$$

The result follows. □

Remark 3.3. Let T^o be an ideal triangulation of Σ and β be any arc. Assume that $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from p and ends at q . Let T be the tagged triangulation corresponding to T^o . By Proposition 3.2, to give an expansion formula of X_γ concerning a quantum seed X_Δ for any tagged arc γ and tagged triangulation Δ , it suffices to restrict to the following three cases:

- (i) $\gamma = \tilde{\beta}$ and $\Delta = T$;
- (ii) q is a puncture with $q \neq p$, $\gamma = \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}$, $\Delta = T$ contains no arcs tagged notched at q ;
- (iii) p, q are punctures, $\gamma = \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}$, $\Delta = T$ contains no arcs tagged notched at p or q .

4. THREE LATTICES ASSOCIATED WITH TAGGED ARCS

Fix an ideal triangulation T° of Σ and an arc β . Let T be the corresponding tagged triangulation of T° . Let

$$(4) \quad \tilde{\beta} = \begin{cases} \beta, & \text{if } \beta \text{ is not a pending arc of weight } 1/2, \\ sl(\beta), & \text{if } \beta \text{ is a pending arc of weight } 1/2. \end{cases}$$

Denote by G_1, \dots, G_c the tiles of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ in order. Assume that $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from p and ends at q . In this section, we recall the three lattices $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$, $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ and $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ constructed in [24], which will be the index sets for our expansion formulas in the quantum case. These three lattices also appear in [1, 22] for providing expansion formulas for tagged curves in (non-commutative) cluster algebras from Σ .

4.1. $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$. Let $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}) = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$. For any $P \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$ can twist on a tile G_i , let $P < \mu_{G_i}(P)$ if $W(G_i), E(G_i) \in P, rel(G_i, T^\circ) = 1$ or $N(G_i), S(G_i) \in P, rel(G_i, T^\circ) = -1$.

Proposition 4.1. [10, 35] $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$ with above order forms a lattice.

The following proposition is an immediate consequence.

Proposition 4.2. (1) *The maximum element P_+ in $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ is the perfect matching contains only boundary edges such that for any $e \in P_+ \cap \text{edge}(G_i)$ we have $e \in \{N(G_i), S(G_i)\}$ if $rel(G_i, T^\circ) = 1$ and $e \in \{W(G_i), E(G_i)\}$ if $rel(G_i, T^\circ) = -1$;*
 (2) *The minimum element P_- in $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ is the perfect matching contains only boundary edges such that for any $e \in P_- \cap \text{edge}(G_i)$ we have $e \in \{W(G_i), E(G_i)\}$ if $rel(G_i, T^\circ) = 1$ and $e \in \{N(G_i), S(G_i)\}$ if $rel(G_i, T^\circ) = -1$.*

It follows that any two perfect matchings are related by a sequence of twists.

Lemma 4.3. *The Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$ is connected.*

4.2. $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. Herein we assume that q is a puncture in Σ and $q \neq p$. We label clockwise the triangles in T° incident to q by $\Delta_1(q), \Delta_2(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)$ such that either $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses $\Delta_1(q)$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ is the common side of $\Delta_1(q)$ and $\Delta_t(q)$, see Figure 4. Denote

$$\Delta(T^\circ, q) = \{\Delta_1(q), \Delta_2(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)\}.$$




FIGURE 4. Triangles incident to q

Let

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}) = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}) \times \{\Delta_1(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)\}.$$

Set $\Delta_{t+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. Denote by $\tau_j(q)$ the common side of $\Delta_j(q)$ and $\Delta_{j+1}(q)$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$. Let $\tau_0(q) = \tau_t(q)$. Thus $\tau_{j-1}(q)$ and $\tau_j(q)$ are two sides of $\Delta_j(q)$. Denote by $\tau_{[j]}(q)$ the third side of $\Delta_j(q)$. We have $\tau_t(q) = \tilde{\beta}$ when $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$.

4.2.1. $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$. Herein we consider the case that $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$. Define

$$(6) \quad E_1(q) = \begin{cases} E(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^\circ) = 1, \\ N(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^\circ) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E_2(q) = \begin{cases} N(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^\circ) = 1, \\ E(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^\circ) = -1. \end{cases}$$

Thus $E_1(q)$ is labeled $\tau_t(q)$ and $E_2(q)$ is labeled $\tau_1(q)$. By Proposition 4.2, we have $E_1(q) \in P_-$ and $E_2(q) \in P_+$.

For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$, it is clear that either $E_1(q) \in P$ or $E_2(q) \in P$.

It is proved in [24] that $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ forms a lattice with minimum element $(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$ and maximum element $(P_+, \Delta_1(q))$, under the partial order induced by the following.

- (i) For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$,
- (a) if $E_1(q) \in P$ then

$$(P, \Delta_1(q)) < (P, \Delta_2(q)) < (P, \Delta_3(q)) < \dots < (P, \Delta_t(q));$$

- (b) if $E_2(q) \in P$ then

$$(P, \Delta_2(q)) < \dots < (P, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) < (P, \Delta_t(q)) < (P, \Delta_1(q)).$$

- (ii) For any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $(P, \Delta_j(q)) < (Q, \Delta_j(q))$ if $P < Q$.

The following lemmas are immediate.

Lemma 4.4. *Let P be a perfect matching which can twist on G_l such that $P > \mu_{G_l} P$. Then for any $\Delta_j(q)$, we have $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$ unless $j = 1$ and $l = c$.*

Lemma 4.5. *For any $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$,*

- (1) *if $E_1(q) \in P$, then $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ for all $j \neq 1$;*
 (2) *if $E_2(q) \in P$, then $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ for all $j \neq 2$.*

Example 4.6. In Figure 5, we show an example of the Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.




FIGURE 5. Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$

4.2.2. $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$. Herein we consider the case that $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$. It is clear that $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ forms a lattice under the following partial order.

$$(P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_1(q)) < (P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_2(q)) < \cdots < (P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) < (P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_t(q)).$$

The following Lemma follows by Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 4.7. *The Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ is connected.*

Lemma 4.8. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\mathbf{P}_1 = (P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} with $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, then $\mathbf{Q}_1 = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ and \mathbf{P}_1 covers \mathbf{Q}_1 .*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if \mathbf{P} covers $\mathbf{P}_1 = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ with $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$, then $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q}_1 = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ covers and \mathbf{P}_1 covers \mathbf{Q}_1 .*

Proof. We shall only prove (1). We may assume that $k = 1$. We first prove \mathbf{Q}_1 covers \mathbf{Q} . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.5, we have either $E_1(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$ or $E_2(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. In case $E_1(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, as \mathbf{P}_1 covers \mathbf{P} we have $E_2(q) \in P$ by Lemma 4.5. Thus $G_l = G_c$. As $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha_1$, we have $\tau_t(q) = \alpha_4$. It contradicts to $\tau_j(q) = \tau_t(q) = \alpha$. We then prove \mathbf{P}_1 covers \mathbf{Q}_1 . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.4, we have $G_l = G_c$ and $\Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, it is impossible from the above discussion. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ but $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , then $G_l \neq G_c$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ but \mathbf{P} does not cover $(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, then $G_l \neq G_c$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*

Proof. We shall only prove one. As $\mathbf{P}_1 = (P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , by Lemma 4.5, we have either $E_1(q) \in P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$ or $E_2(q) \in P, \Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$.

In case $E_1(q) \in P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, as $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, we have $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_2$ or α_4 . Thus $\tau_{i_c} = \tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_2$ or α_4 . It follows that $E_1(q)$ is labeled α and thus $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$. $E_1(q) \in P$ implies $G_l \neq G_c$. Thus, $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.

In case $E_2(q) \in P, \Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, as $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, we have $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_1$ or α_3 . Thus $\tau_{i_c} = \tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_1$ or α_3 . It follows that $E_2(q)$ is labeled α and thus $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$. As $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, $G_l \neq G_c$. Thus, $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.

From $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, we see that $m_{\eta_{\alpha+1}}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$. Therefore, in both cases we have $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}; \alpha)$ -pair. \square

Lemma 4.10. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Assume that P can twist on some G_l with $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha$.*

- (1) In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $P < \mu_{G_l}P$, then $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} and $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} .
- (2) In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $P > \mu_{G_l}P$, then \mathbf{P} covers $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$, and $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ is covered by \mathbf{Q} and $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$.

Proof. We shall only prove (1).

We first prove $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.4 we have $G_l = G_c$ and $\Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. As $P < \mu_{G_l}P$, we see that $E_1(q) \in P$. Thus $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_1(q))$ does not cover $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_t(q))$, a contradiction.

We then prove $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. Otherwise, by Lemma 4.5 we have either $E_1(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$ or $E_2(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. If $E_1(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, as $P < \mu_{G_l}P$, we have $E_1(q) \in P, \Delta_{j+1}(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, it is contradictions to \mathbf{P} covers to \mathbf{Q} . If $E_2(q) \in \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$, as \mathbf{P} covers to \mathbf{Q} , we see that $G_l = G_c$. Thus $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha$ and hence $\tau_j(q) \in \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$, contradicts to $\tau_j(q) \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3\}$.

Last, we prove $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.4 we have $G_l = G_c$ and $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. Thus $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha$ and hence $\tau_j(q) \in \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$, contradicts to $\tau_j(q) \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3\}$.

The proof is complete. \square

4.3. $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. In this section, we assume that p, q are punctures. As the once notched case, we label clockwise the triangles in T^o incident to p by $\Delta_1(p), \Delta_2(p), \dots, \Delta_s(p)$ such that either $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses $\Delta_1(p)$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ is the common side of $\Delta_1(p)$ and $\Delta_s(p)$. See Figure 6. Denote

$$\Delta(T^o, p) = \{\Delta_1(p), \Delta_2(p), \dots, \Delta_s(p)\}.$$

Set $\Delta_{s+1}(p) = \Delta_1(p)$. Denote by $\tau_i(p)$ the common side of the triangles $\Delta_i(p)$ and $\Delta_{i+1}(p)$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$. Set $\tau_0(p) = \tau_s(p)$. Thus $\tau_{i-1}(p)$ and $\tau_i(p)$ are two sides of $\Delta_i(p)$. Denote by $\tau_{[i]}(p)$ the third edge of $\Delta_i(p)$.

In particular, if $\tilde{\beta} \in T^o$ then $\tau_s(p) = \tau_t(q) = \tilde{\beta}$, $\tau_{[s]}(p) = \tau_1(q)$, $\tau_{[t]}(q) = \tau_1(p)$.




FIGURE 6. Triangles incident to p and q

Let

$$\begin{aligned} (7) \quad \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}) &= \{\Delta_1(p), \dots, \Delta_s(p)\} \times \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}) \times \{\Delta_1(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)\} \\ &= \{\Delta_1(p), \dots, \Delta_s(p)\} \times \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}). \end{aligned}$$

4.3.1. $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^o$. Herein we suppose that $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^o$. Similar to (6) in Section 4.2, define

$$(8) \quad E_1(p) = \begin{cases} W(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = 1, \\ S(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E_2(p) = \begin{cases} S(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = 1, \\ W(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = -1. \end{cases}$$

Then $E_1(p)$ is labeled $\tau_s(p)$ and $E_2(p)$ is labeled $\tau_1(p)$. By Proposition 4.2, we have $E_1(p) \in P_-$ and $E_2(p) \in P_+$.

For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$, it is clear that either $E_1(p) \in P$ or $E_2(p) \in P$.

It is proved in [24] that $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ forms a lattice with minimum element $(\Delta_1(p), P_-, \Delta_1(q))$ and maximum element $(\Delta_1(p), P_+, \Delta_1(q))$, under the partial order induced by the following relations.

(i) For any $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}) \times \Delta(T^o, q)$,

(a) if $E_1(p) \in P$ then

$$(\Delta_1(q), P, \Delta_j(q)) < (\Delta_2(q), P, \Delta_j(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_s(q), P, \Delta_j(q));$$

(b) if $E_2(q) \in P$ then

$$(\Delta_2(q), P, \Delta_j(q)) < (\Delta_3(q), P, \Delta_j(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_s(q), P, \Delta_j(q)) < (\Delta_1(q), P, \Delta_j(q));$$

(ii) For any $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_a(q)) < (\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_b(q))$ if $(P, \Delta_a(q)) < (Q, \Delta_b(q))$ in $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.

The following two lemmas follow immediately by the partial order defined above, Lemma 4.4 and Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 4.11. *For any P can twist on G_l with $\mu_{G_l}P > P$, then for any $\Delta_i(p)$ and $\Delta_j(q)$, we have $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ unless $i = 1, l = 1$ or $j = 1, l = c$.*

Lemma 4.12. *For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$,*

- (1) if $E_1(q) \in P$, then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ for all $j \neq 1$;
- (2) if $E_2(q) \in P$, then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ for all $j \neq 2$;
- (3) if $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) > (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$;
- (4) if $E_1(p) \in P$, then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ for all $i \neq 1$;
- (5) if $E_2(p) \in P$, then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ for all $i \neq 2$;
- (6) if $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) > (\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$.

See the following example of the Hasse diagram for $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, where Σ is the twice punctured digon and T^o is shown in the left below Figure.

4.3.2. $\tilde{\beta} \in T^o$. Herein we suppose that $\tilde{\beta} \in T^o$.


- If $s, t \geq 2$, then $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ forms a lattice with the following order.

(i)

$$(\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_t(q)) < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_1(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-2}(q)) < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-1}(q)).$$

(ii) For $i = 2, \dots, s-1$,

$$(\Delta_i(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_1(q)) < (\Delta_i(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_2(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_i(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) < (\Delta_i(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_t(q)).$$



 FIGURE 7. Hasse diagram of $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(0,1)})$

(iii)

$$(\Delta_s(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_2(q)) < (\Delta_s(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_3(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_s(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_t(q)) < (\Delta_s(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_1(q)).$$

 (iv) For $j = 1, \dots, t$,

$$(\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_j(q)) < (\Delta_2(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_j(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_{s-1}(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_j(q)) < (\Delta_s(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_j(q)).$$

 See the Hasse diagram of $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ in Figure 8.

 FIGURE 8. Hasse diagram of $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ in case $\tilde{\beta} \in T^o$ and $s \geq 2$

• If $s = 1$ or $t = 1$, we may assume that $s = 1$, then $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ forms a lattice with the following order.

$$(\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_t(q)) < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_1(q)) < \cdots < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-2}(q)) < (\Delta_1(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_{t-1}(q)).$$

The following lemma follows by Lemma 4.7.

Lemma 4.13. *The Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ is connected.*

The following two lemmas are similar to Lemma 4.9.

Lemma 4.14. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\tau_i(p) = \alpha$ but $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , then $G_l \neq G_1$ and $m_1(\mathbf{P}) = m_1(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ but $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , then $G_l \neq G_c$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (3) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$ but \mathbf{P} does not cover $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$, then $G_l \neq G_1$ and $m_1(\mathbf{P}) = m_1(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (4) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ but \mathbf{P} does not cover $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, then $G_l \neq G_c$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*

Lemma 4.15. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ but $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ but \mathbf{P} does not cover $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*

Lemma 4.16. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $\tau_i(p) = \alpha$ but $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} , then $m_1(\mathbf{P}) = m_1(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$ but \mathbf{P} does not cover $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$, then $m_1(\mathbf{P}) = m_1(\mathbf{Q}) = 1$.*

The following two lemmas can be proved similar to Lemma 4.8.

Lemma 4.17. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} with $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, then $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ and $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} .*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ with $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$, then $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ is covered by \mathbf{Q} and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$.*

Lemma 4.18. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} with $\tau_i(p) = \alpha$, then $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} .*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ with $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$, then $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ is covered by \mathbf{Q} and $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$.*

The following two lemmas can be proved similar to Lemma 4.10.

Lemma 4.19. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Assume that P can twist on some G_l with $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $P < \mu_{G_l}P$, then $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q)), (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} .*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $P > \mu_{G_l}P$, then \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$, and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ is covered by \mathbf{Q} and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$.*

Lemma 4.20. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) = \alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Assume that P can twist on some G_l with $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha$.*

- (1) *In case $k \in \{1, 3\}$, if $P < \mu_{G_l}P$, then $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q)), (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} .*
- (2) *In case $k \in \{2, 4\}$, if $P > \mu_{G_l}P$, then \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ is covered by \mathbf{Q} and $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$.*

5. VALUATION MAPS

Let T° be an ideal triangulation and β be an arc. Assume that $s(\tilde{\beta}) = p, t(\tilde{\beta}) = q$. In this section, for $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}), \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ or $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ we construct a map $w : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, which will act as the quantum coefficients in the expansion formula for quantum cluster variables. To this end, we should introduce some integers.

Let α be an arc in T° . For any perfect matching $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$, denote

$$(9) \quad m(P; \alpha) = \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } P.$$

For any snake subgraph G of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$, denote

$$(10) \quad n(G; \alpha) = \text{number of diagonals labeled } \alpha \text{ of } G.$$

In the case that $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$, $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ is the graph with two vertices and one edge labeled $\tilde{\beta}$ connecting them, it has a unique perfect matching $P_{\tilde{\beta}}$. Set $m(P_{\tilde{\beta}}; \alpha) = 1$ and $n(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha) = 0$.

With the notation in Subsection 4.2, for any $j = 1, \dots, t$, denote

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) &= \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{[j]}(q)\} \\ &\quad - \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{j-1}(q), \tau_j(q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, with the notation in Subsection 4.3, for any $i = 1, \dots, s$, denote

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) &= \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{[i]}(p)\} \\ &\quad - \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{i-1}(p), \tau_i(p)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $l = 1, \dots, c$, denote by G_l^+ (resp. G_l^-) the snake subgraph of $G_{T^\circ, \beta}$ formed by the tiles G_{l+1}, \dots, G_c (resp. G_1, \dots, G_{l-1}).

Moreover, if P can twist on a tile G_l for some $l = 1, \dots, c$, denote

$$m^\pm(P, G_l; \alpha) = \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } P \cap (\text{edge}(G_l^\pm) \setminus \text{edge}(G_l)).$$

5.1. Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$. In this section, we construct a map

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

Definition 5.1. Let P be a perfect matching of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$. Suppose that P can twist on a tile G_l for some $l = 1, \dots, c$. Assume that the diagonal of G_l is labeled τ_{i_l} . The *gradient number* $\Omega(P; G_l)$ of P at G_l is defined to be

$$\Omega(P; G_l) = d(\tau_{i_l})[(m^+(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) - m^-(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l})) - (n(G_l^+; \tau_{i_l}) - n(G_l^-; \tau_{i_l}))].$$

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that P can twist on two tiles G_l and G_r with $r - l > 1$ such that $\mu_{G_l}P, \mu_{G_r}P > P$. Then*

$$\Omega(P; G_l) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P; G_r) = \Omega(P; G_r) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P; G_l).$$

Proof. We first consider the case that $b_{\tau_{i_l}\tau_{i_r}}^{T^\circ} = 0$. Then we have

$$m^\pm(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) = m^\pm(\mu_{G_r}P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}), \quad m^\pm(P, G_r; \tau_{i_r}) = m^\pm(\mu_{G_l}P, G_r; \tau_{i_r}).$$

Thus the result follows in this case.

We then consider the case that $b_{\tau_{i_l}\tau_{i_r}}^{T^o} \neq 0$. We may assume that $b_{\tau_{i_l}\tau_{i_r}}^{T^o} > 0$. As $\mu_{G_l}P, \mu_{G_r}P > P$, the edge labeled τ_{i_r} of G_{i_l} is in P and the edge labeled τ_{i_l} of G_{i_r} is not in P . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m^+(\mu_{G_r}P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) &= m^+(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) + b_{\tau_{i_l}\tau_{i_r}}^{T^o}, & m^-(\mu_{G_r}P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) &= m^-(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}), \\ m^-(\mu_{G_l}P, G_r; \tau_{i_l}) &= m^-(P, G_r; \tau_{i_l}) + b_{\tau_{i_r}\tau_{i_l}}^{T^o}, & m^+(\mu_{G_l}P, G_r; \tau_{i_l}) &= m^+(P, G_r; \tau_{i_l}). \end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by $d(\tau_{i_l})b_{\tau_{i_l}\tau_{i_r}}^{T^o} = -d(\tau_{i_r})b_{\tau_{i_r}\tau_{i_l}}^{T^o}$, as $B(T^o)$ is skew-symmetrizable. \square

Proposition 5.3. *There is a unique map*

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) (Initial condition) $w(P_-) = 0$, where P_- is the minimum element in $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$,
- (2) (Recurrence condition) $w(\mu_{G_l}(P)) - w(P) = \Omega(P; G_l)$ for any $P \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$ such that P can twist on G_l with $P < \mu_{G_l}(P)$.

Proof. We shall only consider the case that $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^o$. The uniqueness of w is clear since the Hasse graph of $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ is connected (by Lemma 4.3).

We now show the existence. For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \beta})$ and two chains $P_- = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_a = P$, $P_- = P'_0 < P'_1 < \dots < P'_{a'} = P$ such that P_{i+1} covers P_i and P'_{i+1} covers P'_i for any i , it suffices to prove that $w_1(P) = w_2(P)$, where $w_1(P)$ (resp. $w_2(P)$) is obtained via the chain $P_- = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_a = P$ (resp. $P_- = P'_0 < P'_1 < \dots < P'_{a'} = P$). Suppose that $P \ominus P_-$ encloses the union of tiles $\bigcup_{j \in J} G_j$ for some $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, c\}$. Denote $\Psi(P) = \prod_{j \in J} \chi_j$. It is clear that $\frac{\Psi(\mu_{G_l}Q)}{\Psi(Q)} = \chi_l$ for any Q can twist on G_l with $Q < \mu_{G_l}Q$. Therefore $a = a' = |J|$. We say that $a = |J|$ is the distance between P and P_- .

Next, we show that $w_1(P) = w_2(P)$ by induction on the distance a between P and P_- . If $a = 0$ then $P = P_-$ and thus $w_1(P) = w_2(P) = 0$. Suppose that $P_{a-1} = \mu_{G_l}P$ and $P'_{a-1} = \mu_{G_r}P$. Assume that $w_1(P) = w_2(P)$ holds for all the cases that the distance is less than a . In particular, we have $w_1(P_{a-1}) = w_2(P'_{a-1})$.

If $P_{a-1} = P'_{a-1}$ then we have

$$w_1(P) = w_1(P_{a-1}) + \Omega(P_{a-1}; G_l) = w_2(P_{a-1}) + \Omega(P_{a-1}; G_l) = w_2(P).$$

If $P_{a-1} \neq P'_{a-1}$, we have $|l - r| > 1$ as $P_{a-1}, P'_{a-1} < P$. Thus $\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P = \mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} w_1(P) &= w_1(P_{s-1}) + \Omega(P_{a-1}; G_l) \\ &= (w_1(\mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P; G_r)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P; G_l) \\ &= (w_2(\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P; G_l)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P; G_r) \\ &= w_2(\mu_{G_r}P) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P; G_r) \\ &= w_2(P'_{a-1}) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P; G_r) \\ &= w_2(P), \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.2. The result follows. \square

5.2. **Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.** Suppose that q is a puncture and $q \neq p$. Assume that T contains no arc tagged notched at q . In this section, we construct a map

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

Definition 5.4. For $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ and $\zeta \in T^\circ$, the *gradient number* $\Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta)$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ at $\Delta_j(q)$ is defined to be

$$\Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta) = d(\zeta) \left(-m(P; \zeta) + n(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}; \zeta) \right) = -d(\zeta) \hat{m}(P; \zeta).$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \tau_j(q)$, we write $\Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta)$ as $\Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)})$.

Definition 5.5. For $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$, assume that P can twist on a tile G_l with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} , the *gradient number* $\Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l)$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ at G_l is defined to be

$$\Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) = \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}).$$

Lemma 5.6. Suppose that P can twist on two tiles G_l and G_r with $r - l > 1$ such that $\mu_{G_l}P, \mu_{G_r}P > P$. Then for any $\Delta_j(q) \in \Delta(T^\circ, q)$ we have

$$\Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) = \Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l).$$

Proof. It follows by Lemma 5.2 and Definition 5.5. \square

Lemma 5.7. Suppose that P can twist on a tile G_l with $\mu_{G_l}P > P$. Then for any $\Delta_j(q) \in \Delta(T^\circ, q)$ we have

$$\Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) = \Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q); G_l).$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) &= \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) \\ &\quad + d(\tau_j(q))(-m(\mu_{G_l}(P); \tau_j(q)) + n(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q))), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q); G_l) &= d(\tau_j(q))(-m(P; \tau_j(q)) + n(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q))) \\ &\quad + \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_{i_l}), \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the case that $b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ} = 0$. Then we have

$$m(P; \tau_j(q)) = m(\mu_{G_l}P; \tau_j(q)), \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_{i_l}).$$

Thus the result follows in this case.

We then consider the case that $b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ} \neq 0$. We may assume that $b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ} > 0$. As $\mu_{G_l}P > P$, the edge labeled $\tau_j(q)$ of G_{i_l} is in P . Therefore, we have

$$m(P; \tau_j(q)) = m(\mu_{G_l}P; \tau_j(q)) - b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_{i_l}}^{T^\circ}, \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_{i_l}) - b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ}.$$

Then the result follows by $d(\tau_{i_l})b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ} = -d(\tau_j(q))b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_{i_l}}^{T^\circ}$, as $B(T^\circ)$ is skew-symmetrizable.

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 5.8. *Assume that q is a puncture and $q \neq p$. Assume that T contains no arc tagged notched at q . Then there is a unique map*

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

satisfies the following conditions:

(1) *(Initial condition) $w(\mathbf{P}_-) = 0$, where $\mathbf{P}_- = (P_-, \Delta_1(q))$ is the minimum element in $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$,*

(2) *(Recurrence condition)*

(a) *For any $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(P, \Delta_j(q))$,*

$$w(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) - w(P, \Delta_j(q)) = \Omega(P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}).$$

(b) *For any $(P, \Delta_j(q)), (Q, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \beta^{(q)})$ such that $(Q, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(P, \Delta_j(q))$, in particular $P < Q$ are related by a twist on some tile G_l ,*

$$w(Q, \Delta_j(q)) - w(P, \Delta_j(q)) = \Omega(P, \Delta_j(q); G_l).$$

Proof. The result holds for the case $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$ as the Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ does not have any un-oriented cycles in this case.

We now consider the case that $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$. The uniqueness holds as the Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ is connected (By Lemma 4.7). We now show the existence. For any $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$, for any two chains $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}_1 < \dots < \mathbf{P}_a = \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P}'_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}'_1 < \dots < \mathbf{P}'_{a'} = \mathbf{P}$ such that \mathbf{P}_{i+1} covers \mathbf{P}_i and \mathbf{P}'_{i+1} covers \mathbf{P}'_i for all i , it suffices to show that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$, where $w_1(\mathbf{P})$ (resp. $w_2(\mathbf{P})$) is determined by the chain $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}_1 < \dots < \mathbf{P}_a = \mathbf{P}$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}'_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}'_1 < \dots < \mathbf{P}'_{a'} = \mathbf{P}$).

Suppose that $P \ominus P_-$ encloses the union of tiles $\bigcup_{i \in J} G_i$ for some $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, c\}$. Denote

$$\Psi(\mathbf{P}) = \begin{cases} \prod_{i \in J} \chi_i, & \text{if } E_1(q) \in P \text{ and } j = 1, \\ \prod_{i \in J} \chi_i(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \dots \kappa_{t-1} \kappa_t), & \text{if } E_2(q) \in P \text{ and } j = 1, \\ \prod_{i \in J} \chi_i(\kappa_1 \kappa_2 \dots \kappa_{j-1}), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $E_1(q)$ and $E_2(q)$ are the edges of G_c determined by (6) in Section 4. Thus $\Psi(\mu_{G_l} Q, \Delta) = \Psi(Q, \Delta) \chi_l$ if $(\mu_{G_l} Q, \Delta)$ covers (Q, Δ) and $\Psi(Q, \Delta_{l+1}(q)) = \Psi(Q, \Delta_l(q)) \kappa_l$ if $(Q, \Delta_{l+1}(q))$ covers $(Q, \Delta_l(q))$. It follows that $a = a'$ equals the exponent of $\Psi(\mathbf{P})$. We say that $a = a'$ is the distance between \mathbf{P}_- and \mathbf{P} . We prove that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$ by induction on the distance a .

In case $a = 0$ we have $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_-$, it follows that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P}) = 0$. Assume that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$ holds for any case that the distance is less than a .

If $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = \mathbf{P}'_{a-1}$ then

$$w_1(\mathbf{P}) - w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) = w_2(\mathbf{P}) - w_2(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}).$$

Thus by hypothesis, we have

$$w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P}).$$

If $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} \neq \mathbf{P}'_{a-1}$, we have either $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q))$ for some l, r with P can twist on G_l and G_r or $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ for some l .

(1) If $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q))$, as $\mathbf{P}_{a-1}, \mathbf{P}'_{a-1} < \mathbf{P}$, we have that $\mu_{G_l}P, \mu_{G_r}P < P$ and $|l-r| > 1$. Consequently, $\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P = \mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P$, moreover, as \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{P}_{s-1} , $l = c$ and $j = 1$ can not hold simultaneously by Lemma 4.4. Similarly, $r = c$ and $j = 1$ can not hold simultaneously. Thus by Lemma 4.4, we have both \mathbf{P}_{a-1} and \mathbf{P}'_{a-1} cover $(\mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(\mathbf{P}) &= w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= (w_1(\mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= w_2(\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q)) + (\Omega(\mu_{G_l}\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r)) \\
&= w_2(\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}'_{a-1}) + \Omega(\mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.6.

(2) If $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, we see that $l = c$ and $j-1 = 1$ can not hold simultaneously, since otherwise $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) < \mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. Thus, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ covers $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ by Lemma 4.4. We also see that $l = c$ and $j = 1$ can not hold simultaneously, since otherwise $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ does not cover $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. As $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, by Lemma 4.5, we thus have $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(\mathbf{P}) &= w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= \left(w_1(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q); G_l) \right) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= w_2(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j-1}(q); G_l) + \Omega(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) \\
&= w_2(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}'_{a-1}) + \Omega(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.7.

The proof is complete. \square

5.3. Valuation map on $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. Suppose that p and q are punctures. Assume that T contains no arcs tagged notched at p or q . In this section, we construct a map

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}.$$

Definition 5.9. For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ and $\zeta \in T^\circ$, the *gradient number* $\Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \Delta_j(q); \zeta)$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ at $\Delta_i(p)$ is defined to be

$$\Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \Delta_j(q); \zeta) = d(\zeta)[m(P; \zeta) - n(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}; \zeta) + m(\Delta_j(q); \zeta)].$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \tau_i(p)$, we write $\Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \Delta_j(q); \zeta)$ as $\Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \Delta_j(q))$.

Definition 5.10. For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ and $\zeta \in T^o$, the *gradient number* $\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta)$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ at $\Delta_j(q)$ is defined to be

$$\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta) = -d(\zeta)[m(P; \zeta) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \zeta) + m(\Delta_i(p); \zeta)].$$

In particular, if $\zeta = \tau_j(q)$, we write $\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}; \zeta)$ as $\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)})$.

Definition 5.11. Assume that $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ and P can twist on a tile G_l for some $l \in \{1, \dots, c\}$. Assume that the diagonal of G_l is labeled τ_{i_l} . The *gradient number* $\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l)$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ at G_l is defined to be

$$\Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) = \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})[m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) - m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_{i_l})].$$

Lemma 5.12. Suppose that P can twist on two tiles G_l and G_r with $r - l > 1$ such that $\mu_{G_l}P, \mu_{G_r}P > P$. Then for any $\Delta_i(p) \in \Delta(T^o, p)$, $\Delta_j(q) \in \Delta(T^o, q)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) \\ &= \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q); G_l). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. It follows by Lemma 5.2 and Definition 5.11. \square

Lemma 5.13. Suppose that P can twist on a tile G_l such that $\mu_{G_l}P > P$. Then for any $\Delta_i(p) \in \Delta(T^o, p)$, $\Delta_j(q) \in \Delta(T^o, q)$ we have

(1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) \\ &= \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q); G_l). \end{aligned}$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q)) \\ &= \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \Delta_j(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We shall only prove (1) as the proof of (2) is similar.

By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) \\ &= \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})[m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) - m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_{i_l})] \\ &\quad - d(\tau_j(q))[m(\mu_{G_l}P; \tau_j(q)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q)) + m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_j(q))] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q); G_l) \\ &= -d(\tau_j(q))[m(P; \tau_j(q)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q)) + m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_j(q))] \\ &\quad + \Omega(P; G_l) + d(\tau_{i_l})[m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_{i_l}) - m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_{i_l})]. \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the case that $b_{\tau_{i_l}, \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} = 0$. Then we have

$$m(P; \tau_j(q)) = m(\mu_{G_l}P; \tau_j(q)), \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_{i_l}) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_{i_l}).$$

Thus the result follows in this case.

We then consider the case that $b_{\tau_i, \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} \neq 0$. We may assume that $b_{\tau_i, \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} > 0$. As $\mu_{G_l} P > P$, the edge labeled $\tau_j(q)$ of G_{i_l} is in P . Therefore, we have

$$m(P; \tau_j(q)) = m(\mu_{G_l} P; \tau_j(q)) - b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_i}^{T^o}, \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_i) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_i) - b_{\tau_i, \tau_j(q)}^{T^o}.$$

Then the result follows by $d(\tau_i) b_{\tau_i, \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} = -d(\tau_j(q)) b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_i}^{T^o}$, as $B(T^o)$ is skew-symmetrizable.

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 5.14. *For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) \\ &= \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_{j+1}(q)}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) \\ &= d(\tau_i(p)) [m(P; \tau_i(p)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_i(p)) + m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_i(p))] \\ & \quad - d(\tau_j(q)) [m(P; \tau_j(q)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q)) + m(\Delta_{i+1}(p); \tau_j(q))], \\ & \quad \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}) + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_{j+1}(q)}) \\ &= -d(\tau_j(q)) [m(P; \tau_j(p)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_j(q)) + m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_j(q))] \\ & \quad + d(\tau_i(p)) [m(P; \tau_i(p)) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \tau_i(p)) + m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_i(p))], \end{aligned}$$

We first consider the case that $b_{\tau_i(p), \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} = 0$. Then we have

$$m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_j(q)) = m(\Delta_{i+1}(p); \tau_j(q)), \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_i(p)) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_i(p)).$$

Thus the result follows in this case.

We then consider the case that $b_{\tau_i(p), \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} \neq 0$. We may assume that $b_{\tau_i(p), \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} > 0$. Then we have

$$m(\Delta_i(p); \tau_j(q)) = m(\Delta_{i+1}(p); \tau_j(q)) - b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_i(p)}^{T^o}, \quad m(\Delta_j(q); \tau_i(p)) = m(\Delta_{j+1}(q); \tau_i(p)) - b_{\tau_i(p), \tau_j(q)}^{T^o}.$$

Then the result follows by $d(\tau_i(p)) b_{\tau_i(p), \tau_j(q)}^{T^o} = -d(\tau_j(q)) b_{\tau_j(q), \tau_i(p)}^{T^o}$, as $B(T^o)$ is skew-symmetrizable.

The proof is complete. \square

Proposition 5.15. *With the foregoing notation. Suppose that p and q are punctures and T contains no arcs tagged notched at p or q . There is a unique map*

$$w : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

satisfies the following conditions:

(1) (Initial condition) $w(\mathbf{P}_-) = 0$, where \mathbf{P}_- is the minimum element in $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$,

(2) (Recurrence condition)

(a) For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$,

$$w(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) - w(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) = \Omega(\underline{\Delta_i(p)}, P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}).$$

(b) For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$,

$$w(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) - w(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) = \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_j(q)}).$$

(c) For any $(\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_j(q)), (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ such that $(\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$, in particular, $Q > P$ are related by a twist on some tile G_l ,

$$w(\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_j(q)) - w(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) = \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q); G_l).$$

Proof. The uniqueness holds as the Hasse graph of $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ is connected (by Lemma 4.13). We now show the existence. For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, for any two chains $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}_1 < \cdots < \mathbf{P}_a = \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P}'_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}'_1 < \cdots < \mathbf{P}'_{a'} = \mathbf{P}$ such that \mathbf{P}_{i+1} covers \mathbf{P}_i and \mathbf{P}'_{i+1} covers \mathbf{P}'_i for all i , it suffices to show that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$, where $w_1(\mathbf{P})$ (resp. $w_2(\mathbf{P})$) is determined by the chain $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}_1 < \cdots < \mathbf{P}_a = \mathbf{P}$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}'_0 = \mathbf{P}_- < \mathbf{P}'_1 < \cdots < \mathbf{P}'_{a'} = \mathbf{P}$).

If $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$, denote

$$\Psi(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) = \begin{cases} \Psi(P, \Delta_j(q)), & \text{if } E_1(p) \in P \text{ and } i = 1, \\ \Psi(P, \Delta_j(q))\vartheta_1\vartheta_2 \cdots \vartheta_{s-1}\vartheta_s, & \text{if } E_2(p) \in P \text{ and } i = 1, \\ \Psi(P, \Delta_j(q))\vartheta_1\vartheta_2 \cdots \vartheta_{i-1}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $E_1(p)$ and $E_2(p)$ are the edges of G_1 determined by (8) in Section 4 and $\Psi(P, \Delta_j(q))$ is given in the proof of Proposition 5.8.

If $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$, denote

$$(13) \quad \Psi(\Delta_i(p), P_{\tilde{\beta}}, \Delta_j(q)) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j = t, \\ \vartheta_1\vartheta_2 \cdots \vartheta_s\kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_t, & \text{if } i = s \text{ and } j = 1, \\ \vartheta_1\vartheta_2 \cdots \vartheta_{i-1}\kappa_1 \cdots \kappa_{j-1}\kappa_t, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\Psi(\Delta, \mu_{G_l}Q, \Delta') = \Psi(\Delta, Q, \Delta')\chi_l$ if $(\Delta, \mu_{G_l}Q, \Delta')$ covers (Δ, Q, Δ') , $\Psi(\Delta, Q, \Delta_{l+1}(q)) = \Psi(\Delta, Q, \Delta_l(q))\kappa_l$ if $(\Delta, Q, \Delta_{l+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta, Q, \Delta_l(q))$, and $\Psi(\Delta_{l+1}(p), Q, \Delta') = \Psi(\Delta_l(p), Q, \Delta')\vartheta_l$ if $(\Delta_{l+1}(p), Q, \Delta')$ covers $(\Delta_l(p), Q, \Delta')$. It follows that $a = a'$ equals the exponent of $\Psi(\mathbf{P})$. We say that $a = a'$ is the distance between \mathbf{P}_- and \mathbf{P} . We prove that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$ by induction on the distance a .

In case $a = 0$ we have $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_-$. It follows that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P}) = 0$ in this case. Assume that $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$ holds for any case that the distance is less than a .

If $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = \mathbf{P}'_{a-1}$ then $w_1(\mathbf{P}) - w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) = w_2(\mathbf{P}) - w_2(\mathbf{P}_{a-1})$. Thus by the hypothesis we have $w_1(\mathbf{P}) = w_2(\mathbf{P})$.

We now consider the case that $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} \neq \mathbf{P}'_{a-1}$. There are four possibilities:

- (1) $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r}P, \Delta_j(q))$ for some G_l and G_r such that P can twist on G_l and G_r ;
- (2) $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ for some G_l such that P can twist on G_l ;
- (3) $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ for some G_l such that P can twist on G_l ;
- (4) $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$.

We shall only prove cases (1) (3) and (4) as cases (2) and (3) are dual.

For the case (1), we have $|l - r| > 1$ and \mathbf{P}_{a-1} covers $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$ and \mathbf{P}'_{a-1} covers $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q))$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(\mathbf{P}) &= w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= (w_1(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q); G_r)) \\
&\quad + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= w_2(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q)) + (\Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&\quad + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q); G_r)) \\
&= w_2(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}'_{a-1}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_r} P, \Delta_j(q); G_r) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.12.

For the case (3), as $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$, we have $E_2(q) \in P$ and $j \neq 1$. Thus, $E_1(q) \in \mu_{G_l} P$ and $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ by Lemma 4.12. We also have that $l = c$ and $j - 1 = 1$ can not hold simultaneously, since otherwise $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) < \mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. Thus by Lemma 4.11, $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1(\mathbf{P}) &= w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= w_1(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
&\quad + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_j(q); G_l) \\
&= w_2(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta_{j-1}(q); G_l) \\
&\quad + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
&= w_2(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}'_{a-1}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
&= w_2(\mathbf{P}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.13.

For the case (4), as \mathbf{P} covers $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, we have $\mathbf{P}_{a-1} = (\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{P}'_{a-1} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ by Lemma 4.12.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 w_1(\mathbf{P}) &= w_1(\mathbf{P}_{a-1}) + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_{i-1}(p)}, \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q)) \\
 &= w_1(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
 &\quad + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_{i-1}(p)}, \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q)) \\
 &= w_2(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\underline{\Delta_{i-1}(p)}, P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) \\
 &\quad + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
 &= w_2(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q)) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
 &= w_2(\mathbf{P}'_{a-1}) + \Omega(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \underline{\Delta_{j-1}(q)}) \\
 &= w_2(\mathbf{P}),
 \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows by induction hypothesis and Lemma 5.14.

The proof is complete. □

6. EXPANSION FORMULAS AND THE POSITIVITY

Let Σ be an orbifold and $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ be a quantum cluster algebra arising from Σ . Let β be an arc in Σ and T° be an ideal triangulation. Let $\tilde{\beta}$ be the curve associated with β given by (4). Let T be the corresponding tagged triangulation. Assume that $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from p and ends at q . In this section using the lattices $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$, $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ and $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, respectively in Section 4, we give expansion formulas for quantum cluster variables $\tilde{\beta}$, $\tilde{\beta}^{(q)}$ and $\tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}$, respectively. As a corollary, we obtain the positivity for quantum cluster algebras from orbifolds.

6.1. Expansion formula for ordinary arcs.

Definition 6.1. [34] Suppose that the diagonal of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ are labeled $\tau_{i_1}, \dots, \tau_{i_c}$. Let P be a perfect matching of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ with edges labeled by $\tau_{k_1}, \dots, \tau_{k_r}$. Suppose that $P \ominus P_-$ encloses the union of tiles $\bigcup_{j \in J} G_j$ for some $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, c\}$.

(1) The *weight* $x^T(P)$ of P is defined to be

$$x^T(P) := \frac{x_{\tau_{k_1}} \cdots x_{\tau_{k_r}}}{x_{\tau_{i_1}} \cdots x_{\tau_{i_c}}},$$

(2) The *height monomial* $h^T(P)$ of P is defined to be

$$h^T(P) := \prod_{j \in J} h_{i_j}^T,$$

(3) The *specialized height monomial* $y^T(P)$ of P is defined to be

$$y^T(P) := \Phi(h^T(P)),$$

where Φ is given by

$$(14) \quad \Phi(h_{\tau_i}^T) = \begin{cases} y_{\tau_i}^T, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is not a side of a self-folded triangle,} \\ \frac{y_r^T}{y_{r(p)}^T}, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is a radius } r \text{ to puncture } p \text{ in a self-folded triangle,} \\ y_{r(p)}^T, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is a loop in a self-folded triangle with radius } r \text{ to a puncture } p. \end{cases}$$

(4) The *quantum weight* $X^T(P)$ of P is defined to be the element $X^{a(P)}$ such that

$$X^{a(P)}|_{v=1} = \frac{x^T(P)y^T(P)}{\bigoplus_{R \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})} y^T(R)}.$$

In particular, if $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$ we have $x^T(P_{\tilde{\beta}}) = x_{\tilde{\beta}}, y^T(P_{\tilde{\beta}}) = 1$, where $P_{\tilde{\beta}}$ is the unique perfect matching of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$.

For an arc γ incident to a puncture p , we let the weight $x_{l_q(\gamma)} = x_\gamma x_{\gamma(q)}$.

Remark 6.2. (1) Note that the weight of a perfect matching slightly differs from the original definition in [34], here we quotient the crossing monomial.

(2) For convenience, we denote

$$y_{\tau_i}^{T^o} = \begin{cases} y_{\tau_i}^T, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is not a side of a self-folded triangle,} \\ \frac{y_r^T}{y_{r(p)}^T}, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is a radius } r \text{ to puncture } p \text{ in a self-folded triangle,} \\ y_{r(p)}^T, & \text{if } \tau_i \text{ is a loop in a self-folded triangle with radius } r \text{ to a puncture } p. \end{cases}$$

$$\text{Then } \Phi(h_{\tau_i}^T) = y_{\tau_i}^{T^o}.$$

For $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, if α_i is a radius of some self-folded triangle in T^o , then α is the loop.

Lemma 6.3. *Let T^o be an ideal triangulation and T be the corresponding tagged triangulation. For any arc $\alpha \in T^o$ which can be flipped, denote $T'^o = (T^o \setminus \{\alpha\}) \cup \{\alpha'\}$ be flipped ideal triangulation and T' the corresponding tagged triangulation. Suppose that α is a diagonal of the quadrilateral $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)$ in T^o and α_1, α_3 are in the clockwise direction of α . Then*

(1) if $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then $y_{\tau}^{T'^o} = y_{\tau}^{T^o}$,

(2) $y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o} = (y_{\alpha}^{T^o})^{-1}$,

(3) For $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$,

(a) if α_i is not a radius of any self-folded triangles in T^o or T'^o , i.e., $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_{i-1}, \alpha_{i+1}$, then we have $y_{\alpha_i}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha_i}^{T^o} (y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{[-b_{\alpha\alpha_i}^{T^o}] + (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{b_{\alpha\alpha_i}^{T^o}}}$,

(b) if α_i is a radius of some self-folded triangle in T'^o to some puncture p , then we have

$$y_{\alpha_i}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha_i}^{T^o} y_{l_p(\alpha_i)}^{T'^o},$$

(4) $x_{\alpha} = \frac{x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3} y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}}{x_{\alpha'} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})}$.

Proof. (1) It is clear.

(2) It is clear if α, α' are not sides of self-folded triangles. We may assume one of α, α' is a side of a self-folded triangle, without loss of generality, we may assume that α is a loop of a self-folded triangle with the radius $\alpha_3 = \alpha_4$ to a puncture p . Then $y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha'}^{T'} = (y_{\alpha_3(p)}^T)^{-1} = (y_{\alpha}^{T^o})^{-1}$.

(3) We may assume $i = 1$. For the statement (a), if α_1 and α are not a side of a self-folded triangle in T^o or T'^o , then

$$y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'} = y_{\alpha_1}^T (y_{\alpha}^T)^{b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha}^{T^o})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus (y_{\alpha}^T)^{-1})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}}.$$

If α_1 is not a side of a self-folded triangle in T^o or T'^o but α is a side of a self-folded triangle, then $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$ is the radius to some puncture p , then

$$y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'} = y_{\alpha_1}^T (y_{\alpha_2(p)}^T)^{b_{\alpha_2(p)\alpha_1}^T} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha_2(p)}^T)^{-b_{\alpha_2(p)\alpha_1}^T} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus (y_{\alpha}^{T^o})^{-1})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}}.$$

If α_1 is a side of a self-folded triangle in T^o , but α is not a side of a self-folded triangle in T^o , then α_1 is a loop of a self-folded triangle with radius r to a puncture p . Thus we have

$$y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'} = y_{\alpha_1}^T (y_{\alpha}^T)^{b_{\alpha r(p)}^T} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha}^T)^{-b_{\alpha r(p)}^T} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus (y_{\alpha}^{T^o})^{-1})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{-b_{\alpha\alpha_1}^{T^o}}.$$

If α_1 and α are sides of some self-folded triangles in T^o , then α_1, α are loops of some self-folded triangles. Assume that $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$ is the radius to some puncture p and α_1 is the

loop of a self-folded triangle with radius r to a puncture q . Thus we have

$$y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o} = y_{r(q)}^{T'} = y_{r(q)}^T (y_{\alpha_2^{(p)}}^T)^{b^T_{\alpha_2^{(p)}, r(p)}} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha_2^{(p)}}^T)^{-b^T_{\alpha_2^{(p)}, r(p)}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o} (1 \oplus (y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o})^{-1})^{-b_{\alpha_1}^{T'o}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o})^{-b_{\alpha_1}^{T'o}}.$$

The result follows.

The statement (b) follows immediately by $y_{\alpha_1}^{T'} = y_{\alpha_1}^T$.

(4) As $x_{\alpha'} = \frac{y_{\alpha}^{T'o} x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3}}{x_{\alpha'} \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha}^{T'o})}$, we have

$$x_{\alpha} = \frac{y_{\alpha}^{T'o} x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3}}{x_{\alpha'} \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha}^{T'o})} = \frac{x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + (y_{\alpha}^{T'o})^{-1} x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3}}{x_{\alpha'} \cdot ((y_{\alpha}^{T'o})^{-1} \oplus 1)} = \frac{x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3} y_{\alpha'}^{T'o}}{x_{\alpha'} \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'o})}.$$

□

The following lemma follows by Definition 6.1 (2) (3).

Lemma 6.4. *Let P, Q be two perfect matchings. If $P < Q$ are related by a twist on a tile with diagonal labeled τ_i then $\frac{y^T(Q)}{y^T(P)} = y_{\tau_i}^{T'o}$.*

The following theorem is the first main result of this paper.

Theorem 6.5. *Let Σ be an orbifold without orbifold points of weight 2. Let T^o be an ideal triangulation of Σ and β be an arc. Then in the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ we have*

$$X_{\beta} = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})} v^{w(P)} X^T(P),$$

where $w : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is given by Proposition 5.3.

6.2. Expansion formula for one end tagged notched arcs. Suppose that q is a puncture and $q \neq p$. Thus $\tilde{\beta} = \beta$. Assume T contains no arc tagged notched at q . In this section, we give a quantum expansion formula for $\beta^{(q)} = \tilde{\beta}^{(q)}$.

For any triangle $\Delta_j(q)$ incident to q , recall that the three sides are $\tau_{j-1}(q)$, $\tau_j(q)$ and $\tau_{[j]}(q)$.

Definition 6.6. With the notation in Section 4.2. For any $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ with $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$,

(1) The *weight* $x^T(\Delta_j(q))$ of $\Delta_j(q)$ is defined to be

$$x^T(\Delta_j(q)) := x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[j]}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}^{-1}.$$

(2) The *weight* $x^T(P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be

$$(15) \quad x^T(P, \Delta_j(q)) := x^T(P) x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = x^T(P) x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[j]}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}^{-1}.$$

(3) The *height monomial* $h^T(P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined as follows:

(a) if $\tilde{\beta} (= \beta) \notin T^o$ then

$$(16) \quad h^T(P, \Delta_j(q)) := \begin{cases} h^T(P), & \text{if } E_1(q) \in P \text{ and } j = 1, \\ h^T(P) h_{\tau_1(q)}^T h_{\tau_2(q)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{t-1}(q)}^T h_{\tau_t(q)}^T, & \text{if } E_2(q) \in P \text{ and } j = 1, \\ h^T(P) h_{\tau_1(q)}^T h_{\tau_2(q)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^T, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $E_1(q)$ and $E_2(q)$ are the edges of G_c determined by (6) in Section 4.

(b) if $\tilde{\beta}(= \beta) \in T^\circ$ then

$$h^T(P, \Delta_j(q)) := h_{\tau_1(q)}^T h_{\tau_2(q)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^T.$$

(4) The *specialized height monomial* $y^T(P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be

$$(17) \quad y^T(P, \Delta_j(q)) := \Phi(h^T(P, \Delta_j(q))),$$

where Φ is given by (14) in Definition 6.1.

(5) The *quantum weight* $X^T(P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be the element $X^{a(P, \Delta_j(q))}$ such that

$$X^{a(P, \Delta_j(q))}|_{v=1} = \frac{x^T(P, \Delta_j(q))y^T(P, \Delta_j(q))}{\bigoplus_{(R, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}(q))} y^T(R, \Delta)}.$$

The following lemmas follow by Definition 6.6.

Lemma 6.7. *Assume $P > Q$ are related by a twist on a tile G with diagonal labeled τ and $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(Q, \Delta_j(q))$. Then $\frac{y^T(P, \Delta_j(q))}{y^T(Q, \Delta_j(q))} = y_\tau^{T^\circ}$*

Lemma 6.8. *If $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(P, \Delta_j(q))$ then $\frac{y^T(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))}{y^T(P, \Delta_j(q))} = y_{\tau_j}^{T^\circ}$.*

The following theorem is the second main result of this paper.

Theorem 6.9. *Let Σ be an orbifold without orbifold points of weight 2. Let T° be an ideal triangulation of Σ and T be the corresponding tagged triangulation. For any β , let $\tilde{\beta}$ be the curve associated with β by (4). Assume that $\tilde{\beta}$ connects p and a puncture q with $q \neq p$. If T contains no arc tagged notched at q , then in the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ we have*

$$X_{\beta(q)} = \sum_{(P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}(q))} v^{w(P, \Delta_j(q))} X^T(P, \Delta_j(q)),$$

where $w : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}(q)) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is given by Proposition 5.8.

6.3. Expansion formula for two ends tagged notched arcs. Suppose that p and q are punctures. Assume that T contains no arc tagged notched at p or q . If β is a pending arc incident to puncture p , let $X_{\tilde{\beta}(p,q)} = X_{\beta(p)}$. Herein, we give an expansion formula for $\tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}$.

For any triangle $\Delta_i(p)$ incident to p , recall that the three sides are $\tau_{i-1}(p)$, $\tau_i(p)$ and $\tau_{[i]}(p)$.

Definition 6.10. With the notation in Section 4.3. Assume that p and q are punctures. For any $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ with $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$,

(1) The *weight* $x^T(\Delta_i(p))$ of $\Delta_i(p)$ is defined to be

$$x^T(\Delta_i(p)) := x_{\tau_{i-1}(p)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[i]}(p)} x_{\tau_i(p)}^{-1}.$$

(2) The *weight* $x^T(\Delta_j(q))$ of $\Delta_j(q)$ is defined to be

$$x^T(\Delta_j(q)) := x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[j]}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}^{-1}.$$

(3) The *weight* $x^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be

$$(18) \quad x^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) := x_{\tau_{i-1}(p)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[i]}(p)} x_{\tau_i(p)}^{-1} x^T(P) x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{-1} x_{\tau_{[j]}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}^{-1}.$$

(4) The *height monomial* $h^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined as follows:

(a) if $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$ then

$$h^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) := \begin{cases} h^T(P, \Delta_j(q)), & \text{if } E_1(p) \in P \text{ and } i = 1, \\ h^T(P, \Delta_j(q))h_{\tau_1(p)}^T h_{\tau_2(p)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{s-1}(p)}^T h_{\tau_s(p)}^T, & \text{if } E_2(p) \in P \text{ and } i = 1, \\ h^T(P, \Delta_j(q))h_{\tau_1(p)}^T h_{\tau_2(p)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{i-1}(p)}^T, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $E_1(p)$ is the edge of G_1 determined by (8) in Section 4.

(b) if $\tilde{\beta} \in T^\circ$ and $s, t \geq 2$ then

(19)

$$h^T(\Delta_i(p), P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j = t, \\ h_{\tau_1(p)}^T h_{\tau_2(p)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{s-1}(p)}^T h_{\tau_1(q)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{t-1}(q)}^T (h_\beta^T)^2, & \text{if } i = s \text{ and } j = 1, \\ h_{\tau_1(p)}^T h_{\tau_2(p)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{i-1}(p)}^T h_{\tau_1(q)}^T \cdots h_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^T h_\beta^T, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(5) The *specialized height monomial* $y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be

$$y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) := \Phi(h^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))),$$

where Φ is given by (14) in Definition 6.1.

(6) The *quantum weight* $X^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ of $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ is defined to be the element $X^{a(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))}$ such that

$$X^{a(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))}|_{v=1} = \frac{x^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))}{\bigoplus_{(\Delta, R, \Delta') \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}(p, q))} y^T(\Delta, R, \Delta')}.$$

From the definition of weight $x^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $x^T(P, \Delta_j(q))$, we have

$$x^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) = x^T(\Delta_i(p))x^T(P, \Delta_j(q)).$$

The following lemmas follow by Definition 6.10 (4) (5).

Lemma 6.11. *Let P, Q be two perfect matchings such that $P > Q$ are related by a twist on a tile G with diagonal labeled τ . If $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_j(q))$ then*

$$\frac{y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))}{y^T(\Delta_i(p), Q, \Delta_j(q))} = y_\tau^{T^\circ}.$$

Lemma 6.12. *If $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ then*

$$\frac{y^T(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))}{y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))} = y_{\tau_i(p)}^{T^\circ}.$$

Lemma 6.13. *If $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ then*

$$\frac{y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))}{y^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))} = y_{\tau_j(q)}^{T^\circ}.$$

The following theorem is the third main result of this paper.

Theorem 6.14. *Let Σ be an orbifold without orbifold points of weight 2. Let T° be an ideal triangulation of Σ and β be an arc. Let T be the corresponding tagged triangulation of T° . Let $\tilde{\beta}$ be the curve associated with β given by (4). Assume that $\tilde{\beta}$ connects two punctures p*

and q . If T contains no arc tagged notched at p or q , then in the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ we have

$$X_{\tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}} = \sum_{(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})} v^{w(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))} X^T(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)),$$

where $w : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is given by Proposition 5.15.

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 6.5, Theorem 6.9, and Theorem 6.14, we obtain the positivity for quantum cluster algebras from orbifolds.

Theorem 6.15. *Positivity conjecture holds for quantum cluster algebras from orbifolds without orbifold points of weight 2.*

Remark 6.16. In case Σ be an orbifold with or without orbifold points of weight 2, our method can be also applied to its associated orbifold $\hat{\Sigma}$, which is obtained from Σ by making all orbifold points of weight 2 to punctures.

7. PARTITION BIJECTION BETWEEN PERFECT MATCHINGS

Let T^o be an ideal triangulation and γ be a curve connecting two marked points p and q . Choose an orientation of γ , assume that γ crosses T^o at p_1, \dots, p_c sequentially. Denote $p_0 = p$ and $p_{c+1} = q$. Suppose that $p_j \in \tau_{i_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$. Given a non-self-folded arc $\alpha \in T^o$, denote $T'^o = \mu_\alpha(T^o)$ and by α' the new arc obtained.

In this section we construct a partition bijection $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma})$. To this end, we first construct a partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T^o} : \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$ between the complete (T^o, γ) -paths.

We start with the polygon case.


7.1. Polygon case. In this subsection, let Σ be the n -gon, i.e., the disk with n marked points labeled $1, \dots, n$ clockwise on the boundary.

7.1.1. Partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$. For any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi}$ and $\zeta \in T^o$, recall $m(\vec{\xi}, \zeta)$ given in (2). In the case that Σ is a polygon, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \zeta) \in \{1, 0, -1\}$.

Assume that $\alpha = (a, c)$ is the diagonal of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) in T^o , where a, b, c, d are in the clockwise order. Then $\alpha' = (b, d)$.

Let $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$ be a complete (T^o, γ) -path. We would like to construct a set of complete (T'^o, γ) -paths as follows.

Case I: γ crosses with two parallel edges of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) . We may assume that γ crosses $\dots, (a, b), (a, c), (c, d), \dots$ sequentially. Then $\xi_{2j-2} = (a, b), \xi_{2j} = (a, c)$ and $\xi_{2j+2} = (c, d)$ for some $j \in \{2, \dots, c-1\}$.



Case 1

(1) If $\vec{\xi}_{2j} = (a, c)$ then $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (c, d), (d, c))$. We have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, d), (d, c))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2) If $\vec{\xi}_{2j} = (c, a)$ then there are four possibilities of $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$: $((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, c), (c, d))$, $((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, c))$, $((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, c), (c, d))$ and $((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, c))$.

(2.1) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, c), (c, d))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 1$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((b, a), (a, d), (d, b), (b, c), (c, d))$ or $((b, a), (a, b), (b, d), (d, c), (c, d))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2.2) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, c))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((b, a), (a, d), (d, b), (b, d), (d, c))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2.3) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, c), (c, d))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$.


In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, c), (c, d))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2.4) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, c))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, d), (d, c))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

In each case, one can see that the new sequences $\vec{\xi}'$ obtained are complete (T'^o, γ) -paths and satisfy $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

Case II: γ crosses with (a, c) and two adjacent edges of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) . We may assume that γ crosses with $\dots, (a, b), (a, c), (a, d), \dots$ sequentially. Then $\xi_{2j-2} = (a, b)$, $\xi_{2j} = (a, c)$ and $\xi_{2j+2} = (a, d)$ for some $j \in \{2, \dots, c-1\}$.



Case II

(1) If $\vec{\xi}_{2j} = (a, c)$ then $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d))$ or $((a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (c, d), (d, a))$.

(1.1) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, a), (a, d))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(1.2) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, a), (a, c), (c, d), (d, a))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, a))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2) If $\vec{\xi}_{2j} = (c, a)$ then $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$ or $((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$.

(2.1) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((a, b), (b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$.


In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, a))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2.2) In case $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$.

In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j+2})$ by $((b, a), (a, d), (d, a))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

In each case, one can see that the new sequences $\vec{\xi}'$ obtained are complete (T^{v_0}, γ) -paths and satisfy $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

Case III: γ crosses two adjacent edges of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) but not cross (a, c) . We may assume that γ crosses with $\cdots, (a, b), (b, c), \cdots$ sequentially. Then $\xi_{2j-2} = (a, b), \xi_{2j} = (b, c)$ for some $j \in \{2, \cdots, c\}$. Then we have $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}) = ((b, a), (a, b), (b, c))$ or $((a, b), (b, c), (c, b))$ or $((b, a), (a, c), (c, b))$.




Case III

- (1) If $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}) = ((b, a), (a, b), (b, c))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j})$ by $((b, a), (a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, c))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.
- (2) If $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}) = ((a, b), (b, c), (c, b))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j})$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, c), (c, b))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.
- (3) If $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, b))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 1$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_{2j-2}, \vec{\xi}_{2j-1}, \vec{\xi}_{2j})$ by $((b, a), (a, d), (d, b), (b, c), (c, b))$ or $((b, a), (a, b), (b, d), (d, c), (c, b))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

In each case, one can see that the new sequences $\vec{\xi}'$ obtained are complete (T^{v_0}, γ) -paths and satisfy $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

Case IV: γ crosses with (a, c) and exactly one edge of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) . We may assume that γ crosses with $(a, c), (a, d), \cdots$ sequentially. Then $\xi_2 = (a, c), \xi_4 = (a, d)$. Thus we have $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d))$ or $((b, a), (a, c), (c, d), (d, a))$ or $((b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$.




Case IV

- (1) If $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, a), (a, d))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4)$ by $((b, a), (a, d))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.
- (2) If $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, d), (d, a))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4)$ by $((b, d), (d, a))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.
- (3) If $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4) = ((b, c), (c, a), (a, d), (d, a))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2, \vec{\xi}_3, \vec{\xi}_4)$ by $((b, d), (d, a))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

In each case, one can see that the new sequences $\vec{\xi}'$ obtained are complete (T^{v_0}, γ) -paths and satisfy $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

Case V: γ crosses with exactly one edge of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) but does not cross with (a, c) . We may assume that γ crosses with $(b, c), \cdots$ sequentially. Then $\xi_2 = (b, c)$. Thus we have $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2) = ((a, b), (b, c))$ or $((a, c), (c, b))$.



Case V

(1) If $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2) = ((a, b), (b, c))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2)$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, b), (b, c))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

(2) If $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2) = ((a, c), (c, b))$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 1$. In this case we replace $(\vec{\xi}_1, \vec{\xi}_2)$ by $((a, b), (b, d), (d, c), (c, b))$ or $((a, d), (d, b), (b, c), (c, b))$ in the sequence $\vec{\xi}$.

In each case, one can see that the new sequences $\vec{\xi}'$ obtained are complete (T^o, γ) -paths and satisfy $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

From the above discussion, we have the following observation.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$ be a complete (T^o, γ) -path. Assume that $\xi_j = \alpha = (a, c)$ for some even j such that $\xi_{j-1} \neq \alpha \neq \xi_{j+1}$.*

(1) *If $\vec{\xi}_j = (a, c)$ then $(\vec{\xi}_{j-1}, \vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, d))$ or $((d, a), (a, c), (c, b))$.*

(2) *If $\vec{\xi}_j = (c, a)$ then $(\vec{\xi}_{j-1}, \vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1}) = ((b, c), (c, a), (a, d))$ or $((d, c), (c, a), (a, b))$.*

Therefore, for any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi}$, we obtain a set of complete (T^o, γ) -paths, denoted by $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, moreover, for any $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha') = -m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)$.

The construction of $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ can be summarized as follows:

Construction of $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$: given any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$.

If $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 1$, then the set $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ contains all sequences of oriented arcs $\vec{\xi}'$, where $\vec{\xi}'$ is obtained via the following recipe:

(i) First remove a pair $(\vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1})$ in case $\xi_j = \xi_{j+1} = \alpha$ and $\xi_{j-1} \neq \alpha$;

(ii) Next for any $\xi_j = \alpha$ with odd j ,

(a) if $\vec{\xi}_j = (a, c)$, then replace $\vec{\xi}_j$ by $(a, b), (b, d), (d, c)$ or $(a, d), (d, b), (b, c)$;

(b) if $\vec{\xi}_j = (c, a)$, then replace $\vec{\xi}_j$ by $(c, b), (b, d), (d, a)$ or $(c, d), (d, b), (b, a)$;

If $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 0$, then the set $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ contains all sequences of oriented arcs $\vec{\xi}'$, where $\vec{\xi}'$ can be obtained via the following recipe:

(i) First remove a pair $(\vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1})$ in case $\xi_j = \xi_{j+1} = \alpha$ and $\xi_{j-1} \neq \alpha$;

(ii) Next, if γ crosses with $\alpha' = (b, d)$, then add $(b, d), (d, b)$ or $(d, b), (b, d)$ to make the sequences to complete (T^o, γ) -paths;

If $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$, then $\xi_j = \alpha$ for some even j such that $\xi_{j-1} \neq \alpha \neq \xi_{j+1}$. The set $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ contains all sequences of oriented arcs $\vec{\xi}'$, where $\vec{\xi}'$ can be obtained via the following recipe:

(i) First, $(\vec{\xi}_{j-1}, \vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, d)); ((b, c), (c, a), (a, d)); ((d, a), (a, c), (c, b))$ or $((d, c), (c, a), (a, b))$ by Lemma 7.1.

(a) if $(\vec{\xi}_{j-1}, \vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1}) = ((b, a), (a, c), (c, d))$ or $((b, c), (c, a), (a, d))$, then replace it by (b, d) ;

(b) if $(\vec{\xi}_{j-1}, \vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1}) = ((d, a), (a, c), (c, b))$ or $((d, c), (c, a), (a, b))$, then replace it by (d, b) ;

(ii) Next, if γ crosses with $\alpha' = (b, d)$, then add $(b, d), (d, b)$ or $(d, b), (b, d)$ to make the sequences to complete (T'^o, γ) -paths.

Remark 7.2. In particular, if γ crosses neither α nor α' then $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) = \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$ and $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ is the identity map.

In summary, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 7.3. *With the foregoing notation. For any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi}$, we have*

- (1) $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \subset \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$;
- (2) $|\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})| = 2^{[m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha)]_+}$, moreover, if $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = 1$, assume that $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \{\vec{\xi}', \vec{\xi}''\}$, then $\vec{\xi}'$ and $\vec{\xi}''$ are related by a twist at α' ;
- (3) $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$ for some $\zeta \neq \xi$ if and only if $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -1$, and $\vec{\xi}$ and $\vec{\zeta}$ are related by a twist on α ;
- (4) for any $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = -m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha')$;
- (5) for any $(a, b), (b, c), (c, d), (a, d), (a, c) \neq \zeta \in T^o$ and $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \zeta) = m(\vec{\xi}', \zeta)$.

Similarly, we can construct $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T^o}$.

Theorem 7.4. *With the foregoing notation. $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are partition bijections between $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$, moreover, $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are inverse to each other.*

Proof. We first show that $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are partition bijections. We shall only consider $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$. By Proposition 7.3 (2), we have $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $\vec{\xi} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$.

Suppose that $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\zeta} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$. Assume that $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$. Then $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = m(\vec{\zeta}, \alpha) = -m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha')$ by Proposition 7.3 (4). If $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = m(\vec{\zeta}, \alpha) \leq 0$ then $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) = \{\vec{\xi}'\}$ by Proposition 7.3 (2). If $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha) = m(\vec{\zeta}, \alpha) = 1$, then $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) = \{\vec{\xi}', \vec{\xi}''\}$ by Proposition 7.3 (2), where $\vec{\xi}''$ is the complete (T'^o, γ) -path related to $\vec{\xi}'$ by a twist on α' . Therefore we have either $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) = \emptyset$ or $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$ for any $\vec{\xi}, \vec{\zeta} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$.

According to the construction of $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$, we see that $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ if and only if $\vec{\xi} \in \phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}(\vec{\xi}')$ for any $\vec{\xi} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ and $\vec{\xi}' \in \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$. Thus $\bigcup_{\vec{\xi} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)} \phi_\alpha^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$. Therefore, $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ is a partition bijection by Remark 2.5. Similarly, $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ is a partition bijection. By Proposition 2.6, $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are inverse to each other. \square

7.1.2. Partition bijection $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be a set of arcs in T^o such that α_i, α_j are not two sides of any triangle in T^o for any $i \neq j$. Denote $T'^o = \mu_{\alpha_k} \circ \dots \circ \mu_{\alpha_1}(T^o)$. Denote by α'_i the arc obtained from T^o by flip at α_i . Assume that $\alpha_i = (a_i, c_i)$ and α_i is a diagonal of the quadrilateral (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i) in T^o , where a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i are in the clockwise order.

For any given complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$, we construct a subset $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ of complete (T'^o, γ) -paths, which is obtained from $\vec{\xi}$ via the following receipt:

- (i) First, remove all the pairs $(\vec{\xi}_j, \vec{\xi}_{j+1})$ such that $\xi_j = \xi_{j+1} = \alpha_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\xi_{j-1} \neq \alpha_i$;

(ii) Next, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

- (a) if $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = 1$, we have $\xi_{j_i} = \alpha_i$ for some odd j_i , then replace $\vec{\xi}_{j_i}$ by $(a_i, b_i), (b_i, d_i), (d_i, c_i)$ or $(a_i, d_i), (d_i, b_i), (b_i, c_i)$ in case $\vec{\xi}_{j_i} = (a, c)$ and replace $\vec{\xi}_{j_i}$ by $(c_i, b_i), (b_i, d_i), (d_i, a_i)$ or $(c_i, d_i), (d_i, b_i), (b_i, a_i)$ in case $\vec{\xi}_{j_i} = (c_i, a_i)$;
- (b) if $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = -1$, we have $\xi_{j_i} = \alpha_i$ for some even j_i , then replace $(\vec{\xi}_{j_i-1}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i+1})$ by (b_i, d_i) in case $(\vec{\xi}_{j_i-1}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i+1}) = ((b_i, a_i), (a_i, c_i), (c_i, d_i))$ or $((b_i, c_i), (c_i, a_i), (a_i, d_i))$, and replace $(\vec{\xi}_{j_i-1}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i+1})$ by (d_i, b_i) in case $(\vec{\xi}_{j_i-1}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i}, \vec{\xi}_{j_i+1}) = ((d_i, a_i), (a_i, c_i), (c_i, b_i))$ or $((d_i, c_i), (c_i, a_i), (a_i, b_i))$;

(iii) Last, for all the $\alpha'_i = (b_i, d_i)$ such that γ crosses with α'_i , then add $(b_i, d_i), (d_i, b_i)$ or $(d_i, b_i), (b_i, d_i)$ to make the sequences to complete $(T^{o'}, \gamma)$ -paths.

As α_i, α_j are not two sides of any triangle in T^o for any $i \neq j$, the above construction is well-defined and we have

$$(20) \quad \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_{\alpha_k}^{\mu_{\alpha_k-1} \circ \dots \circ \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o} \left(\dots \phi_{\alpha_2}^{\mu_{\alpha_1} T^o}(\phi_{\alpha_1}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})) \right),$$

moreover, $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ does not depend on the order of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$.

We can also construct a subset $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T^{o'}}(\vec{\xi}')$ for any complete $(T^{o'}, \gamma)$ -path $\vec{\xi}'$.

We have the following proposition which generalizes Proposition 7.3.

Proposition 7.5. *Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be a set of arcs in T^o such that α_i and α_j are not two sides of any triangle in T^o for any $i \neq j$. For any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi}$, we have*

- (1) $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \subset \mathcal{CP}(T^{o'}, \gamma)$,
- (2) $|\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})| = 2^{\sum_{i=1}^k [m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i)]_+}$, moreover, for any α_i with $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = 1$ and $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, there exists $\vec{\xi}'' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ such that $\vec{\xi}'$ and $\vec{\xi}''$ are related by a twist on α'_i ;
- (3) if $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = -1$ for some α_i then we have $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$, where $\vec{\zeta}$ is the complete $(\prod_{i=1}^k \mu_{\alpha_i}(T^o), \gamma)$ -path which is related to $\vec{\xi}$ by a twist at α_i ;
- (4) for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = -m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha'_i)$.
- (5) If $\zeta \in T^o$ and $\zeta \neq (a_i, b_i), (b_i, c_i), (c_i, d_i), (a_i, d_i), (a_i, c_i)$ for all i , then for any $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, we have $m(\vec{\xi}, \zeta) = m(\vec{\xi}', \zeta)$.

The following theorem generalizes Theorem 7.4.

Theorem 7.6. *With the foregoing notation. $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T^{o'}}$ are partition bijections between $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T^{o'}, \gamma)$ inverse to each other.*

Proof. It is clear that $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $\vec{\xi} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$.

Suppose that $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) \neq \emptyset$ for some $\vec{\xi}$ and $\vec{\zeta}$. Assume that $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$. Then $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = m(\vec{\zeta}, \alpha_i) = -m(\vec{\xi}', \alpha'_i)$ for any i by Proposition 7.5 (4). By Proposition 7.5 (2), we see that $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$ contains all $\vec{\xi}''$ which are related to $\vec{\xi}'$ by a sequence of twists on some α'_i with $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = 1$. Therefore, we have $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$.

For any $\vec{\xi} \in \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ and $\vec{\xi}' \in \mathcal{CP}(T^{o'}, \gamma)$, we show that $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$ if and only if $\vec{\xi} \in \phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T^{o'}}(\vec{\xi}')$ by induction on k . If $k = 1$, it follows by Theorem 7.4. Suppose

that it is true for the cases less than k . If $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$, then $\vec{\xi}' \in \phi_{\alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\eta})$ for some $\vec{\eta} \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi})$. By induction hypothesis, we have $\vec{\xi} \in \phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{k-1}}^{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_{\alpha_i} T^o}(\vec{\eta})$ and $\vec{\eta} \in \phi_{\alpha'_k}^{\prod_{i=1}^k \mu_{\alpha_i} T^o}(\vec{\xi}')$. Thus, $\vec{\xi} \in \phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_{\alpha_i} T^o}(\phi_{\alpha'_k}^{\prod_{i=1}^k \mu_{\alpha_i} T^o}(\vec{\xi}')) = \phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T'^o}(\vec{\xi}')$. The statement is proved.

By Remark 2.5, $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ is a partition bijection. Similarly, $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T'^o}$ is a partition bijection. By Proposition 2.6, $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T'^o}$ are inverse to each other. \square

Remark 7.7. $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) \cap \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta}) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\xi}) = \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\vec{\zeta})$ if and only if $\vec{\xi}$ and $\vec{\zeta}$ are related by a sequence of twists on some α_i such that $m(\vec{\xi}, \alpha_i) = -1$.

7.1.3. *Partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$.* Recall that there are natural bijective maps from $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ to $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ and from $\mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$ to $\mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma})$, see Subsection 2.7. Therefore, the partition bijection $\phi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$ from $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ to $\mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$ induces a partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$ from $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ to $\mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma})$, that is, we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{\alpha}^{T^o}} & \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \\ \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma}) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}} & \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma}). \end{array}$$

We also have the inverse partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ of $\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$.

Under the bijection between $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$ and $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$, for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$, denote by $\vec{\xi}(P)$ the perfect matching of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ corresponding to P . For any $\zeta \in T^o$, let

$$\hat{m}(P, \zeta) = m(\vec{\xi}(P), \zeta),$$

where $m(\vec{\xi}(P), \zeta)$ is given by (2).

In view of (2) and (9) (10), by the bijection between $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$, we have

$$\hat{m}(P, \zeta) = m(P; \zeta) - n(G_{T^o, \gamma}; \zeta).$$

Similarly we can define $\hat{m}(P', \zeta)$ for any $P' \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma})$ and $\zeta \in T'^o$.

Assume that $\alpha = (a, c)$ and α is the diagonal of the quadrilateral (a, b, c, d) in T^o . Suppose that a, b, c, d are in the clockwise order.

Proposition 7.8. *With the foregoing notation. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$.*

- (1) We have $|\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}(P)| = 2^{[\hat{m}(P, \alpha)]_+}$, moreover,
 - (a) if $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = 1$, then there is a tile G' of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α' such that any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$ can twist on G' and $\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}$ is closed under the twist on G' ;
 - (b) if $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = -1$, then there is a tile G of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α such that P can twist on G and $\varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}(P) = \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}(\mu_G P)$;
- (2) For any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}(P)$, we have $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = -\hat{m}(P', \alpha')$.
- (3) For any $\zeta \in T^o$ such that $\zeta \neq (a, b), (b, c), (c, d), (a, d), (a, c)$ and $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^o}(P)$, we have

$$\hat{m}(P, \zeta) = \hat{m}(P', \zeta).$$

Proof. It follows immediately by Proposition 7.3. \square

Proposition 7.9. *Assume P can twist on a tile G_l with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} and $P > \mu_{G_l}P$.*

(1) *if $\tau_{i_l} \neq \alpha$, (a, b) , (b, c) , (c, d) , (a, d) then there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} such that: any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$, $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P')$, and*

$$\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l}P) = \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)).$$

(2) *if $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha$, then $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = -1$ and $\{P, \mu_{G_l}P\} = \varphi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}(P')$, where $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P) = \{P'\}$.*

(3) *if $\tau_{i_l} \in \{(a, b), (c, d)\}$, then $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = \hat{m}(\mu_{G_l}P, \alpha) - 1$. For $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$, there are tiles $G'_{[l]}$ and $G'_{[l']}$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} and (b, d) , respectively, such that*

(a) $|[l] - [l']| = 1$,

(b) P' can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P'$ can twist on $G'_{[l']}$,

(c) $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}P' > \mu_{G'_{[l']}}\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P'$,

(d) $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l}P)$.

(4) *if $\tau_{i_l} \in \{(b, c), (a, d)\}$, then $\hat{m}(P, \alpha) = \hat{m}(\mu_{G_l}P, \alpha) + 1$. For $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l}P)$, there are tiles $G'_{[l]}$ and $G'_{[l']}$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} and (b, d) , respectively, such that*

(a) $|[l] - [l']| = 1$,

(b) P' can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P'$ can twist on $G'_{[l']}$,

(c) $P' < \mu_{G'_{[l]}}P' < \mu_{G'_{[l']}}\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P'$,

(d) $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$.

Proof. It follows by the construction of $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$. \square

Example 7.10. Let Σ be the hexagon. If T^o and T'^o are triangulations as shown in Figure 9,




FIGURE 9

then the snake graphs $G_{T^o, \gamma}$, $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ and the partition bijections $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}$, $\varphi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are shown in Figure 10.




FIGURE 10

If T^o and T'^o are triangulations as shown in Figure 11, then the snake graphs $G_{T^o, \gamma}$, $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ and the partition bijections $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}$, $\varphi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$ are shown in Figure 11.




FIGURE 11

According to Lemma 2.35, we have the following observation.

- Lemma 7.11.** (1) If $\hat{m}(P_-, \alpha) = 1$, then one of the following cases happens: (1) γ crosses $(a, b), \alpha, (c, d)$ consecutively; (2) γ starts from a then crosses (c, d) ; (3) γ starts from c then crosses (a, b) .
- (2) If $\hat{m}(P_-, \alpha) = -1$, then one of the following cases happens: (1) γ crosses $(a, d), \alpha, (b, c)$ consecutively; (2) γ starts from d then crosses $\alpha, (b, c)$ sequentially; (3) γ starts from b then crosses $\alpha, (a, d)$ sequentially.

7.1.4. *Partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$.* Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be a set of arcs in T^o such that α_i, α_j are not two sides of any triangle in T^o for any $i \neq j$. Denote by α'_i the arc obtained from T^o by flip at α_i . Assume that $\alpha_i = (a_i, c_i)$ and α_i is the diagonal of the quadrilateral (a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i) in T^o , where a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i are in the clockwise order. Denote $T'^o = \mu_{\alpha_k} \circ \dots \circ \mu_{\alpha_1}(T^o)$.

The partition bijection $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o} : \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma)$ induces a partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma})$, i.e., we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}} & \mathcal{CP}(T'^o, \gamma) \\
 \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma}) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}} & \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma}).
 \end{array}$$

We have the inverse partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T'^o} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ of $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$.

The following proposition generalizes Proposition 7.8, follows by Proposition 7.5.

Proposition 7.12. *With the foregoing notation. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$.*

- (1) We have $|\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)| = 2^{\sum_{i=1}^k [\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i)]_+}$, moreover,

- (a) if $\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i) = 1$ for some i , then there is a tile G' of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α'_i such that any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ can twist on G' and $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}$ is closed under the twist on G' ;
- (b) if $\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i) = -1$ for some i , then there is a tile G of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α_i such that P can twist on G and $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P) = \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\mu_G P)$;
- (2) For any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have $\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i) = -\hat{m}(P', \alpha'_i)$.
- (3) For any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$ and $\zeta \in T^o$ with $\zeta \neq (a_i, b_i), (b_i, c_i), (c_i, d_i), (a_i, d_i), (a_i, c_i)$ for all i , we have $\hat{m}(P, \zeta) = \hat{m}(P', \zeta)$.
- (4) For any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$ and $\zeta \in \{(a_i, b_i), (b_i, c_i), (c_i, d_i), (a_i, d_i)\}$, the number of non- α_i -mutable edges labeled ζ in P equals the number of non- α'_i -mutable edges labeled ζ in P' .


The following proposition follows by Proposition 7.9.

Proposition 7.13. *Assume P can twist on a tile G_l with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} and $P > \mu_{G_l} P$.*

- (1) If $\tau_{i_l} \neq (a_i, b_i), (b_i, c_i), (c_i, d_i), (a_i, d_i), \alpha_i$ for any i , then there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} such that: for any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$, P' can twist on $G'_{[l]}$, $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P')$, and $\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l} P) = \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(\varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P))$.
- (2) If $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_i$ for some i , then $\mu_{G_l} P \in \varphi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{T^o}(P')$ for any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$.
- (3) If $\tau_{i_l} \in \{(a_i, b_i), (c_i, d_i)\}$ for some i , then $\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i) = \hat{m}(\mu_{G_l} P, \alpha_i) - 1$. Moreover, there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} such that: any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}} P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l} P)$.
- (4) If $\tau_{i_l} \in \{(b_i, c_i), (a_i, d_i)\}$ for some i , then $\hat{m}(P, \alpha_i) = \hat{m}(\mu_{G_l} P, \alpha_i) + 1$. Moreover, there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled (a_i, b_i) such that: any $P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l} P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $P' < \mu_{G'_{[l]}} P' \in \varphi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l} P)$.

7.2. General case. In this subsection, we assume that Σ is an arbitrary orbifold without orbifold points of weight 2. Let T^o be an ideal triangulation and $\alpha \in T^o$ be a non-self-folded arc. Denote $T'^o = \mu_\alpha(T^o)$ and by α' the new edge obtained. Let γ be an arc in Σ . Let P_n be the canonical polygon of γ in T^o with morphism $f : P_n \rightarrow \Sigma$ and triangle \hat{T}^o . Assume that $f(\hat{\gamma}) = \gamma$ for some diagonal $\hat{\gamma}$ in P_n .

Assume that α is a diagonal of the quadrilateral $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)$ in T^o and α_1, α_3 are in the clockwise direction of α .



Denote by η_α the cardinality of $f^{-1}(\alpha)$. We may label $f^{-1}(\alpha)$ as $\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}$ in order according to the orientation of $\hat{\gamma}$. We may further assume that $\hat{\alpha}_i$ is not a boundary edge in P_n for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$, otherwise we may extend P_n to a larger polygon. As α is not a folded arc, $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{\alpha}_j$ are not in a same triangle in \hat{T}^o for $i \neq j$. Denote $\hat{T}'^o = \mu_{\hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}} \cdots \mu_{\hat{\alpha}_1} \hat{T}^o$.

7.2.1. *Partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T^o}$.* Using Theorem 7.6, as $\hat{\alpha}_i$ and $\hat{\alpha}_j$ are not in a same triangle in \hat{T}^o for $i \neq j$, we have a partition bijection

$$(21) \quad \phi_{\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}}^{\hat{T}^o} : \mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^o, \hat{\gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^{'o}, \hat{\gamma}).$$

Since f induces bijections between $\mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^o, \hat{\gamma})$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma)$, and between $\mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^{'o}, \hat{\gamma})$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma)$, we have $\phi_{\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}}^{\hat{T}^o}$ induces a partition bijection

$$(22) \quad \phi_\alpha^{T^o} : \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma).$$

That is, we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^o, \hat{\gamma}) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}}^{\hat{T}^o}} & \mathcal{CP}(\hat{T}^{'o}, \hat{\gamma}) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \\ \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) & \xrightarrow{\phi_\alpha^{T^o}} & \mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma). \end{array}$$

For any complete (T^o, γ) -path $\vec{\xi} = (\vec{\xi}_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}_{2c+1})$, denote by $\vec{\hat{\xi}} = (\vec{\hat{\xi}}_1, \dots, \vec{\hat{\xi}}_{2c+1})$ the corresponding complete $(\hat{T}^o, \hat{\gamma})$ -path under f . We may associate $\vec{\hat{\xi}}$ with an integer vector

$$(23) \quad \mathbf{m}(\vec{\hat{\xi}}, \alpha) = (m(\vec{\hat{\xi}}, \hat{\alpha}_1), \dots, m(\vec{\hat{\xi}}, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha})),$$

where each $m(\vec{\hat{\xi}}, \hat{\alpha}_i)$ is given by (2).

For any $i \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$, denote by $\hat{\alpha}'_i$ the new arc in P_n obtained from \hat{T}^o by flip at $\hat{\alpha}_i$. For any complete $(T^{'o}, \gamma)$ -path $\vec{\xi}' = (\vec{\xi}'_1, \dots, \vec{\xi}'_{2c'+1})$, denote by $\vec{\hat{\xi}}' = (\vec{\hat{\xi}}'_1, \dots, \vec{\hat{\xi}}'_{2c'+1})$ the corresponding complete $(\mu_{\hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}} \cdots \mu_{\hat{\alpha}_1} \hat{T}^o, \hat{\beta})$ -path under f . Similarly, we may associate $\vec{\hat{\xi}}'$ with an integer vector

$$\mathbf{m}(\vec{\hat{\xi}}', \alpha') = (m(\vec{\hat{\xi}}', \hat{\alpha}'_1), \dots, m(\vec{\hat{\xi}}', \hat{\alpha}'_{\eta_\alpha})).$$

Similarly, we define the partition bijection

$$(24) \quad \phi_{\alpha'}^{T^{'o}} : \mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma),$$

which is induced by the partition bijection $\phi_{\hat{\alpha}'_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}'_{\eta_\alpha}}^{\hat{T}^{'o}}$.

7.2.2. *Partition bijection $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}$.* Since $\mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) \cong \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ and $\mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma) \cong \mathcal{P}(G_{T^{'o}, \gamma})$, we have the partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T^o} : \mathcal{CP}(T^o, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}(T^{'o}, \gamma)$ in (22) induces partition bijections $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T^{'o}, \gamma})$. Similarly, we have the inverse partition bijection $\varphi_{\alpha'}^{T^{'o}} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T^{'o}, \gamma}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$.

In this subsection, we study the properties of $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}$ and $\varphi_{\alpha'}^{T^{'o}}$.

For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$, denote by $\vec{\xi}(P)$ the corresponding complete (T^o, γ) -path and \hat{P} the corresponding perfect matching of $G_{\hat{T}^o, \hat{\gamma}}$, let

$$\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\vec{\xi}(P), \alpha),$$

where $\mathbf{m}(\vec{\xi}(P), \alpha)$ is given by (23).

Assume that $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P))$. In view of (9) and (10), we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\eta(\alpha)} m_i(P) = m(P; \alpha) - n(G_{T^o, \gamma}; \alpha).$$

Similarly we can define $\mathbf{m}(P'; \alpha')$ for any $P' \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \alpha'})$.

Among $f^{-1}(\alpha) = \{\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{\eta_\alpha}\}$, assume that $\hat{\gamma}$ crosses $\hat{\alpha}_{i_1}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_{i_l}$ sequentially, among $\{\hat{\alpha}'_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}'_{\eta_\alpha}\}$, assume that $\hat{\gamma}$ crosses $\hat{\alpha}'_{j_1}, \dots, \hat{\alpha}'_{j_{l'}}$ sequentially.

The following two Propositions follows by Proposition 7.12 (1) (2).

Proposition 7.14. *Assume that $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P))$.*

- (1) *If $m_k(P) = -1$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$, then there exists a tile $G(k)$ of $G_{T^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α such that P can twist on the tile $G(k)$.*
- (2) *If $m_k(P) = 1$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$, then there exists a tile $G'(k)$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α' such that any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on $G'(k)$.*

Proposition 7.15. *For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ with $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P))$, we have*

$$|\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)| = 2^{\sum_{i=1}^{\eta_\alpha} [m_i(P)]_+},$$

more precisely, for any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$,

- (1) *we have $\mathbf{m}(P', \alpha') = -\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$,*
- (2) *for any k such that $m_k(P) = 1$, P' can twist on the tiles $G'(k)$ and $\mu_{G'(k)}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$, where $G'(k)$ are the tiles given in Proposition 7.14.*

Lemma 7.16. *For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \gamma})$ and $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$, for any $(\alpha \neq) \tau \in T^o$,*

- (1) *if $\tau \neq \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then we have $\hat{m}(P; \tau) = \hat{m}(P'; \tau)$;*
- (2) *if $\tau \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$, then the number of edges in P labeled τ which are not α -mutable equals the number of edges in P' labeled τ which are not α' -mutable.*

Proof. It follows by Proposition 7.12 (3) (4). □

The following Proposition follows by Propositions 7.12 and 7.13.

Proposition 7.17. *Assume that P can twist on a tile G_l with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} and $P > \mu_{G_l}P$. Assume that $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P))$,*

- (1) *if $\tau_{i_l} \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled τ_{i_l} such that any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$, $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P')$, and $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l}P) = \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P))$, moreover, the following equalities hold:*
 - (a) $m^\pm(P, G_l; \tau_{i_l}) = m^\pm(P', G'_{[l]}; \tau_{i_l})$; (b) $n(G_l^\pm; \tau_{i_l}) = n(G'_{[l]}^\pm; \tau_{i_l})$.*In fact $G'_{[l]}$ corresponds to the same crossing point of γ and τ_{i_l} as G_l .*
- (2) *if $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha$, then $m_k(P) = -1$ and $G_l = G(k)$ for some k , where $G(k)$ is the tile given in Proposition 7.14, moreover, $\mu_{G_l}P \in \varphi_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}(P')$ for any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$.*
- (3) *if $\tau_{i_l} \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ and τ_{i_l} is not the radius of any self-folded triangle in T^o or T'^o , without loss of generality, we may assume $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_1$, then there exists a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T'^o, \gamma}$ with diagonal labeled α_1 such that any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mu_{G_l}P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$. Moreover, if the α' -mutable edges in P' are labeled α_2, α_4 then*
 - (a) $m^\pm(P, G_l; \alpha_1) = m^\pm(P', G'_{[l]}; \alpha_1)$, (b) $n(G_l^\pm; \alpha_1) = n(G'_{[l]}^\pm; \alpha_1)$.

Proposition 7.18. *Assume that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and the diagonal of G_l is labeled α_1 . We further assume that $\text{rel}(G_l, T^o) = 1$ and $N(G_l), W(G_l)$ are labeled α . If P can twist on G_l and $P > Q := \mu_{G_l}P$, denote $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P))$, $\mathbf{m}(Q, \alpha) = (m_1(Q), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(Q))$, then $m_k(P) = m_k(Q) - 1, m_{k+1}(P) = m_{k+1}(Q) + 1$ for some k and $m_i(P) = m_i(Q)$ for any $i \neq k, k + 1$. Consequently, we have $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1), (0, 0)$ or $(0, 1)$.*

(1) *In case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$, we have $(m_k(\mu_{G_l}P), m_{k+1}(\mu_{G_l}P)) = (0, 0)$. Assume the tile left to $G'(k + 1)$ is G' . Then the diagonal of G' is labeled α_1 and any $Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)$ can twist on G' , see Figure 12. Moreover,*

(a) $\mu_{G'}Q', \mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$, (b) $Q' < \mu_{G'}Q' < \mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q'$,

(c),

(d) $\Omega(Q'; G') = \Omega(Q; G_l) + \Omega(P; G_{l+1})$.

In particular, $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P) = \{\mu_{G'}Q', \mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q' \mid Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)\}$.




FIGURE 12

(2) *In case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 0)$, we have $(m_k(Q), m_{k+1}(\mu_{G_l}P)) = (1, -1)$. Assume the tile right to $G'(k)$ is G' . Then the diagonal of G' is labeled α_1 and any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on G' , see Figure 13. Moreover,*

(a) $\mu_{G'}P', \mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)$, (b) $P' > \mu_{G'}P' > \mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P'$,

(c) $\Omega(Q; G_l) = \Omega(\mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P'; G'(k)) + \Omega(\mu_{G'}P'; G')$,

In particular, $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q) = \{\mu_{G'}P', \mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P' \mid P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)\}$.




FIGURE 13

(3) *In case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 1)$, we have $(m_k(Q), m_{k+1}(Q)) = (1, 0)$. There is a unique tile G' between $G'(k)$ and $G'(k + 1)$ and its diagonal is labeled α_1 . Assume that*

$P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ with $P' < \mu_{G'(k+1)}P'$. Then P' can twist on G' , see Figure 14. Moreover,

(a) $\mu_{G'}P', \mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)$, (b) $\mu_{G'(k+1)}P' > P' > \mu_{G'}P' > \mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P'$,
 (c) $\Omega(Q; G_l) = \Omega(\mu_{G'(k)}\mu_{G'}P'; G'(k)) + \Omega(\mu_{G'}P'; G')$.




FIGURE 14

(4) In all cases, for any $Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)$ we have

$$m(Q; \alpha_1) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha_1) = m(Q'; \alpha_1) - n(G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha_1) + m(Q'; \alpha') - n(G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha').$$

Proof. Since $P > Q$, we have $N(G_l) \in P, W(G_l) \in Q$. Thus $m_k(P) = m_k(Q) - 1, m_{k+1}(P) = m_{k+1}(Q) + 1$ for some k and $m_i(P) = m_i(Q)$ for any $i \neq k, k + 1$. It follows that $m_k(P) \in \{-1, 0\}$ and $m_{k+1}(P) \in \{0, 1\}$. Since $\tilde{\beta}$ can not cross α, α_1, α consecutively, we have $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) \neq (-1, 0)$. Therefore, $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1), (0, 0)$ or $(0, 1)$.

We only consider the case that $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$, as the other cases can be proved similarly. We have the diagonal of G_{l-1} is labeled α and $S(G_{l-1}) \in P \cap Q$. We may assume $rel(G'(k+1), T'^o) = 1$. As $E(G_l)$ is labeled α_4 , from the construction of snake groups, we have $E(G'(k+1))$ is labeled α_4 and the diagonal of G' is labeled α_1 . For any $Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(Q)$, since $m_k(Q) = m_k(P) + 1 = 0$, we have $m_k(Q') = 0$ by Proposition 7.15. Thus we have $N(G') \in Q'$. As $S(G_{l-1})$ is labeled α_1 and $S(G_{l-1}) \in Q$, we have $S(G') \in Q'$. Thus Q' can twist on G' . For any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$, since $m_k(P) = -1$, we have $m_k(P') = 1$ by Proposition 7.15. Thus we have $W(G') \in P'$. Therefore, $\mu_{G'}Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$. By Proposition 7.14 (2), $\mu_{G'}Q'$ can twist on $G'(k+1)$ and $\mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$. $Q' < \mu_{G'}Q' < \mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q'$ is immediate. By Proposition 7.12 (3) (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 m^\pm(Q, G_l; \alpha_1) &= m^\pm(Q', G'; \alpha_1) + m^\pm(\mu_{G'}Q', G'(k+1); \alpha') - n((G'(k+1))^\pm; \alpha'), \\
 m^+(Q', G'; \alpha_1) &= m^+(Q, G_l; \alpha_1) + m^+(P, G_{l-1}; \alpha) - n(G_{l-1}^+; \alpha) - 1, \\
 m^-(Q', G'; \alpha_1) &= m^-(Q, G_l; \alpha_1) + m^-(P, G_{l-1}; \alpha) - n(G_{l-1}^-; \alpha) - 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

We have $n(G_l^\pm; \alpha_1) = n(G'^\pm; \alpha_1)$. Therefore, we have

$$\Omega(Q; G_l) = \Omega(Q'; G') + \Omega(\mu_{G'}Q'; G'(k+1)), \quad \Omega(Q'; G') = \Omega(Q; G_l) + \Omega(P; G_{l+1})$$

and

$$m(Q; \alpha_1) - n(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha_1) = m(Q'; \alpha_1) - n(G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha_1) + m(Q'; \alpha') - n(G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}; \alpha').$$

□

Lemma 7.19. *We have $P'_- \in \varphi_\alpha^{T_\circ}(P_-)$.*

Proof. Assume P' is the minimum element in $\varphi_\alpha^{T_\circ}(P_-)$. For any tile G' that P' can twist on, as P_- is the minimum perfect matching, we have $P' < \mu_{G'}P'$ by Proposition 7.17 and Proposition 7.18. It follows that $P' = P'_-$. \square

The following result follows by Lemma 7.11.

Lemma 7.20. *For P_- , we have $m_i(P_-)m_j(P_-) \geq 0$ for any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$.*

Proof. Otherwise, $m_i(P_-)m_j(P_-) < 0$ for some $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$. We see that γ intersects itself by Lemma 7.11, a contradiction. \square

8. PARTITION BIJECTION BETWEEN TRIANGLES

With the notation in Section 4.2. Let q be a puncture. Let $\Delta(T^\circ, q)$ (resp. $\Delta(T'^\circ, q)$) be the set of triangles incident to q in T° (resp. $T'^\circ = \mu_\alpha(T^\circ)$). In this section, we give a partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ} : \Delta(T^\circ, q) \rightarrow \Delta(T'^\circ, q)$.

8.1. Once-puncture polygon case. We first consider the case that Σ is the once-punctured polygon $P_{n,1}$, the disk with n marked points labeled $1, \dots, n$ clockwise and one puncture labeled 0. Let T° be a triangulation of $P_{n,1}$. Assume that $\Delta(T^\circ, 0) = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_t\}$ and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ the three edges of Δ_i are labeled $\tau_{i-}, \tau_i, \tau_{[i]}$, where we denote

$$i^+ = \begin{cases} i+1, & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq t-1, \\ 1, & \text{if } i = t, \end{cases}, \quad i^- = \begin{cases} i-1, & \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq t, \\ t, & \text{if } i = 1. \end{cases}$$

Fix an arc $\alpha \in T^\circ$, we have one of the following cases happens: (1) $\alpha = \tau_i$ for some i ; (2) $\alpha = \tau_{[i]}$ for some i ; (3) the rest cases.

For any $\Delta_j \in \Delta(T^\circ, 0)$, we associate with a subset $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_j) \subset \Delta(T'^\circ, 0)$ as follows.

Case I: $\alpha = \tau_i$ for some i . Then $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0) = \{(\tau_{i-}, \tau_{i+}, \alpha'), \Delta_j \mid j \neq i, i^+\}$. In this case, let

$$\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_j) = \begin{cases} (\tau_{i-}, \tau_{i+}, \alpha'), & \text{if } j = i \text{ or } i^+, \\ \Delta_j, & \text{if } j \neq i, i^+, \end{cases}$$

Case II: $\alpha = \tau_{[i]}$ for some i . Then τ_{i-1}, α' are the two sides of some triangle $\hat{\Delta}_1$ in T'° and τ_i, α' are the two sides of some triangle $\hat{\Delta}_2$ in T'° . We have $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0) = \{\hat{\Delta}_1, \hat{\Delta}_2, \Delta_j \mid j \neq i\}$.

In this case, let

$$\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_j) = \begin{cases} \{\hat{\Delta}_1, \hat{\Delta}_2\}, & \text{if } j = i, \\ \Delta_j, & \text{if } j \neq i, \end{cases}$$

Case III: the rest cases. In this case we have $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0) = \Delta(T^\circ, 0)$. In this case let $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_j) = \Delta_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$.

Similarly we can associate a subset $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta')$ of $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0)$ for any $\Delta' \in \Delta(T'^\circ, 0)$.

Assume that $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0) = \{\Delta'_1, \dots, \Delta'_{s'}\}$ and for any $i \in \{1, \dots, s'\}$ the three edges of Δ'_i are labeled $\tau'_{i-}, \tau'_i, \tau'_{[i]}$.

Proposition 8.1. *With the foregoing notation. $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}$ is a partition bijection from $\Delta(T^\circ, 0)$ to $\Delta(T'^\circ, 0)$ with inverse $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}$. For any $\Delta_i \in \Delta(T^\circ, 0)$ we have*

$$|\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_i)| = 2^{[m(\Delta_i; \alpha)]_+},$$

where $m(\Delta_i; \alpha)$ is given by (11), moreover, if $m(\Delta_i; \alpha) = 1$, then $\alpha = \tau_{[i]}$ and $\phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_i) = \{\Delta'_j, \Delta'_{j+1}\}$ for some j such that $\tau'_j = \alpha'$.

Proof. The result follows easily by checking all the above three cases. \square

The following result is clear.

Lemma 8.2. *For any $\Delta_i \in \Delta(T^\circ, 0)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T'^\circ, q}(\Delta_i)$, we have $m(\Delta_i; \alpha) = -m(\Delta'; \alpha')$.*

Next, we generalize the above construction for a sequence of non-self-folded arcs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in T^\circ$. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in T^\circ$ be a sequence of arcs such that α_i, α_j are not two sides of any triangulation in T° for any $i \neq j$. Denote by $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k$ the new arcs obtained from T° by flip

at $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$, respectively. For any triangle $\Delta_i \in \Delta(T^o, 0)$, recall that the three sides of Δ_i are τ_{i-1}, τ_i and $\tau_{[i]}$, one and exactly one of the following cases happens:

- (i) Case I: $\tau_{i-1} = \alpha_a$ for some $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- (ii) Case II: $\tau_i = \alpha_a$ for some $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- (iii) Case III: $\tau_{[i]} = \alpha_a$ for some $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$;
- (iv) Case IV: $\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i, \tau_{[i]} \neq \alpha_a$ for any $a \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

We associate a subset $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) \subset \Delta(\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o, 0)$ as follows:

- (i) In case I, we have $\tau_{i-2}, \tau_i, \alpha'_a$ form a triangle in $\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o$, let

$$\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = (\tau_{i-2}, \tau_i, \alpha'_a);$$

- (ii) In case II, we have $\tau_{i-1}, \tau_{i+1}, \alpha'_a$ form a triangle in $\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o$, let

$$\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = (\tau_{i-1}, \tau_{i+1}, \alpha'_a);$$

- (iii) In case III, we have τ_{i-1}, α' are the two sides of some triangle $\hat{\Delta}_1$ in $\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o$ and τ_i, α' are the two sides of some triangle $\hat{\Delta}_2$ in $\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o$, let

$$\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = \{\hat{\Delta}_1, \hat{\Delta}_2\};$$

- (iv) In case IV, let

$$\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = \Delta_i.$$

Similarly, we can associate a subset $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o, q}(\Delta'_i) \subset \Delta(T^o, 0)$ for any $\Delta'_i \in \Delta(\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o, 0)$.

Proposition 8.3. *With the foregoing notation. We have $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}$ and $\phi_{\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_k}^{\mu_{\alpha_k} \cdots \mu_{\alpha_1} T^o, q}$ are partition bijections inverse to each other, moreover, for any $\Delta_i \in \Delta(0)$ we have*

$$|\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i)| = 2^{\sum_{j=1}^k [m(\Delta_i; \alpha_j)]_+},$$

where $m(\Delta_i; \alpha_j)$ is given by (11), moreover, if $m(\Delta_i; \alpha_j) = 1$ for some j , then $\alpha_j = \tau_{[i]}$ and $\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = \{\Delta'_{j'}, \Delta'_{j'+1}\}$ for some j' such that $\tau'_{j'} = \alpha'_j$.

Proof. The result follows easily by checking all the above three cases. \square

Note that $\sum_{j=1}^k [m(\Delta_i(q); \alpha_j)]_+ = 1, 0$ or -1 .

The following result follows immediately by Lemma 8.2.

Lemma 8.4. *For any $\Delta_i \in \Delta(T^o, 0)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i)$, we have $m(\Delta_i; \alpha_j) = -m(\Delta'; \alpha'_j)$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.*

8.2. General case. The following is a generalization of ‘‘canonical polygon’’ in [2] to ‘‘canonical once - polygon’’.

Theorem 8.5. *Let T^o be an ideal triangulation of Σ . For any puncture q of Δ , assume that $\Delta(T^o, q) = \{\Delta_1(q), \dots, \Delta_s(q)\}$ with the three sides of $\Delta_i(q)$ are τ_{i-1}, τ_i and $\tau_{[i]}$. Then there is a morphism π from $P_{s,1}$ to Σ such that $\pi(0i) = \tau_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, s$ and $\pi(i, i^+) = \tau_{[i+]}$.*

We call $P_{s,1}$ together with the morphism π the *canonical-once punctured polygon* for q concerning T^o . It is clear that $\Delta_i(q)$ corresponds to a unique triangle Δ_i incident to 0 in $P_{s,1}$ for any i .

Example 8.6. In the twice punctured digon with triangulation T^o , as shown in the right below figure. We have $\alpha_2 = \alpha_4$, $\alpha_{[2]} = \alpha_5$, $\alpha_{[3]} = \alpha_3 = \alpha_{[4]}$ and $\alpha_{[5]} = \alpha_1$. Then the canonical once-punctured polygon for 0 is shown in the left below figure.




FIGURE 15. Canonical once-punctured polygon for puncture 0

For any non-self-folded arc $\alpha \in T^o$, let $T'^o = \mu_\alpha(T^o)$, we now construct partition bijection $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}$ from $\Delta(T^o, q)$ to $\Delta(T'^o, 0)$.

In case $\alpha \notin \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{[i]} \mid i = 1, \dots, s\}$, we have $\Delta(T'^o, 0) = \Delta(T^o, 0)$. Then let $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i) = \Delta_i$ for any $i = 1, \dots, s$.

In case $\alpha \in \{\alpha_i, \alpha_{[i]} \mid i = 1, \dots, s\}$, we can extend the canonical once punctured polygon $(P_{s,1}, \pi)$ to a bigger once punctured polygon $P_{n,1}$ for some $n > s$ with an ideal triangulation \hat{T}^o and a morphism $\pi' : P_{n,1} \rightarrow \Sigma$ such that (1) $\pi'|_{P_{s,1}} = \pi$, (2) the preimages of α are inner arcs, and (3) $\pi'(\Delta)$ is a triangle in T^o for any triangle Δ in \hat{T}^o .

Assume that $\pi^{-1}(\alpha) = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k\} \subset \hat{T}^o$. It is easy to see that α_i, α_j are not two sides of any triangulation in \hat{T}^o for all $i \neq j$ from the construction of the canonical once punctured polygon.

For any $\Delta_i(q) \in \Delta(T^o, q)$, let $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i(q)) = \pi'(\phi_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k}^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i))$, where Δ_i is the triangle incident to 0 in the canonical once punctured polygon. Similarly, we can define $\phi_\alpha^{T'^o, q}$.

Proposition 8.7. *With the foregoing notation. $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}$ is a partition bijection from $\Delta(T^o, q)$ to $\Delta(T'^o, q)$ with inverse $\phi_\alpha^{T'^o, q}$, moreover, for any $\Delta_i(q) \in \Delta(T^o, q)$ we have*

$$|\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_i(q))| = 2^{[m(\Delta_i(q); \alpha)]_+},$$

where $m(\Delta_i(q); \alpha)$ is given by (11).

Proof. It follows immediately by Proposition 8.3. □

The following lemma is clear.

Lemma 8.8. *We have $\Delta'_1(q) \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_1(q))$, where $\Delta'_1(q)$ is the first triangle incident to q in T'^o .*

By Lemma 8.4, we have

Lemma 8.9. *For any $\Delta \in \Delta(T^o, q)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta)$, we have $m(\Delta; \alpha) = -m(\Delta'; \alpha')$.*

Lemma 8.10. *For any $\Delta \in \Delta(T^o, q)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta)$, for any $\tau \in T^o$,*

- (1) *if $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then $m(\Delta; \tau) = m(\Delta'; \tau)$;*
- (2) *if $\tau \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ and $m(\Delta; \alpha) = 0$, then $m(\Delta; \tau) = m(\Delta'; \tau)$.*

NOTATION

We fix some notation throughout the rest of this paper. Fix an arc $\tilde{\beta}$, an ideal triangulation T^o and a non-self-folded $\alpha \in T^o$, let $T'^o = \mu_\alpha T^o$ and α' be the new arc obtained. Suppose that α is a diagonal of the quadrilateral $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)$ in T^o and α_1, α_3 are in the clockwise direction of α . As α is not folded in T^o , $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_3\} \neq \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$.

Denote by $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ (resp. $G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$) the associated snake graph with tiles G_1, \dots, G_c (resp. G'_1, \dots, G'_c) in order and $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}(G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}})$) the set of all perfect matching. Denote by P_\pm (resp. P'_\pm) the maximal/minimal perfect matching. Denote by τ_{i_i} (resp. τ'_{i_i}) the label of the diagonal of G_l (resp. G'_l).

If $t(\tilde{\beta}) = q$ is a puncture, denote by $\Delta_1(q), \Delta_2(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(q), \Delta'_2(q), \dots, \Delta'_t(q)$) the triangles incident to q in T^o (resp. T'^o) in clockwise order such that $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses $\Delta_1(q)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(q)$) or $\tilde{\beta}$ is the common side of $\Delta_1(q)$ and $\Delta_t(q)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(q)$ and $\Delta'_t(q)$). Denote the common side of $\Delta_i(q)$ and $\Delta_{i+1}(q)$ (resp. $\Delta'_i(q)$ and $\Delta'_{i+1}(q)$) by $\tau_i(q)$ (resp. $\tau'_i(q)$). Denote the third side of $\Delta_i(q)$ (resp. $\Delta'_i(q)$) by $\tau_{[i]}(q)$ (resp. $\tau'_{[i]}(q)$).

If $s(\tilde{\beta}) = p$ is a puncture, denote by $\Delta_1(p), \Delta_2(p), \dots, \Delta_s(p)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(p), \Delta'_2(p), \dots, \Delta'_s(p)$) the triangles incident to p in T^o (resp. T'^o) in clockwise order such that $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses $\Delta_1(p)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(p)$) or $\tilde{\beta}$ is the common side of $\Delta_1(p)$ and $\Delta_s(p)$ (resp. $\Delta'_1(p)$ and $\Delta'_s(p)$). Denote the common side of $\Delta_i(p)$ and $\Delta_{i+1}(p)$ (resp. $\Delta'_i(p)$ and $\Delta'_{i+1}(p)$) by $\tau_i(p)$ (resp. $\tau'_i(p)$). Denote the third side of $\Delta_i(p)$ (resp. $\Delta'_i(p)$) by $\tau_{[i]}(p)$ (resp. $\tau'_{[i]}(p)$).

If $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^o$ and $t(\tilde{\beta}) = q$, denote

$$E_1(q) = \begin{cases} E(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^o) = 1, \\ N(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^o) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E_2(q) = \begin{cases} N(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^o) = 1, \\ E(G_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_c, T^o) = -1. \end{cases}$$

If $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^o$ and $s(\tilde{\beta}) = p$, denote

$$E_1(p) = \begin{cases} W(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = 1, \\ S(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E_2(p) = \begin{cases} S(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = 1, \\ W(G_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G_1, T^o) = -1. \end{cases}$$

If $\tilde{\beta} \notin T'^o$ and $t(\tilde{\beta}) = q$, denote

$$E'_1(q) = \begin{cases} E(G'_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_c, T'^o) = 1, \\ N(G'_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_c, T'^o) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E'_2(q) = \begin{cases} N(G'_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_c, T'^o) = 1, \\ E(G'_c), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_c, T'^o) = -1. \end{cases}$$

If $\tilde{\beta} \notin T'^o$ and $s(\tilde{\beta}) = p$, denote

$$E'_1(p) = \begin{cases} W(G'_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_1, T'^o) = 1, \\ S(G'_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_1, T'^o) = -1, \end{cases} \quad E'_2(p) = \begin{cases} S(G'_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_1, T'^o) = 1, \\ W(G'_1), & \text{if } \text{rel}(G'_1, T'^o) = -1. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}), \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ or $\mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. Let $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T'^o, \tilde{\beta}), \mathcal{L}(T'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$ or $\mathcal{L}(T'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ correspondingly. Denote the minimal elements in \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' by \mathbf{P}_- and \mathbf{P}'_- , respectively.

9. PARTITION BIJECTION BETWEEN LATTICES \mathcal{L} AND \mathcal{L}'

For any pair $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$, assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} , then we have that \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are either related by a twist on a tile G_l or related by two adjacent triangles incident to p or q , assume τ is the label of the diagonal or the common side of the triangles. In both cases, we say that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and *related by τ* . We denote by

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = w(\mathbf{P}) - w(\mathbf{Q}).$$

We say that $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$ are *related by a twist at τ* if either \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by τ or \mathbf{Q} covers \mathbf{P} and related by τ .

In this section, we construct a partition bijection from \mathcal{L} to \mathcal{L}' via the partition bijections $\varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ} : \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(G_{T'^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ and $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q} : \Delta(T^\circ, q) \rightarrow \Delta(T'^\circ, q)$, which are given in Section 7.

Partition bijection $\pi : \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T'^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$. Herein, we assume that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$ and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T'^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$.

Recall that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ we have $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (m_1(P), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(P)) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\eta_\alpha}$.

Definition 9.1. [22, 23] For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$, we choose pairs of indices in $\{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$ via the following algorithm:

- (i) If $m_i(P) \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \eta_\alpha$ or $m_i(P) \leq 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, \eta_\alpha$, then nothing is chosen;
- (ii) If $m_i(P)m_j(P) = -1$ for some i, j , choose the pair of indices (a, b) with $a < b$ such that (1) $m_a(P)m_b(P) = -1$, (2) $m_\ell(P) = 0$ for all $a < \ell < b$, (3) $m_a(P)m_\ell(P) \geq 0$ for all $\ell < a$.
- (iii) Delete $m_a(P)$ and $m_b(P)$ from $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$. Then return to step (i).

We call any above chosen pair (a, b) of indices an $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.

Example 9.2. If $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (1, 1, 0, -1, 0, 1, -1, 1)$. Then all of the $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs are $(2, 4)$ and $(6, 7)$. If $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = (1, 1, -1, 0, -1, 1)$. Then all the the $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs are $(2, 3)$ and $(1, 5)$.

The following is immediate.

Lemma 9.3. For $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$, we have

- (1) $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs and $-\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs coincide.
- (2) For any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair (a, b) with $a < b$ we have $\sum_{a < \ell < b} m_\ell(P) = 0$.
- (3) If $\sum m_i(P) \geq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) < 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.
- (4) If $\sum m_i(P) \leq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) > 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.

Let (a, b) be an $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair. Then either $m_a(P) = 1, m_b(P) = -1$ or $m_a(P) = -1, m_b(P) = 1$. By Proposition 7.14, in case $m_a(P) = 1, m_b(P) = -1$, we have P can twist on the tile $G(b)$ and any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$ can twist on $G'(a)$; in case $m_a(P) = -1, m_b(P) = 1$, we have P can twist on the tile $G(a)$ and any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$ can twist on $G'(b)$, where $G(a), G(b)$ (resp. $G'(a), G'(b)$) are the tiles with diagonal labeled α (resp. α') given in Proposition 7.14.

Construction of π . For any $P \in \mathcal{L}$, $\pi(P)$ contains all $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ satisfy the following condition: for any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair (a, b) ,

- if $m_a(P) = 1, m_b(P) = -1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(a))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ coincide;

- if $m_a(P) = -1, m_b(P) = 1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(b))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ coincide.

Similarly, we can construction a set $\pi'(P') \subset \mathcal{L}$ for any $P' \in \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$.

Proposition 9.4. *For any $P \in \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ we have*

$$|\pi(P)| = 2^{[\sum m_i(P)]_+},$$

to be precise, for any $P' \in \pi(P)$, we have

(1) $\mathbf{m}(P', \alpha') = -\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$,

(2) *if $m_k(P) = 1$ and k is not in any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair then P' can twist on the tiles $G'(k)$ and $\mu_{G'(k)}P' \in \pi(P)$.*

where $G'(k)$ are the tiles given in Proposition 7.14.

Proof. It follows by Proposition 7.15 and the construction of $\pi(P)$. □

Remark 9.5. Let $P \in \mathcal{L}$.

(1) Denote $r = [\sum m_i(P)]_+$. Denote by $\{k_1, \dots, k_r\} \subset \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha\}$ the set of indices that are not in any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair and $m_{k_j} = 1$. Assume $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_r$. By Proposition 9.4, we may write $\pi(P)$ as $\{P(\vec{c}) \mid \vec{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_r) \in \{0, 1\}^r\}$. To be precise, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ the edges labeled α_1, α_3 of $G'(k_j)$ are in $P(\vec{c})$ if $c_j = 1$ and the the edges labeled α_2, α_4 of $G'(k_j)$ are in $P(\vec{c})$ if $c_j = 0$.

(2) Under the order of $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ in Section 4, we have $P(\vec{c}) \leq P(\vec{c}')$ if and only if $c_j \leq c'_j$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$.

Partition bijection $\pi : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)})$. Herein, we assume that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)})$ and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)})$. Recall in (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) &= \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{[j]}(q)\} \\ &\quad - \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{j-1}(q), \tau_j(q)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 1$ then $\alpha = \tau_{[j]}(q)$ and thus either $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$ or $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_2$.

For $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, denote $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = (\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha), m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha))$. As α is not a self-folded arc in T^o , we have $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and thus $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\eta_\alpha+1}$.

Definition 9.6. Assume that $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = (m_1(\mathbf{P}), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}), m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}))$. We choose pairs of indices (a, b) via the following algorithm:

- (i) If $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P})m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$, then first choose $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha+1)$ and all of the $(m_1(\mathbf{P}), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha-1}(\mathbf{P}))$ -pairs as in Definition 9.1;
- (ii) If $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P})m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) \neq -1$, then we choose all of the $(m_1(\mathbf{P}), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}))$ -pairs as in Definition 9.1.

The chosen pairs are called $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pairs.

The following is immediate.

Lemma 9.7. *For $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$, we have*

- (1) $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs and $-\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs coincide.
- (2) For any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair (a, b) with $a < b$ we have $\sum_{a < \ell < b} m_\ell(P) = 0$.
- (3) If $\sum m_i(P) \geq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) < 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.
- (4) If $\sum m_i(P) \leq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) > 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.

Construction of π . For $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, $\pi(\mathbf{P})$ contains all $(P', \Delta') \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P) \times \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q))$ satisfy the following condition: for any $\mathbf{m}(P, \Delta_j(q); \alpha)$ -pair¹ (a, b) ,

- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(a))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ coincide;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(b))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ coincide;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $b = \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the edges labeled $\tau_{j-2}(q)$ and $\tau_{[j]}(q)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(a))$ are in P' in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$, or the edges labeled $\tau_{j+1}(q)$ and $\tau_{[j]}(q)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(a))$ are in P' in case $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $b = \eta_\alpha + 1$,
 - (i) in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .
 - (ii) in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_2$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .

Similarly, we can construction a set $\pi'(\mathbf{P}') \subset \mathcal{L}$ for any $\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}(q)})$.

By Propositions 7.15, 8.7, from the construction, the following proposition follows.

Proposition 9.8. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$ we have*

$$|\pi(\mathbf{P})| = 2^{[\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+},$$

to be precise, for any $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$, we have

- (1) $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}'; \alpha') = -\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$;
- (2) if $k \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ is not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_k(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, then P' can twist on $G'(k)$ and $(\mu_{G'(k)} P', \Delta') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$, where $G'(k)$ is the tile given in Proposition 7.14;
- (3) if $\eta(\alpha) + 1$ is not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_{\eta_\alpha + 1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, then $(P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$, where $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta', \Delta''\}$.

Lemma 9.9. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, if $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 1$, then $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2\}$ satisfies that $(P', \Delta'_1) < (P', \Delta'_2)$ for any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$.*

¹We use $\mathbf{m}(P, \Delta_j(q); \alpha)$ -pair as in Definition 9.15 to ensure Proposition 9.12 holds

Proof. Otherwise, by Lemma 4.5, we have $\Delta'_1(q) \in \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q))$ and there exist $P', Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$ such that $E'_1(q) \in P', E'_2(q) \in Q'$. Thus by Proposition 7.15, the diagonal of $G'_{\mathcal{C}'}$ is labeled α' . Thus $m(\Delta'_1(q), \alpha') = 1$. It contradicts to $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 1$ and Lemma 8.9. \square

Remark 9.10. Denote $r = [\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+$. Denote by $\{k_1, \dots, k_r\} \subset \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha + 1\}$ the set of indices that are not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_{k_\ell}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, r$. Suppose that $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_r$. By Proposition 9.8, we may write $\pi(\mathbf{P})$ as $\{\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) \mid \vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r\}$, to be precise, assume that $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) = (P', \Delta')$, for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

- (i) if $k_\ell \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the edges labeled α_1, α_3 of $G'(k_\ell)$ are in P in case $c_\ell = 1$ and the edges labeled α_2, α_4 of $G'(k_\ell)$ are in P in case $c_\ell = 0$;
- (ii) if $k_\ell = \eta_\alpha + 1$, then $\Delta' = \Delta'_1$ in case $c_\ell = 0$ and $\Delta' = \Delta'_2$ in case $c_\ell = 1$, where Δ'_1 and Δ'_2 are given by Lemma 9.9.

Lemma 9.11. *Suppose that $\tilde{\beta} \notin T^\circ$. For any $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$,*

- (1) *if $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q), \Delta'_2(q)\}$ and $E'_2(q) \in P'$ for some $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$, then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$;*
- (2) *If $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta'_{\ell'}(q), \Delta'_1(q)\}$ and $E'_1(q) \in P'$ for some $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P)$, then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$.*

Consequently, we have $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair.

Proof. We shall only prove the first statement, as the second one can be proved similarly. As $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta) = \{\Delta'_1(q), \Delta'_2(q)\}$, we see that $\tau'_1(q) = \alpha$ and the diagonal of $G'_{\mathcal{C}'}$ is labeled α_1 or α_3 . It follows that $m(\Delta'_1(q)) = -1$ and $E'_2(q)$ is labeled α' . Thus $m(\Delta_j(q)) = 1$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(P') = 1$. It follows that $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = -m_{\eta_\alpha}(P') = -1$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = m(\Delta_j(q)) = 1$. \square

Proposition 9.12. *Suppose that $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$. Given any k , for $\vec{c}, \vec{c}' \in \{0, 1\}^r$ such that $c_k = 1, c'_k = 0$ and $c_a = c'_a$ for $a \neq k$, then $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})$ covers $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}')$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}') = (P'_1, \Delta'_1)$ and $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) = (P'_2, \Delta'_2)$. By Remark 9.10, we have either $P'_1 = P'_2$ or $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$.

(Case I) $P'_1 = P'_2$. We have $(P'_2, \Delta'_2) = (P'_1, \Delta'_2) > (P'_1, \Delta'_1)$ by Remark 9.10 (2). By Lemma 4.5, (P'_1, Δ'_2) does not cover (P'_1, Δ'_1) if and only if either $E'_2(q) \in P'_1, \Delta'_2 = \Delta'_1(q), \Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2(q)$ or $E'_1(q) \in P'_1, \Delta'_2 = \Delta'_{\ell'}(q), \Delta'_1 = \Delta'_1(q)$. We have $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair by Lemma 9.11. From the construction of π , we see that (P'_1, Δ'_1) and (P'_1, Δ'_2) can not belong to $\pi(\mathbf{P})$, a contradiction.

(Case II) $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$. We have $P'_1 < P'_2 = \mu_{G'_i} P'_1$ for some tile G'_i with diagonal labeled α' by Remark 9.10 (1). If $(P'_2, \Delta'_2) = (\mu_{G'_i} P'_1, \Delta'_1)$ does not cover (P'_1, Δ'_1) , by Lemma 4.4, we have $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_1(q)$ and $G'_i = G'_{\mathcal{C}'}$ is the last tile of $G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$. It follows that $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(P'_1, \Delta'_1) = 1$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(P'_1, \Delta'_1) = -1$. Thus $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$. It follows that $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair. From the construction of π , we see that (P'_1, Δ'_1) and (P'_2, Δ'_1) can not belong to $\pi(\mathbf{P})$, a contradiction. \square

Partition bijection $\pi_\alpha^{T^o, p, q} : \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p, q)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p, q)})$. Herein we assume that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p, q)})$ and $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p, q)})$.

Recall in (12) that

$$m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) = \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{[i]}(p)\} \\ - \text{number of edges labeled } \alpha \text{ in } \{\tau_{i-1}(p), \tau_i(p)\}.$$


Lemma 9.13. *If $m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) = 1$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$, assume that $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta''\}$, then there is a unique $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o, p}(\Delta_i(p))$ such that*

$$x^T(\Delta_i(p))x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = x^{T'}(\Delta')x^{T'}(\Delta'').$$

Proof. Since $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$, we have the following cases: $\Delta_j(q) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha\}$, $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha_1$; $\Delta_j(q) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha\}$, $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha_4$; $\Delta_j(q) = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha\}$, $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha_2$; $\Delta_j(q) = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha\}$, $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha_3$. We shall only consider the case that $\Delta_j(q) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha\}$, $\tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha_1$, as the remaining cases can be proved similarly. Then $x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = x_{\alpha_1}x_{\alpha_4}^{-1}x_\alpha^{-1}$, $\Delta'' = \{\alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha'\}$ with $m(\Delta''; \alpha') = 1$ and thus $x^{T'}(\Delta'') = x_{\alpha'}x_{\alpha_3}^{-1}x_{\alpha_4}^{-1}$

Since $m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) = 1$, we have $\tau_{[i]}(p) = \alpha$ and $\Delta_i(p) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha\}$ or $\{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha\}$.

In case $\Delta_i(p) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4, \alpha\}$, then $x^T(\Delta_i(p)) = x_\alpha x_{\alpha_1}^{-1} x_{\alpha_4}^{-1}$. Thus $\Delta' = \{\alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha'\}$ with $m(\Delta'; \alpha_3) = 1$. Therefore $x^T(\Delta_i(p))x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = \frac{1}{x_{\alpha_4}^2} = x^{T'}(\Delta')x^{T'}(\Delta'')$. The uniqueness of Δ' follows as $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_4$ can not hold simultaneous.



In case $\Delta_i(p) = \{\alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha\}$, then $x^T(\Delta_i(p)) = x_\alpha x_{\alpha_2}^{-1} x_{\alpha_3}^{-1}$. Thus $\Delta' = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha'\}$ with $m(\Delta'; \alpha_1) = 1$. Therefore $x^T(\Delta_i(p))x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_{\alpha_2}x_{\alpha_3}x_{\alpha_4}} = x^{T'}(\Delta')x^{T'}(\Delta'')$. The uniqueness of Δ' follows as $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_4$ can not hold simultaneous. \square

Similarly, we have the following result.

Lemma 9.14. *If $m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) = -1$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 1$, assume that $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, p}(\Delta_i(p)) = \{\Delta'\}$, then there is a unique $\Delta'' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_j(q))$ such that*

$$x^T(\Delta_i(p))x^T(\Delta_j(q)) = x^{T'}(\Delta')x^{T'}(\Delta'').$$

For $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, denote $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = (m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha), \mathbf{m}(P, \alpha), m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha))$. As α is not a self-folded arc in T^o , we have $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and thus $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\eta_\alpha + 1}$. Denote $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = (m_0(\mathbf{P}), m_1(\mathbf{P}), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}), m_{\eta_\alpha + 1}(\mathbf{P}))$.

Definition 9.15. For $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$, we choose pairs of indices (a, b) via the following algorithm:

- (i) If $m_0(\mathbf{P})m_1(\mathbf{P}) = -1$, then choose $(0, 1)$ and let $\mathbf{m}' = (m_2(\mathbf{P}), \dots, m_{\eta_\alpha + 1}(\mathbf{P}))$, otherwise let $\mathbf{m}' = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$;
- (ii) In \mathbf{m}' , if $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P})m_{\eta_\alpha + 1}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$, then choose $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ and let \mathbf{m}'' be obtained by delete $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}), m_{\eta_\alpha + 1}(\mathbf{P})$ from \mathbf{m}' , otherwise let $\mathbf{m}'' = \mathbf{m}'$;
- (iii) Choose all of the \mathbf{m}'' -pairs as in Definition 9.1.

The chosen pairs are called $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pairs.

The following is immediate.

Lemma 9.16. *For $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$, we have*

- (1) $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs and $-\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pairs coincide.
- (2) For any $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair (a, b) with $a < b$ we have $\sum_{a < \ell < b} m_\ell(P) = 0$.
- (3) If $\sum m_i(P) \geq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) < 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.
- (4) If $\sum m_i(P) \leq 0$ then for any a with $m_a(P) > 0$ we have a is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair.

Note that if $m_0(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ then $\alpha = \tau_{[i]}(p)$ and thus either either $\tau_{j-1}(p) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(p) = \alpha_4$ or $\tau_{j-1}(p) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(p) = \alpha_2$. Similarly, if $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ then $\alpha = \tau_{[j]}(q)$ and thus either $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$ or $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_2$.

Construction of π . For $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, $\pi(\mathbf{P})$ contains all $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, p}(\Delta_i(p)) \times \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P) \times \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_j(q))$ satisfy the following condition: for any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair (a, b) ,

- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $a \neq 0, b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(a))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ coincide;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $a \neq 0, b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the labels of $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(b))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ coincide;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $a = 0, b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$,
 - (i) in case $\tau_{j-1}(p) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(p) = \alpha_4$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .
 - (ii) in case $\tau_{j-1}(p) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(p) = \alpha_2$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(b))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $a = 0, b \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$, then the edges labeled $\tau_{i-2}(p)$ and $\tau_{[i]}(p)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(b))$ are in P' in case $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$, or the edges labeled $\tau_{i+1}(p)$ and $\tau_{[i]}(p)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(a))$ are in P' in case $\tau_i(p) = \alpha$;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $a \neq 0, b = \eta_\alpha + 1$ then the edges labeled $\tau_{j-2}(q)$ and $\tau_{[j]}(q)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(a))$ are in P' in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$, or the edges labeled $\tau_{j+1}(q)$ and $\tau_{[j]}(q)$ of $\text{edge}(G'(a))$ are in P' in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$;
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $a \neq 0, b = \eta_\alpha + 1$,
 - (i) in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .
 - (ii) in case $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_2$, then $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_1 and α_3 , or $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$ when the edges in $P \cap \text{edge}(G(a))$ labeled α_2 and α_4 .
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = 1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $a = 0, b = \eta_\alpha + 1$, then Δ' is given by Lemma 9.13.
- if $m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1, m_b(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ with $a = 0, b = \eta_\alpha + 1$, then Δ'' is given by Lemma 9.14.

Similarly, we can construction a set $\pi'(\mathbf{P}') \subset \mathcal{L}$ for any $\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{P}(G_{T^{\circ}, \tilde{\beta}(p,q)})$.

By Propositions 7.15, 8.7, from the construction, the following proposition follows.

Proposition 9.17. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$ we have*

$$|\pi(\mathbf{P})| = 2^{[\sum m_a(\mathbf{P})]_+},$$

more precisely, for any $\mathbf{P}' = (\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$,

- (1) $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}') = -\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P})$;
- (2) if $k(\neq 0, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_k(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, then P' can twist on $G'(k)$ and $(\Delta', \mu_{G'(k)}P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$;
- (3) if 0 is not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_0(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, then there is a triangle $\tilde{\Delta}' \in \Delta_p(T^{\circ})$ such that $\tilde{\Delta}'$ and Δ' share the common side α' , and $(\tilde{\Delta}', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$.
- (4) if $\eta(\alpha) + 1$ is not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, then there is a triangle $\tilde{\Delta}'' \in \Delta_q(T^{\circ})$ such that $\tilde{\Delta}''$ and Δ'' share the common side α' , and $(\Delta', P', \tilde{\Delta}'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$.

where $G'(k)$ are the tiles given in Proposition 7.14.

The following lemmas are similar to Lemma 9.9, the proofs are also similar, we omit them.

Lemma 9.18. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, if $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 1$, then $\phi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}, q}(\Delta_j(q)) = \{\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2\}$ satisfies that $(\Delta', P', \Delta'_1) < (\Delta', P', \Delta'_2)$ for any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}}(P)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}, p}(\Delta_i(p))$.*

Lemma 9.19. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, if $m(\Delta_i(p); \alpha) = 1$, then $\phi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}, p}(\Delta_i(p)) = \{\Delta'_1, \Delta'_2\}$ satisfies that $(\Delta'_1, P', \Delta') < (\Delta'_2, P', \Delta')$ for any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}}(P)$ and $\Delta' \in \phi_\alpha^{T^{\circ}, q}(\Delta_j(q))$.*

Remark 9.20. Denote $r = [\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+$. Denote by $\{k_1, \dots, k_r\} \subset \{1, \dots, \eta_\alpha + 1\}$ the set of indices that are not in any $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair and $m_{k_\ell}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$ for $\ell = 1, \dots, r$. Suppose that $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_r$. By Proposition 9.17, we may write $\pi(\mathbf{P})$ as $\{\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) \mid \vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r\}$, to be precise, assume that $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) = (\Delta', P', \Delta'')$, for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

- (i) if $k_\ell \neq 0, \eta_\alpha + 1$, then the edges labeled α_1, α_3 of $G'(k_j)$ are in P' in case $c_j = 1$ and the the edges labeled α_2, α_4 of $G'(k_j)$ are in P' in case $c_j = 0$;
- (ii) if $k_\ell = 0$, then $\Delta' = \Delta'_1$ in case $c_\ell = 0$ and $\Delta' = \Delta'_2$ in case $c_\ell = 1$, where Δ'_1 and Δ'_2 are given by Lemma 9.19;
- (iii) if $k_\ell = \eta_\alpha + 1$, then $\Delta'' = \Delta''_1$ in case $c_\ell = 0$ and $\Delta'' = \Delta''_2$ in case $c_\ell = 1$, where Δ''_1 and Δ''_2 are given by Lemma 9.18.

Proposition 9.21. *Suppose that $r = \sum m_a(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$. Given any k , assume that \vec{c}, \vec{c}' in $\{0, 1\}^r$ satisfy $c_k = 1, c'_k = 0$ and $c_a = c'_a$ for $a \neq k$, then $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})$ covers $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}')$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}') = (\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta''_1)$ and $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) = (\Delta'_2, P'_2, \Delta''_2)$. By Remark 9.20, one of the following three cases happens: (1) $P'_1 = P'_2$ and $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_2$, (2) $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$ and $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_2$, (3) $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$ and $P'_1 = P'_2$.

In case $P'_1 = P'_2$ and $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_2$, we have $(\Delta'_2, P''_2, \Delta''_2) = (\Delta'_2, P''_1, \Delta''_2) > (\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta'_1)$ by Remark 9.20 (2). By Lemma 4.12, $(\Delta'_2, P''_2, \Delta''_2) = (\Delta'_2, P''_1, \Delta''_2)$ covers $(\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta'_1)$.

Similarly, $(\Delta'_2, P''_2, \Delta''_2)$ covers $(\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta'_1)$ in case $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$ and $P'_1 = P'_2$.

In case $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_2$ and $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_2$, by Remark 9.20 (1), $P'_1 < P'_2 = \mu_{G'_1} P'_1$ for some tile G'_l with diagonal labeled α' . Otherwise, if $(\Delta'_1, \mu_{G'_1} P'_1, \Delta''_1)$ does not cover $(\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta''_1)$, by Lemma 4.11, we have either $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_1(p)$ is the first triangle in $\Delta(T'^o, p)$ and G'_l is the first tile of $G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ or $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_1(q)$ is the first triangle in $\Delta(T'^o, q)$ and G'_l is the last tile of $G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$.

Suppose that $\Delta'_1 = \Delta'_1(p)$ is the first triangle in $\Delta(T'^o, p)$ and G'_l is the first tile of $G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$. It follows that the diagonal $G'_l = G'_1$ is labeled α' and $m_0(\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta''_1) = 1$. Thus $m_0(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ and $m_1(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, thus $(0, 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair. From the construction of π , we see that $(\Delta'_1, \mu_{G'_1} P'_1, \Delta''_1)$ and $(\Delta'_1, P'_1, \Delta''_1)$ can not belong to $\pi(\mathbf{P})$, a contradiction.

Suppose that $\Delta''_1 = \Delta''_1(q)$ is the first triangle in $\Delta(T'^o, q)$ and G'_l is the last tile of $G_{T'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$. Similarly, $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ and $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ can not be an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair. Thus, $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha$, $\eta_\alpha = 1$ and $m_0(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ with $(0, 1 = \eta_\alpha)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair. It follows that $r = \sum m_a(\mathbf{P}) = -1 + 1 - 1 = -1$, contradicts to $r = \sum m_a(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$.

The proof is complete. \square

In summary of Propositions 9.4, 9.8, 9.17, 9.12, 9.21 and Remarks 9.5, 9.10, 9.20, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 9.22. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

- (1) $|\pi(\mathbf{P})| = 2^{[\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+}$ and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}', \alpha') = -\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ for all $\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$;
- (2) *There is a bijective map $\{0, 1\}^{[\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+} \rightarrow \pi(\mathbf{P})$, $\vec{c} \mapsto \mathbf{P}(\vec{c})$ such that $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})$ covers $\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}')$ in \mathcal{L} if and only if \vec{c} covers \vec{c}' in the lattice $\{0, 1\}^{[\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})]_+}$.*

We need the following lemma for later use.

Lemma 9.23. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ with $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) > 0$, for any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, assume that \vec{c}, \vec{c}' in $\{0, 1\}^r$ satisfy $c_\ell = 1, c'_\ell = 0$ and $c_i = c'_i$ for $i \neq \ell$, we have*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}'), \mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) = d(\alpha')(2\ell - 1 - r).$$

Proof. We have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}'), \mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) = d(\alpha')(-r - \ell) - (-\ell - 1) = d(\alpha')(2\ell - 1 - r)$. \square

Proof. It follows by Lemma 7.16 and Lemma 8.10. \square

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 9.24. *π is a partition bijection with inverse π' .*

Proof. By Theorem 9.22, $\pi(\mathbf{P}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$.

If $\pi(\mathbf{P}) \cap \pi(\mathbf{Q}) \neq \emptyset$ for some \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} , from the construction of π , \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are related by a sequence of twists at α . By Theorem 9.22, we have $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}, \alpha)$. Thus $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \pi(\mathbf{Q})$ by the construction of π .

For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$, $\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$, we have $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pairs and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}', \alpha')$ -pairs coincide by Lemmas 9.3, 9.7, 9.16 and Theorem 9.22. Thus $\mathbf{P} \in \pi'(\mathbf{P}')$ iff $\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$. Therefore, $\bigcup_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}} \pi(\mathbf{P}) = \mathcal{L}'$.

Therefore, by Remark 2.5, π is a partition bijection. Similarly, π' is a partition bijection. Furthermore, π' is the inverse of π by Proposition 2.6. \square

10. COMPATIBILITY OF THE PARTITION BIJECTIONS AND THE LATTICE STRUCTURES

For any pair $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$, assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} , then we have that \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are either related by a twist on a tile G_l or related by two adjacent triangles incident to p or q , assume τ is the label of the diagonal or the common side of the triangles. In both cases, we say that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and *related by* τ . We denote

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = w(\mathbf{P}) - w(\mathbf{Q}).$$

We say that $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$ are *related by a twist at* α if either \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by τ or \mathbf{Q} covers \mathbf{P} and related by τ .

Assumption: We always assume that T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at q in case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$, T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at p or q in case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ if there is no other state.

Proposition 10.1. *We have $\mathbf{P}'_- \in \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)$. In particular, we have $\mathbf{P}'_- = \mathbf{P}_-(0, \dots, 0)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.19, $P'_- \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P_-)$. By Proposition 7.15 we may assume $\sum m_i(P_-) \geq 0$. By Lemma 7.20, $m_i(P_-) \geq 0$ for any i . We have $\Delta'_1(q) \in \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_1(q))$, $\Delta'_1(p) \in \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, p}(\Delta_1(p))$ from Lemma 8.8.

The situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$ follows by Lemma 7.19 and Lemma 7.20.

We then consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.

Case 1. If $m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) \geq 0$, as $\Delta'_1(q) \in \phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_1(q))$, we see that $(P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Case 2. If $m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) < 0$, then $m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) = -1$ and $\tau_1(q) = \alpha$ or $\tau_t(q) = \alpha$. Thus we have $\phi_\alpha^{T^\circ, q}(\Delta_1(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q)\}$.

Case 2.1. $\tau_t(q) = \alpha$. We may assume that $\tau_t(q) = \alpha_4$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_1$. We have either $\tilde{\beta} = \tau_t(q)$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_1 and ending at q .

Case 2.1.1. $\tilde{\beta} = \tau_t(q)$. Then $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha_4 \in T^\circ \cap T'^\circ$. Thus $P_- = P'_- = P_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P_-) = \{P'_-\}$ and thus $(P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Case 2.1.2. $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_1 and ending at q . If $\sum m_i(P_-) = 0$, then $\varphi_\alpha^{T^\circ}(P_-) = \{P'_-\}$ and thus $(P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$. If $\sum m_i(P_-) > 0$, then $m_i(P_-) = 1$ for some i . By Lemma 7.11, one the following happens: $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses $\alpha_2, \alpha, \alpha_4$ consecutively; or $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from the common endpoint of α and α_1 then crosses α_4 ; or $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from q then crosses α_2 , see Figure 16. We have either $\tilde{\beta}$ intersects itself or the two endpoints are q , a contradiction.




FIGURE 16

Case 2.2. $\tau_t(q) = \alpha$, we may assume that $\tau_1(q) = \alpha_1$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_4$. We have either $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_4 and ending at q .

Case 2.2.1. $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha$. Thus we have $\phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, q}(\Delta_1(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q)\}$, $P_- = P_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\varphi_\alpha^{T_\alpha}(P_-) = \{P'_-, P'_+\}$. For any $(P', \Delta') \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$, from the construction of π , the edges labeled α_2 and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_4$ are in P' . Thus $(P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Case 2.2.2. $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_4 and ending at q . Then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(P_-) = 1$ and thus $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(P_-; \alpha)$ -pair. For any $(P', \Delta') \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$, from the construction of π , we have the edges labeled $\tau_{t-1}(q) = \alpha_2$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_4$ of $G'(\eta_\alpha)$ are in P' . Thus $(P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Last, we consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T_\alpha, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$.

Case 1. $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha), m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) \geq 0$. As $\Delta'_1(p) \in \phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, p}(\Delta_1(p))$ and $\Delta'_1(q) \in \phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, q}(\Delta_1(q))$, we see that $(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(\Delta_1(p), P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Case 2. $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) \geq 0, m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) < 0$. Then $m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) = -1$ and $\tau_1(q) = \alpha$ or $\tau_t(q) = \alpha$. Thus we have $\phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, q}(\Delta_1(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q)\}$.

Case 2.1. $\tau_1(q) = \alpha$. We may assume that $\tau_t(q) = \alpha_4$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_1$. We have either $\tilde{\beta} = \tau_t(q)$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_1 and ending at q .

Case 2.1.1. $\tilde{\beta} = \tau_t(q)$. Then $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha_4 \in T_\alpha \cap T'_\alpha$. Thus $P_- = P'_- = P_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $m(\Delta_1(p), \alpha) = 0$. Therefore, $\varphi_\alpha^{T_\alpha}(P_-) = \{P'_-\}$ and thus $(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(\Delta_1(p), P_-, \Delta_1(q))$.

Case 2.1.2. $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_1 and ending at q .

If $\sum m_i(P_-) > 0$, then $m_i(P_-) = 1$ for some i . From the above discussion, we have $p = q$, $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from q then crosses α_2 and $m_i(P_-) = 0$ for all i with $1 < i < \eta_\alpha$. We see that $\tau_{[1]}(p) = \alpha_2$, $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) = -1$ and $m_1(P_-) = 1$. Contradicts to the assumption that $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) \geq 0$.

If $\sum m_i(P_-) = 0$ and $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) = 1$, then $\varphi_\alpha^{T_\alpha}(P_-) = \{P'_-\}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ starts from the common endpoint of α_2 and α_3 then crosses α and α_1 , see Figure 17. Then we have $\tau_{i_1} = \alpha, \tau_{i_2} = \alpha_1$, thus $m_1(P_-) = -1$, see Figure 17, contradicts to $\sum m_i(P_-) = 0$.




FIGURE 17

Case 2.2. $\tau_t(q) = \alpha$, we may assume that $\tau_1(q) = \alpha_1$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_4$. We have either $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha$ or $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_4 and ending at q .

Case 2.2.1. $\tilde{\beta} = \alpha$. Then we have $\phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, q}(\Delta_1(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q)\}$, $P_- = P_{\tilde{\beta}}$ and $\Delta_1(p) = \{\tau_s(p) = \alpha, \tau_1(p) = \alpha_3, \tau_{[1]}(p) = \alpha_2\}$. Thus $\varphi_\alpha^{T_\alpha}(P_-) = \{P'_-, P'_+\}$, $\phi_\alpha^{T_\alpha, p}(\Delta_1(p)) = \{\Delta'_1(p)\}$ and $(1, 2)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(P_-; \alpha)$ -pair. For any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(P_-)$, from the construction of π , the edges labeled $\alpha_2 = \tau_{[1]}(p)$ and α_4 are in P' . Thus $(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-)$.

Case 2.2.2. $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses α_4 and ending at q . Then $m_{\eta_\alpha}(P_-) = 1$ and thus $\sum m_i(P_-) > 0$. As $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) \geq 0$, we have $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(P_-; \alpha)$ -pair. For any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(P_-)$, from the construction of π , we have the edges labeled $\tau_{t-1}(q) = \alpha_2$ and $\tau_{[1]}(q) = \alpha_4$ of $G'(\eta_\alpha)$ are in P' . Thus $(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(P_-)$.

Case 3. $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha) < 0, m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) \geq 0$. This case is similar to case 2.

Case 4. $m(\Delta_1(p); \alpha), m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha) < 0$. Thus we have $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, q}(\Delta_1(q)) = \{\Delta'_1(q)\}$ and $\phi_\alpha^{T^o, p}(\Delta_1(p)) = \{\Delta'_1(p)\}$.

If $\sum m_i(P_-) \leq 0$, then $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P_-) = \{P'_-\}$. Thus $\{(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q))\} = \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)$.

If $\sum m_i(P_-) > 0$, then by Lemma 7.11 we see that $\tau_{[1]}(p), \tau_{[1]}(q) \in \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$. For any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)$, from the construction of π , we have the edges labeled α_2 and α_4 of $G'(a)$ are in P' , where a is in some $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}_-; \alpha)$ -pair. Thus $(\Delta'_1(p), P'_-, \Delta'_1(q)) \in \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)$.

The proof is complete. \square

Theorem 10.1. *Under the Assumption, assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by τ . Denote $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{Q}'$.*

(1) *If $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by τ . Moreover, we have*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}').$$

(2) *If $\tau = \alpha$, then we have either*

- $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{Q}'$ or
- \mathbf{P}' is covered by \mathbf{Q}' and related by α' with $\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

Proof. (1) As $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, we have $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}; \alpha)$.

We first consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$. Then $\mathbf{P} = P$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mu_{G_l}P$. By Proposition 7.17, there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ with diagonal labeled τ such that any $P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P)$ can twist on $G'_{[l]}$, $P' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P')$, and $\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(\mathbf{Q}) = \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(\varphi_\alpha^{T^o}(P))$. Thus \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by τ . As $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\mu_{G_l}P, \alpha)$, we see that $\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(\pi(P))$. By Proposition 7.17 (1), we have $m^\pm(P, G_l; \tau_i) = m^\pm(\mathbf{P}', G'_{[l]}; \tau_i)$ and $n(G_l^\pm; \tau_i) = n(G'_{[l]}^\pm; \tau_i)$, thus $\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}') = \Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$.

We then consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$.

If $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, then by Proposition 7.17 there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ with diagonal labeled τ such that $\pi(Q) = \{(\mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P'), \Delta') \mid (P', \Delta') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})\}$ and $(P', \Delta') > (\mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P'), \Delta')$. In particular, $\mathbf{P}' > \mathbf{Q}'$. Next, we show \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.4 we have $G'_{[l]}$ is the last tile of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ and $\Delta' = \Delta'_1(q)$ is the first triangle incidents to q in T^o . As $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, we see that G_l is the last tile of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ and $m(\Delta'; \alpha) = 0$ and thus $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta' = \Delta_1(q)$ is the first triangle incidents to q in T^o . By Lemma 4.4, $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ does not cover $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, a contradiction. Therefore, \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' . Assume that $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta')$. Then $\mathbf{Q}' = (\mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P'), \Delta')$. From the previous case, we have $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(P', \mu_{G'_{[l]}}(P'))$. By Lemma 8.10, we see that $\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}') = \Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$.

If $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, as $\tau \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, we have $m(\Delta_{j-1}(q); \alpha) = m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = 0$. Thus $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta_j(q))$ for some P' and $\mathbf{Q}' = (P', \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. In case neither $\Delta_{j-1}(q)$ nor $\Delta_j(q)$ is the first triangle incident to q in T^o , by Lemma 4.5 \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' . In case either $\Delta_{j-1}(q)$ or $\Delta_j(q)$ is the first triangle incident to q in T^o , as $\tau = \tau_{j-1}(q) \neq \alpha, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, we see the last tiles of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ and $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ are the same and $E_1(p) \in P$ iff $E'_1(p) \in P'$. As \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} , by Lemma 4.5 we have \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' . By Lemma 7.16, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}') = \Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$.

The situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p, q)})$ is similar to the case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.

(2) As $\tau = \alpha$, we have $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}; \alpha)$. Suppose that $\mathbf{P}' \neq \mathbf{Q}'$.

We first consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$. Then $\mathbf{P} = P$ and $\mathbf{Q} = \mu_{G_l}P$. By Proposition 7.17 (2), we have $m_k(P) = -1$ and $G_l = G(k)$ for some k . As $\mathbf{P}' \neq \mathbf{Q}'$, k is in some $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = \mathbf{m}(\mu_{G_l}P, \alpha)$ -pair. Assume that (k, k') is an $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair, then $m_{k'}(\mu_{G_l}P) = m_{k'}(P) = 1$. Thus the labels of $\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{edge}(G'(k'))$ and $P \cap \text{edge}(G(k))$ coincide, the labels of $\mathbf{Q}' \cap \text{edge}(G'(k'))$ and $\mu_{G_l}P \cap \text{edge}(G(k))$ coincide. Therefore $\mathbf{Q}' = \mu_{G'(k')} \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}' > \mathbf{P}'$. Denote $G'_{[l]} = G'(k')$. We have

$$m^+(P, G_l; \alpha) - n(G_l^+; \alpha) = \sum_{i>k} m_i(P), \quad m^-(P, G_l; \alpha) - n(G_l^-; \alpha) = \sum_{i<k} m_i(P),$$

$$m^+(\mathbf{P}', G'_{[l]}; \alpha') - n(G'_{[l]}^+; \alpha') = \sum_{i>k'} m_i(\mathbf{P}'), \quad m^-(\mathbf{P}', G'_{[l]}; \alpha') - n(G'_{[l]}^-; \alpha') = \sum_{i<k'} m_i(\mathbf{P}').$$

It follows that

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = d(\alpha) \left(\sum_{i>k} m_i(P) - \sum_{i<k} m_i(P) \right), \quad \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}') = d(\alpha') \left(\sum_{i>k'} m_i(\mathbf{P}') - \sum_{i<k'} m_i(\mathbf{P}') \right).$$

As $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha) = -\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}', \alpha')$ and (k, k') is an $\mathbf{m}(P, \alpha)$ -pair, we obtain $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

We then consider the situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$.

If $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$, then by Proposition 7.17 (2) we have $m_k(\mathbf{P}) = -1$ and $G_l = G(k)$ for some k . As $\mathbf{P}' \neq \mathbf{Q}'$, k is in some $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair. Assume that (k, k') is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair, then $m_{k'}(\mathbf{Q}) = m_{k'}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$. Assume $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta')$.

In case $k' \neq \eta_\alpha + 1$, we have $\mathbf{Q}' = (\mu_{G'(k')}P', \Delta') > \mathbf{P}'$. We claim \mathbf{Q}' covers \mathbf{P}' . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.4 $G'(k')$ is the last tile of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ and $\Delta' = \Delta'_1(q)$. It follows $k' = \eta_\alpha$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}') = -1, m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}') = 1$. Thus $(k' = \eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair, contradicts to (k, k') is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair. Therefore, \mathbf{Q}' covers \mathbf{P}' . Similar to the case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

In case $k' = \eta_\alpha + 1$, we have $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = 1$, we may assume that $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$. Thus, $\Delta' = \{\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = (P', \Delta'')$, where $\Delta'' = \{\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4\}$, see Figure 18. We claim \mathbf{Q}' covers \mathbf{P}' . Otherwise, by Lemma 4.5, we have either $\Delta' = \Delta'_1(q), E'_2(q) \in P'$ or $\Delta'' = \Delta'_1(q), E'_1(q) \in P'$. In both cases, we have $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$ and $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha$. If $\Delta' = \Delta'_1(q), E'_2(q) \in P'$, then $E'_2(q)$ is labeled α' . If $\Delta'' = \Delta'_1(q), E'_1(q) \in P'$, then $E'_1(q)$ is labeled α' . Thus $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}') = 1$ and $m_{\eta_\alpha}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$. It follows that $G_l = G_c$ is the last tile. It contradicts to $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. Therefore, \mathbf{Q}' covers \mathbf{P}' . Similar to the case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.




FIGURE 18

If $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$, then $m_{\eta_\alpha+1}(\mathbf{P}) = -1$. As $\mathbf{P}' \neq \mathbf{Q}'$, $\eta_\alpha + 1$ is in some $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair. Assume that $(k, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}, \alpha)$ -pair and $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta')$. Then $\mathbf{Q}' = (\mu_{G'(k')}P', \Delta')$.

Dual to the case $k' = \eta_\alpha + 1$ for $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$, we can prove \mathbf{Q}' covers \mathbf{P}' and $\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

The situation that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ is similar to the case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. \square

Theorem 10.2. *Under the Assumption, let $\mathbf{P} = P, (P, \Delta_j(q))$ or $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$. Assume that \mathbf{P} covers some \mathbf{Q} and related by α_k for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $\alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$. Suppose that all α -mutable edges of P are labeled α_{k-1} or α_{k+1} .*

(1) *Assume that $k \in \{1, 3\}$, denote $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{Q}'$. Then except for the following cases,*

- $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ and $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} ,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) \neq \alpha, \tau_j(q) = \alpha$ and $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} ,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) \neq \alpha, \tau_i(p) = \alpha$ and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} ,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) = \tau_j(q) = \alpha$, $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} ,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_i(p) = \alpha$ and $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} ,

we have \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by α_k . Moreover, we have $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}'(1, \dots, 1)$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}'(1, \dots, 1)$ and related by α_k , and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}_1) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}').$$

(2) *Assume that $k \in \{2, 4\}$, denote $\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1) = \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}(1, \dots, 1) = \mathbf{Q}'$. Then except for the following cases,*

- $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ and \mathbf{P} covers $(P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i-1}(p) \neq \alpha, \tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ and \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{j-1}(q) \neq \alpha, \tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$ and \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$, \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{j-1}(q) = \alpha$ and \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$,
- $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)), \mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_{i-1}(p) = \alpha$ and \mathbf{P} covers $(\Delta_{i-1}(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$,

we have \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by α_k . Moreover, assume that $\mathbf{P}_1 = \mathbf{P}'(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{Q}'(0, \dots, 0)$, then \mathbf{P}_1 covers \mathbf{Q}_1 and related by α_k , and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}_1, \mathbf{Q}_1) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}').$$

Proof. We shall prove (1) as (2) can be proved similarly.

We first consider the situation that $\mathbf{P} = P$. Then $\mathbf{Q} = \mu_{G_l}P$ for some tile G_l . As all the α -mutable edges in P are labeled α_2 or α_4 , we see that all the α -mutable edges in $\mu_{G_l}P$ and α' -mutable edges in \mathbf{P}' are labeled α_2 or α_4 . By Proposition 7.17 (3), there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^{\circ}, \tilde{\beta}}$ with diagonal labeled α_1 such that \mathbf{P}' can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $\mathbf{P}' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}' \in \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^{\circ}}(\mu_{G_l}P)$. It follows that all the α' -mutable edges in $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}'$ are labeled α_2 or α_4 . Therefore, we have $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mu_{G_l}P)$ and $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}' = (\mu_{G_l}P)(0, \dots, 0), (\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}')(1, \dots, 1) = \mu_{G_l}(P)$. By Proposition 7.17 (3), we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}'; G'_{[l]}) = \Omega(P; G_l)$.

We then consider the situation that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$.

Case 1. $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. As the case that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ and $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} is excepted, we shall consider the following cases:

Case 1.1. $\tau_j(q) \neq \alpha$; Case 1.2. $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ but $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ does not cover \mathbf{P} .

In Case 1.1, we have either $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \geq 0$ or $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $\tau_{[j]}(q) \in \{\alpha_2, \alpha_4\}$, the case can be proved similar to the case that $\mathbf{P} = P$.

In Case 1.2, by Lemma 4.9 we have $G_l \neq G_c$ and $(\eta_{\alpha}, \eta_{\alpha} + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}; \alpha)$ -pair. Assume that $\mathbf{P}' = (P', \Delta')$. Thus $P' \cap \text{edge}(G'(\eta_{\alpha}))$ is labeled α_1, α_3 . By Proposition 7.17 (3), there is a tile $G'_{[l]}$ of $G_{T^{\circ}, \tilde{\beta}}$ with diagonal labeled α_1 such that \mathbf{P}' can twist on $G'_{[l]}$ and $\mathbf{P}' > \mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}' \in \varphi_{\alpha}^{T^{\circ}}(\mu_{G_l}P)$. Since $G_l \neq G_c$, we have $\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}' \cap \text{edge}(G'(\eta_{\alpha}))$ is labeled α_1, α_3 . Thus $(\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}', \Delta') \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = (\mu_{G'_{[l]}}\mathbf{P}', \Delta')$. By Proposition 7.17 (3), we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}'; G'_{[l]}) = \Omega(P; G_l)$.

Case 2. $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. Since all α -mutable edges of P are labeled α_2 or α_4 , this case can be proved similar to the case that $\mathbf{P} = P$.

The situation that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ can be proved similarly to situation that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ by using Proposition 7.17 (3) and Lemmas 4.14, 4.15, 4.16. \square

The case that $\alpha_k = \alpha_{k-1}$ or α_{k+1} need more careful discussion.

Theorem 10.3. *Under the Assumption, assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by α_k for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{k-1}$ or α_{k+1} , without loss of generality, we may assume $k = 1$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$. Then one of the following holds:*

- (i) *there exist $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{R}', \mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'$ satisfying*
 - (1) \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P} are related by a sequence of twists at α ;
 - (2) \mathbf{Q}_0 and \mathbf{Q} are related by a sequence of twists at α ;
 - (3) \mathbf{P}_0 covers \mathbf{Q}_0 and related by α_1 ;
 - (4) $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(1, \dots, 1)$;
 - (5) $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(1, \dots, 1)$;
 - (6) \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{R}' and \mathbf{R}' covers \mathbf{Q}' .

Moreover, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{R}') + \Omega(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

- (ii) *there exist $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'$ satisfying*
 - (1) \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P} are related by a sequence of twists at α ;
 - (2) \mathbf{Q}_0 and \mathbf{Q} are related by a sequence of twists at α ;
 - (3) \mathbf{P}_0 covers \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_0 covers \mathbf{Q}_0 ;

- (4) $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{P}_0(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{Q}_0(1, \dots, 1)$;
 (5) $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{P}'(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(0, \dots, 0)$ or $\mathbf{Q}'(1, \dots, 1)$;
 (6) \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' .

Moreover, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{R}_0) + \Omega(\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

Proof. We first consider the situation that $\mathbf{P} = P$. Assume that $Q = \mu_{G_l}P$ and the conditions in Proposition 7.18 hold.

In case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$, do twists for P on the tiles G_a with diagonal labeled α and $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Thus all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 . Since $m_k(P) = -1$, we have $\tau_{i-1} = \alpha$. We see that Q can twist on these tiles G_a . Do the same twists for Q on these G_a , we obtain Q_0 . Therefore, $Q_0 = \mu_{G_l}P_0 < P_0$. Let $Q' = Q_0(1, \dots, 1)$. By Proposition 7.18, we have $P' = \mu_{G^{(k+1)}}\mu_{G'}Q' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T_0}(P_0)$. Since all α -twist-able edges in P_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 and all α' -twist-able edges in P' are labeled α_1, α_3 , we have $P' = P_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Let $R' = \mu_{G'}Q'$. By Proposition 7.18 (1) (c), we have $\Omega(P_0, Q_0) = \Omega(P', R') + \Omega(R', Q')$.

The case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 0)$ is similar to the case that $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$ as $(m_k(Q), m_{k+1}(Q)) = (1, -1)$.


In case $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 1)$, do twist for P on the tiles G_a with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Thus all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 . Since $m_k(P) = 0$, we see that Q can twist on these tiles G_a . Do the same twists for Q on these G_a , we obtain Q_0 . Therefore, $Q_0 = \mu_{G_l}P_0 < P_0$. Let $P' = P_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Then $P' > \mu_{G^{(k+1)}}P'$. By Proposition 7.18, $\mu_{G^{(k+1)}}P'$ can twist on G' and $Q' := \mu_{G'}\mu_{G^{(k+1)}}P' \in \varphi_\alpha^{T_0}(Q_0)$. Since all α -twist-able edges in Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 and all α' -twist-able edges in Q' are labeled α_1, α_3 , we have $Q' = Q_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Let $R' = \mu_{G^{(k+1)}}P'$. By Proposition 7.18 (1) (c), we have $\Omega(P_0, Q_0) = \Omega(P', R') + \Omega(R', Q')$.

We then consider the situation that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$. We have the following two cases: $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$ or $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$.

Case 1. $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. Since T' contains no arc tagged notched at q , we have $\tau_{[j-1]}(q) = \tau_{[j]}(q) = \alpha, \tau_{j-2}(q) = \alpha_3, \tau_j(q) = \alpha_4$. Do twist for P on the tiles $G_a (\neq G_c)$ with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Let $\mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_{j-1}(q))$. Since $G_a \neq G_c$, we have \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P} are related by a sequence of twists at α , \mathbf{Q}_0 and \mathbf{Q} are related by a sequence of twists at α and \mathbf{P}_0 covers \mathbf{Q}_0 . Let $\mathbf{P}'_0 = \mathbf{P}_0(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}'_0 = \mathbf{Q}_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Assume $\mathbf{P}'_0 = (P', \Delta'_{j'}(q))$.

If $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha$ and P can twist on G_c with $P \cap \text{edge}(G_c)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 . Then $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $m(\mathbf{P}_0; \alpha)$ and $m(\mathbf{Q}_0; \alpha)$ -pair. Thus $\Delta'_{j'}(q) = (\alpha_1, \alpha', \alpha_1)$ with $\tau'_{j'}(q) = \alpha', \tau'_{j'-1}(q) = \alpha_1$ and $\mathbf{Q}'_0 = (P', \Delta'_{j'-2}(q))$ with $\Delta'_{j'-2}(q) = (\alpha', \alpha_3, \alpha_4)$ and $\tau'_{j'-2}(q) = \alpha', \tau'_{j'-3}(q) = \alpha_3$. Therefore, $\Delta'_{j'-1}(q) = (\alpha_1, \alpha', \alpha_1)$. Let $\mathbf{R}' = (P', \Delta'_{j'-1}(q))$. Since all α -twist-able edges in P_0 (except for the edges in G_c) are labeled α_1, α_3 and $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $m(\mathbf{P}_0; \alpha)$ and $m(\mathbf{Q}_0; \alpha)$ -pair, we have $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(0, \dots, 0)$.

Otherwise, we have $\Delta'_{j'}(q) = (\alpha_4, \alpha', \alpha_3)$ with $\tau'_{j'}(q) = \alpha_4, \tau'_{j'-1}(q) = \alpha'$ and $\mathbf{Q}'_0 = (P', \Delta'_{j'-2}(q))$ with $\Delta'_{j'-2}(q) = (\alpha_1, \alpha', \alpha_1)$ and $\tau'_{j'-2}(q) = \alpha_1, \tau'_{j'-3}(q) = \alpha'$. Thus $\Delta'_{j'-1}(q) =$



$(\alpha', \alpha_1, \alpha_1)$. Let $\mathbf{R}' = (P', \Delta'_{j'-1}(q))$. Since all α -twist-able edges in P_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 , we have $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(0, \dots, 0)$.

In both cases, one see that $E_1(q) \in P$ iff $E'_1(q) \in P'$. Since \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} , we have \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{R}' and \mathbf{R}' covers \mathbf{Q}' by Lemma 4.5. We have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{R}') + \Omega(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{Q}')$ by Proposition 7.18 (4).

Case 2. $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$. We assume that the conditions in Proposition 7.18 hold since the other cases can be proved similarly.

Case 2.1. $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$.

Case 2.1.1. We first assume that $G_l = G_c$. Since the conditions in Proposition 7.18 hold, we have $\Delta_1(q) = (\alpha, \alpha_4, \alpha_1)$ with $m(\Delta_1(q); \alpha_1) = 1$. Do twist for P on the tiles G_a with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_3 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Do twist for $\mu_{G_l}(P)$ on these tiles $G_a \neq G_{c-1}$, we obtain a perfect matching Q_0 . Thus, $Q_0 < \mu_{G_{c-1}}P_0 < P_0$ and all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_4 . Let $\mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{R}_0 = (\mu_{G_{c-1}}P_0, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (Q_0, \Delta_j(q))$. By Lemma 4.4, we have \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P} are related by a sequence of twist at α , \mathbf{Q}_0 and \mathbf{Q} are related by a sequence of twist at α , and \mathbf{P}_0 covers \mathbf{R}_0 and \mathbf{R}_0 covers \mathbf{Q}_0 . Let $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(0, \dots, 0)$. From Proposition 7.18 (1), we see that \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by α_1 . Since \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} , by Lemma 4.4, we have $\Delta_j(q) \neq \Delta_1(q)$. Therefore, $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta_2(q) = (\alpha, \alpha_3, \alpha_1)$ with $m(\Delta_2(q); \alpha_1) = 1$ in case $m_{\eta_{\alpha+1}}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha) = -1$ (i.e., $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ -pair). As all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_4 , we have $\mathbf{P}_0 = \mathbf{P}'(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{Q}'(1, \dots, 1)$. By Proposition 7.18 (1) (d), we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{R}_0) + \Omega(\mathbf{R}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}')$.

Case 2.1.2. We then assume that $G_l \neq G_c$.

Case 2.1.2.1. $\tau_{i_c} \neq \alpha$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_3) = -1$. Then do twist for P on the tiles G_a with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_3 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Do twist for $\mu_{G_l}(P)$ on these tiles $G_a \neq G_{l-1}$, we obtain a perfect matching Q_0 . Thus, $Q_0 < \mu_{G_{l-1}}P_0 < P_0$ and all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_4 . Let $\mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{R}_0 = (\mu_{G_{l-1}}P_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (Q_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(0, \dots, 0)$. This case can be proved similarly to the case $G_l = G_c$.

Case 2.1.2.2. $\tau_{i_c} \neq \alpha$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \geq 0$ or $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_4) = -1$. Then do twist for P on the tiles G_a with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Do twist for $\mu_{G_l}(P)$ on these tiles G_a , we obtain a perfect matching Q_0 . Thus, $Q_0 < P_0$ and all α -twist-able edges in P_0 and Q_0 are labeled α_1, α_3 . Let $\mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (Q_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Assume that $\mathbf{Q}' = (Q', \Delta')$. By Proposition 7.18, we see that

$\mathbf{P}' = (\mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q', \Delta')$. Let $\mathbf{R}' = (\mu_{G'}Q', \Delta')$. This case can be proved similarly to the situation that $\mathbf{P} = P$.

Case 2.1.2.3. $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha$ and $\Delta_j(q) \neq \Delta_1(q)$.

Case 2.1.2.3.1. If $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \geq 0$ or $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_4) = -1$, then it can be proved similarly to the case that $\tau_{i_c} \neq \alpha$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) \geq 0$ or $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_4) = -1$.

Case 2.1.2.3.2. If $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_3) = -1$, then it can be proved similarly to the case that $\tau_{i_c} \neq \alpha$ and $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha) = -1$ with $m(\Delta_j(q); \alpha_3) = -1$.

Case 2.1.2.4. $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha$ and $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. Then $(\eta_\alpha, \eta_\alpha + 1)$ is an $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{P}; \alpha)$ and $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{Q}; \alpha)$ -pair. Then do twist for P on the tiles $G_a \neq G_c$ with diagonal labeled α such that $P \cap \text{Edge}(G_a)$ are labeled α_1, α_4 , we obtain a perfect matching P_0 . Do twist for $\mu_{G_l}(P)$ on these tiles $G_a \neq G_c$, we obtain a perfect matching Q_0 . Thus, $Q_0 < P_0$. Let $\mathbf{P}_0 = (P_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{Q}_0 = (Q_0, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}_0(1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{Q}_0(1, \dots, 1)$. Assume that $\mathbf{Q}' = (Q', \Delta')$. By Proposition 7.18, we see that $\mathbf{P}' = (\mu_{G'(k+1)}\mu_{G'}Q', \Delta')$. Let $\mathbf{R}' = (\mu_{G'}Q', \Delta')$. This case can be proved similarly to the situation that $\mathbf{P} = P$.

Case 2.2. $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 0)$. The case is similar to the case that $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (-1, 1)$ as $(m_k(Q), m_{k+1}(Q)) = (1, -1)$.

Case 2.3. $(m_k(P), m_{k+1}(P)) = (0, 1)$.

Case 2.3.1. $G_l = G_c$. The case can be proved similarly to the Case 2.1.1.

Case 2.3.2. $G_l \neq G_c$ and $\tau_{i_c} \neq \alpha$. The case can be proved similarly to the Case 2.1.2.2.

Case 2.3.3. $G_l \neq G_c$ and $\tau_{i_c} = \alpha$.

Case 2.3.3.1. $\Delta_j(q) \neq \Delta_1(q)$. The case can be proved similarly to the Case 2.1.2.3.1

Case 2.3.3.2. $\Delta_j(q) = \Delta_1(q)$. The case can be proved similarly to the Case 2.1.2.4.

The situation that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ can be proved similarly to the situation that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$. \square

11. TWO EQUIVALENT RELATIONS IN \mathcal{L} .

Assumption: We always assume that T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at q in case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$, T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at p or q in case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$ if there is no other state.

In this section, we introduce two equivalent relations in \mathcal{L} and show any two elements of \mathcal{L} are equivalent.

For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$, we denote $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P})_\pm$ the maximum/minimum element in $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P})$ and $\pi(\mathbf{P})_\pm$ the maximum/minimum element in $\pi(\mathbf{P})$.

Lemma 11.1. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

$$w(\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P}_+)) = w(\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P}_-)), \quad w(\pi(\mathbf{P}_+)) = w(\pi(\mathbf{P}_-)).$$

Proof. It follows by Lemma 9.23. □

Definition 11.2. For any $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$,

(1) we say that \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are *y-equivalent*, denoted as $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$, if in \mathbb{P} ,

$$\frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi'(\mathbf{P})} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi'(\mathbf{Q})} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}.$$

(2) we say that \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{Q} are *w-equivalent*, denoted as $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$, if

$$w(\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P})_\pm) - w(\pi(\mathbf{P})_\pm) = w(\pi'\pi(\mathbf{Q})_\pm) - w(\pi(\mathbf{Q})_\pm).$$

It is clear that \sim, \approx are equivalence relations on $\mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.

Lemma 11.3. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$, for $\mathbf{P}' = \mathbf{P}(\vec{c}) \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$ corresponding to some $\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r$ as in Theorem 9.22. Then in \mathbb{P} we have*

- (1) $\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}') = y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^\circ})^r$ if $\vec{c} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$.
- (2) $\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}') = y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha}^{T'^\circ})^r$ if $\vec{c} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$.

Summarize Lemmas 6.4, 6.7, 6.8, 6.11, 6.12 and 6.13, we obtain the following result.

Lemma 11.4. *Assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by τ . Then we have*

$$\frac{y^T(\mathbf{Q})}{y^T(\mathbf{P})} = y_{\tau}^{T^\circ}.$$

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 11.5. *For any $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

In the rest of this section, we give the proof of Theorem 11.5

Lemma 11.6. *Assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by τ . If $\tau \neq \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, then we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. As $\tau \neq \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$, we have $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) = \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) = \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q}) \geq 0$. Then we have $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{\mathbf{P}\}$ and $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{\mathbf{Q}\}$ by Theorem 9.22. Denote $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{Q}'$.

By Lemma 11.4, we have

$$(25) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi'\pi(\mathbf{P})} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi'\pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^T(\mathbf{R})} = \frac{y^T(\mathbf{P})}{y^T(\mathbf{Q})} = y_\tau^{T\circ}.$$

In case $\tau \neq \alpha$, by Theorem 10.1 (1), \mathbf{P}' covers \mathbf{Q}' and related by τ , and

$$(26) \quad \Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}').$$

By Lemmas 11.3 and 11.4, we have

$$(27) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'\circ})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})}}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'\circ})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})}} = y_\tau^{T'\circ}.$$

Then $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ follows by (25), (27) and Lemma 6.3 (1).

By (26), $w(\mathbf{P}) - w(\mathbf{Q}) = w(\mathbf{P}') - w(\mathbf{Q}') = w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) - w(\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0))$. Thus $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.

In case $\tau = \alpha$, by Theorem 10.1 (2), \mathbf{P}' is covered \mathbf{Q}' and related by α' , and

$$(28) \quad \Omega(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q}) = -\Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{Q}').$$

By Lemmas 11.3 and 11.4, we have

$$(29) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'\circ})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})}}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'\circ})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})}} = y_{\alpha'}^{T'\circ}.$$

Then $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ follows by (25), (29) and Lemma 6.3 (2).

By (28), $w(\mathbf{P}) - w(\mathbf{Q}) = w(\mathbf{P}') - w(\mathbf{Q}') = w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) - w(\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0))$. Thus $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 11.7. *Assume that \mathbf{P} covers \mathbf{Q} and related by α_k for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $\alpha_k = \alpha_{k-1}$ or α_{k+1} . Then we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

We shall only consider the statement (i) of Theorem 10.3 holds, as it can be proved similarly if the statement (ii) holds.

Let $\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0, \mathbf{P}', \mathbf{R}'$ and \mathbf{Q}' be the elements given in Theorem 10.3. Then \mathbf{P}_0 and \mathbf{P} are related by a sequence of twists at α . By Lemma 11.6 we have $\mathbf{P}_0 \sim \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P}_0 \approx \mathbf{P}$. Similarly, $\mathbf{Q}_0 \sim \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{Q}_0 \approx \mathbf{Q}$. Thus it suffices to prove $\mathbf{P}_0 \sim \mathbf{Q}_0$ and $\mathbf{P}_0 \approx \mathbf{Q}_0$.

From Theorem 10.3, we have $\Omega(\mathbf{P}_0, \mathbf{Q}_0) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}', \mathbf{R}') + \Omega(\mathbf{R}', \mathbf{Q}')$. Thus, $w(\mathbf{P}_0) - w(\mathbf{Q}_0) = w(\mathbf{P}') - w(\mathbf{Q}')$. Therefore, $\mathbf{P}_0 \approx \mathbf{Q}_0$ follows by Theorem 10.3 (i) (4), (5).

We now prove $\mathbf{P}_0 \sim \mathbf{Q}_0$.

As \mathbf{P}_0 covers \mathbf{Q}_0 and related by α_1 , we see that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}_0) - \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q}_0) = b_{\alpha_1}^{T\circ} = 0$. We may assume that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}_0) = \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q}_0) \geq 0$. Then $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{P}_0) = \{\mathbf{P}_0\}$ and $\pi'\pi(\mathbf{Q}_0) = \{\mathbf{Q}_0\}$ by Theorem 9.22.

By Lemma 11.4, we have

$$(30) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P}_0)} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{Q}_0)} y^T(\mathbf{R})} = \frac{y^T(\mathbf{P}_0)}{y^T(\mathbf{Q}_0)} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o}.$$

By Theorem 10.3 and Lemmas 11.3, 11.4, we have

$$(31) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{S}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P}_0)} y^{T'}(\mathbf{S}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{S}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q}_0)} y^{T'}(\mathbf{S}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}')}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}') y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}.$$

As $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$, α_1 is the radius of the self-folded triangle $(\alpha_1, \alpha_1, \alpha')$ in T'^o . By Lemma 6.3 (3) (b), $y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o}$. Thus, $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ follows by (30), (31).

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 11.8. *Let $\mathbf{P} = P, (P, \Delta_j(q))$ or $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$. Assume that \mathbf{P} covers some \mathbf{Q} and related by α_k for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ with $\alpha_k \neq \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}$. If all the α -mutable edges of P are labeled α_{k-1} or α_{k+1} , then we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$. Then $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) - \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q}) = b_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} > 0$. We may further assume that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$. Then we have $\pi' \pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{\mathbf{P}\}$ by Theorem 9.22. Denote $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{P}'$ and $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0) = \mathbf{Q}'$.

We divide the proof into two parts according to the conditions in Theorem 10.2 (1).

1) The cases except for the exceptional cases in Theorem 10.2 (1).

As $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2, \alpha_4$, by Theorem 10.2 (1), we see that

$$w(\mathbf{P}'(1, \dots, 1)) - w(\mathbf{Q}'(1, \dots, 1)) = w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) - w(\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)).$$

Thus $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.

We now show that $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$.

We first consider the case that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q}) \geq 0$. Then by Theorem 9.22 $\pi' \pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{\mathbf{Q}\}$.

By Lemma 11.4, we have

$$(32) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^T(\mathbf{R})} = \frac{y^T(\mathbf{P})}{y^T(\mathbf{Q})} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o}.$$

By Lemmas 11.3 and 11.4, we have

$$(33) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})}}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'^o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{b_{\alpha_1}^{T^o}}.$$

By (32), (33) and Lemma 6.3 (3) (a), we obtain $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$.

We then consider the case that $\sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0 > \sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})$. By Theorem 9.22, we have $\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{\mathbf{Q}'\}$.

By Lemmas 11.3 and 11.4, we have

$$(34) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^T(\mathbf{R})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^T(\mathbf{R})} = \frac{y^T(\mathbf{P})}{y^T(\mathbf{Q}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{-\sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})}} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T^o} \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'^o})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{Q})}.$$

By Lemmas 11.3 and 11.4, we have

$$(35) \quad \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{R}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{R}')} = \frac{y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'o})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})}}{y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'o} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T'o})^{\sum m_i(\mathbf{P})}.$$

By (34), (35) and Lemma 6.3 (3) (a), we obtain $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$.

2) The exceptional cases in Theorem 10.2 (1).

Case 1. $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$, $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ such that $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$ and $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{P} . By Lemma 4.10, we have $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ and $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers \mathbf{Q} . By the previous discussion, we have $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) \star \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)$ for $\star \in \{\sim, \approx\}$. Since $\tau_j(q) = \alpha$, we have $(P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) \star \mathbf{P}$ and $(\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) \star \mathbf{Q}$ for $\star \in \{\sim, \approx\}$ by Lemma 11.6. Therefore, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.

The remaining exceptional cases in Theorem 10.2 (1) can be proved similarly to Case 1 by using Lemmas 4.17, 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20.

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 11.9. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ (resp. $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$) covers $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ (resp. $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$) with $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$. We can do twists on the tiles with diagonals labeled α for P to obtain a perfect matching R such that all α -mutable edges are labeled α_2 or α_4 . We obtain a sequence of perfect matchings $P = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_n = R$ such that P_ℓ covers $P_{\ell-1}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$.

We first consider the case that $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$. By Lemma 4.10, we have $(P_\ell, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$, $(P_\ell, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $(P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q))$ for all ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq n$ and $(R, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ covers $(R, \Delta_j(q))$. Thus by Lemmas 11.6, 11.8 and 11.7, for $\star \in \{\sim, \approx\}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P} \star (R, \Delta_{j+1}(q)) \star (R, \Delta_j(q)) \star \mathbf{Q}.$$

The case that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_{j+1}(q))$ can be proved similarly by Lemmas 4.19, 11.6, 11.8 and 11.7. \square

The following result can be proved similarly by Lemmas 4.20, 11.6, 11.7 and 11.8.

Lemma 11.10. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_{i+1}(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ with $\tau_j(q) = \alpha_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Then we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Lemma 11.11. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta})$. Assume that $P \in \mathcal{L}$ can twist on G_l such that P covers $Q = \mu_{G_l}P$. If $\tau_{i_l} = \alpha_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then we have $P \sim Q$ and $P \approx Q$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$. Then we have $\alpha_1 = \tau_{i_l}$. By Lemma 11.7, it suffices to consider the case that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2, \alpha_4$. We can do twists on the tiles with diagonals labeled α for P to obtain a perfect matching R such that all α -mutable edges are labeled α_2 or α_4 . We obtain a sequence of perfect matchings $P = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_n = R$ such that P_ℓ covers $P_{\ell-1}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$.

As $P > \mu_{G_l}P$, we see that P_ℓ can twist on G_l and $P_\ell > \mu_{G_l}P$ for any $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Thus R covers $\mu_{G_l}R$ in \mathcal{L} . For any $\star \in \{\sim, \approx\}$, we have $P \star R$ and $\mu_{G_l}P \star \mu_{G_l}R$ by Lemma 11.6 and $R \star \mu_{G_l}R$ by Lemma 11.8.

Therefore, $P \sim Q = \mu_{G_l}P$ and $P \approx Q = \mu_{G_l}P$. \square

The following proposition follows immediately by Lemmas 11.6 and 11.11.

Proposition 11.12. *For any $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta})$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

We now consider the case that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$.

The following is a corollary of Lemmas 11.6 and 11.9.

Corollary 11.13. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. For any $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_i(q))$ and $\mathbf{Q} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Lemma 11.14. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$. If $\mathbf{P} = (P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ with $\tau_{i_k} = \alpha_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$. By Lemma 11.7, it suffices to consider the case that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2, \alpha_4$. We can do twists on the tiles with diagonals labeled α for P to obtain a perfect matching R such that all α -mutable edges are labeled α_2 or α_4 . We obtain a sequence of perfect matchings $P = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_n = R$ such that P_ℓ covers $P_{\ell-1}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$. From the proof of Lemma 11.11, R can twist on G_l .

We first prove that

$$(36) \quad (P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (R, \Delta_j(q)), \quad (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}R, \Delta_j(q))$$

for $\star = \sim, \approx$. It suffices to prove that, for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)), \quad (\mu_{G_l}P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)).$$

As T contains no arc tagged notched at q , we have $|\Delta(T^o, q)| \geq 2$, it implies $\Delta_2(q) \in \Delta(T^o, q)$. For any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by Lemma 4.4, we have $(P_\ell, \Delta_2(q))$ covers $(P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_2(q))$. Therefore, by Lemma 11.6 and Corollary 11.13, we have

$$(P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (P_\ell, \Delta_2(q)) \star (P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_2(q)) \star (P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)).$$

Similarly, $(\mu_{G_l}P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q))$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$.

We then prove that $(R, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}R, \Delta_j(q))$. As T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at q , we can choose $\Delta_\ell(q)$ such that $m(\Delta_\ell(q); \alpha) \geq 0$. Then by Lemma 11.8 and Corollary 11.13, we have

$$(37) \quad (R, \Delta_j(q)) \star (R, \Delta_\ell(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}R, \Delta_\ell(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}R, \Delta_j(q)).$$

Therefore, we obtain $(P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\mu_{G_l}P, \Delta_j(q))$ by (36) (37). \square

The following proposition follows immediately by Lemmas 11.6, 11.9 and 11.14.

Proposition 11.15. *For any $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(q)})$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

We now turn to the case that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$.

The following is a corollary of Lemmas 11.6, 11.9 and 11.10.

Corollary 11.16. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ and $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_{i'}(p), P, \Delta_{j'}(q))$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Lemma 11.17. *Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. If $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q))$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ with $\tau_{i_i} = \alpha_k$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. We may assume that $k = 1$. By Lemma 11.7, it suffices to consider the case that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2, \alpha_4$. We can do twists on the tiles with diagonals labeled α from P to obtain a perfect matching R such that all α -mutable edges are labeled α_2 or α_4 . We obtain a sequence of perfect matchings $P = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_n = R$ such that P_ℓ covers $P_{\ell-1}$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$.

We first prove that

$$(38) \quad (\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), R, \Delta_j(q)), \quad (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}R, \Delta_j(q))$$

for $\star = \sim, \approx$. It suffices to prove that, for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$,

$$(\Delta_i(p), P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)), \quad (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)).$$

As T contains no arc tagged notched at p or q , we have $|\Delta(T^\circ, p)|, |\Delta(T^\circ, q)| \geq 2$, it implies $\Delta_2(p) \in \Delta(T^\circ, p), \Delta_2(q) \in \Delta(T^\circ, q)$. For any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, by Lemma 4.11, we have $(\Delta_2(p), P_\ell, \Delta_2(q))$ covers $(\Delta_2(p), P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_2(q))$. Therefore, by Lemma 11.6 and Corollary 11.16, we have

$$(\Delta_i(p), P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_2(p), P_\ell, \Delta_2(q)) \star (\Delta_2(p), P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_2(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q)).$$

Similarly, $(\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P_\ell, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P_{\ell-1}, \Delta_j(q))$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, n$.

We then prove that $(\Delta_i(p), R, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}R, \Delta_j(q))$. As T and T' contain no arc tagged notched at q , we can choose $\Delta_\ell(p), \Delta_{\ell'}(q)$ such that $m(\Delta_\ell(p); \alpha), m(\Delta_{\ell'}(q); \alpha) \geq 0$. Then by Lemma 11.8 and Corollary 11.16, we have

$$(39) \quad (\Delta_i(p), R, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_\ell(p), R, \Delta_{\ell'}(q)) \star (\Delta_\ell(p), \mu_{G_i}R, \Delta_{\ell'}(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}R, \Delta_j(q)).$$

Therefore, we obtain $(\Delta_i(p), P, \Delta_j(q)) \star (\Delta_i(p), \mu_{G_i}P, \Delta_j(q))$ by (38) (39). \square

The following proposition follows immediately by Lemmas 11.6, 11.17 and Corollary 11.16.

Proposition 11.18. *For any $\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}(T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, we have $\mathbf{P} \sim \mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P} \approx \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof of Theorem 11.5 It follows by Propositions 11.12, 11.15 and 11.18. \square

12. PROOF FOR THE EXPANSION FORMULAS

Let x_0, x_1 be two variables such that $x_0x_1 = v^{2\lambda}x_1x_0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$. Denote $\Lambda(x_0, x_1) = -\Lambda(x_1, x_0) = \lambda$ and $\Lambda(x_0, x_0) = \Lambda(x_1, x_1) = 0$. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\vec{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_r) \in \{0, 1\}^r$, denote

$$(40) \quad \lambda(\vec{c}) = \sum_{i < j} \Lambda(x_{c_i}, x_{c_j}), \quad x^{\vec{c}} = v^{-\lambda(\vec{c})} x_{c_1} x_{c_2} \cdots x_{c_r}.$$

Thus, we have

$$(41) \quad (x_0 + x_1)^r = \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} x^{\vec{c}}.$$

We have the following observation.

Lemma 12.1. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$.*

- (1) *For any i with $1 \leq i \leq r$, given $\vec{c}, \vec{c}' \in \{0, 1\}^r$ with $c_i = 1, c'_i = 0$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for $j \neq i$, we have $\lambda(\vec{c}) - \lambda(\vec{c}') = (2i - r - 1)\lambda$.*
- (2) *For any i with $1 \leq i \leq r - 1$, given $\vec{c}, \vec{c}' \in \{0, 1\}^r$ with $c_i = c'_{i+1} = 0, c_{i+1} = c'_i = 1$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for $j \neq i, i + 1$, we have $\lambda(\vec{c}) - \lambda(\vec{c}') = 2\lambda$.*

Proof. (1) As $c_i = 1, c'_i = 0$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for $j \neq i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda(\vec{c}) - \lambda(\vec{c}') \\ &= \sum_{s < t} \Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_{c_t}) - \sum_{s < t} \Lambda(x_{c'_s}, x_{c'_t}) \\ &= \sum_{s < i} (\Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_1) - \Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_0)) + \sum_{i < s} (\Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_1) - \Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_0)) \\ &= (i - 1)\lambda - (r - i)\lambda \\ &= (2i - r - 1)\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

(2) As $c_i = c'_{i+1} = 0, c_{i+1} = c'_i = 1$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for $j \neq i, i + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda(\vec{c}) - \lambda(\vec{c}') \\ &= \sum_{s < t} \Lambda(x_{c_s}, x_{c_t}) - \sum_{s < t} \Lambda(x_{c'_s}, x_{c'_t}) \\ &= \Lambda(x_0, x_1) - \Lambda(x_1, x_0) \\ &= 2\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

□

Throughout this section, denote by $b_{\alpha'}^{T'o}$ the α' -th column of the extended exchange matrix $\tilde{B}(T'o)$ and $(b_{\alpha'}^{T'o})_{\pm}$ are the positive and negative part, respectively, of $b_{\alpha'}^{T'o}$.

Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}), \mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)})$ or $\mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$. Correspondingly, let $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}), \mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)})$ or $\mathcal{L}(T'o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, $\pi = \pi, \pi$ or $\pi_{\alpha}^{T'o, p, q}$ and $\pi' = \pi_{\alpha'}^{T'o}, \pi_{\alpha'}^{T'o, q}$ or $\pi_{\alpha'}^{T'o, p, q}$. Denote the minimal elements in \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}' by \mathbf{P}_- and \mathbf{P}'_- , respectively.

As a corollary of Theorem 11.5, by the definition of the y -equivalent, we have the following.

Proposition 12.2. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

$$\frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^T(\mathbf{Q})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}} y^T(\mathbf{Q})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')}.$$

Proposition 12.3. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ with $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$, we have*

$$X^T(\mathbf{P})|_{v=1} = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}')|_{v=1}.$$

Proof. As $r \geq 0$, we have that in the cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)|_{v=1}$

$$(42) \quad X^T(\mathbf{P})|_{v=1} = \frac{M \cdot (x_\alpha)^r \cdot y^T(\mathbf{P})}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{L}} y^T(\mathbf{Q})},$$

where M is the cluster Laurent monomial corresponding to the edges not labeled α in P , the diagonals not labeled α of $G_{T^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ and the sides of Δ not equal α .

For each $\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r$, by Theorem 9.22, Lemmas 7.16, 8.10, 6.7 and 6.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) &= M \cdot (x_{\alpha'})^{-r} \cdot (x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4})^{r - \sum_i c_i} \cdot (x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3})^{\sum_i c_i}, \\ y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) &= y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) (y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})^{\sum_i c_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Definitions 6.1, 6.6, 6.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}))|_{v=1} \\ &= \sum_{\vec{c}} \frac{M \cdot (x_{\alpha'})^{-r} \cdot (x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4})^{r - \sum_i c_i} \cdot (x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3})^{\sum_i c_i} \cdot y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) (y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})^{\sum_i c_i}}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} \\ &= M \cdot (x_{\alpha'})^{-r} \cdot y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) \frac{\sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r} (x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4})^{r - \sum_i c_i} \cdot (x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3} y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})^{\sum_i c_i}}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')} \\ &= M \cdot (x_{\alpha'})^{-r} \cdot y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) \frac{(x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3} y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})^r}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')}, \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.3 (4), $x_\alpha = \frac{x_{\alpha_2} x_{\alpha_4} + x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_3} y_{\alpha'}^{T' o}}{x_{\alpha'} \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})}$. Thus we have

$$\sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}))|_{v=1} = \frac{M \cdot (x_\alpha)^r \cdot y^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) \cdot (1 \oplus y_{\alpha'}^{T' o})^r}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')}.$$

By Lemma 11.3, we obtain

$$(43) \quad \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}))|_{v=1} = \frac{M \cdot (x_\alpha)^r \cdot \bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \mathcal{L}'} y^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}')}.$$

Then the result follows by (42) (43) and Proposition 12.2. \square

From the proof, we see the following result.

Lemma 12.4. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ with $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$, assume that $X^T(\mathbf{P}) = (X^T)^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} + re_\alpha}$, then for any $\vec{c} \in \{0, 1\}^r$ we have*

$$X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) = (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+}.$$

Proposition 12.5. *We have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}} X^T(\mathbf{P})|_{v=1} = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}'} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}')|_{v=1}.$$

Proof. The result follows by Proposition 12.3 and π is a partition bijection. \square

It follows that the commutative version of Theorems 6.5, 6.9, 6.14 hold.

Theorem 12.6. *For $X = X_\beta, X_{\beta^{(q)}}$ or $X_{\beta^{(p,q)}}$, in the commutative cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)|_{v=1}$ we have*

$$X|_{v=1} = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}} X^T(\mathbf{P})|_{v=1}.$$

We now turn to the quantum case.

Lemma 12.7. *For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ with $r = \sum m_i(\mathbf{P}) \geq 0$, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^T(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}')$,
- (ii) $w(\mathbf{P}) = w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0))$,
- (iii) $w(\mathbf{P}) = w(\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1))$.

Proof. As in Lemma 12.4, we may write $X^T(\mathbf{P})$ as $(X^T)^{re_\alpha + \vec{\mathbf{P}}}$. Hence the coordinates of e_α and $e_{\alpha'}$ in $\vec{\mathbf{P}}$ are zero. It follows that $(X^T)^{\vec{\mathbf{P}}} = (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}}}$.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (44) \quad X^T(\mathbf{P}) &= (X^T)^{re_\alpha + \vec{\mathbf{P}}} = v^{-\Lambda^T(\vec{\mathbf{P}}, re_\alpha)} (X^T)^{\vec{\mathbf{P}}} \cdot (X^T)^{re_\alpha} \\ &= v^{-\Lambda^T(\vec{\mathbf{P}}, re_\alpha)} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}}} \cdot \left((X^{T'})^{-e_{\alpha'} + (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+} + (X^{T'})^{-e_{\alpha'} + (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_-} \right)^{re_\alpha} \\ &= v^{-\Lambda^T(\vec{\mathbf{P}}, re_\alpha)} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}}} \cdot \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} (X^{T'})^{-re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+} \\ &= v^{-\Lambda^T(\vec{\mathbf{P}}, re_\alpha)} v^{\Lambda^T(\vec{\mathbf{P}}, -re_{\alpha'} + r(b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+)} \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+} \\ &= \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+}, \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows by (41) and $\lambda(\vec{c})$ is given by (40) under the convention that $x_0 = (X^{T'})^{-e_{\alpha'} + (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_-}$, $x_1 = (X^{T'})^{-e_{\alpha'} + (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+}$.

On the other hand, by Remark 9.10, Proposition 9.12 and Lemma 12.4, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') = \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{w(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}))} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+}.$$

By Lemma 9.23 and Lemma 12.1 (1), for any $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $\vec{c}, \vec{c}' \in \{0,1\}^r$ with $c_i = 1, c'_i = 0$ and $c_j = c'_j$ for $j \neq i$, we have

$$w(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c})) - w(\mathbf{P}(\vec{c}')) = (2i - r - 1)d(\alpha') = \lambda(\vec{c}) - \lambda(\vec{c}'),$$

by (40), we have $\lambda(0, \dots, 0) = \lambda(1, \dots, 1) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (45) \quad & \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}') \\ &= v^{w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0))} \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+} \\ &= v^{w(\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1))} \sum_{\vec{c} \in \{0,1\}^r} v^{\lambda(\vec{c})} (X^{T'})^{\vec{\mathbf{P}} - re_{\alpha'} + \sum c_i (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_- + (r - \sum c_i) (b_{\alpha'}^{T' o})_+}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the result follows by (44) and (45). \square

As a corollary of Lemma 12.7 and Proposition 10.1, we have the following.

Lemma 12.8. *With the foregoing notation. We have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)} v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^T(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P}_-)} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}').$$

As a consequence of Theorem 11.5 and Lemma 12.8, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 12.9. *With the foregoing notation. For any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}$ we have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{Q} \in \pi' \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{Q})} X^T(\mathbf{Q}) = \sum_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{Q}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{Q}').$$

It follows that

Theorem 12.10. *With the foregoing notation. We have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}} v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^T(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}'} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'}(\mathbf{P}').$$

12.1. Proofs of Theorems 6.5, 6.9. We can now give the proofs of Theorems 6.5, 6.9.

Proof of Theorem 6.5: If $\beta \in T^\circ$, then $\mathcal{P}(G_{T^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$ contains only one perfect matching P with $X^T(P) = X_\beta$ and $w(P) = 0$. Thus the result holds in case $\beta \in T^\circ$. If $\beta \notin T^\circ$, as any two ideal triangulations are related by a sequence of flips, the result follows by Theorem 12.10 and the case that $\beta \in T^\circ$. The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 12.11. *Assume that $p \neq q$, for an ideal triangulation T_0° such that $\beta, l_q(\beta) \in T_0^\circ$, let $\alpha = l_q(\beta)$ and $T_0^{\circ\circ} = \mu_\alpha(T_0^\circ)$. Then we have $X^{T_0}(P_\beta, \Delta) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^{\circ\circ}, \beta)} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T_0'}(\mathbf{P}')$.*

Proof of Theorem 6.9: Choose an ideal triangulation T_0° such that $\beta, l_q(\beta) \in T_0^\circ$. Then $\mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(a)}) = \{(P_\beta, \Delta)\}$ contains a unique element, where $\Delta = (\beta, \beta, l_q(\beta))$. In this case, we have $w(P_\beta, \Delta) = 0$. From Definition 6.1, we see that $X^{T_0}(P_\beta, \Delta) = X_{\beta^{(a)}}$. By Lemma 12.11, we see the result holds for T_0' . For any ideal triangulation T° such that the corresponding tagged triangulation T contains no arc tagged notched at q . We see the result holds for T by Lemma 2.19 and Theorem 12.10. The proof is complete. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to giving the proof of Theorem 6.14.

Given a quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)$ and a puncture p , recall the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_v^{(p)}(\Sigma)$ and the isomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_v^{(p)}(\Sigma)$ in Section 3. Denote by $\sigma|_{v=1}$ the corresponding isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}_v(\Sigma)|_{v=1}$ and $\mathcal{A}_v^{(p)}(\Sigma)|_{v=1}$. For a given tagged triangulation T , for any $\Delta_j(p) \in \Delta(T^\circ, p)$, denote by $x^{T, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(p))$, $h^{T, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(p))$, $y^{T, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(p))$ and $X^{T, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(p))$ the weight, height monomial, specialized height monomial and quantum weight, respectively of $(P_\beta, \Delta_j(p))$ in $\mathcal{A}_v^{(p)}(\Sigma)$, which are given in Definition 6.6.

We divide the proof of Theorem 6.14 into two cases: $p \neq q$ or $p = q$.

12.2. Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p \neq q$. As $p \neq q$, we have $\tilde{\beta} = \beta, \beta$ and $\beta^{(p)}$ are compatible. We may choose a tagged triangulation T_0 such that $\beta, \beta^{(p)} \in T_0$ and any arc $\gamma (\neq \beta^{(p)}) \in T_0$ does not tagged notched. Thus $T_0^{(p)} = T_0$. Let $T_0^\circ = l(T_0)$ be the corresponding ideal triangulation. Thus $l_p(\beta) \in T_0^\circ$ and $\Delta = (\beta, \beta, l_p(\beta))$ is a self-folded

triangle in T_0° . Denote $\Delta(T_0^\circ, q) = \{\Delta_1(q), \dots, \Delta_t(q)\}$. Then $\tau_{t-1}(q) = \tau_1(q) = l_p(\beta)$, $\tau_t(q) = \tau_{[1]}(q) = \tau_{[t]}(q) = \beta$ and $\tau_j[q] \neq \beta, l_p(\beta)$ for any $j \in \{2, \dots, t-1\}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &:= \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(p,q)}) = \{\Delta\} \times \{P_\beta\} \times \{\Delta_1(q), \Delta_3(q), \dots, \Delta_{t-3}(q), \Delta_t(q)\}, \\ \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(q)}) &= \{P_\beta\} \times \{\Delta_1(q), \Delta_2(q), \dots, \Delta_{t-1}(q), \Delta_t(q)\}.\end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 19

For $j < t$, let

$$y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = y_\beta^{T_0} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T_0} \cdots y_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{T_0},$$

and

$$y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) = y_\beta^{T_0} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T_0} \cdots y_{\tau_{t-2}(q)}^{T_0} y_\beta^{T_0}.$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 12.12. *For any $(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

- (1) $\sigma|_{v=1}(x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))) = x^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))$,
- (2) $\sigma|_{v=1}(y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))) = y^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))$,
- (3) $\sigma(X^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))) = X^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))$.

Proof. (1) For $j = 1, t$, we have $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = (x_{l_p(\beta)} x_\beta^{-2}) x_\beta (x_\beta x_\beta^{-1} x_{l_p(\beta)}^{-1}) = x_\beta^{-1}$. $x^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = x_\beta^{(p)} (x_\beta^{(p)} (x_\beta^{(p)})^{-1} (x_{l_p(\beta)}^{(p)})^{-1}) = (x_\beta^{(p)})^{-1}$. Thus the result holds for $j = 1, t$. For $j \neq 1, t$, we have $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = (x_{l_p(\beta)} x_\beta^{-2}) x_\beta x^{T_0}(\Delta_j(q)) = x_{\beta^{(p)}} x^{T_0}(\Delta_j(q))$. Thus $\sigma|_{v=1}(x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))) = x_\beta^{(p)} x^{T_0, (p)}(\Delta_j(q)) = x^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))$.

(2) Since $\tau_j[q] \neq \beta, l_p(\beta)$ for any $j \in \{2, \dots, t-1\}$, we have for $j < t$

$$\sigma|_{v=1}(y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))) = y_{\beta^{(p)}}^{T_0, (p)} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T_0, (p)} \cdots y_{\tau_{j-1}(q)}^{T_0, (p)} = y^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)),$$

$$\sigma|_{v=1}(y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q))) = y_{\beta^{(p)}}^{T_0, (p)} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T_0, (p)} \cdots y_{\tau_{t-2}(q)}^{T_0, (p)} y_{\beta^{(p)}}^{T_0, (p)} = y^{T_0, (p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)).$$

(3) It follows by (1) and (2). □

The following proposition follows immediately by Lemma 12.12.

Proposition 12.13. *With the foregoing notation. We have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P}=(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}} v^{w(\mathbf{P}, \Delta_j(q))} \sigma(X^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(q)})} v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^{T_0, (p)}(\mathbf{P}).$$

Proposition 12.14. *Assume that $p \neq q$, for any ideal triangulation T_0° such that $\beta, l_q(\beta) \in T_0^\circ$, let $\alpha = l_q(\beta)$ and $T_0^\circ = \mu_\alpha(T_0^\circ)$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{P}=(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(p,q)})} v^{w(\mathbf{P}, \Delta_j(q))} X^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(p,q)})} v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^{T_0'}(\mathbf{P}).$$

Proof. Assume $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \beta$. Denote $\Delta'_1 = \{\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha'\}$ and $\Delta'_2 = \{\beta, \alpha_4, \alpha'\}$. Assume that the endpoints of γ are p and p' . We have the following two cases $p' \neq q$ and $p' = q$.

Case I: $p' \neq q$. Then we have $\Delta(T_0^o, q) = \{\Delta'_1, \Delta_3(q), \dots, \Delta_{t-2}(q), \Delta'_2\}$ and $\Delta(T_0^o, p) = \{\Delta'_2, \Delta'_1\}$. See Figure 19. Then the following assignments

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) &= (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2), & \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) &= (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1), \\ \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) &= \{(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)), (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))\} \end{aligned}$$

for $3 \leq j \leq t-2$,

$$\pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) = (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2), \quad \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) = (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1)$$

give a partition bijection $\pi : \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$.

We have

$$x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) = \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_\beta}{x_\alpha x_\beta} = \frac{1}{x_\beta}, \quad y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) = 1,$$

$$x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2) = \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha'}}{x_{\alpha_4} x_\beta} = \frac{1}{x_\beta}, \quad y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2) = 1.$$

Thus $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) = x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2) y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2)$.

We have

$$x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) = \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\alpha x_{\alpha_1}} = \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha_1}}, \quad y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) = y_\beta^{T_0},$$

$$x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1) = \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha'}}{x_{\alpha_1} x_\beta} = \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha_1}}, \quad y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1) = y_\beta^{T'_0}.$$

Thus $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) = x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1) y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1)$.

For $3 \leq j \leq t-2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) &= y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_{[j]}(q)}{x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}} \\ &= y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta} \frac{x_{[j]}(q)}{x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))} x^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}') y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}') &= y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \left(\frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} + y_{\alpha'}^{T'_0} \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} \right) x_\beta \frac{x_{[j]}(q)}{x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}} \\ &= y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \frac{x_\alpha (1 + y_{\alpha'}^{T'_0})}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_{[j]}(q)}{x_{\tau_{j-1}(q)} x_{\tau_j(q)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.3 (3)(a), we have $y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) (1 + y_{\alpha'}^{T'_0})$. Thus

$$x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))} x^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}') y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}').$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) &= \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha_4}} = \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha_4}}, \\ y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) &= y_\beta^{T_0} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T_0} \cdots y_{\tau_{t-2}(q)}^{T_0}, \\ x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2) &= \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha'}}{x_{\alpha_4} x_\beta} = \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha_4}}, \\ y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2) &= y_\beta^{T'_0} y_{\tau_2(q)}^{T'_0} \cdots y_{\tau_{t-2}(q)}^{T'_0} y_{\alpha'}^{T'_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau_2(q) = \alpha_1, \tau_{t-2}(q) = \alpha_4$, we have $y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) = y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2)$ by Lemma 6.3 (3)(a). Thus $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q))y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) = x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2)y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2)$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) &= \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\beta^2} x_\beta \frac{x_\beta}{x_\beta x_\alpha} = \frac{1}{x_\beta}, \\ y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) &= y_\beta^{T_0} y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)), \\ x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1) &= \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\beta x_{\alpha'}} x_\beta \frac{x_{\alpha'}}{x_{\alpha_1} x_\beta} = \frac{1}{x_\beta}, \\ y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1) &= y_\beta^{T'_0} y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) = y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1)$ and

$$x^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q))y^{T_0}(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) = x^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1)y^{T'_0}(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1).$$

From the above, we see that $\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)})} y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \beta^{(p,q)})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')$. Thus, we have $X^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} X^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')$ for any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$. To end the proof, it remains to prove that $w(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = w(\mathbf{P}')$ for any $(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$ and $\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))$.

It is easy to see that $w(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $w(\mathbf{P}') = 0$ for all $\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$.

Case II. $p' = q$. Then there exists k such that $\tau_k(q) = \alpha_1$ and $\tau_{k+1}(q) = \alpha_4$. See Figure 20. Thus we have $\Delta(T_0'^o, q) = \{\Delta'_1, \Delta_3(q), \dots, \Delta_k(q), \Delta'_{k+1}, \Delta''_{k+1}, \Delta_{k+2}(q), \dots, \Delta_{t-2}(q), \Delta'_2\}$ and $\Delta(T_0'^o, p) = \{\Delta'_2, \Delta'_1\}$, where $\Delta'_{k+1} = \Delta'_1$ with $m(\Delta'_{k+1}; \alpha') = -1$ and $\Delta''_{k+1} = \Delta'_2$ with $m(\Delta''_{k+1}; \alpha') = -1$. Then the following assignments

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_1(q)) &= (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_2), \quad \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_2(q)) = (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_1), \\ \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{k+1}(q)) &= \{(\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_{k+1}), (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta''_{k+1}), (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta'_{k+1}), (\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta''_{k+1})\}, \\ \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) &= \{(\Delta'_2, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)), (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))\} \end{aligned}$$

for $3 \leq j \leq k$ or $k+2 \leq j \leq t-2$,

$$\pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_{t-1}(q)) = (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_2), \quad \pi(\Delta, P_\beta, \Delta_t(q)) = (\Delta'_1, P_\beta, \Delta'_1)$$

give a partition bijection $\pi : \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$.




FIGURE 20

As Case I, we can similarly prove $X^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} X^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')$ for any $\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$ and $w(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ and $w(\mathbf{P}') = 0$ for all $\mathbf{P}' \in \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \beta^{(p,q)})$.

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p \neq q$ Choose a tagged triangulation T_0 contains $\beta, \beta^{(p)}$ and any arc $\gamma (\neq \beta^{(p)}) \in T_0$ does not tagged notched. By Theorem 6.9, we have

$$\sum_{(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \beta^{(q)})} v^{w(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q))} X^{(p)}(P_\beta, \Delta_j(q)) = X_{\beta^{(q)}}^{(p)}.$$

By Propositions 12.13 and 12.14, we have Theorem 6.14 holds for T'_0 . For any ideal triangulation T° such that the corresponding tagged triangulation T contains no arc tagged notched at p or q , we see Theorem 6.14 holds for T by Lemma 2.20 and Theorem 12.10. \square

12.3. Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p = q$. As (S, M) is not a once-punctured closed surface, we may choose an arc γ incident to p with another endpoint different from p and compatible with $\tilde{\beta}$. Then we have γ and $\gamma^{(p)}$ are compatible. We may choose a tagged triangulation T_0 such that $\gamma, \gamma^{(p)} \in T_0$. Thus $T_0^{(p)} = T_0$. Let $T_0^\circ = l(T_0)$ be the corresponding ideal triangulation. Thus $l_p(\gamma) \in T_0^\circ$ and $\Delta = (\gamma, \gamma, l_p(\gamma))$ is a self-folded triangle in T_0° .

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)}) &= \{\Delta\} \times \mathcal{P}(G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}) \times \{\Delta\}, \\ \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}) &= \mathcal{P}(G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}). \end{aligned}$$

For any $(\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, let $y^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta) = \sigma|_{v=1}(y^{T_0, (p)}(P))$.

The following result follows by Lemma 6.4.

Lemma 12.15. *Assume that $P > \mu_{G_i} P$. Then we have*

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)}{y^{T_0}(\Delta, Q, \Delta)} = \begin{cases} y_\gamma^{T_0}, & \text{if } \tau_{i_l} = l_q(\gamma), \\ y_{\tau_{i_l}}^{T_0}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 12.16. *For any $(\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, we have*

- (1) $\sigma|_{v=1}(x^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)) = x^{T_0, (p)}(P)$,
- (2) $\sigma|_{v=1}(y^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)) = y^{T_0, (p)}(P)$,
- (3) $\sigma(X^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)) = X^{T_0, (p)}(P)$.

Proof. (1) We have the west edge E_1 and south edge E_2 of the first tile of $G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ are labeled γ . The east edge F_1 and north edge F_2 of the last tile of $G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$ are labeled γ . For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}})$, we have either $E_1 \in P$ or $E_2 \in P$, either $F_1 \in P$ or $F_2 \in P$. Thus $x^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta) = \frac{x_{l_p(\gamma)}}{x_\gamma^2} x_\gamma X x_\gamma \frac{x_{l_p(\gamma)}}{x_\gamma^2} = x_{\gamma^{(p)}}^2 X$, where X is the cluster Laurent monomial corresponding to the edges except E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2 in P and the diagonals of $G_{T_0^\circ, \tilde{\beta}}$. Since x_γ is not a factor of X , we have $\sigma|_{v=1}(x^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)) = (x_\gamma^{(p)})^2 X^{(p)} = x^{T_0, (p)}(P)$.

(2) It follows by the definition of $y^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)$.

(3) It follows by (1) and (2). \square

The following proposition follows immediately by Lemma 12.16.

Proposition 12.17. *With the foregoing notation. We have*

$$\sum_{(\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})} v^{w(P)} \sigma(X^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta)) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \tilde{\beta})} v^{w(P)} X^{T_0, (p)}(P).$$

Proposition 12.18. *Assume that $p = q$, let $\alpha = l_q(\gamma)$ and $T_0'^o = \mu_\alpha(T_0^o)$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{(\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})} v^{w(P)} X^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})} v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^{T_0'}(\mathbf{P}).$$

We will prove Proposition 12.18 in Section 12.4.

Proof of Theorem 6.14 in case $p = q$. By Theorem 6.5, we have

$$\sum_{P \in \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \tilde{\beta})} v^{w(P)} X^{T_0, (p)}(P) = X_{\tilde{\beta}}^{(p)}.$$

By Proposition 12.17, we have Theorem 6.14 holds for T_0 . By Proposition 12.18, Theorem 6.14 holds for T_0' . For any ideal triangulation T^o such that the corresponding tagged triangulation T contains no arc tagged notched at p , we see Theorem 6.14 holds for T by Lemma 2.20 and Theorem 12.10.


The proof of Theorem 6.14 is complete. \square

12.4. Proof of Proposition 12.18. Assume that the tiles of $G_{T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ are G'_1, \dots, G'_c with diagonals labeled $\tau'_{i_1}, \dots, \tau'_{i_c}$. Then $\tau'_{i_1}, \tau'_{i_c} \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_4\}$. Since $\gamma, \tilde{\beta}$ are compatible, $\tilde{\beta}$ crosses T_0^o $c + 2$ times. Assume that the tiles of $G_{T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ are $G_0, G_1, \dots, G_c, G_{c+1}$ with diagonals labeled $\tau_{i_j}, j = 0, \dots, c + 1$. Then $\tau_{i_j} = \tau'_{i_j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, c$ and $\tau_{i_0}, \tau_{i_{c+1}} = \alpha$. We may further assume that $rel(T_0^o, G_1) = rel(T_0^o, G_c) = rel(T_0'^o, G'_1) = rel(T_0'^o, G'_c) = 1$. (Here the assumption implies c is odd, the result can be proved similarly in case c is even, the assumption fixes the labels of the edges of these tiles.)

Denote $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$, $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}(T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}^{(p,q)})$.

By symmetry, we shall consider the following cases. Case I: $\tau'_{i_1} = \alpha_1, \tau'_{i_c} = \alpha_4$; Case II: $\tau'_{i_1} = \alpha_1, \tau'_{i_c} = \alpha_1$ and Case III: $\tau'_{i_1} = \alpha_4, \tau'_{i_c} = \alpha_4$.

We consider the Case I, as the other cases can be proved similarly.



In this case, the subgraph of $G_{T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ formed by $N(G_1), E(G_1), S(G_c), W(G_c)$ and G_2, \dots, G_{c-1} equals the subgraph of $G_{T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}}$ formed by $N(G'_1), E(G'_1), S(G'_c), W(G'_c)$ and G'_2, \dots, G'_{c-1} . See Figure 21. Denote this common subgraph by H .

The following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 12.19. *For any $P \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}})$, there is a unique $P' \in \mathcal{P}(G_{T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}})$ such that $P \cap \text{edge}(H) = P' \cap \text{edge}(H)$. We denote $P|_{G_{T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}}} = P'$. In particular, $P_-|_{G_{T_0'^o, \tilde{\beta}}} = P'_-$ is the minimal perfect matching.*




FIGURE 21

Denote $\Delta_1 = \{\gamma, \alpha', \alpha_1\}$ and $\Delta_2 = \{\gamma, \alpha', \alpha_4\}$. Then the maximal/minimal element in \mathcal{L}' is $(\Delta_1, P'_\pm, \Delta_2)$. In this case the partition bijection $\pi : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}'$ has the following explicit construction: for any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$,

- (i) if $S(G_1), E(G_c) \in P$, then $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_1), (\Delta_1, P', \Delta_2), (\Delta_2, P', \Delta_1), (\Delta_2, P', \Delta_2)\}$;
- (ii) If $S(G_1) \in P, E(G_c) \notin P$, then $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_1), (\Delta_2, P', \Delta_1)\}$ in case $N(G_{c+1}) \in P$ and $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_2), (\Delta_2, P', \Delta_2)\}$ in case $N(G_{c+1}) \notin P$;
- (iii) If $S(G_1) \notin P, E(G_c) \in P$, then $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_1), (\Delta_1, P', \Delta_2)\}$ in case $W(G_0) \notin P$ and $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_2, P', \Delta_1), (\Delta_2, P', \Delta_2)\}$ in case $W(G_0) \in P$;
- (iv) If $S(G_1), E(G_c) \notin P$, then $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_1)\}$ in case $W(G_0) \notin P, N(G_{c+1}) \in P$, $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_2, P', \Delta_1)\}$ in case $W(G_0), N(G_{c+1}) \in P$, $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta_2)\}$ in case $W(G_0), N(G_{c+1}) \notin P$ and $\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_2, P', \Delta_2)\}$ in case $W(G_0) \in P, N(G_{c+1}) \notin P$,

where $P' = P|_{G_{T_0^o, \tilde{\beta}}}$.

The following is immediate.

Lemma 12.20. $\pi(\Delta, P_-, \Delta)$ contains the minimal element $(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_2)$.

Lemma 12.21. Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta, \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$.

- (1) If $l = 0$, then for any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$ we have $\Delta' = \Delta_2$ and

$$\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{(\Delta_1, P', \Delta'') \mid (\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by γ , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0));$$

- (2) If $l = 1$, then for any $(\Delta', Q', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})$ we have $\Delta' = \Delta_2$, Q' can twist on G'_1 with $Q' < \mu_{G'_1}(Q')$ and

$$\pi(\mathbf{P}) = \{(\Delta_1, \mu_{G'_1}Q', \Delta''), (\Delta_2, \mu_{G'_1}Q', \Delta'') \mid (\Delta', Q', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by α_1 , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0));$$

- (3) If $2 \leq l \leq c - 1$, then for any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$ we have P' can twist on G'_l with $P' > \mu_{G'_l}(P')$ and

$$\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{(\Delta', \mu_{G_l}P', \Delta'') \mid (\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by τ_{i_l} , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0));$$

(4) If $l = c$, then for any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$ we have $\Delta'' = \Delta_1$, P' can twist on G'_c with $P' > \mu_{G'_c}(P')$ and

$$\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{(\Delta', \mu_{G'_c}P', \Delta_1), (\Delta', \mu_{G'_c}P', \Delta_2) \mid (\Delta', Q', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(1, \dots, 1)$ and related by α_1 , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1), \mathbf{Q}(1, \dots, 1));$$

(5) If $l = c + 1$, then for any $(\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})$ we have $\Delta'' = \Delta_2$ and

$$\pi(\mathbf{Q}) = \{(\Delta', P', \Delta_1) \mid (\Delta', P', \Delta'') \in \pi(\mathbf{P})\}.$$

Moreover, $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by γ , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)).$$

Proof. The relation between $\pi(\mathbf{P})$ and $\pi(\mathbf{Q})$ follows immediately by the construction of π .

(1) Since $W(G'_1) \in P'$, we have $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by γ . If $E(G_c) \in P$, then $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = 0$ and $E(G'_c) \in P'$. Thus

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)) = 1 + m(\Delta_2; \gamma) = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

If $E(G_c) \notin P$, then $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = -1$ and $S(G'_c) \in P'$. Thus

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)) = 0 + m(\Delta_1; \gamma) = 0 - 1 = -1.$$

(2) Since $l = 1$, we have $S(G'_1) \in P'$. Thus $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by α_1 . If $N(G_c) \in P$, then $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = 1$ and $N(G_{c+1}) \in P, N(G'_c) \in P'$. Thus $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = (\Delta_2, \mu_{G'_1}Q', \Delta_1)$ and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)) = m(\Delta_1; \alpha_1) - m(\Delta_2; \alpha_1) = 1 - 0 = 1.$$

If $N(G_c) \notin P$, then $\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = 0$ and $E(G_c) \in P$ in case $N(G_{c+1}) \in P$. Thus $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0) = (\Delta_2, \mu_{G'_1}Q', \Delta_2)$ and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)) = m(\Delta_2; \alpha_1) - m(\Delta_2; \alpha_1) = 0.$$

(3) Since $2 \leq l \leq c - 1$, we have $\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)$ covers $\mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)$ and related by τ_{i_l} , and

$$\Omega(P, \mu_{G_l}P) = \Omega(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0), \mathbf{Q}(0, \dots, 0)) = 0.$$

(4) and (5) are similar to (2) and (1). □

Lemma 12.22. Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta, \mu_{G_l}P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$. Then

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}.$$

Proof. If $l = 0$, then by Lemmas 12.15, 6.11 and 12.21 we have

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = y_\gamma^{T_0} = y_\gamma^{T'_0} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}$$

If $l = 1$, then by Lemmas 12.15, 6.3, 6.11 and 12.21 we have

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T_0} = y_{\alpha_1}^{T'_0} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha_1'}^{T'_0}) = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}$$

If $2 \leq l \leq c - 1$, then by Lemmas 6.11 and 12.21 we have

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = y_{\tau_i}^{T_0} = y_{\tau_i}^{T'_0} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}$$

If $l = c$, then by Lemmas 12.15, 6.3, 6.11 and 12.21 we have

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = y_{\alpha_4}^{T_0} = y_{\alpha_4}^{T'_0} \frac{1}{y_{\alpha_4'}^{T'_0}} (1 \oplus y_{\alpha_4'}^{T'_0}) = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}$$

If $l = c + 1$, then by Lemmas 12.15, 6.11 and 12.21 we have

$$\frac{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P})}{y^{T_0}(\mathbf{Q})} = y_\gamma^{T_0} = y_\gamma^{T'_0} = \frac{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{Q}' \in \pi(\mathbf{Q})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{Q}')}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Lemma 12.23. *Assume that $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$ covers $\mathbf{Q} = (\Delta, \mu_{G_l} P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$. Then we have $w(P) = w(\mathbf{P}(0, \dots, 0)) = w(\mathbf{P}(1, \dots, 1))$.*

Proof. It follows by Lemmas 12.20 and 12.21. \square

Proposition 12.24. *For any $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P, \Delta) \in \mathcal{L}$, we have*

$$v^{w(\mathbf{P})} X^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} v^{w(\mathbf{P}')} X^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{P} = (\Delta, P_-, \Delta)$, we have $W(G_0), S(G_1) \notin P, E(G_c), N(G_{c+1}) \in P$. Then

$$x^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta) = \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\gamma^2} x_\gamma x_\alpha^{-1} x(P|_H) x_{\alpha_4}^{-1} x_\gamma \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\gamma^2} = x(P|_H) \frac{x_\alpha}{x_\gamma^2 x_{\alpha_4}}, \quad y^{T_0}(\Delta, P, \Delta) = 1,$$

$$x^{T'_0}(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_1) = \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\gamma x_{\alpha'}} x_{\alpha'} x_{\alpha_1}^{-1} x(P'_-|_H) x_{\alpha_4}^{-1} x_\gamma \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_\gamma x_{\alpha'}} = x(P'_-|_H) \frac{x_{\alpha_1}}{x_{\alpha_4} x_\gamma x_{\alpha'}},$$

$$x^{T'_0}(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_2) = x^{T'_0}(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_1) \frac{x_{\alpha_4}}{x_{\alpha_1}} = x(P'_-|_H) \frac{1}{x_\gamma x_{\alpha'}},$$

$$y^{T_0}(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_1) = y_{\alpha'}^{T_0}, \quad y^{T_0}(\Delta_1, P'_-, \Delta_2) = 1.$$

where $x(P|_H)$ (resp. $x(P'_-|_H)$) is the Laurent monomial determined by the edges $P \cap \text{edge}(H)$ (resp. $P'_- \cap \text{edge}(H)$) and the diagonals of H . Thus,

$$x^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) y^{T_0}(\mathbf{P}) = \frac{1}{\bigoplus_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')} \sum_{\mathbf{P}' \in \pi(\mathbf{P})} x^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}') y^{T'_0}(\mathbf{P}')$$

Then the proof is similar to Proposition 12.9 by using Lemma 12.22. \square

Proof of Proposition 12.18. It follows immediately by Proposition 12.24.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Berenstein, M. Huang, V. Retakh, Noncommutative marked surfaces II: tagged triangulations, clusters, and their symmetries, in Preparation.
- [2] A. Berenstein, V. Retakh, Noncommutative marked surfaces, *Adv. Math.* 328 (2018), 1010-1087.
- [3] A. Berenstein, A. Zelevinsky, Quantum cluster algebras. *Adv Math* 195 (2) (2005) 405-455.
- [4] P. Caldero, F. Chapoton, Cluster algebras as Hall algebras of quiver representations, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 81 (2006) 595-616.
- [5] P. Caldero, B. Keller, From triangulated categories to cluster algebras, *Invent. Math.* 172 (2008) 169-211.
- [6] P. Caldero, B. Keller, From triangulated categories to cluster algebras II, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* (4) 39 (6) (2006) 983-1009.
- [7] P.G. Cao, M. Huang, F. Li, Categorification of sign-skew-symmetric cluster algebras and some conjectures on g-vectors, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 25 (2022), no. 6, 1685-1698.
- [8] I. Canakci, P. Lampe, An expansion formula for type A and Kronecker quantum cluster algebras, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 171 (2020), 105132, 30 pp.
- [9] I. Canakci, R. Schiffler, Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces, *J. Algebra* 2013, 382, 240-281.
- [10] I. Canakci and S. Schroll, Lattice bijections for string modules, snake graphs and the weak Bruhat order, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 126 (2021), Paper No. 102094, 22 pp.
- [11] B. Davison, Positivity for quantum cluster algebras, *Annals of Mathematics* 187 (2018) 157-219.
- [12] L. Demonet, Categorification of skew-symmerizable cluster algebras, *Algebr Represent Theory* 14 (2011) 1087-1162.
- [13] H. Derksen, J. Weyman, A. Zelevinsky, Quivers with potentials and their representations II: applications to cluster algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 23(3) (2010) 749-790.
- [14] A. Felikson, M. Shapiro, P. Tumarkin, Cluster algebras and triangulated orbifolds, *Adv. Math.* 231 (2012) 2953-3002.
- [15] A. Felikson, P. Tumarkin, Bases for cluster algebras from orbifolds, *Adv. Math.* 318 (2017) 191-232.
- [16] S. Fomin, M. Shapiro, D. Thurston, Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part I: Cluster complexes, *Acta Math.* 201 (2008) 83-146.
- [17] S. Fomin, D. Thurston, Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part II: Lambda lengths, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 255 (2018), no. 1223, v+97 pp.
- [18] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras I: Foundations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 15 (2002) 497-529.
- [19] S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras IV: Coefficients, *Comp. Math.* 143 (2007) 112-164.
- [20] C.J. Fu, B. Keller, On cluster algebras with coefficients and 2-Calabi-Yau categories, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 362 (2) (2010) 859-895.
- [21] M. Gross, P. Hacking, S. Keel, M. Kontsevich, Canonical bases for cluster algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31 (2018) 497-608.
- [22] M. Huang, An expansion formula for quantum cluster algebras from unpunctured triangulated surfaces, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 28 (2022), no. 2, Paper No. 21, 58 pp.
- [23] M. Huang, Positivity for quantum cluster algebras from unpunctured orbifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 376 (2023), no. 2, 1155-1197.
- [24] M. Huang, New expansion formulas for cluster algebras from surfaces, *Journal of Algebra* 588 (2021) 538-573.
- [25] M. Huang, F. Li, Unfolding of sign-skew-symmetric cluster algebras and its applications to positivity and F-polynomials, *Adv. Math.* 340 (2018) 221-283.
- [26] S.J Kang, M. Kashiwara, M. Kim and S.J Oh, Monoidal categorification of cluster algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31 (2018) 349-426.
- [27] M. Kashiwara, Bases cristallines, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 311 (6) (1990) 277-280.
- [28] Y. Kimura, F. Qin, Graded quiver varieties, quantum cluster algebras and dual canonical basis, *Adv. Math.* 262 (2014) 261-312.
- [29] K.Y. Lee, R. Schiffler, Positivity for cluster algebras, *Annals of Mathematics* 182 (2015) 73-125.
- [30] D. Labardini-Fragoso, Quivers with potentials associated to triangulated surfaces, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) 98 (3) (2009) 797-839.
- [31] G. Lusztig, Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 3(2) (1990) 447-498.
- [32] G. Muller, Skein and cluster algebras of marked surfaces, *Quantum Topol.* 7 (2016), no. 3, 435-503.

- [33] G. Musiker, R. Schiffler, Cluster expansion formulas and perfect matchings, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 32 (2) (2010) 187-209.
- [34] G. Musiker, R. Schiffler, and L. Williams, Positivity for cluster algebras from surfaces, *Adv. Math.* 227 (2011) 2241-2308.
- [35] G. Musiker, R. Schiffler, L. Williams, Bases for cluster algebras form surfaces, *Compos. Math.* 149(2) (2013) 217-263.
- [36] Y. Palu, Cluster characters for triangulated 2-Calabi-Yau categories, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* 58 (6) (2008) 2221-2248.
- [37] P.-G. Plamondon, Cluster characters for cluster categories with infinite-dimensional morphism spaces, *Adv. Math.* 227 (2011) 1-39.
- [38] P.-G. Plamondon, Cluster algebras via cluster categories with infinite-dimensional morphism spaces, *Compositio Math.* 147 (2011) 1921-1954.
- [39] F. Qin, Triangular bases in quantum cluster algebras and monoidal categorification conjectures, *Duke Math. J.* 166, Number 12 (2017) 2337-2442.
- [40] F. Qin, Dual canonical bases and quantum cluster algebras, arXiv.2003.13674.
- [41] D. Rupel, On Quantum analogue of the Caldero-Chapoton formula, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 14 (2011) 3207-3236.
- [42] D. Rupel, Quantum cluster characters for valued quivers, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 367 (2015), no. 10, 7061-7102.
- [43] R. Schiffler, On cluster algebras arising from unpunctured surfaces II, *Adv. Math.* 223 (6) (2010) 1885-1923.
- [44] R. Schiffler, H. Thomas, On cluster algebras arising from unpunctured surfaces, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 17 (2009) 3160-3189.
- [45] T. Yurikusa, Combinatorial cluster expansion formulas from triangulated surfaces, *Electron. J. Combin.* 26 (2019), no. 2, Paper No. 2.33, 39 pp.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS (ZHUHAI), SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY,
Email address: huangm97@mail.sysu.edu.cn