

# DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURES ON SURFACES WITH BOUNDARY (II)—RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE

XU XU, CHAO ZHENG

ABSTRACT. This is a continuation of [16] studying the discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary, in which we gave a classification of the discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary. In this paper, we prove the rigidity and existence of these discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Basic definition and notations	2
1.2. Main results	5
1.3. Basic ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.9	6
2. Discrete conformal variations of generalized angles	7
2.1. Some basic knowledge	7
2.2. A geometric explanation	8
2.3. Variational formulas of generalized angle	14
3. Rigidity and existence of the discrete conformal structure (A1)	20
3.1. Admissible space of the discrete conformal structure (A1)	20
3.2. Negative definiteness of Jacobian	22
3.3. Rigidity of the discrete conformal structure (A1)	23
3.4. Existence of the discrete conformal structure (A1)	24
4. Rigidity and existence of the discrete conformal structure (A2)	26
5. Rigidity and existence of the discrete conformal structure (A3)	28
6. Rigidity and existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure III	29
6.1. Rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure III	29
6.2. Existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure III	31
7. Rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure II	33
8. Rigidity and existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure I	35
8.1. Admissible space of the mixed discrete conformal structure I	35
8.2. Negative definiteness of Jacobian	40
8.3. Rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure I	40
8.4. Existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure I	41
Appendix A. Proofs of Lemmas	46
References	50

*Date:* August 13, 2024.

*Key words and phrases.* Discrete conformal structures; Rigidity; Existence; Surfaces with boundary.  
MSC (2020): 52C25, 52C26.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Basic definition and notations.** Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = (V, \tilde{E}, \tilde{F})$  be a triangulation of a closed surface  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , where  $V, \tilde{E}, \tilde{F}$  represent the sets of vertices, edges and faces respectively and  $V$  is a finite subset of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  with  $|V| = N$ . Denote  $N(V)$  as a small open regular disjoint neighborhood of the union of all vertices  $V$ . Then  $\Sigma = \tilde{\Sigma} - N(V)$  is a compact surface with  $N$  boundary components. The intersection  $\mathcal{T} = \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \cap \Sigma$  is called an ideal triangulation of the surface  $\Sigma$ . The intersections  $E = \tilde{E} \cap \Sigma$  and  $F = \tilde{F} \cap \Sigma$  are the sets of the ideal edges and ideal faces of  $\Sigma$  in the ideal triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$  respectively. The intersection of an ideal face and the boundary  $\partial\Sigma$  is called a boundary arc. For simplicity, we use  $B = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  to denote the boundary components and label them as  $i \in B$ . We use  $E_+$  to denote the set of oriented edges. Denote  $\{ij\} \in E$  as the ideal edge between two adjacent boundary components  $i, j \in B$ . Label the ordered ideal edge as  $(i, j)$ . Denote  $\{ijk\} \in F$  as the ideal face adjacent to the boundary components  $i, j, k \in B$ . In fact, the ideal face  $\{ijk\}$  is a hexagon, which corresponds to the triangle  $v_i v_j v_k \in \tilde{F}$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ . The sets of real valued functions on  $B, E$  and  $E_+$  are denoted by  $\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}^E$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{E_+}$  respectively.

An edge length function associated to  $\mathcal{T}$  is a vector  $l \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  assigning each ideal edge  $\{ij\} \in E$  a positive number  $l_{ij} = l_{ji}$ . For any three positive numbers, there exists a unique right-angled hyperbolic hexagon (up to isometry) with the lengths of three non-pairwise adjacent edges given by these three positive numbers [7]. Hence, for any ideal face  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , there exists a unique right-angled hyperbolic hexagon whose three non-pairwise adjacent edges have lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{ik}, l_{jk}$ . Gluing all such right-angled hyperbolic hexagons isomorphically along the ideal edges in pairs, one can construct a hyperbolic surface with totally geodesic boundary from the ideal triangulation  $\mathcal{T}$ . Conversely, any ideally triangulated hyperbolic surface  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  with totally geodesic boundary produces a function  $l \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  with  $l_{ij}$  given by the length of the shortest geodesic connecting the boundary components  $i, j \in B$ . The edge length function  $l \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  is called a *discrete hyperbolic metric* on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . The length  $K_i$  of the boundary component  $i \in B$  is called the *generalized combinatorial curvature* of the discrete hyperbolic metric  $l$  at  $i$ . Namely, the generalized combinatorial curvature  $K_i$  is defined to be

$$K_i = \sum_{\{ijk\} \in F} \theta_i^{jk},$$

where the summation is taken over all the right-angled hyperbolic hexagons adjacent to  $i$  and the generalized angle  $\theta_i^{jk}$  is the length of the boundary arc of the right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  at  $i$ .

Motivated by Glickenstein's work in [2] and Glickenstein-Thomas' work in [3] for triangulated closed surfaces, we introduced the following two definitions of partial edge length and discrete conformal structures on an ideally triangulated surface with boundary.

**Definition 1.1** ([16], Definition 1.1). Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary. An assignment of partial edge lengths is a map  $d \in \mathbb{R}^{E_+}$  such that  $l_{ij} = d_{ij} + d_{ji} > 0$  for every edge  $\{ij\} \in E$  and

$$(1) \quad \sinh d_{ij} \sinh d_{jk} \sinh d_{ki} = \sinh d_{ji} \sinh d_{kj} \sinh d_{ik}$$

for every ideal face  $\{ijk\} \in F$ .

**Definition 1.2** ([16], Definition 1.2). Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary. A discrete conformal structure  $d = d(f)$  on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  is a smooth map, sending a function

$f \in \mathbb{R}^N$  defined on boundary components  $B$  to a partial edge length function  $d \in \mathbb{R}^{E_+}$ , such that

$$(2) \quad \frac{\partial l_{ij}}{\partial f_i} = \coth d_{ij}$$

for each  $(i, j) \in E_+$  and

$$(3) \quad \frac{\partial d_{ij}}{\partial f_k} = 0$$

if  $k \neq i$  and  $k \neq j$ . The function  $f \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is called a discrete conformal factor.

**Remark 1.3.** In general, the partial edge lengths  $d \in \mathbb{R}^{E_+}$  do not satisfy the symmetry condition, i.e.,  $d_{ij} \neq d_{ji}$ . Denote  $E_{ij}$  as the hyperbolic geodesic in the hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}^2$  extending the ideal edge  $\{ij\} \in E$ . The partial edge length  $d_{ij}$  represents the signed distance from a point  $c_{ij}$  in  $E_{ij}$  to  $i \in B$  and  $d_{ji}$  represents the signed distance from  $c_{ij}$  to  $j \in B$ . This point  $c_{ij}$  is called the edge center of the ideal edge  $\{ij\}$ . Note that the signed distance  $d_{ij}$  of  $c_{ij}$  to  $i$  is positive if  $c_{ij}$  is on the same side of  $i$  as  $j$  along the hyperbolic geodesic  $E_{ij}$ , and negative otherwise. Please refer to Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Poincaré dual to the ideal edge  $\{ij\} \in E$  with the position determined by  $d_{ij}$  and  $d_{ji}$  in the Klein model (dotted). The red lines represent the boundary arcs of the ideal face  $\{ijk\}$ . The black triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$  is the corresponding hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle.

**Remark 1.4.** We briefly explain the motivation of Definition 1.1 for the partial edge length on surfaces with boundary. One can refer to [16] for more details. The hyperbolic geodesic orthogonal to the hyperbolic geodesic  $E_{ij}$  through  $c_{ij}$  is called the edge perpendicular, denoted by  $P_{ij}$ . We can identify the perpendicular  $P_{ij}$  with a unique 2-dimensional time-like subspace  $\tilde{P}_{ij}$  of the Lorentzian space  $\mathbb{R}^3$  such that  $\tilde{P}_{ij} \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = P_{ij}$ . Since the 2-dimensional subspaces  $\tilde{P}_{ij}$  and  $\tilde{P}_{jk}$  associated to  $P_{ij}$  and  $P_{jk}$  intersect in a 1-dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , then the intersection  $\tilde{P}_{ij} \cap \tilde{P}_{jk}$  corresponds to a point  $q$  in the Klein model of hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . We view this point  $q$  as the intersection point of the perpendiculars  $P_{ij}$  and  $P_{jk}$ . Note that the point  $q$  may be not in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , i.e., the perpendiculars  $P_{ij}, P_{jk}$  may not intersect within  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . Lemma 2.4 in [16] shows that the perpendiculars  $P_{ij}, P_{jk}, P_{ki}$  of  $\{ijk\}$  intersect at a common point  $c_{ijk}$  (called face center) if and only if the condition (1) holds. Hence, the condition (1) in Definition 1.1 ensures the existence of a dual geometric structure on the Poincaré dual of an ideally triangulated surface with boundary.

**Remark 1.5.** The geometric motivation for Definition 1.2 is that the vertex  $v_k$  and the face center  $c_{ijk}$  of a hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle should be in the 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  including the vertex  $\bar{v}_k$  of the new hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle under the  $f_k$ -conformal variation. In the Klein model, this is equivalent to  $v_k, c_{ijk}$  and  $\bar{v}_k$  stays in a line. Please refer to [16, Remark 1.3] for more details.

The main result in [16] is the following theorem, which gives the explicit forms of the discrete conformal structures in Definition 1.2.

**Theorem 1.6** ([16], Theorem 1.4). Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary and let  $d = d(f)$  be a discrete conformal structure on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . There exist constant vectors  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^E$  satisfying  $\eta_{ij} = \eta_{ji}$ , such that for any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ ,

**(A1):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = \sqrt{\frac{1+\alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1+\alpha_j e^{2f_j}}} > 0$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} > 0, 1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} > 0$ , then

$$(4) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = -\sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}};$$

**(A2):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = \sqrt{\frac{1+\alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1+\alpha_j e^{2f_j}}} > 0$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} < 0, 1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} < 0$ , then

$$(5) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}};$$

**(A3):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = e^{\frac{1}{2}C_{ij}(f_i - f_j)} > 0$ , then

$$(6) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = -\cosh(f_j - f_i - C_{ij}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j},$$

where  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{E+}$  is a constant vector satisfying  $C_{ij} + C_{jk} + C_{ki} = 0$  for any  $\{ijk\} \in F$  and  $C_{rs} + C_{sr} = 0$  for any  $\{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}$ ;

**(B1):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1+\alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1+\alpha_j e^{2f_j}}} < 0$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} > 0, 1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} > 0$ , then

$$(7) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}};$$

**(B2):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1+\alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1+\alpha_j e^{2f_j}}} < 0$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} < 0, 1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} < 0$ , then

$$(8) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = -\sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}};$$

**(B3):** if  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -e^{\frac{1}{2}C_{ij}(f_i - f_j)} < 0$ , then

$$(9) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = \cosh(f_j - f_i - C_{ij}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j},$$

where  $C \in \mathbb{R}^{E+}$  is a constant vector satisfying  $C_{ij} + C_{jk} + C_{ki} = 0$  for any  $\{ijk\} \in F$  and  $C_{rs} + C_{sr} = 0$  for any  $\{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}$ .

**Remark 1.7.** As mentioned in [16, Remark 1.5], we can always assume  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  in the discrete conformal structures (A1) and (B1),  $\alpha \equiv -1$  in the discrete conformal structures (A2) and (B2), and  $C \equiv 0$  in the discrete conformal structures (A3) and (B3) for simplicity.

**Remark 1.8.** According to [16, Remark 1.7], the discrete conformal structures (A1), (A2) and (A3) can exist alone on an ideally triangulated surface with boundary, but they can not exist simultaneously on the same ideally triangulated surface with boundary. Moreover, the discrete conformal structures (B1), (B2) and (B3) can not exist alone on an ideally triangulated surface

with boundary. We consider the mixed type of discrete conformal structures, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  are induced by (4) and (7), (5) and (8) or (6) and (9), such that the condition (1) holds. We call them **the mixed discrete conformal structure I**, **the mixed discrete conformal structure II** and **the mixed discrete conformal structure III** respectively. For example, set  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ , if  $d_{rs} < 0$ , then  $d_{rt} < 0$  by Lemma 2.17, and  $d_{sr} > 0$ ,  $d_{tr} > 0$  by the conditions  $l_{rs} = d_{rs} + d_{sr} > 0$  and  $l_{rt} = d_{rt} + d_{tr} > 0$  in Definition 1.1. We need  $d_{st} > 0$ ,  $d_{ts} > 0$  to make the condition (1) hold. Thus  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are defined by (7) and  $l_{st}$  is defined by (4),  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are defined by (8) and  $l_{st}$  is defined by (5), or  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are defined by (9) and  $l_{st}$  is defined by (6).

**1.2. Main results.** An important problem in discrete conformal geometry is to obtain the relationships between the discrete conformal structures and their combinatorial curvatures. The main result in this paper is the following theorem, which gives the global rigidity and existence of discrete conformal structures on ideally triangulated surfaces with boundary.

**Theorem 1.9.** Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary and let  $d = d(f)$  be a discrete conformal structure on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ .

- (i): For the discrete conformal structure (A1), let  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  be the weights on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  satisfying  $\eta_{ij} > \alpha_i \alpha_j$  if  $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$  for any two adjacent boundary components  $i, j \in B$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, if  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , then the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .
- (ii): For the discrete conformal structure (A2), let  $\eta \in [-1, +\infty)^E$  be the weight on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, if the weight  $\eta \in [-1, 0]^E$ , then the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .
- (iii): For the discrete conformal structure (A3), let  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  be the weight on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .
- (iv): For the mixed discrete conformal structure I, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  are induced by (4) and (7), let  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in (1, +\infty)^E$  be the weights on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, if  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and satisfies a restrictive condition, then the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .
- (v): For the mixed discrete conformal structure II, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  are induced by (5) and (8), let  $\eta \in [1, +\infty)^E$  be the weights on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .
- (vi): For the mixed discrete conformal structure III, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  are induced by (6) and (9), let  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  be the weights on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ . Then the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

**Remark 1.10.** If  $\alpha \equiv 0$ , the case (i) in Theorem 1.9 generalizes Guo's results [4] and Li-Xu-Zhou's results [6]. If  $\alpha \equiv 1$ , the case (i) in Theorem 1.9 was proved by Guo-Luo [5]. Moreover, the cases (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 1.9 have also been proved by Guo-Luo [5]. We include them in Theorem 1.9 for completeness. In the case (iv) in Theorem 1.9, the weight  $\eta \in (1, +\infty)^E$

can be extended to a wider range, and we will use a new notation  $\Xi$  to denote the set of the range of weight because of its complexity, please see Subsection 8.1. Moreover, for the image of  $K$  in the mixed discrete conformal structure I, we not only require  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ , but also  $\alpha$  satisfies a restrictive condition. Here the restrictive condition means to exclude the case that  $\alpha_j = \alpha_k = 1$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with the edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{ik}$  are given by (7) and the edge length  $l_{jk}$  is given by (4), please see Subsection 8.4. For the case (v) in Theorem 1.9, we only give the rigid result without any existence result. The reason refers to Remark 7.3. For the case (vi) in Theorem 1.9, the weight  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  can also be extended to a wider range, please see Theorem 6.1.

**1.3. Basic ideas of the proof of Theorem 1.9.** The proof for the existence of discrete conformal structures involves the continuity method. We will show that the image of the curvature map  $K$  is both open and closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , and thus is the whole space  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . The proof for the rigidity of discrete conformal structures involves a variational principle, which was pioneered by Colin de Verdière's work [1] for tangential circle packings on triangulated closed surfaces. The proof of the rigidity consists of the following three steps.

The first step is to give a characterization of the admissible space of discrete conformal factor  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon. By a change of variables  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  described in the proof of Lemma 2.22, the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}$  of  $f$  is transferred to the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}$  of  $u$ , which is proved to be convex and simply connected. The second step is to prove that the Jacobian of the generalized angles  $\theta$  with respect to  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon is symmetric and negative definite. As a consequence, the Jacobian of the generalized combinatorial curvature  $K$  with respect to  $u$  is symmetric and negative definite on the admissible space  $\mathcal{U} = \cap \mathcal{U}_{ijk}$ . The first step and second step enable us to define a strictly concave function on  $\mathcal{U}$ . The third step is to use the following well-known result from analysis:

**Lemma 1.11.** If  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a  $C^1$ -smooth strictly concave function on an open convex set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , then its gradient  $\nabla f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is injective. Furthermore,  $\nabla f$  is a smooth embedding.

The key step is how to get a change of variables  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$ . For this, we need to calculate the variation formulas of the generalized angles, which is as follows.

**Theorem 1.12.** Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary and let  $d = d(f)$  be a discrete conformal structure on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$ .

(i): For any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ ,

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_j} = \frac{-1}{\sinh d_{ji}} \frac{\tanh^\beta h_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ij}},$$

where  $\beta = 1$  if  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like and  $\beta = -1$  if  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like. If  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like, we interpret the formula as  $\tanh^\beta h_{ij} = \tanh^\beta h_{jk} = \tanh^\beta h_{ki} = 1$ .

(ii): Furthermore, we have the following Glickenstein-Thomas' formula for  $\frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_i}$ ,  $\frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial f_i}$  and  $\frac{\partial \theta_k^{ij}}{\partial f_i}$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_i} = \cosh l_{ij} \frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial f_i} + \cosh l_{ik} \frac{\partial \theta_k^{ij}}{\partial f_i}.$$

(iii): Moreover, there is a change of variables  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  such that

$$(10) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial u_j} = \frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial u_i}.$$

The function  $u$  is also called a discrete conformal factor.

Here  $h_{ij}$  is the signed distance of the face center  $c_{ijk}$  to the hyperbolic geodesic  $E_{ij}$ , which is positive if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the same side of the geodesic  $E_{ij}$  as the right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  and negative otherwise (or zero if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the geodesic  $E_{ij}$ ).

## 2. DISCRETE CONFORMAL VARIATIONS OF GENERALIZED ANGLES

In this section, we first present some basic facts in the 2-dimensional hyperbolic geometry, which are discussed in [7, Chapter 3 and 6]. Then we prove Theorem 1.12. Different from the proof of Theorem 7 in Glickenstein-Thomas [3], we are unable to get the variational formulas of generalized angle by similar geometric properties directly from the figure under the  $f_k$ -conformal variation, and we obtain them by complex calculations.

**2.1. Some basic knowledge.** For any vectors  $x, y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , the Lorentzian inner product  $*$  of  $x$  and  $y$  is given by  $x * y = xJy^T$ , where  $J = \text{diag}\{1, 1, -1\}$ . If  $x * y = 0$ , then we say  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are Lorentz orthogonal. The Lorentzian cross product  $\otimes$  of  $x$  and  $y$  is defined as  $x \otimes y := J(x \times y)$ , where  $\times$  is the Euclidean cross product.

The Lorentzian norm of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is defined to be the complex number  $\|x\| = \sqrt{x * x}$ . Here  $\|x\|$  is either positive, zero or positive imaginary. If  $\|x\|$  is positive imaginary, we denote by  $|\|x\||$  its absolute value. Furthermore,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is called space-like if  $x * x > 0$ , light-like if  $x * x = 0$  and time-like if  $x * x < 0$ . The hyperboloid model of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is defined to be

$$\mathbb{H}^2 = \{x = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x * x = -1 \text{ and } x_3 > 0\},$$

which can be embedded in  $(\mathbb{R}^3, *)$ . A geodesic (or hyperbolic line) in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is the non-empty intersection of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  with a 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

The Klein model of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is the center projection of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  into the plane  $x_3 = 1$  of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . In the Klein model, the interior, boundary and external points of the unit disk represent the time-like, light-like and space-like vectors respectively, and they are called hyperbolic points, ideal points and hyper-ideal points respectively. A geodesic in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is a chord on the unit disk. In the Klein model, a triangle  $xyz$  with its three vertices  $x, y, z$  being hyperbolic is called a hyperbolic triangle. If at least one of  $x, y, z$  is ideal or hyper-ideal, then we say the triangle  $xyz$  is a generalized hyperbolic triangle. Specially, if  $x, y, z$  are all hyper-ideal, we call this triangle as a hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle for simplicity.

The following proposition follows from the properties of Lorentzian cross product, which is used extensively in this paper.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let  $xyz$  be a (hyperbolic or generalized hyperbolic) triangle with  $x \in \mathbb{H}^2$  and a right angle at  $x$ . Then

$$-(z * y) = (z * x)(x * y).$$

For two vectors  $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^2$ , we denoted by  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(x, y)$  the hyperbolic distance between  $x$  and  $y$ , which is the arc length of the geodesic between  $x$  and  $y$ . We use  $\text{Span}(x)$  and  $\text{Span}(x, y)$  to denote the vector subspace spanned  $x$  and  $x, y$ , respectively. If  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a space-like vector, then the Lorentzian complement  $x^\perp := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid x * w = 0\}$  of  $\text{Span}(x)$  is a 2-dimension vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $x^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  is non-empty. And the hyperbolic distance between  $x$  and  $y \in \mathbb{H}^2$  is defined to be  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(y, x^\perp) = \inf\{d_{\mathbb{H}}(y, z) \mid z \in x^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2\}$ . Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$  be space-like vectors. If  $\text{Span}(x, y) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  is non-empty, then the hyperbolic distance between  $x$  and  $y$  is defined by  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(x^\perp, y^\perp) = \inf\{d_{\mathbb{H}}(z, w) \mid z \in x^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2, w \in y^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2\}$ . If  $\text{Span}(x, y) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  is empty, then  $x^\perp$  and  $y^\perp$  intersect in an angle  $\angle(x^\perp, y^\perp)$  in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .

**Proposition 2.2** ([7], Chapter 3). Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^2$  are time-like vectors and  $z, w \in \mathbb{R}^3$  are space-like vectors. Then

- (i):  $x * y = -\|x\| \cdot \|y\| \cosh d_{\mathbb{H}}(x, y)$ ;
- (ii):  $|x * z| = \|x\| \cdot \|z\| \sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(x, z^\perp)$ , and  $x * z < 0$  if and only if  $x$  and  $z$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $z^\perp$ ;
- (iii): if  $\text{Span}(z, w) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  is non-empty, then  $|z * w| = \|z\| \cdot \|w\| \cosh d_{\mathbb{H}}(z^\perp, w^\perp)$ , and  $z * w < 0$  if and only if  $z$  and  $w$  are oppositely oriented tangent vectors of  $Q$ , where  $Q$  is the hyperbolic line Lorentz orthogonal to  $z^\perp$  and  $w^\perp$ ;
- (iv): if  $\text{Span}(z, w) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  is empty, then  $z * w = \|z\| \cdot \|w\| \cos \angle(z^\perp, w^\perp)$ .

The following proposition is useful for identifying perpendicular geodesics in the Klein model.

**Proposition 2.3.** ([7], Theorem 3.2.11) Let  $P$  be a geodesic in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  and let  $y \in \mathbb{H}^2$  be a time-like vector. Then there exists a unique geodesic of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  through  $y$  and Lorentz orthogonal to  $P$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** ([8], Proposition 4) Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$  be a space-like vector and let  $\gamma = x^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2$  be the geodesic corresponding to  $x^\perp$ . Suppose  $\omega$  is another geodesic that intersects  $\gamma$ , and  $P$  is the plane such that  $\omega = P \cap \mathbb{H}^2$ . Then  $\gamma$  and  $\omega$  meet at a right angle if and only if  $x \in P$ .

**2.2. A geometric explanation.** Consider a hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$  in the Klein model. Set  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Set  $E_{rs} = \text{Span}(v_r, v_s) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$ , then  $E_{rs}$  is a geodesic in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . Set  $v_r^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = E'_{st}$ , then  $E'_{st}$  is also a geodesic in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  and Lorentz orthogonal to the geodesics  $E_{rs}, E_{rt}$ . The geodesic arc in  $E'_{st}$  bounded by  $E_{rs}$  and  $E_{rt}$  is called a boundary arc, denoted by  $r \in B$ . The geodesic arc between two adjacent boundary arcs  $r$  and  $s$  is denoted by  $\{rs\}$ , which is a part of  $E_{rs}$  and called an ideal edge. Moreover, the six geodesic arcs form a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$ . Conversely, for any geodesic  $E_{rs}$  in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , there exists a unique space-like vector  $v'_i$  such that  $(v'_i)^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = E_{rs}$ . Then the three points  $v'_i, v'_j$  and  $v'_k$  are hyper-ideal and form a hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , which is called the polar triangle of the hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$ . Please refer to Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. A hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$  and its polar triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$  in the Klein model (left), and a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  in the Poincaré model (right).

By the construction of the polar triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , the vertices  $v'_i, v'_j, v'_k$  are determined by the vertices  $v_i, v_j, v_k$  and vice versa. Without loss of generality, we assume  $\|v_i\| = \|v_j\| =$



$\|v_k\| = 1$ , then

$$(11) \quad v'_i = \frac{v_k \otimes v_j}{\|v_k \otimes v_j\|}, \quad v'_j = \frac{v_i \otimes v_k}{\|v_i \otimes v_k\|}, \quad v'_k = \frac{v_j \otimes v_i}{\|v_j \otimes v_i\|}.$$

Therefore, given a hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$ , there exists a unique polar triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$  with its vertices satisfying (11). The length of the ideal edge  $\{rs\} \in E$  is denoted by  $l_{rs}$  and the length of the boundary arc  $t \in B$  is denoted by  $\theta_t^{rs}$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** The vectors  $c_{ijk}, c_{rs}, v'_t$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , where the notations of  $c_{ijk}, c_{rs}$  follows from Remark 1.4 and Remark 1.3.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume  $r = i, s = j, t = k$ . Since  $c_{ij} \in E_{ij}$ , by Proposition 2.3, there exists a unique geodesic of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  through  $c_{ij}$  and Lorentz orthogonal to  $E_{ij}$ , which is  $P_{ij} = \text{Span}(c_{ij}, c_{ijk}) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$ . Note that  $E_{ij} = (v'_k)^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2$ . By Proposition 2.4, since  $E_{ij}$  and  $P_{ij}$  meet at a right angle, then  $v'_k \in \text{Span}(c_{ij}, c_{ijk})$ . Q.E.D.

Combining Remark 1.4 and Lemma 2.5, we have  $c_{ijk} = \text{Span}(v'_i, c_{jk}) \cap \text{Span}(v'_j, c_{ik}) \cap \text{Span}(v'_k, c_{ij})$ . Due to the equivalence of  $v_i v_j v_k$  and  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , it is natural to consider a dual model. Note that for any  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\text{Span}(v_r, c_{ijk}) \cap v_r^\perp$  may not intersect within  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . For the convenience of calculations, we focus on the case that

$$\text{Span}(v_r, c_{ijk}) \cap v_r^\perp \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = \text{Span}(v_r, c_{ijk}) \cap E'_{st} \neq \emptyset, \quad \forall r \in \{i, j, k\}.$$

This condition limits the positions of  $c_{ijk}$  when  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, i.e.,  $c_{ijk}$  can only be in some certain open domains. Denote  $c'_{st} = \text{Span}(v_r, c_{ijk}) \cap E'_{st}$  as the dual edge center, which is the unique point along the geodesic  $E'_{st}$  such that  $c'_{st}$  is of (signed) distance  $\theta_{st}$  from  $\{rt\}$  and  $\theta_{ts}$  from  $\{rs\}$ . Thus we have

$$(12) \quad \theta_r^{st} = \theta_{st} + \theta_{ts}.$$

Note that the signed distance  $\theta_{st}$  is positive if  $c'_{st}$  is on the same side of  $\{rt\}$  as  $\{rs\}$  along the hyperbolic geodesic  $E'_{st}$ , and negative otherwise. The above construction shows the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.6.** The vectors  $c_{ijk}, c'_{rs}, v_t$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ .

By Proposition 2.3, we denote by  $P'_{ij}$  the edge perpendicular through  $c'_{ij}$  and Lorentz orthogonal to  $E'_{ij}$ . Then  $P'_{ij} = \text{Span}(v_k, c_{ijk}) \cap \mathbb{H}^2$ . Hence, the three edge perpendiculars  $P'_{ij}, P'_{jk}, P'_{ki}$  of  $\{ijk\}$  intersect in a point  $c_{ijk}$ . Similar to [16, Lemma 2.4], we further have that the three perpendiculars  $P'_{ij}, P'_{jk}, P'_{ki}$  of  $\{ijk\}$  intersect in a point if and only if

$$(13) \quad \sinh \theta_{ij} \sinh \theta_{jk} \sinh \theta_{ki} = \sinh \theta_{ji} \sinh \theta_{kj} \sinh \theta_{ik}.$$

Hence, Definition 1.1 is equivalent to the following definition with respect to the parameter  $\theta$ . For precision, we rewrite the boundary component  $i \in B$  as  $\{j'k'\} \in B$ . We use  $B_+$  to denote the sets of oriented boundary components and label them with ordered pairs  $(j', k') \in B_+$ .

**Definition 2.7.** Let  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T})$  be an ideally triangulated surface with boundary. An assignment of partial edge lengths is a map  $\theta : B_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , such that  $\theta_i^{j'k'} = \theta_{jk} + \theta_{kj} > 0$  for each oriented boundary arc  $(j', k') \in B_+$  and formula (13) holds for every right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ .

Recall the definition of  $h_{rs}$ , which is the signed distance of the face center  $c_{ijk}$  to the hyperbolic geodesic  $E_{rs}$  and is positive if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the same side of the geodesic  $E_{rs}$  as the hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$  and negative otherwise (or zero if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the geodesic  $E_{ij}$ ). Similarly, we denote  $q_{rs}$  as the signed distance from  $c_{ijk}$  to  $c'_{rs}$ , which is defined to be positive if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the same side of the geodesic  $E'_{rs}$  as the polar triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$  and negative otherwise (or zero if  $c_{ijk}$  is on the geodesic  $E'_{rs}$ ). Please refer to Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. Data for two hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangles in the Klein model

In the Klein model, the hyper-ideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$  and the polar triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$  divide the unit disk into 13 open domains, denoted by  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{13}$  respectively. Please refer to Figure 4. By the definition of  $h$  and  $q$ , one can directly obtain the relationships between the position of  $c_{ijk}$  and the signs of  $h$  and  $q$  in these 13 open domains, as shown in Table 1. For example, suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_1$ . Then  $c_{ijk}$  is on the opposite side of  $E_{ik}$  as  $v_i v_j v_k$  and hence  $h_{ik} < 0$ . Moreover,  $c_{ijk}$  is on the same side of  $E_{ij}, E_{jk}$  as  $v_i v_j v_k$  and hence  $h_{ij} > 0, h_{jk} > 0$ . Similarly,  $c_{ijk}$  is on the opposite side of  $E'_{ij}$  and the same side of  $E'_{ik}, E'_{jk}$  as  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ . Hence  $q_{ij} < 0, q_{jk} > 0, q_{ki} > 0$ . If  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, then  $c_{ijk}$  can be only in one of 12 open domains, and each domain is bounded by two tangential lines and unit circle, denoted by  $D_I, D_{II}, D_{III}, D_{IV}, D_V, D_{VI}$  and  $D_i, D_{ii}, D_{iii}, D_{iv}, D_v, D_{vi}$  respectively. Please refer to Figure 4. If  $c_{ijk}$  is not in one of 12 open domains, then either  $\text{Span}(c_{ijk}, v_r) \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = \emptyset$  or  $\text{Span}(c_{ijk}, v'_r) \cap \mathbb{H}^2 = \emptyset$ , which contradicts with the assumption that the edge centers  $c_{st} \in E_{rs}$  and  $c'_{st} \in E'_{rs}$  are in  $\mathbb{H}^2$  for  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Similar to the case that  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, one can also directly obtain the relationships between the position of  $c_{ijk}$  and the signs of  $h$  and  $q$  in these 12 open domains, as shown in Table 1. By moving  $c_{ijk}$  to the light cone continuously, one can obtain similar results. Note that if  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like, then it can only be on the unit disk that removes 12 points.

In the following, we provide another way to obtain Table 1. Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like. Without loss of generality, we assume  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_1$ . By Lemma 2.5, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c_{ik}, v'_j$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $c_{ijk}$  is not in the polar




FIGURE 4. Division for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$  in the Klein model. If  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, then it can be in red and blue open domains.

Domains	$D_1(D_i)$	$D_2(D_I)$	$D_3(D_{ii})$	$D_4(D_{II})$	$D_5(D_{iii})$	$D_6(D_{III})$	$D_7(D_{iv})$	$D_8(D_{IV})$	$D_9(D_V)$	$D_{10}(D_V)$	$D_{11}(D_{vi})$	$D_{12}(D_{VI})$	$D_{13}$
$h_{jk}$	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
$h_{ik}$	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+
$h_{ij}$	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
$q_{jk}$	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+
$q_{ik}$	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
$q_{ij}$	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

TABLE 1. Relationships between the position of  $c_{ijk}$  and the signs of  $h$  and  $q$

triangle  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , then  $c_{ik} \in E_{ik}$  is not in  $\{ik\}$ . Furthermore, since  $c_{ijk}$  is in  $D_1$ , then  $c_{ik}$  is on the opposite side of  $k$  as  $i$ . By the definition of  $d$  in Remark 1.3, we have  $d_{ki} < 0, d_{ik} > 0$ . Similarly, we have  $d_{kj} < 0, d_{jk} > 0, d_{ij} > 0, d_{ji} > 0$ . By Lemma 2.6, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c'_{ij}, v_k$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $c_{ijk}$  is not in the hyperideal hyperbolic triangle  $v_i v_j v_k$ , then  $c'_{ij} \in E'_{ij}$  is not in  $k$ . Furthermore, since  $c_{ijk}$  is in  $D_1$ , then  $c'_{ij}$  is on the opposite side of  $\{ik\}$  as  $\{jk\}$  and hence  $\theta_{ji} < 0, \theta_{ij} > 0$ . Similarly, we have  $\theta_{jk} < 0, \theta_{kj} > 0, \theta_{ik} > 0, \theta_{ki} > 0$ . By Corollary 2.11, we have  $h_{ik} < 0, h_{jk} > 0, h_{ij} > 0$  and  $q_{ij} < 0, q_{ik} > 0, q_{jk} > 0$ . The case that  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like follows from the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 2.8.** The signs of  $q$  and  $h$  in the domains  $D_I, D_{II}, D_{III}, D_{IV}, D_V, D_{VI}$  are the same as those in the domains  $D_2, D_4, D_6, D_8, D_{10}, D_{12}$ , respectively.

*Proof.* We only prove the signs of  $q$  and  $h$  in the domain  $D_V$  are the same as those in the domain  $D_{10}$ , and the remaining cases are similar.

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{10}$ , then  $q_{jk} < 0$  and the rest is positive by Table 1. Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_V$ . By Lemma 2.5, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c_{ij}, v'_k$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $c_{ijk}$  is not in  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , then  $c_{ij} \in E_{ij}$  is not in  $\{ij\}$ . Furthermore, since  $c_{ijk}$

is in  $D_V$ , then  $c_{ij}$  is on the opposite side of  $j$  as  $i$  and hence  $d_{ij} < 0, d_{ji} > 0$ . Similarly, we have  $d_{ik} < 0, d_{ki} > 0, d_{jk} > 0, d_{kj} > 0$ . By Proposition 2.12, we have  $h_{ij} > 0, h_{jk} > 0, h_{ik} > 0$ . Note that  $c_{ijk}$  is in  $v_i v_j v_k$ . By Lemma 2.6, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c'_{rs}, v_t$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  for  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Then  $c'_{rs} \in E'_{rs}$  is in  $t$ . Hence,  $\theta_{ij} > 0, \theta_{ji} > 0, \theta_{jk} < 0, \theta_{kj} > 0, \theta_{ik} > 0, \theta_{ki} > 0$ . By Proposition 2.12, we have  $q_{ij} > 0, q_{jk} < 0, q_{ik} > 0$ .  
Q.E.D.

**Lemma 2.9.** The signs of  $q$  and  $h$  in the domains  $D_I, D_{II}, D_{III}, D_{IV}, D_V, D_{VI}$  are the same as those in the domains  $D_1, D_3, D_5, D_7, D_9, D_{11}$ , respectively.

*Proof.* We only prove the signs of  $q$  and  $h$  in the domain  $D_{VI}$  are the same as those in the domain  $D_{11}$ , and the remaining cases are similar.

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{11}$ , then  $q_i < 0, h_j < 0$  and the rest is positive by Table 1. Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{VI}$ . By Lemma 2.5, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c_{ij}, v'_k$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $c_{ijk}$  is not in  $v'_i v'_j v'_k$ , then  $c_{ij} \in E_{ij}$  is not in  $\{ij\}$ . Furthermore, since  $c_{ijk}$  is in  $D_{VI}$ , then  $c_{ij}$  is on the opposite side of  $j$  as  $i$  and hence  $d_{ij} < 0, d_{ji} > 0$ . Similarly, we have  $d_{ik} < 0, d_{ki} > 0, d_{jk} > 0, d_{kj} > 0$ . By Proposition 2.14, we have  $h_{ij} < 0, h_{jk} > 0, h_{ik} > 0$ . By Lemma 2.6, the vectors  $c_{ijk}, c'_{jk}, v_i$  lie in the same 2-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Since  $c_{ijk}$  is not in  $v_i v_j v_k$ , then  $c'_{jk} \in E'_{jk}$  is not in  $i$ . Furthermore, since  $c_{ijk}$  is in  $D_{VI}$ , then  $c'_{jk}$  is on the opposite side of  $\{ik\}$  as  $\{ij\}$  and hence  $\theta_{jk} < 0, \theta_{kj} > 0$ . Similarly, we have  $\theta_{ji} < 0, \theta_{ij} > 0, \theta_{ik} > 0, \theta_{ki} > 0$ . By Proposition 2.14, we have  $q_{ij} > 0, q_{jk} < 0, q_{ik} > 0$ .  
Q.E.D.

By direct calculations, we can get the following results. As the proofs of the Lemma 2.10, Proposition 2.12 and Proposition 2.14 are too long, we defer them to Appendix A. For simplicity, we set  $h_t = h_{rs}, q_t = q_{rs}$  for  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ .

**Lemma 2.10.** If  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sinh q_r &= \cosh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{rt} = \cosh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{rs}, \\ \sinh h_r &= \cosh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{rt} = \cosh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{rs}.\end{aligned}$$

As a direct corollary of Lemma 2.10, we have

**Corollary 2.11.** If  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, then the signs of  $q_r, d_{rt}$  and  $d_{rs}$  are the same and the signs of  $h_r, \theta_{rs}$  and  $\theta_{rt}$  are the same.

**Proposition 2.12.** If  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lies in the open domain  $D_V$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh q_i &= -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik} = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}, \\ \cosh q_j &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk} = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}, \\ \cosh q_k &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj} = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}, \\ \cosh h_i &= \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}, \\ \cosh h_j &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}, \\ \cosh h_k &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj} = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}.\end{aligned}$$

If  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lies in the open domain  $D_{II}$ , then we swap  $h$  and  $q$ , and  $\theta$  and  $d$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the domains  $D_I, D_{III}, D_{IV}$  or  $D_{VI}$ , we have similar propositions. Using these propositions, we can prove Lemma 2.8 and further obtain Table 1. Moreover, from Table 1, we see that  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the open domains  $D_I, D_{II}, D_{III}, D_{IV}, D_V$  or  $D_{VI}$  if and only if one of

$q_i, q_j, q_k, h_i, h_j, h_k$  is negative and the others are positive. Hence, these propositions can be written as a unified form.

**Lemma 2.13.** Let  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lie in one of the open domains  $D_I, D_{II}, D_{III}, D_{IV}, D_V, D_{VI}$ . If  $q_r < 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh q_r &= -\sinh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{rt} = -\sinh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{rs}, \\ \cosh q_s &= \sinh h_r \cdot \sinh d_{st} = \sinh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{sr}, \\ \cosh q_t &= \sinh h_r \cdot \sinh d_{ts} = \sinh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{tr}, \\ \cosh h_r &= \sinh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{rt} = \sinh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{rs}, \\ \cosh h_s &= -\sinh q_r \cdot \sinh \theta_{st} = \sinh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{sr}, \\ \cosh h_t &= -\sinh q_r \cdot \sinh \theta_{ts} = \sinh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{tr}.\end{aligned}$$

If  $h_r < 0$ , then we swap  $h$  and  $q$ , and  $\theta$  and  $d$ .

**Proposition 2.14.** Let  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lie in the open domain  $D_{vi}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh q_i &= \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik} = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}, \\ \cosh q_j &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk} = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}, \\ \cosh q_k &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj} = -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}, \\ \cosh h_i &= \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}, \\ \cosh h_j &= \sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk} = -\sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}, \\ \cosh h_k &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj} = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the domains  $D_i, D_{ii}, D_{iii}, D_{iv}$  or  $D_v$ , we have the corresponding propositions. Using these propositions, we can prove Lemma 2.9 and further obtain Table 1. Moreover, from Table 1, we see that  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the open domains  $D_i, D_{ii}, D_{iii}, D_{iv}, D_v$  or  $D_{vi}$  if and only if  $q_r < 0, h_s < 0$  and the rest are positive. Hence, these propositions can also be written as a unified form.

**Lemma 2.15.** Let  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lie in one of the open domains  $D_i, D_{ii}, D_{iii}, D_{iv}, D_v, D_{vi}$ . If  $q_r < 0, h_s < 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh q_r &= \sinh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{rt} = -\sinh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{rs}, \\ \cosh q_s &= \sinh h_r \cdot \sinh d_{st} = \sinh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{sr}, \\ \cosh q_t &= \sinh h_r \cdot \sinh d_{ts} = -\sinh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{tr}, \\ \cosh h_r &= \sinh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{rt} = \sinh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{rs}, \\ \cosh h_s &= \sinh q_r \cdot \sinh \theta_{st} = -\sinh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{sr}, \\ \cosh h_t &= -\sinh q_r \cdot \sinh \theta_{ts} = \sinh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{tr}.\end{aligned}$$

As a direct corollary of Lemma 2.13 and Lemma 2.15, we have

**Corollary 2.16.** If  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, then the signs of  $q_r, d_{rt}$  and  $d_{rs}$  are the same and the signs of  $h_r, \theta_{rs}$  and  $\theta_{rt}$  are the same.

Combining Corollary 2.11 and Corollary 2.16 gives the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.17.** For any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , the signs of  $q_r, d_{rt}$  and  $d_{rs}$  are the same and the signs of  $h_r, \theta_{rs}$  and  $\theta_{rt}$  are the same.

*Proof.* If  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, the conclusion follows from Corollary 2.11. If  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, the conclusion follows from Corollary 2.16. If  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like, the conclusion follows from continuity by moving the face center  $c_{ijk}$  to the light cone. Q.E.D.

**2.3. Variational formulas of generalized angle.** We divide Theorem 1.12 into Lemma 2.18, Lemma 2.20 and Lemma 2.22, and prove them respectively.

**Lemma 2.18.** For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , we have

$$(14) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_j} = \frac{-1}{\sinh d_{ji}} \frac{\tanh^\beta h_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ij}},$$

where  $\beta = 1$  if  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like and  $\beta = -1$  if  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like. If  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like, we interpret the formula as  $\tanh^\beta h_{ij} = \tanh^\beta h_{jk} = \tanh^\beta h_{ki} = 1$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume  $\|v_i\| = \|v_j\| = \|v_k\| = 1$  and  $\|c_{ijk}\|^2 = \pm 1$ . For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$ ,  $h_r = h_{st}$ ,  $q_r = q_{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh \theta_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . By generalized hyperbolic cosine law, i.e.,  $\cosh l_r = \cosh \theta_r \sinh l_s \sinh l_t - \cosh l_s \cosh l_t$ , we have

$$(15) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_i} = \frac{\sinh l_i}{A}, \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_j} = -\frac{\sinh l_i \cosh \theta_k}{A}, \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_k} = -\frac{\sinh l_i \cosh \theta_j}{A}.$$

By (2) and (3), we have

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} &= \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_i} \frac{\partial l_i}{\partial f_j} + \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_j} \frac{\partial l_j}{\partial f_j} + \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_k} \frac{\partial l_k}{\partial f_j} \\ &= \frac{\sinh l_i}{A} \cdot \coth d_{jk} + \frac{-\sinh l_i \cosh \theta_j}{A} \cdot \coth d_{ji} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot (\coth d_{jk} - \cosh \theta_j \cdot \coth d_{ji}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot [\coth d_{jk} - \cosh(\theta_{ki} + \theta_{ik}) \cdot \coth d_{ji}] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot (\coth d_{jk} - \cosh \theta_{ki} \cosh \theta_{ik} \coth d_{ji} \\ &\quad - \sinh \theta_{ki} \sinh \theta_{ik} \coth d_{ji}), \end{aligned}$$

where (12) is used in the forth line. Set

$$(17) \quad L_1 = \coth d_{jk} - \cosh \theta_{ki} \cosh \theta_{ik} \coth d_{ji}, \quad L_2 = -\sinh \theta_{ki} \sinh \theta_{ik} \coth d_{ji}.$$

Then

$$(18) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} = \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot (L_1 + L_2).$$

In order to calculate  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ , some preparation is required. Please refer to Figure 3. By Proposition 2.2 (ii),  $v_j * c_{ij} = +\sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_j^\perp, c_{ij}) = +\sinh(-d_{ji}) = -\sinh d_{ji}$  or  $v_j * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_j^\perp, c_{ij}) = -\sinh(+d_{ji}) = -\sinh d_{ji}$ . Then  $v_j * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ji}$ . Applying Proposition 2.1 to the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_j$  gives

$$(19) \quad v_j * c_{ijk} = -(c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{ij}) = \sinh d_{ji} \cdot (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}).$$

Similarly, in the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_j$ , we have

$$(20) \quad v_j * c_{ijk} = -(v_j * c_{jk})(c_{jk} * c_{ijk}) = \sinh d_{jk} \cdot (c_{jk} * c_{ijk}),$$

where  $v_j * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{jk}$  follows from Proposition 2.2 (ii). Combining (19) and (20) gives

$$(21) \quad \sinh d_{ji} \cdot (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) = \sinh d_{jk} \cdot (c_{jk} * c_{ijk}).$$

By Proposition 2.2 (iii), we have  $(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{jk}) = \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{jk}\| (-\cosh \theta_{ik})$ . Moreover,

$$(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{jk}) = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk}) \|v_j\|^2 - (v_j * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{jk}) = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \cosh^2 d_{jk},$$

where (20) is used in the second equality. Since  $\|v_j \otimes c_{jk}\|^2 = (v_j * c_{jk})^2 + 1 = \cosh^2 d_{jk}$ , then

$$(22) \quad \cosh \theta_{ik} = -\frac{(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{jk})}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{jk}\|} = -\frac{(c_{jk} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \cosh d_{jk}}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}.$$

Similarly,  $(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{ij}) = \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ij}\| (-\cosh \theta_{ki})$ . Moreover,

$$(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{ij}) = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \|v_j\|^2 - (v_j * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{ij}) = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \cosh^2 d_{ji},$$

where (19) is used in the second equality. Since  $\|v_j \otimes c_{ij}\|^2 = (v_j * c_{ij})^2 + 1 = \cosh^2 d_{ji}$ , then

$$(23) \quad \cosh \theta_{ki} = -\frac{(c_{ijk} \otimes v_j) * (v_j \otimes c_{ij})}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ij}\|} = -\frac{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \cosh d_{ji}}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}.$$

By the properties of Lorentzian cross product, we have

$$(24) \quad \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2 = (v_j \otimes c_{ijk}) * (v_j \otimes c_{ijk}) = (v_j * c_{ijk})^2 - \|c_{ijk}\|^2,$$

and

$$(25) \quad \|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2 = (c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}) * (c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}) = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 + \|c_{ijk}\|^2.$$

Adding (24) and (25) gives

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2 + \|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2 &= (v_j * c_{ijk})^2 + (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \\ &= (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \cdot \sinh^2 d_{ji} + (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \\ &= (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \cosh^2 d_{ji}, \end{aligned}$$

where (19) is used in the second line. Then

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} \sinh^2 \theta_{ki} &= \cosh^2 \theta_{ki} - 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2} [(c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \cosh^2 d_{ji} - \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2] \\ &= \frac{\|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where (23) is used in the second line and (26) is used in the last line.

Now we begin to calculate  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  in (17).

$$\begin{aligned}
L_2 &= -\sinh \theta_{ki} \sinh \theta_{ik} \cdot \coth d_{ji} \\
&= -\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik} \cdot \frac{\cosh d_{ji}}{\sinh d_{ji}} \cdot \frac{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{c_{ij} * c_{ijk}} \cdot \frac{c_{ij} * c_{ijk}}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|} \\
&= \sinh \theta_{ki} \sinh \theta_{ik} \cdot \frac{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \sinh d_{ji}} \cdot \cosh \theta_{ki},
\end{aligned}$$

where (23) is used in the last line.

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= \coth d_{jk} - \cosh \theta_{ki} \cosh \theta_{ik} \cdot \coth d_{ji} \\
&= \frac{\cosh d_{jk} \cdot (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})}{\sinh d_{ji} \cdot (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})} + \frac{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \cosh d_{ji}}{\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|} \cdot \cosh \theta_{ik} \cdot \frac{\cosh d_{ji}}{\sinh d_{ji}} \\
&= \frac{\cosh \theta_{ik}}{\sinh d_{ji} \cdot (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|} \left( -\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2 + (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2 \cosh^2 d_{ji} \right) \\
&= \frac{\cosh \theta_{ik} \cdot \|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2}{\sinh d_{ji} \cdot (c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|} \\
&= \frac{\cosh \theta_{ik} \sinh^2 \theta_{ki} \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{\sinh d_{ji} (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})},
\end{aligned}$$

where (21) and (23) are used in the second line, (22) is used in the third line, (26) is used in the fourth line, and (27) is used in the last line. Therefore, the formula (18) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} &= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot (L_1 + L_2) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot \frac{\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \sinh d_{ji}} \cdot (\cosh \theta_{ik} \sinh \theta_{ki} + \sinh \theta_{ik} \cosh \theta_{ki}) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh \theta_j} \cdot \frac{\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk}) \sinh d_{ji}} \cdot \sinh \theta_j \\
&= \frac{1}{\sinh l_k \sinh d_{ji}} \cdot \frac{\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|}{c_{ij} * c_{ijk}}.
\end{aligned}$$

**(i):** Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, then  $\|c_{ijk}\|^2 = -1$  and  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ . By (24), we have  $\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \cosh q_j$ . Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \cosh q_j = \sinh h_k$  by Lemma 2.10. Since  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ , then

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} = \frac{1}{\sinh d_{ji} \sinh l_k} \cdot \frac{\sinh h_k}{-\cosh h_k} = \frac{-1}{\sinh d_{ji}} \frac{\tanh h_k}{\sinh l_k}.$$

**(ii):** Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, then  $\|c_{ijk}\|^2 = 1$  and  $v_j * c_{ijk} = \pm \cosh q_j$ , thus  $\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh q_j$  if  $q_j > 0$  and  $\|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = -\sinh q_j$  if  $q_j < 0$  by (24).

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in one of the domains  $D_I, D_{II}, D_V, D_{VI}$ , then  $q_j > 0$  and  $h_k > 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \sinh q_j = \cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.13. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{III}$ , then  $q_j < 0$  and  $h_k > 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot (-\sinh q_j) = \cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.13. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{IV}$ , then  $q_j > 0$  and  $h_k < 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \sinh q_j = -\cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.13. Note that  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ij}, (c_{ijk})^\perp)) = -\sinh(-h_k) = \sinh h_k$ .



If  $c_{ijk}$  is in one of the domains  $D_i, D_{ii}, D_{vi}$ , then  $q_j > 0$  and  $h_k > 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \sinh q_j = \cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.15. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{iii}$ , then  $q_j < 0$  and  $h_k > 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot (-\sinh q_j) = \cosh h_k$  Lemma 2.15. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_v$ , then  $q_j > 0$  and  $h_k < 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \sinh q_j = -\cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.15. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = \sinh h_k$ .

If  $c_{ijk}$  is in the domain  $D_{iv}$ , then  $q_j < 0$  and  $h_k < 0$  by Table 1. Then  $\sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\| = \sinh \theta_{ki} \cdot (-\sinh q_j) = -\cosh h_k$  by Lemma 2.15. And  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = \sinh h_k$ .

In summary, if  $c_{ijk}$  is space-like, then

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} = \frac{-1}{\sinh d_{ji}} \frac{\coth h_k}{\sinh l_k}.$$

(iii): The case that  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like follows from continuity by moving the center to the light cone. In fact, if  $c_{ijk}$  is light-like, then  $\|c_{ijk}\|^2 = 0$ . Combining (27) and (25) gives

$$\frac{\sinh^2 \theta_{ki} \cdot \|v_j \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2}{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2} = \frac{\|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\|^2}{(c_{ij} * c_{ijk})^2} = 1.$$

Since  $\|c_{ij} \otimes c_{ijk}\| = -(c_{ij} * c_{ijk})$ , then

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_j} = \frac{-1}{\sinh d_{ji} \sinh l_k}.$$

This completes the proof.

Q.E.D.

**Remark 2.19.** Actually, the formulas in the proof of Lemma 2.18 are the sine and cosine laws of generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangles. In order to avoid discussing one by one, we use Lorentzian inner product and Lorentzian cross product to unify calculations.

**Lemma 2.20.** For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , we have

$$(28) \quad \frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_i} = \cosh l_{ij} \frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial f_i} + \cosh l_{ik} \frac{\partial \theta_k^{ij}}{\partial f_i}.$$

*Proof.* Under the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 2.18, a similar calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_i} &= \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_i} \frac{\partial l_i}{\partial f_i} + \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_j} \frac{\partial l_j}{\partial f_i} + \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial l_k} \frac{\partial l_k}{\partial f_i} \\ &= \frac{-\sinh l_i \cosh \theta_k}{A} \cdot \coth d_{ik} + \frac{-\sinh l_i \cosh \theta_j}{A} \cdot \coth d_{ij} \\ &= \frac{-\sinh l_i}{A} \cdot (\cosh \theta_k \cdot \coth d_{ik} + \cosh \theta_j \cdot \coth d_{ij}). \end{aligned}$$

Similar to (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial f_i} &= \frac{\sinh l_j}{A} (\coth d_{ik} - \cosh \theta_i \coth d_{ij}), \\ \frac{\partial \theta_k}{\partial f_i} &= \frac{\sinh l_k}{A} (\coth d_{ij} - \cosh \theta_i \coth d_{ik}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cosh l_k \frac{\partial \theta_j}{\partial f_i} + \cosh l_j \frac{\partial \theta_k}{\partial f_i} \\
&= \frac{1}{A} (\cosh l_k \sinh l_j \coth d_{ik} - \cosh l_k \sinh l_j \cosh \theta_i \coth d_{ij} \\
&\quad + \cosh l_j \sinh l_k \coth d_{ij} - \cosh l_j \sinh l_k \cosh \theta_i \coth d_{ik}) \\
&= \frac{1}{A} [\coth d_{ik} \cdot (\cosh l_k \sinh l_j - \cosh l_j \sinh l_k \cdot \cosh \theta_i) \\
&\quad + \coth d_{ij} \cdot (\cosh l_j \sinh l_k - \cosh l_k \sinh l_j \cosh \theta_i)] \\
&= \frac{1}{A} [\coth d_{ik} \cdot (\cosh l_k \sinh l_j - \cosh l_j \sinh l_k \cdot \frac{\cosh l_i + \cosh l_j \cosh l_k}{\sinh l_j \sinh l_k}) \\
&\quad + \coth d_{ij} \cdot (\cosh l_j \sinh l_k - \cosh l_k \sinh l_j \cdot \frac{\cosh l_i + \cosh l_j \cosh l_k}{\sinh l_j \sinh l_k})] \\
&= \frac{1}{A} (-\coth d_{ik} \sinh l_i \cosh \theta_k - \coth d_{ij} \sinh l_i \cosh \theta_j) \\
&= \frac{\partial \theta_i}{\partial f_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Q.E.D.

**Remark 2.21.** The formula (28) was first obtained by Glickenstein-Thomas [3] for generalized discrete conformal structures on closed surfaces, which has lots of applications. See [9, 10, 12–15] and others for example. In [11], Xu showed that the formula (28) holds for a special class of discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary and conjectured this formula holds for generalized discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary. Lemma 2.20 provides an affirmative answer to Xu’s conjecture.

Since the variational formula of generalized angle (14) is not symmetric in  $i$  and  $j$ , we need to obtain a symmetric variational formula of generalized angle by reparameterization.

**Lemma 2.22.** There is a change of variables  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  such that

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial u_j} = \frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial u_i}.$$

The function  $u$  is also called a discrete conformal factor.

*Proof.* Take new coordinates  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  such that  $\partial \theta_i^{jk} / \partial u_j = \partial \theta_j^{ik} / \partial u_i$ . By (14), we have

$$\frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial u_j} = \frac{\partial \theta_i^{jk}}{\partial f_j} \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \frac{-\partial f_j / \partial u_j}{\sinh d_{ji}} \cdot \frac{\tanh^\beta h_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ij}},$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \theta_j^{ik}}{\partial u_i} = \frac{-\partial f_i / \partial u_i}{\sinh d_{ij}} \cdot \frac{\tanh^\beta h_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ij}}.$$

This implies

$$\frac{\partial f_i / \partial u_i}{\partial f_j / \partial u_j} = \frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}}.$$

Recall the following formulas from the proof of [16, Theorem 1.6]

$$\frac{\sinh^2 d_{ij}}{\sinh^2 d_{ji}} = e^{C_{ij}} e^{2f_i - 2f_j} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\sinh^2 d_{ij}}{\sinh^2 d_{ji}} = \frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}.$$

(i): By Remark 1.7, we can set  $e^{C_{ij}} = 1$ . If  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = e^{f_i - f_j}$ , then

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = e^{f_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = e^{f_j}.$$

Suppose  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -e^{f_i - f_j}$ . If  $d_{ij} < 0$ , then  $d_{ik} < 0$  by Lemma 2.17, and thus  $d_{ji} > 0$ ,  $d_{ki} > 0$ . We need  $d_{jk} > 0$ ,  $d_{kj} > 0$  to make the condition (1) hold. Hence  $\frac{\sinh d_{ik}}{\sinh d_{ki}} = -e^{f_i - f_k}$  and  $\frac{\sinh d_{jk}}{\sinh d_{kj}} = e^{f_j - f_k}$ . Then

$$(29) \quad \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -e^{f_i}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = e^{f_j} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = e^{f_k}.$$

Similarly, if  $d_{ji} < 0$ , then  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = e^{f_i}$ ,  $\frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = -e^{f_j}$  and  $\frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = e^{f_k}$ .

(ii): If  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}}$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} > 0$ ,  $1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} > 0$ , then

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}.$$

If  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}}$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} < 0$ ,  $1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} < 0$ , then  $\alpha \equiv -1$  and

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \sqrt{e^{2f_j} - 1}.$$

(iii): If  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}}$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} > 0$ ,  $1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} > 0$ , then by the arguments similar to that in the case (i), when  $d_{ij} < 0$ ,

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}};$$

when  $d_{ji} < 0$ ,

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = -\sqrt{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}}.$$

If  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}}$  and  $1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} < 0$ ,  $1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} < 0$ , then when  $d_{ij} < 0$ ,

$$(30) \quad \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -\sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \sqrt{e^{2f_j} - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = \sqrt{e^{2f_k} - 1};$$

when  $d_{ji} < 0$ ,

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = -\sqrt{e^{2f_j} - 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = \sqrt{e^{2f_k} - 1}.$$

Q.E.D.

**Remark 2.23.** In fact, the function  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  can be computed explicitly.

(i): If  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = e^{f_i}$ , then  $u_i = -e^{-f_i}$ . If  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -e^{f_i}$ , then  $u_i = e^{-f_i}$ .

(ii): Suppose  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}$ , if  $\alpha_i = 0$ , then  $u_i = f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\alpha_i \neq 0$ , then

$$u_i = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left| \frac{\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}} + 1} \right|.$$

Specially, if  $\alpha_i = -1$ , then

$$(31) \quad -\tanh u_i = \sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}},$$

which implies  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\cosh u_i}$ . Note that  $\sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}} \neq 0$  and thus  $f_i \neq 0$ . Then  $f_i, u_i \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ . If  $\alpha_i = 1$ , then

$$(32) \quad -\coth u_i = \sqrt{1 + e^{2f_i}},$$

which implies  $e^{f_i} = -\frac{1}{\sinh u_i}$  and  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ .

(iii): Suppose  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}$ , then if  $\alpha_i = 0$ , then  $u_i = -f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\alpha_i \neq 0$ , then

$$u_i = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \left| \frac{\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}} + 1} \right|.$$

Specially, if  $\alpha_i = -1$ , then

$$\tanh u_i = \sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}},$$

which implies  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\cosh u_i}$ . Similarly, the case that  $f_i = 0$  is removed. Then  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ ,  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . If  $\alpha_i = 1$ , then

$$\coth u_i = \sqrt{1 + e^{2f_i}},$$

which implies  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\sinh u_i}$  and  $f_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

(iv): If  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \tan u_i &= \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \text{ for } u_i \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}), \\ -\frac{1}{\tan u_i} &= \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \text{ for } u_i \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\cos u_i}$  for  $u_i \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$  and  $e^{f_i} = -\frac{1}{\sin u_i}$  for  $u_i \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$ . If  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -\sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} -\tan u_i &= \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \text{ for } u_i \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0), \\ \frac{1}{\tan u_i} &= \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}, \text{ for } u_i \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\cos u_i}$  for  $u_i \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$  and  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\sin u_i}$  for  $u_i \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$ .

### 3. RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE OF THE DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE (A1)

3.1. **Admissible space of the discrete conformal structure (A1).** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \alpha, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary, and the weights  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in$

$\mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ . The admissible space of the discrete conformal factors  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  given by (4) is defined to be

$$(33) \quad \Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{(1 + \alpha_r e^{2f_r})(1 + \alpha_s e^{2f_s})} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} > 1, \forall \{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}\}.$$

By a change of variables  $u_i = u_i(f_i)$  in Lemma 2.22, the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $f$  is transferred to the following admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  of the discrete conformal factors  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\}$

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = u(\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^{3-N_1} \mid (f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)\},$$

where  $N_1$  is the number of the boundary components  $i \in B$  with  $\alpha_i = 0$ .

Since  $\frac{\sinh d_{rs}}{\sinh d_{sr}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_r e^{2f_r}}{1 + \alpha_s e^{2f_s}}} > 0$  and  $1 + \alpha_r e^{2f_r} > 0, 1 + \alpha_s e^{2f_s} > 0$  in Theorem 1.6, then by the proof of Lemma 2.22, we have

$$(34) \quad \frac{\partial f_r}{\partial u_r} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_r e^{2f_r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f_s}{\partial u_s} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_s e^{2f_s}}.$$

According to Remark 2.23, we can describe the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  explicitly as follows:

- (i): If  $\alpha \equiv 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -1 + \eta_{rs} e^{u_r + u_s} > 1$ , which implies  $u_r + u_s > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{rs}}$ .
- (ii): If  $\alpha \equiv -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{(1 - e^{2f_r})(1 - e^{2f_s})} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} = -\tanh u_r \tanh u_s + \eta_{rs} \frac{1}{\cosh u_r \cosh u_s} > 1$ , which implies  $\cosh(u_r + u_s) < \eta_{rs}$ . Since  $u \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}^3$ , then  $u_r + u_s > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{rs}$ . It is worth noting that  $\eta_{rs} > 1$ .
- (iii): If  $\alpha \equiv 1$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{(1 + e^{2f_r})(1 + e^{2f_s})} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} = -\coth u_r \coth u_s + \eta_{rs} \frac{1}{\sinh u_r \sinh u_s} > 1$ , which implies  $\cosh(u_r + u_s) < \eta_{rs}$ . Since  $u \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}^3$ , then  $u_r + u_s > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{rs}$ . It is worth noting that  $\eta_{rs} > 1$ .
- (iv): If  $\alpha_r = 0, \alpha_s = -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{1 - e^{2f_s}} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} = \tanh u_s + \eta_{rs} e^{u_r} \frac{1}{\cosh u_s} > 1$ , which implies  $u_r + u_s > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{rs}}$ .
- (v): If  $\alpha_r = 0, \alpha_s = 1$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{1 + e^{2f_s}} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} = \coth u_s + \eta_{rs} e^{u_r} \frac{-1}{\sinh u_s} > 1$ . Since  $u_s \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ , then  $u_r + u_s > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{rs}}$ .
- (vi): If  $\alpha_r = 1, \alpha_s = -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{rs} = -\sqrt{(1 + e^{2f_r})(1 - e^{2f_s})} + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} = -\coth u_r \tanh u_s + \eta_{rs} \frac{-1}{\sinh u_r \cosh u_s} > 1$ . Since  $u_r, u_s \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ , then  $\sinh(u_r + u_s) > -\eta_{rs}$  and hence  $u_r + u_s > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{rs})$ .

In summary, the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  can be rewritten as

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^{3-N_1} \mid u_r + u_s > C(\eta_{rs}), \forall \{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}\},$$

where  $C(\eta_{rs})$  is a constant that depends on  $\eta_{rs}$ .

The above arguments show the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \alpha, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary, and the weights  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$  satisfying  $\eta_{ij} > \alpha_i \alpha_j$  if  $\alpha_i = \alpha_j$  for two adjacent boundary components  $i, j \in B$ . Then the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is a convex polytope. As a result, the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is a convex polytope.

**3.2. Negative definiteness of Jacobian.** For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh l_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Define

$$(36) \quad Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cosh \theta_k & \cosh \theta_j \\ \cosh \theta_k & -1 & \cosh \theta_i \\ \cosh \theta_j & \cosh \theta_i & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $\det Q_1 = -1 + 2 \cosh \theta_i \cosh \theta_j \cosh \theta_k + \cosh^2 \theta_i + \cosh^2 \theta_j + \cosh^2 \theta_k > 0$ . By calculations similar to (15), we have

$$\frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} \times Q_1.$$

This implies

$$(37) \quad \det \left( \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)} \right) = -\frac{1}{A^3} \sinh l_i \sinh l_j \sinh l_k \cdot \det Q_1 < 0.$$

Combining (2) and (3), we have

$$(38) \quad \frac{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)}{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \coth d_{jk} & \coth d_{kj} \\ \coth d_{ik} & 0 & \coth d_{ki} \\ \coth d_{ij} & \coth d_{ji} & 0 \end{pmatrix} := Q_2.$$

Then

$$(39) \quad \det Q_2 = \coth d_{jk} \coth d_{ki} \coth d_{ij} + \coth d_{kj} \coth d_{ik} \coth d_{ji}.$$

For any  $\alpha_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ , set  $S_i = e^{f_i}$ ,  $C_i = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}$ , then  $S_i, C_i > 0$  and  $C_i^2 - \alpha_i S_i^2 = 1$ . By (34), we have

$$(40) \quad \frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} C_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_k \end{pmatrix} := Q_3.$$

**Theorem 3.2.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$ , the Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite.

*Proof.* Since  $d > 0$  for the discrete conformal structure (A1) in Theorem 1.6, then  $\det Q_2 > 0$  by (39). Hence

$$\det \left( \frac{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} \right) = \det Q_2 \cdot \det Q_3 > 0.$$

Combining with (37) gives

$$(41) \quad \det \Lambda_{ijk} = \det \left( \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)} \right) \cdot \det \left( \frac{\partial(l_i, l_j, l_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} \right) < 0.$$

This implies the matrix  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  is non-degenerate. By Lemma 2.22, the matrix  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  is symmetric. Set  $a_{rrs} := C_r \cdot \coth d_{rs} > 0$ . Define

$$Q := Q_1 Q_2 Q_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cosh \theta_k & \cosh \theta_j \\ \cosh \theta_k & -1 & \cosh \theta_i \\ \cosh \theta_j & \cosh \theta_i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{jjk} & a_{kkj} \\ a_{iik} & 0 & a_{kki} \\ a_{iij} & a_{jji} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} \times Q.$$

To prove the negative definiteness of  $\Lambda_{ijk}$ , it suffices to prove  $Q$  is positive definite. The formula (41) shows that  $\det Q > 0$ . It remains to prove that the determinants of the  $1 \times 1$  and  $2 \times 2$  order principal minor of  $Q$  are positive. Let  $m_{rs}$  be the entry of  $Q$  at  $r$ -th row and  $s$ -th column. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11} &= \cosh \theta_k \cdot a_{iik} + \cosh \theta_j \cdot a_{iij} \\ m_{22} &= \cosh \theta_k \cdot a_{jjk} + \cosh \theta_i \cdot a_{jji} \\ m_{12} &= -a_{jjk} + \cosh \theta_j \cdot a_{jji} \\ m_{21} &= -a_{iik} + \cosh \theta_i \cdot a_{iij}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the determinants of the  $1 \times 1$  principal submatrices of  $Q$  is  $m_{11} > 0$  by  $a_{iik} > 0, a_{iij} > 0$ . And the determinants of the  $2 \times 2$  principal submatrices of  $Q$  is

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}m_{21} &= \sinh^2 \theta_k a_{iik} a_{jjk} + (\cosh \theta_i \cosh \theta_k + \cosh \theta_j) a_{iik} a_{jji} \\ &\quad + (\cosh \theta_j \cosh \theta_k + \cosh \theta_i) a_{iij} a_{jjk} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. Q.E.D.

As a result, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.3.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. The Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

**3.3. Rigidity of the discrete conformal structure (A1).** The following theorem gives the rigidity of discrete conformal structure (A1), which is the rigidity part of Theorem 1.9 (i).

**Theorem 3.4.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. The discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . In particular, the map from  $f$  to  $K$  is a smooth embedding.

*Proof.* Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 imply that the following energy function

$$\mathcal{F}_{ijk}(u_i, u_j, u_k) = \int^{(u_i, u_j, u_k)} \theta_i^{jk} du_i + \theta_j^{ik} du_j + \theta_k^{ij} du_k$$

for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  is a well-defined smooth function on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F}_{ijk}(u_i, u_j, u_k)$  is a strictly concave function on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  with  $\nabla_{u_i} \mathcal{F}_{ijk} = \theta_i^{jk}$ . Define the function  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{U}(\eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(u) = \sum_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{F}_{ijk}(u_i, u_j, u_k).$$

By Corollary 3.3,  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(u)$  is a strictly concave function on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$  with  $\nabla_{u_i} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(u) = K_i$ . According to Lemma 1.11, the map  $\nabla \tilde{\mathcal{F}} : \mathcal{U}(\eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$  is a smooth embedding. Therefore, the map from  $\{f \in \Omega(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)\}$  to  $\{K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N\}$  is a smooth injective map. Q.E.D.

**3.4. Existence of the discrete conformal structure (A1).** The following theorem characterizes the image of  $K$  for the discrete conformal structure (A1), which is the existence part of Theorem 1.9 (i).

**Theorem 3.5.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. Suppose  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . Then the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

To prove Theorem 3.5, we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.6.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = a, \lim f_k = b$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ , where  $a, b, c$  are constants.

*Proof.* For case (i),  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ . By (4), we have

$$(42) \quad \begin{aligned} \cosh l_{ij} &= \left[ \eta_{ij} - \sqrt{(e^{-2f_i} + \alpha_i)(e^{-2f_j} + \alpha_j)} \right] e^{f_i+f_j}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= \left[ \eta_{jk} - \sqrt{(e^{-2f_j} + \alpha_j)(e^{-2f_k} + \alpha_k)} \right] e^{f_j+f_k}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= \left[ \eta_{ik} - \sqrt{(e^{-2f_i} + \alpha_i)(e^{-2f_k} + \alpha_k)} \right] e^{f_i+f_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_i+f_j}$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim c_i e^{f_j+f_k}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim c_j e^{f_i+f_k}$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. Set  $L_1 = \frac{\cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}}$  and  $L_2 = \frac{\cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}}$ , then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2$ . Since

$$L_1 \rightarrow \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{c_k e^{f_i+f_j} \cdot c_j e^{f_i+f_k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad L_2 \rightarrow 1,$$

then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow 1$  and hence  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow 0$ . The same proofs are suitable for the cases (ii) and (iii), and we omit them here. Q.E.D.

**Lemma 3.7.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1. For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$ , if  $\lim f_i = -\infty$ , then  $\lim f_j = \lim f_k = +\infty$ . Furthermore,  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = +\infty$ .

*Proof.* The definition of the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  in (35) implies  $u_r + u_s > C(\eta_{rs})$  for any  $\{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}$ . Hence, there is no subset  $\{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}$  such that  $\lim u_r = -\infty$  and  $\lim u_s = -\infty$  or  $\lim u_s = c$ , where  $c$  is a constant. Combining (34) and Remark 2.23, if  $\lim f_i = -\infty$ , then  $\lim u_i = -\infty$ ; if  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ , then  $\lim u_j = +\infty$  with  $\alpha_j = 0$  and  $\lim u_j = 0^-$  with  $\alpha_j = 1$ . Therefore, if  $\lim f_i = -\infty$ , then  $\lim u_i = -\infty$  and hence  $\lim u_j = \lim u_k = +\infty$ . This implies  $\alpha_j = \alpha_k = 0$  and  $\lim f_j = \lim f_k = +\infty$ .



If  $\alpha_i = 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = -1 + \eta_{ij}e^{u_i+u_j}$ ,  $\cosh l_{jk} = -1 + \eta_{jk}e^{u_j+u_k}$  and  $\cosh l_{ik} = -1 + \eta_{ik}e^{u_i+u_k}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= \frac{-1 + \eta_{jk}e^{u_j+u_k}}{\sqrt{(-1 + \eta_{ij}e^{u_i+u_j})^2 - 1} \cdot \sqrt{(-1 + \eta_{ik}e^{u_i+u_k})^2 - 1}} \\ &= \frac{-1 + \eta_{jk}e^{u_j+u_k}}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij}\eta_{ik}e^{u_j+u_k}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij}e^{2u_i} - 2e^{u_i-u_j}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ik}e^{2u_i} - 2e^{u_i-u_k}}} \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

And  $L_2 > 0$ . Then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , which implies  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

If  $\alpha_i = 1$ , then  $\sqrt{1 + e^{2f_i}} = -\coth u_i$  and  $e^{f_i} = -\frac{1}{\sinh u_i}$ . Hence,

$$\cosh l_{ij} = -\sqrt{1 + e^{2f_i}} + \eta_{ij}e^{f_i+f_j} = \frac{-\cosh u_i + \eta_{ij}e^{u_j}}{-\sinh u_i} \rightarrow -1 + 2\eta_{ij}e^{u_i+u_j}.$$

Similarly,  $\cosh l_{ik} \rightarrow -1 + 2\eta_{ik}e^{u_i+u_k}$  and  $\cosh l_{jk} = -1 + \eta_{jk}e^{u_j+u_k}$ . Similar to the proof of the case  $\alpha_i = 0$ , we have  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

If  $\alpha_i = -1$ , then  $\sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}} = -\tanh u_i$  and  $e^{f_i} = \frac{1}{\cosh u_i}$ . Hence,

$$\cosh l_{ij} = -\sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}} + \eta_{ij}e^{f_i+f_j} = \frac{\sinh u_i + \eta_{ij}e^{u_j}}{\cosh u_i} \rightarrow -1 + 2\eta_{ij}e^{u_i+u_j}.$$

Similarly,  $\cosh l_{ik} \rightarrow -1 + 2\eta_{ik}e^{u_i+u_k}$  and  $\cosh l_{jk} = -1 + \eta_{jk}e^{u_j+u_k}$ . Similar to the proof of the case  $\alpha_i = 0$ , we have  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Q.E.D.

**Proof of Theorem 3.5:** Let the image of  $K$  be  $X$ . To prove  $X = \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , we will show that  $X$  is both open and closed in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . By the definition of curvature map  $K$ , we have  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Since the map from  $f \in \Omega(\eta)$  to  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$  is a smooth injective map, then  $X$  is open in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . It remains to prove that  $X$  is closed in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . We show that if a sequence  $f^{(m)}$  in  $\Omega(\eta)$  satisfies  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , then there exists a subsequence, say  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in  $\Omega(\eta)$ .

Suppose otherwise, there exists a subsequence  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in the boundary of  $\Omega(\eta)$ . By (33), the boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  consists of the following three parts

(i): There exists an ideal edge  $\{rs\} \in E$  such that  $l_{rs} = 0$ , i.e.,  $u_r + u_s = -C(\eta_{rs})$  for the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  defined by (35).

(ii): For  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

(iii): For  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ .

For case (i), in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ik}$  and opposite lengths of boundaries  $\theta_k^{ij}, \theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $l_{ij} \rightarrow 0$ . By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_j^{ik} = \frac{\cosh l_{ik} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{jk}} > \frac{\cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{jk}} \geq \frac{\cosh l_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ij}} \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which contradicts the assumption that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

The case (ii) follows from Lemma 3.6 and the case (iii) follows from Lemma 3.7. In fact, each generalized angle incident to the boundary component  $i \in B$  converges to 0 or  $+\infty$ . Hence,  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} = 0$  or  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} = +\infty$ . They both contradict with the assumption that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Q.E.D.

**Remark 3.8.** Note that Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.7 hold for  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ . But Theorem 3.5 holds for  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . If  $\alpha_i = -1$ , then the boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  will include the case that there exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0^-$ . We are unable to prove the closeness of  $X$  in this case.

#### 4. RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE OF THE DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE (A2)

In this section, we consider the rigidity and existence of the discrete conformal structure (A2). By Remark 1.7, we set  $\alpha \equiv -1$ . Then (5) can be written as

$$(43) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(e^{2f_i} - 1)(e^{2f_j} - 1) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}}.$$

The admissible space of the discrete conformal factors  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  given by (43) is defined to be

$$(44) \quad \Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid l_{ij} > 0, l_{jk} > 0, l_{ki} > 0\}.$$

Since  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}$ , then by Remark 2.23 (iv), we have  $\tan u_i = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}$  for  $u_i \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2})$  and  $-\frac{1}{\tan u_i} = \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1}$  for  $u_i \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)$ . For simplicity, we consider that  $u \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)^N$ . Thus

$$(45) \quad \cosh l_{ij} = \frac{1}{\tan u_i \tan u_j} + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\sin u_i \sin u_j} > 1,$$

which implies  $\cos(u_i + u_j) > -\eta_{ij}$ . Then  $u_i + u_j \in (-\pi, 0)$  for  $\eta_{ij} \in [1, +\infty)$  or  $u_i + u_j > -\arccos \eta_{ij}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \in [-1, 1)$ . Hence, the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $f$  is transferred to the following admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = u(\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)^3 \mid \cos(u_r + u_s) > -\eta_{rs}, \forall \{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}\},$$

where  $\eta_{rs} \in [-1, +\infty)$ . This implies that  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is a convex polytope. As a result, the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is also a convex polytope on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in [-1, +\infty)^E$ . For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$ , the Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite. As a result, the Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh \theta_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Define

$$\frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{e^{2f_j} - 1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{e^{2f_k} - 1} \end{pmatrix} := Q_4.$$

Hence

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} Q_1 Q_2 Q_4,$$

where  $Q_1$  is defined by (36) and  $Q_2$  is defined by (38). Moreover,  $\det Q_1 > 0$ . Since  $d > 0$  for the discrete conformal structure (A2) in Theorem 1.6, then  $\det Q_2 > 0$  by (39). Then

$\det \Lambda_{ijk} < 0$ . This implies  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  is non-degenerate. The symmetry of  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  follows from Lemma 2.22. Set  $a_{rrs} = \sqrt{e^{2f_r} - 1} \cdot \coth d_{rs} > 0$ . Define

$$Q := Q_1 Q_2 Q_4 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cosh \theta_k & \cosh \theta_j \\ \cosh \theta_k & -1 & \cosh \theta_i \\ \cosh \theta_j & \cosh \theta_i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{jjk} & a_{kkj} \\ a_{iik} & 0 & a_{kki} \\ a_{ijj} & a_{jji} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.2, so we omit it.

Q.E.D.

The following theorem gives the rigidity of discrete conformal structure (A2), which is the rigidity part of Theorem 1.9 (ii). As the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, we omit it here.

**Theorem 4.2.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in [-1, +\infty)^E$ . The discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . In particular, the map from  $f$  to  $K$  is a smooth embedding.

The following theorem gives the existence of discrete conformal structure (A2), which is the existence part of Theorem 1.9 (ii).

**Theorem 4.3.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in [-1, 0]^E$ . The image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

To prove Theorem 4.3, we need the following lemma. The proof is almost identical to that of Lemma 3.6, so we omit it here.

**Lemma 4.4.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 4.2. For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = a, \lim f_k = b$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ , where  $a, b, c$  are positive constants.

**Proof of Theorem 4.3:** Let the image of  $K$  be  $X$ . The openness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$  follows from the injectivity of the map  $f$ . To prove the closeness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , we prove that if a sequence  $f^{(m)}$  in  $\Omega(\eta) = \cap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  satisfies  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , then there exists a subsequence, say  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in  $\Omega(\eta)$ .

Suppose otherwise, there exists a subsequence  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in the boundary of  $\Omega(\eta)$ . By (44), the boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  consists of the following three parts

- (i): There exists an ideal edge  $\{rs\} \in E$  such that  $l_{rs} = 0$ .
- (ii): There exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ .
- (iii): There exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0^+$ .

The proof of the case (i) is the same as that of Theorem 3.5, so we omit it here. The case (ii) follows from Lemma 4.4, which contradicts the assumption that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . For the case (iii), if  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0^+$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(e^{2f_i} - 1)(e^{2f_j} - 1)} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} \rightarrow \eta_{ij} e^{f_j}$ . Since  $\eta_{ij} \in [-1, 0]$ , then  $\eta_{ij} e^{f_j} \leq 0$ . This is a contradiction. Q.E.D.

**Remark 4.5.** If  $\eta \in [-1, 1)^E$ , then the discrete conformal structure (A2) is exactly Guo-Luo's  $(-1, -1, 1)$  type generalized circle packings in [5], where the rigidity and existence have been proved. Hence, Theorem 4.2 generalizes Guo-Luo's rigidity result. However, there exists a

gap for the weight  $\eta \in (0, 1)^E$  in the proof of Guo-Luo's existence result, because Guo-Luo did not consider the boundary part  $r \rightarrow 0$ .

### 5. RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE OF THE DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE (A3)

By Remark 1.7, we can set  $C \equiv 0$  in the discrete conformal structure (A3). In this case, the discrete conformal structure (A3) is exactly the  $(-1, -1, 0)$  type generalized circle packings in Guo-Luo [5]. Its rigidity and existence have been proved by Guo-Luo [5], which is as follows.

**Theorem 5.1.** ([5]) Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ , the discrete conformal factor  $f \in \Omega(\eta)$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Furthermore, the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

In this section, we reprove the rigidity part of Theorem 5.1. In [5], Guo-Luo spent lots of space to prove the symmetry and negative definiteness of Jacobian. By (2) and (3), we simplify Guo-Luo's proof, which is similar to that of Theorem 3.2.

The admissible space of the discrete conformal factor  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  given by (6) is defined to be

$$\Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \cosh l_{rs} = -\cosh(f_r - f_s) + \eta_{rs} e^{f_r + f_s} > 1, \forall \{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}\}.$$

By Theorem 1.6, we have  $d > 0$  for the discrete conformal structure (A3). By a change of variables in Remark 2.23, i.e.,  $\frac{df_r}{du_r} = e^{f_r}$  and  $u_r = -e^{-f_r}$ . Thus

$$\eta_{rs} = \frac{\cosh l_{rs} + \cosh(f_r - f_s)}{e^{f_r + f_s}} > \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}(e^{f_r - f_s} + e^{f_s - f_r})}{e^{f_r + f_s}} = \frac{1}{2}(e^{-f_r} + e^{-f_s})^2 = \frac{1}{2}(u_r + u_s)^2.$$

Since  $u_r, u_s \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ , then  $\eta_{rs} > 0$  and  $u_r + u_s > -\sqrt{2\eta_{rs}}$ . Therefore, the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $f$  is transferred to the following admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = u(\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}^3 \mid u_r + u_s > -\sqrt{2\eta_{rs}}, \forall \{r, s\} \subseteq \{i, j, k\}\},$$

which is a convex polytope. Then the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is also a convex polytope on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ . For a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$ , the Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^k, \theta_j^k, \theta_k^j)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite. As a result, the Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh \theta_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Since  $\frac{df_r}{du_r} = e^{f_r}$ , then

$$\frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{f_i} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{f_j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{f_k} \end{pmatrix} := Q_5.$$

Hence

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} Q_1 Q_2 Q_5,$$

where  $Q_1$  is defined by (36) and  $Q_2$  is defined by (38). Moreover,  $\det Q_1 > 0$ . Since  $d > 0$  for the discrete conformal structure (A3) in Theorem 1.6, then  $\det Q_2 > 0$  by (39). Hence,  $\det \Lambda_{ijk} < 0$ . This implies  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  is non-degenerate. The symmetry of  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  follows from Lemma 2.22. Set  $a_{rrs} = e^{fr} \cdot \coth d_{rs} > 0$ . Define

$$Q := Q_1 Q_2 Q_5 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cosh \theta_k & \cosh \theta_j \\ \cosh \theta_k & -1 & \cosh \theta_i \\ \cosh \theta_j & \cosh \theta_i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{jjk} & a_{kkj} \\ a_{iik} & 0 & a_{kki} \\ a_{ijj} & a_{jji} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.2, so we omit it.

Q.E.D.

The following theorem gives the rigidity of discrete conformal structure (A3), which is the rigidity part of Theorem 1.9 (iii). The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, so we omit it.

**Theorem 5.3.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ . The discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ .

## 6. RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE OF THE MIXED DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE III

In this section, we consider the rigidity and existence for the mixed discrete conformal structure III, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  are induced by (6) and (9). By Remark 1.7, we can set  $C \equiv 0$  for (6) and (9). As mentioned in Remark 1.8, if  $d_{rs} < 0$ , then  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are given by (9) and  $l_{st}$  is given by (6), where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $d_{ij} < 0$ . Then for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , the edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{ik}$  are given by (9) and the edge length  $l_{jk}$  is given by (6), i.e.,

$$(46) \quad \begin{aligned} \cosh l_{ij} &= \cosh(f_j - f_i) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= \cosh(f_k - f_i) + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= -\cosh(f_j - f_k) + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\eta_{ij}, \eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\eta_{jk} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .

**6.1. Rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure III.** The admissible space of the discrete conformal factor  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (46) is defined to be

$$\Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid l_{ij} > 0, l_{jk} > 0, l_{ik} > 0\}.$$

Combining (29) and Remark 2.23 gives  $u_i = e^{-f_i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $u_j = -e^{-f_j} \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$  and  $u_k = -e^{-f_k} \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ . Thus

$$\eta_{jk} = \frac{\cosh l_{jk} + \cosh(f_j - f_k)}{e^{f_j + f_k}} > \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}(e^{f_j - f_k} + e^{f_k - f_j})}{e^{f_j + f_k}} = \frac{1}{2}(e^{-f_j} + e^{-f_k})^2 = \frac{1}{2}(u_j + u_k)^2.$$

Since  $u_j, u_k \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ , then  $\eta_{jk} > 0$  and  $u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}$ . Similarly,

$$\eta_{ij} = \frac{\cosh l_{ij} - \cosh(f_j - f_i)}{e^{f_i + f_j}} > \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}(e^{f_j - f_i} + e^{f_i - f_j})}{e^{f_i + f_j}} = -\frac{1}{2}(e^{-f_i} - e^{-f_j})^2 = -\frac{1}{2}(u_i + u_j)^2,$$

which implies  $(u_i + u_j)^2 > -2\eta_{ij}$ . Moreover, if  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ , then  $u_i + u_j \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\eta_{ij} \leq 0$ , then  $u_i + u_j > \sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}}$  or  $u_i + u_j < -\sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}}$ . To remove the solution  $u_i + u_j < -\sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}}$ , we add the condition that  $\eta_{jk} + \eta_{ij} \leq 0$ . In fact,  $u_i + u_j < -\sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}} \leq -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}} < u_j + u_k$ ,

which contradicts with the fact  $u_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $u_k \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ . Similar arguments are also suitable for  $\eta_{ik}$ . Hence, we have the following theorem, which characterizes the admissible space of  $u$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^E$ . Let  $\{ijk\} \in F$  be a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (46). If one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\eta_{jk} > 0, \eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ;
- (ii):  $\eta_{jk} > 0, \eta_{ij} > 0, \eta_{ik} \leq 0$  and  $\eta_{jk} + \eta_{ik} \leq 0$ ;
- (iii):  $\eta_{jk} > 0, \eta_{ij} \leq 0, \eta_{ik} > 0$  and  $\eta_{jk} + \eta_{ij} \leq 0$ ;
- (iv):  $\eta_{jk} > 0, \eta_{ij} \leq 0, \eta_{ik} \leq 0, \eta_{jk} + \eta_{ij} \leq 0$  and  $\eta_{jk} + \eta_{ij} \leq 0$ .

Then the admissible space

$$(47) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) &= u(\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)) \\ &= \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}, \\ &\quad (u_i + u_j)^2 > -2\eta_{ij}, (u_i + u_k)^2 > -2\eta_{ik}\} \end{aligned}$$

of  $u$  is a convex polytope. As a result, the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is also a convex polytope on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$ .

*Proof.* According to the arguments above Theorem 6.1, we can describe the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  explicitly. For the case (i), the admissible space (47) is reduced to

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}\}.$$

For the case (ii), the admissible space (47) is reduced to

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_k > \sqrt{-2\eta_{ik}}\}.$$

For the case (iii), the admissible space (47) is reduced to

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_j > \sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}}\}.$$

For the case (iv), the admissible space (47) is reduced to

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\sqrt{2\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_j > \sqrt{-2\eta_{ij}}, \\ u_i + u_k > \sqrt{-2\eta_{ik}}\}.$$

Each of these four cases shows that  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is a convex polytope. Q.E.D.

**Theorem 6.2.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.1. The Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$ . As a result, the Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

*Proof.* The formula (29) implies

$$\frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} -e^{f_i} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{f_j} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{f_k} \end{pmatrix} := Q_6.$$

Then

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} Q_1 Q_2 Q_6,$$

where  $Q_1$  is defined by (36) and  $Q_2$  is defined by (38). Moreover,  $\det Q_1 > 0$ .

Since  $d_{ij} < 0$ ,  $d_{ik} < 0$  and the others are positive for any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (46), then

$$\begin{aligned} \det Q_2 &= \coth d_{jk} \coth d_{ki} \coth d_{ij} + \coth d_{kj} \coth d_{ik} \coth d_{ji} \\ &= \frac{\cosh d_{jk} \cosh d_{ki} \cosh d_{ij} + \cosh d_{kj} \cosh d_{ik} \cosh d_{ji}}{\sinh d_{ij} \sinh d_{jk} \sinh d_{ki}} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (1) is used in the second line. Thus

$$\det \Lambda_{ijk} = -\frac{1}{A^3} \sinh l_i \sinh l_j \sinh l_k \cdot \det Q_1 \cdot \det Q_2 \cdot \det Q_6 < 0,$$

which implies the matrix  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  is non-degenerate. The symmetry of the matrix  $\Lambda_{ijk}$  follows from Lemma 2.22. Set  $a_{rrs} = e^{f_r} \cdot \coth d_{rs}$ . Then  $a_{iij} < 0$ ,  $a_{iik} < 0$ ,  $a_{jjk} > 0$ ,  $a_{kkj} > 0$ ,  $a_{jji} > 0$ ,  $a_{kki} > 0$ . Define

$$Q := Q_1 Q_2 Q_6 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cosh \theta_k & \cosh \theta_j \\ \cosh \theta_k & -1 & \cosh \theta_i \\ \cosh \theta_j & \cosh \theta_i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{jjk} & a_{kkj} \\ -a_{iik} & 0 & a_{kki} \\ -a_{iij} & a_{jji} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By similar arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we will show that the determinants of the  $1 \times 1$  and  $2 \times 2$  order principal minor of  $Q$  are positive. Let  $m_{rs}$  be the entry of  $Q$  at  $r$ -th row and  $s$ -th column. Then

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11} &= -\cosh \theta_k \cdot a_{iik} - \cosh \theta_j \cdot a_{iij} \\ m_{22} &= \cosh \theta_k \cdot a_{jjk} + \cosh \theta_i \cdot a_{jji} \\ m_{12} &= -a_{jjk} + \cosh \theta_j \cdot a_{jji} \\ m_{21} &= a_{iik} - \cosh \theta_i \cdot a_{iij}. \end{aligned}$$

Then the determinants of the  $1 \times 1$  principal submatrices of  $Q$  is  $m_{11} > 0$  by  $a_{iik} < 0$ ,  $a_{iij} < 0$ . And the determinants of the  $2 \times 2$  principal submatrices of  $Q$  is

$$\begin{aligned} m_{11}m_{22} - m_{12}m_{21} &= -[\sinh^2 \theta_k a_{iik} a_{jjk} + (\cosh \theta_i \cosh \theta_k + \cosh \theta_j) a_{iik} a_{jji} \\ &\quad + (\cosh \theta_j \cosh \theta_k + \cosh \theta_i) a_{iij} a_{jjk}] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. Q.E.D.

The following theorem gives the rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure III, which is the rigidity part of Theorem 1.9 (vi). As the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, we omit it here.

**Theorem 6.3.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.1. The the discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ . In particular, the map from  $f$  to  $K$  is a smooth embedding.

**6.2. Existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure III.** The following theorem characterizes the image of  $K$  for the mixed discrete conformal structure III, which is the existence part of Theorem 1.9 (vi).

**Theorem 6.4.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.1. The image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

To prove Theorem 6.4, we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 6.5.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.1. For any constants  $c_1, \dots, c_6 \in \mathbb{R}$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c_1$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = c_2, \lim f_k = c_3$ ;
- (iv):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (v):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c_4$ ;
- (vi):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = c_5, \lim f_k = c_6$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ .

*Proof.* By (46), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh l_{ij} &= e^{f_i+f_j}(\eta_{ij} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_i} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_j}), \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= e^{f_i+f_k}(\eta_{ik} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_i} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_k}), \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= e^{f_j+f_k}(\eta_{jk} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_j} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_k}).\end{aligned}$$

For the case (i), if  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ , then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_i+f_j}$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim c_i e^{f_j+f_k}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim c_j e^{f_i+f_k}$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = \frac{\cosh l_{jk} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{c_k e^{f_i+f_j} \cdot c_j e^{f_i+f_k}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow 0$ . The proofs of the cases (ii) and (iii) are similar, so we omit them here.

For the case (iv), if  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ . By (46), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh l_{ij} &= e^{f_j-f_i}(\eta_{ij} e^{2f_i} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2f_i-2f_j} + \frac{1}{2}), \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= e^{f_k-f_i}(\eta_{ik} e^{2f_i} + \frac{1}{2}e^{2f_i-2f_k} + \frac{1}{2}), \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= e^{f_j+f_k}(\eta_{jk} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_j} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-2f_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_j-f_i}$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim c_j e^{f_k-f_i}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim c_i e^{f_j+f_k}$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = \frac{\cosh l_{jk} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{c_k e^{f_j-f_i} \cdot c_j e^{f_k-f_i}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow 0$ . The same proofs are suitable for the cases (v) and (vi), and we omit them here. Q.E.D.

**Lemma 6.6.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 6.1. For any constants  $c_1, \dots, c_5 \in \mathbb{R}$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_k = c_1$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (iv):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_k = c_2$ ;
- (v):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = c_3, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (vi):  $\lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_i = c_4, \lim f_k = c_5$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_j^{ik}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ .



*Proof.* For the case (i), if  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_i = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_k = +\infty$ , then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_i+f_j}$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim c_i e^{f_j+f_k}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim c_j e^{f_i+f_k}$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_j^{ik} = \frac{\cosh l_{ik} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{jk}} \rightarrow \frac{c_j e^{f_i+f_k}}{c_k e^{f_i+f_j} \cdot c_i e^{f_j+f_k}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_j^{ik} \rightarrow 0$ . The same proofs are suitable for the cases (ii), (v) and (vi), and we omit them.

For the case (iii), if  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_i = -\infty$ ,  $\lim f_k = +\infty$ , then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_j-f_i}$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim c_j e^{f_k-f_i}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim c_i e^{f_j+f_k}$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_j^{ik} = \frac{\cosh l_{ik} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{jk}} \rightarrow \frac{c_j e^{f_k-f_i}}{c_k e^{f_j-f_i} \cdot c_i e^{f_j+f_k}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_j^{ik} \rightarrow 0$ . The same proof is suitable for the case (iv), so we omit it. Q.E.D.

**Proof of Theorem 6.4:** Let the image of  $K$  is  $X$ . The openness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$  follows from the injectivity of the map  $f$ . To prove the closeness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , we prove that if a sequence  $f^{(m)}$  in  $\Omega(\eta) = \cap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  satisfies  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , then there exists a subsequence, say  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in  $\Omega(\eta)$ .

Suppose otherwise, there exists a subsequence  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in the boundary of  $\Omega(\eta)$ . The boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  consists of the following three parts:

- (i): There exists an ideal edge  $\{rs\} \in E$  such that  $l_{rs} = 0$ .
- (ii): There exists  $i \in B$  in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (46), such that  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .
- (iii): There exists  $j \in B$  in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (46), such that  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

The proof of the case (i) is the same as that of Theorem 3.5, so we omit it here. The case (ii) follows from Lemma 6.5 and the case (iii) follows from Lemma 6.6, which both contradict the assumption that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . Q.E.D.

**Remark 6.7.** Note that in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (46), there is no  $j \in B$  such that  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ . Otherwise,  $u_j = -e^{-f_j} \rightarrow -\infty$ . According to the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  defined by (47), the equation  $u_j + u_k > -2\sqrt{\eta_{jk}}$  implies  $u_k \rightarrow +\infty$ , which contradicts with the fact that  $u_k \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$ .

## 7. RIGIDITY OF THE MIXED DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE II

In this section, we consider the rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure II, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  are induced by (5) and (8). As mentioned in Remark 1.8, if  $d_{rs} < 0$ , then  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are given by (8) and  $l_{st}$  is given by (5), where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Without loss of generality, we can assume  $d_{ij} < 0$ . Then for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , the edge lengths  $l_{ij}, l_{ik}$  are

given by (8) and the edge length  $l_{jk}$  is given by (5), i.e.,

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} \cosh l_{ij} &= -\sqrt{(e^{2f_i} - 1)(e^{2f_j} - 1)} + \eta_{ij}e^{f_i+f_j}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= -\sqrt{(e^{2f_i} - 1)(e^{2f_k} - 1)} + \eta_{ik}e^{f_i+f_k}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= \sqrt{(e^{2f_j} - 1)(e^{2f_k} - 1)} + \eta_{jk}e^{f_j+f_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\eta_{ij}, \eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $\eta_{jk} \in [-1, +\infty)$ .

The admissible space of the discrete conformal factor  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (48) is defined to be

$$\Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3 \mid l_{ij} > 0, l_{jk} > 0, l_{ik} > 0\}.$$

Combining (30) and Remark 2.23 (iv), we consider that  $u \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)^N$  for simplicity. Then  $\cosh l_{ij} = -(-\tan u_i) \frac{-1}{\tan u_j} + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\cos u_i} \frac{-1}{\sin u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $\sin(u_i + u_j) > -\eta_{ij}$ . Then  $u_i + u_j \in (-\pi, 0)$  for  $\eta_{ij} \in (1, +\infty)$  or  $u_i + u_j > -\arcsin \eta_{ij}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ . Moreover, by (45),  $\cosh l_{jk} > 1$  implies  $u_j + u_k \in (-\pi, 0)$  for  $\eta_{jk} \in [1, +\infty)$  or  $u_j + u_k > -\arccos \eta_{jk}$  for  $\eta_{jk} \in [-1, 1)$ . Thus the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $f$  is transferred to the following admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) = u(\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)) &= \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, 0)^3 \mid \sin(u_i + u_j) > -\eta_{ij}, \\ &\quad \sin(u_i + u_k) > -\eta_{ik}, \cos(u_j + u_k) > -\eta_{jk}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is a convex polytope. Then the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  is also a convex polytope on  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** Let  $\{ijk\} \in F$  be a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (48). The Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite. As a result, the Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh \theta_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Define

$$\frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{e^{2f_i} - 1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{e^{2f_j} - 1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{e^{2f_k} - 1} \end{pmatrix} := Q_7.$$

Hence

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} Q_1 Q_2 Q_7,$$

where  $Q_1$  is defined by (36) and  $Q_2$  is defined by (38). Moreover,  $\det Q_1 > 0$ . Note that  $d_{ij} < 0$ ,  $d_{ik} < 0$  and the others are positive for any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (48), then  $\det Q_2 < 0$  by (39). The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 6.2, so we omit it. Q.E.D.

The following theorem gives the rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure II, which is Theorem 1.9 (v). As the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, we omit it here.

**Theorem 7.2.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary and the weight  $\eta \in [1, +\infty)^E$ . The discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ .

**Remark 7.3.** We can not get the existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure II. In fact, the boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  include the case that there exists  $i \in B$  satisfying  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0^+$ . We are unable to prove the closeness of the curvature map in this case.

## 8. RIGIDITY AND EXISTENCE OF THE MIXED DISCRETE CONFORMAL STRUCTURE I

In this section, we consider the rigidity and the existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure I, i.e., the discrete hyperbolic metrics  $l_{ij}, l_{jk}, l_{ki}$  of a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  are induced by (4) and (7). As mentioned in Remark 1.8, if  $d_{rs} < 0$ , then  $l_{rs}, l_{rt}$  are given by (7) and  $l_{st}$  is given by (4), where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $d_{ij} < 0$ . Then for any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$ , the edge lengths  $l_{ij}$  and  $l_{ik}$  are given by (7), and the edge length  $l_{jk}$  is given by (4), i.e.,

$$(49) \quad \begin{aligned} \cosh l_{ij} &= \sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}) + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= \sqrt{(1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i})(1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}) + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k}}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= -\sqrt{(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j})(1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}) + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

**8.1. Admissible space of the mixed discrete conformal structure I.** The admissible space of the discrete conformal factor  $f$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (49) is defined to be

$$\Omega_{ijk}(\eta) = \{(f_i, f_j, f_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid l_{ij} > 0, l_{jk} > 0, l_{ik} > 0\}.$$

Since  $\frac{\sinh d_{ij}}{\sinh d_{ji}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}}$ ,  $\frac{\sinh d_{jk}}{\sinh d_{kj}} = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}}}$  and  $\frac{\sinh d_{ik}}{\sinh d_{ki}} = -\sqrt{\frac{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}}}$ , then by the proof of Lemma 2.22, we have

$$(50) \quad \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial u_i} = -\sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i}}, \quad \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial u_j} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j}}, \quad \frac{\partial f_k}{\partial u_k} = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k}}.$$

To obtain the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta)$  with respect to the discrete conformal factors  $u$ , we need to characterize  $l_{ij} > 0$  and  $l_{jk} > 0$ . Since the case that  $l_{jk} > 0$  has been already discussed in Subsection 3.1, we just need to discuss the case  $l_{ij} > 0$ . By Remark 2.23, we have

- (i): If  $\alpha_i = 0$  and  $\alpha_j = 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = 1 + \eta_{ij} e^{u_j - u_i} > 1$ , which implies  $\eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $(u_j - u_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ .
- (ii): If  $\alpha_i = 1$  and  $\alpha_j = 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{1 + e^{2f_i}} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = \coth u_i + \eta_{ij} e^{u_j} \frac{1}{\sinh u_i} > 1$ , which implies  $\eta_{ij} e^{u_i + u_j} + 1 > 0$  by  $u_i > 0$ . Thus if  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ , then  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ , then  $u_i + u_j < \log(-\frac{1}{\eta_{ij}})$ . For simplicity, we only consider the case  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  in the following.
- (iii): If  $\alpha_i = -1$  and  $\alpha_j = 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{1 - e^{2f_i}} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = \tanh u_i + \eta_{ij} e^{u_j} \frac{1}{\cosh u_i} > 1$ , which implies  $\eta_{ij} e^{u_i + u_j} > 1$ . Thus  $\eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}$ .

- (iv):** If  $\alpha_i = 0$  and  $\alpha_j = 1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{1 + e^{2f_j}} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\coth u_j + \eta_{ij} e^{-u_i} \frac{-1}{\sinh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $e^{u_i + u_j} + \eta_{ij} > 0$  by  $u_j < 0$ . Thus if  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ , then  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ , then  $u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij})$ .
- (v):** If  $\alpha_i = 1$  and  $\alpha_j = 1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 + e^{2f_i})(1 + e^{2f_j})} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\coth u_i \coth u_j + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\sinh u_i} \frac{-1}{\sinh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $\cosh(u_i + u_j) + \eta_{ij} > 0$  by  $u_i > 0$  and  $u_j < 0$ . Thus if  $\eta_{ij} > -1$ , then  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ ; if  $\eta_{ij} < -1$ , then  $u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arccosh}(-\eta_{ij})$  or  $u_i + u_j < -\operatorname{arccosh}(-\eta_{ij})$ . For simplicity, we only consider the case  $\eta_{ij} > -1$  in the following.
- (vi):** If  $\alpha_i = -1$  and  $\alpha_j = 1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 - e^{2f_i})(1 + e^{2f_j})} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\tanh u_i \coth u_j + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\cosh u_i} \frac{-1}{\sinh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $\sinh(u_i + u_j) + \eta_{ij} > 0$  by  $u_j < 0$ . Thus  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij})$ .
- (vii):** If  $\alpha_i = 0$  and  $\alpha_j = -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{1 - e^{2f_j}} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\tanh u_j + \eta_{ij} e^{-u_i} \frac{1}{\cosh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $e^{u_i + u_j} < \eta_{ij}$ . Thus  $\eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $u_i + u_j < \log \eta_{ij}$ .
- (viii):** If  $\alpha_i = 1$  and  $\alpha_j = -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 + e^{2f_i})(1 - e^{2f_j})} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\coth u_i \tanh u_j + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\sinh u_i} \frac{1}{\cosh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $\sinh(u_i + u_j) < \eta_{ij}$ . Thus  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ij}$ .
- (ix):** If  $\alpha_i = -1$  and  $\alpha_j = -1$ , then  $\cosh l_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 - e^{2f_i})(1 - e^{2f_j})} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j} = -\tanh u_i \tanh u_j + \eta_{ij} \frac{1}{\cosh u_i} \frac{1}{\cosh u_j} > 1$ , which implies  $\cosh(u_i + u_j) < \eta_{ij}$ . Thus  $\eta_{ij} > 1$  and  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij} < u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij}$ .

For simplicity, we use triples  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k)$  to represent different types of the admissible spaces of  $u$  for a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (49). By permutations and combinations, the admissible space  $\Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  of  $f$  can be transferred to 27 types of the admissible spaces of  $u$ . Note that the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  are inter-changeable in (49), we regard  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k)$  and  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_k, \alpha_j)$  as the same type. Therefore, there exist 18 types of the admissible spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$  of  $u$ , as shown below. Here  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 18$ .

**(I):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, 0, 0)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$  in Subsection 3.1. By the above discussion, we have  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $(u_j - u_i) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $(u_k - u_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, the admissible space of  $u$  is defined as

$$(51) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ .

**(II):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, 0, 0)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $(u_i + u_k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$ . Then

$$(52) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(2)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$ .

**(III):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, 0, 0)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}$ ,  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}$  and  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $u_i + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ik}}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(3)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}, u_i + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ik}}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ .

**(IV):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, 0, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$  in Subsection 3.1. Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $(u_j - u_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Similarly,  $(u_i + u_k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$  and  $u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})$  for  $\eta_{ik} < 0$ . Then

$$(53) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(4)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, e^{u_i+u_k} > -\eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The admissible space (53) can be described explicitly as follows:

**(i):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$ , then

$$(54) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(4)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}\}.$$

**(ii):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} < 0$ , then

$$(55) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(4)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})\}.$$

**(V):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, 0, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $(u_i + u_k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ik} > -1$ . Then

$$(56) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(5)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > -1$ .

**(VI):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, 0, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ik})$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(6)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}, u_i + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ik})\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**(VII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, 0, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$  in Subsection 3.1. Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $(u_j - u_i) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$  and  $u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(7)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ .

**(VIII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, 0, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(8)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**(IX):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, 0, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$  and  $u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$  and  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}$ .

Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(9)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0} \mid u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}, u_i + u_j > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{ij}}, \\ -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$ .

**(X):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, 1, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$  in Subsection 3.1.

Moreover,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij})$  for  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ . Similarly,  $(u_i + u_k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$  and  $u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})$  for  $\eta_{ik} < 0$ . Then

$$(57) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, e^{u_i+u_j} > -\eta_{ij}, \\ e^{u_i+u_k} > -\eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The admissible space (57) can also be described explicitly as follows:

**(i):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}\}.$$

**(ii):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} < 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})\}.$$

**(iii):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \geq 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij})\},$$

**(iv):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} < 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, \\ u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij}), u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})\}.$$

**(XI):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, 1, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > -1$ ,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\eta_{ik} > -1$ ,  $(u_i + u_k) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then

$$(58) \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(11)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > -1$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > -1$ .

**(XII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, 1, 1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij})$  and  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u_i + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ik})$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(12)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij}), \\ u_i + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ik})\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**(XIII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, 1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk})$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$  in Subsection 3.1. Moreover,  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  and  $u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij})$  for  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$  and  $u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}$ . If  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ , then  $\log(-\eta_{ij}) + \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}) < u_i + 2u_j + u_k < 2u_j + \log \eta_{ik} < \log \eta_{ik}$ , which implies  $(\eta_{ik} - \eta_{ij})(\eta_{ik} + \eta_{ij}) > 2\eta_{jk}\eta_{ij}\eta_{ik}$ . Thus we assume  $\eta_{ik} + \eta_{ij} > 0$  for simplicity. Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(13)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}), e^{u_i+u_j} > -\eta_{ij}, \\ u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$  or  $\eta_{ij} < 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} + \eta_{ik} > 0$ .

The admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(13)}(\eta)$  can be described explicitly as follows:

**(i):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} \geq 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(13)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}), u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}\}.$$

**(ii):** For  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} < 0$  and  $\eta_{ij} + \eta_{ik} > 0$ , then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(13)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}), u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}, \\ u_i + u_j > \log(-\eta_{ij})\}.$$

**(XIV):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, 1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk})$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > -1$  and  $(u_i + u_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}$ . Since  $u_i > 0$ ,  $u_j < 0$ , then  $\operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}) < u_j + u_k < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}$  and hence  $\eta_{ik} + \eta_{jk} > 0$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(14)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}), u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > -1$ ,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\eta_{ik} + \eta_{jk} > 0$ .

**(XV):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, 1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk})$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij})$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$  and  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}$ . Then  $\operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}) + \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij}) < u_i + 2u_j + u_k < 2u_j + \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}$ . For simplicity, we require  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(15)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{jk}), u_i + u_j > \operatorname{arcsinh}(-\eta_{ij}), \\ -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$ .

**(XVI):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (0, -1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$  in Subsection 3.1. Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $u_i + u_j < \log \eta_{ij}$  and  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ ,  $u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(16)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, u_i + u_j < \log \eta_{ij}, \\ u_i + u_k < \log \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ .

**(XVII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (1, -1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ij}$ . Since  $u_i > 0$  and  $u_k < 0$ , then  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk} < u_j + u_k < u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ij}$ . For simplicity, we assume  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}$ , then we assume  $\eta_{ik} > 0$  for simplicity. Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(17)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, \\ u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ij}, u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arcsinh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 0$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 0$ .

**(XVIII):** Set  $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k) = (-1, -1, -1)$ . Then  $u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}$  and  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ . Moreover,  $\eta_{ij} > 1$  and  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij} < u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij}$ . Similarly,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$  and  $-\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(18)}(\eta) = \{(u_i, u_j, u_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \times \mathbb{R}_{<0}^2 \mid u_j + u_k > -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{jk}, \\ -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij} < u_i + u_j < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ij}, \\ -\operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik} < u_i + u_k < \operatorname{arccosh} \eta_{ik}\},$$

where  $\eta_{jk} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ij} > 1$ ,  $\eta_{ik} > 1$ .

In the above different admissible spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$ , the weight  $\eta$  has different range of values. We are unable to use a uniform formula to express them. For simplicity, we use a notation  $\Xi$  to denote the set of the range of weight  $\eta$  in the whole admissible spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$ .

**Theorem 8.1.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \alpha, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary, and the weights  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in \Xi$ . Let  $\{ijk\} \in F$  be a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (49). Then the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$  of  $u$  has 18 types, each of which is convex polytope. As a result, the admissible space

$$\mathcal{U}(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta), \quad \mathcal{U}_{ijk}(\eta) \in \{\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta), n = 1, 2, \dots, 18\}$$

is also a convex polytope.

**Remark 8.2.** The admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$  is a finite intersection of 18 types of admissible spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 18$ . But this finite intersection is not arbitrary because of the connectedness of the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ . For example, if there exist the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(18)}(\eta)$  for some right-angled hyperbolic hexagons  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (49), then there must be the third type of the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$  for  $n \neq 1, 18$ .

## 8.2. Negative definiteness of Jacobian.

**Theorem 8.3.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.1. The Jacobian  $\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i^{jk}, \theta_j^{ik}, \theta_k^{ij})}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)}$  is non-degenerate, symmetric and negative definite. As a consequence, the Jacobian  $\Lambda = \frac{\partial(K_i, \dots, K_N)}{\partial(u_i, \dots, u_N)}$  is symmetric and negative definite on the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}(\eta)$ .

*Proof.* For simplicity, we set  $l_r = l_{st}$ ,  $\theta_r = \theta_r^{st}$  and  $A = \sinh l_r \sinh l_s \sinh \theta_t$ , where  $\{r, s, t\} = \{i, j, k\}$ . By (50), we have

$$\frac{\partial(f_i, f_j, f_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = \begin{pmatrix} -C_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_k \end{pmatrix} := Q_8,$$

where  $C_r = \sqrt{1 + \alpha_r e^{2f_r}}$ . Then

$$\Lambda_{ijk} = \frac{\partial(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_k)}{\partial(u_i, u_j, u_k)} = -\frac{1}{A} \begin{pmatrix} \sinh l_i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh l_j & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh l_k \end{pmatrix} Q_1 Q_2 Q_8,$$

where  $Q_1$  is defined by (36) and  $Q_2$  is defined by (38). Moreover,  $\det Q_1 > 0$ . Since  $d_{ij} < 0$ ,  $d_{ik} < 0$  and the others are positive for any right-angled hyperbolic hexagon  $\{ijk\} \in F$  with edge lengths given by (49), then  $\det Q_2 < 0$  by (39). The rest of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 6.2, so we omit it. Q.E.D.

**8.3. Rigidity of the mixed discrete conformal structure I.** The following theorem gives the rigidity of mixed discrete conformal structure I, which generalizes the rigidity part of Theorem 1.9 (iv). As the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, we omit it.

**Theorem 8.4.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.1. The discrete conformal factor  $f$  is determined by its generalized combinatorial curvature  $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^E$ . In particular, the map from  $f$  to  $K$  is a smooth embedding.



**8.4. Existence of the mixed discrete conformal structure I.** We consider the image of  $K$  for four types of the admissible spaces  $(0, 0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 0, 1)$ ,  $(1, 0, 1)$ . In other words, we do not consider the case that  $\alpha_j = \alpha_k = 1$  for  $\alpha \in \{0, 1\}$ . For simplicity, we use a new notation  $\tilde{\Xi}$  to denote the set of the range of weights  $\eta$  in the admissible spaces  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}$ , i.e.,  $n = 1, 2, 4, 5$ .

**Theorem 8.5.** Suppose  $(\Sigma, \mathcal{T}, \alpha, \eta)$  is a weighted triangulated surface with boundary, and the weights  $\alpha : B \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  and  $\eta \in \tilde{\Xi}$ . Let  $\{ijk\} \in F$  be a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (49). If  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_k$  can not take 1 simultaneously, then the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ .

To prove Theorem 8.5, we need the following four lemmas.

**Lemma 8.6.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.5. For any constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c_1$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = c_2, \lim f_k = c_3$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ .

*Proof.* By (49), we have

$$(59) \quad \begin{aligned} \cosh l_{ij} &= \left[ \eta_{ij} + \sqrt{(e^{-2f_i} + \alpha_i)(e^{-2f_j} + \alpha_j)} \right] e^{f_i+f_j}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &= \left[ \eta_{ik} + \sqrt{(e^{-2f_i} + \alpha_i)(e^{-2f_k} + \alpha_k)} \right] e^{f_i+f_k}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= \left[ \eta_{jk} - \sqrt{(e^{-2f_j} + \alpha_j)(e^{-2f_k} + \alpha_k)} \right] e^{f_j+f_k}. \end{aligned}$$

For the case (i),  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ . Then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim(c_k e^{f_i+f_j})$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := \lim(c_j e^{f_i+f_k})$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim(c_i e^{f_j+f_k})$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. By the cosine law,

$$\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = \frac{\cosh l_{jk} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{c_k e^{f_i+f_j} \cdot c_j e^{f_i+f_k}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow 0$ . The proofs of the cases (ii) and (iii) are similar, so we omit them here. Q.E.D.

**Lemma 8.7.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.5. If  $\lim f_k = -\infty$ , then  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ . Moreover, if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = -\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = c, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = -\infty$ ,

then  $\lim \theta_k^{ij}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = +\infty$ , where  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  is a constant.

*Proof.* Combining (50) and Remark 2.23, if  $\lim f_k = -\infty$ , then  $\lim u_k = -\infty$ . Note that  $l_{jk} > 0$  implies that  $u_j + u_k > C(\eta_{jk})$ , where  $C(\eta_{jk})$  is a constant that depends on  $\eta_{jk}$ . Then  $\lim u_j = +\infty$ . This implies  $\alpha_j = 0$  and  $\lim f_j = +\infty$  by Remark 2.23.

Set  $\tilde{L}_1 = \frac{\cosh l_{ij}}{\sinh l_{ik} \sinh l_{jk}}$  and  $\tilde{L}_2 = \frac{\cosh l_{ik} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ik} \sinh l_{jk}}$ , then  $\cosh \theta_k^{ij} = \tilde{L}_1 + \tilde{L}_2$ . Moreover, (49) is reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh l_{ij} &= \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &\rightarrow \sqrt{1 + \alpha_i e^{2f_i} + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k}}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &\rightarrow -1 + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k}.\end{aligned}$$

For the case (i),  $\lim f_i = +\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = -\infty$ . Then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c_k e^{f_i + f_j}, \lim \cosh l_{jk} = \lim(-1 + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k})$  and

$$\lim \cosh l_{ik} = \begin{cases} \lim(1 + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k}), & \text{if } \alpha_i = 0, \\ \lim(c_j e^{f_i}), & \text{if } \alpha_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. If  $\alpha_i = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{L}_1 &\rightarrow \frac{c_k e^{f_i + f_j}}{\sqrt{(-1 + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k})^2 - 1} \cdot \sqrt{(1 + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k})^2 - 1}} \\ &= \frac{c_k e^{f_i + f_j}}{\sqrt{\eta_{jk} \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_j}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{jk} e^{2f_k} - 2e^{f_k - f_j}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ik} e^{2f_k} + 2e^{f_k - f_i}}} \rightarrow +\infty.\end{aligned}$$

And  $\tilde{L}_2 > 0$ . Then  $\cosh \theta_k^{ij} = \tilde{L}_1 + \tilde{L}_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , which implies  $\theta_k^{ij} \rightarrow +\infty$ . The proof of the case that  $\alpha_i = 1$  is similar, so we omit it here.

For the case (ii),  $\lim f_i = c, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = -\infty$ . Then  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim c'_k e^{f_j}, \lim \cosh l_{jk} = \lim(-1 + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k})$  and

$$\lim \cosh l_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha_i = 0, \\ c'_j, & \text{if } \alpha_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $c'_j, c'_k$  are positive constants. If  $\alpha_i = 0$ , then  $\cosh l_{ik} \rightarrow 1$  and hence  $l_{ik} \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\cosh \theta_k^{ij} > \tilde{L}_2 > \frac{\cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $\theta_k^{ij} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $\alpha_i = 1$ , similar to the proof of the case (i), we still have  $\tilde{L}_1 \rightarrow +\infty$ . This implies  $\theta_k^{ij} \rightarrow +\infty$ . This completes the proof. Q.E.D.

**Lemma 8.8.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.5. For any constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = c_1$ ;
- (iii):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = c_2, \lim f_k = c_3$ ;
- (iv):  $\lim f_i = -\infty, \lim f_j = +\infty, \lim f_k = -\infty$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_i^{jk}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = +\infty$ .

*Proof.* Set  $L_1 = \frac{\cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}}$  and  $L_2 = \frac{\cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{ik}}$ , then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2$ . Since  $\lim f_i = -\infty$ , then (49) is reduced to

$$(60) \quad \begin{aligned}\cosh l_{ij} &\rightarrow \sqrt{1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j} + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i + f_j}}, \\ \cosh l_{ik} &\rightarrow \sqrt{1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k} + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i + f_k}}, \\ \cosh l_{jk} &= -\sqrt{(1 + \alpha_j e^{2f_j})(1 + \alpha_k e^{2f_k})} + \eta_{jk} e^{f_j + f_k}.\end{aligned}$$

For the case (i),  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_k = +\infty$ . By (60), we have  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim(c_i e^{f_j+f_k})$ ,

$$\lim \cosh l_{ij} = \begin{cases} \lim(1 + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i+f_j}), & \text{if } \alpha_j = 0, \\ \lim(c_k e^{f_j}), & \text{if } \alpha_j = 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\lim \cosh l_{ik} = \begin{cases} \lim(1 + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i+f_k}), & \text{if } \alpha_k = 0, \\ \lim(c_j e^{f_k}), & \text{if } \alpha_k = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. If  $\alpha_j = \alpha_k = 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &\rightarrow \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{\sqrt{(1 + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i+f_j})^2 - 1} \cdot \sqrt{(1 + \eta_{ik} e^{f_i+f_k})^2 - 1}} \\ &= \frac{c_i e^{f_j+f_k}}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij} \eta_{ik} e^{f_j+f_k}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij} e^{2f_i} + 2e^{f_i-f_j}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ik} e^{2f_i} + 2e^{f_i-f_k}}} \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

And  $L_2 > 0$ . Thus  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , so  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ . For the cases that  $\alpha_j = 0$ ,  $\alpha_k = 1$  and  $\alpha_j = 1$ ,  $\alpha_k = 0$ , we still have  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$  by similar proofs.

For the case (ii),  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_k = c_1$ . By (60), we have  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim(c'_i e^{f_j})$  and

$$\lim \cosh l_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha_k = 0, \\ c'_j, & \text{if } \alpha_k = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $c'_i, c'_j$  are positive constants. If  $\alpha_k = 0$ , then  $l_{ik} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $L_2 > \frac{\cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow +\infty$ . This implies  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $\alpha_k = 1$ , then by the assumption,  $\alpha_j = 0$ . Hence,  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} = \lim(1 + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i+f_j})$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} = \lim(c'_i e^{f_j})$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} = c'_j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &\rightarrow \frac{c'_i e^{f_j}}{\sqrt{(1 + \eta_{ij} e^{f_i+f_j})^2 - 1} \cdot \sqrt{(c'_j)^2 - 1}} \\ &= \frac{c'_i e^{f_j}}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij}} \sqrt{(c'_j)^2 - 1} e^{f_j}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_{ij} e^{2f_i} + 2e^{f_i-f_j}}} \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

And  $L_2 > 0$ . Thus  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} = L_1 + L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ , so  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

For the case (iii),  $\lim f_j = c_2$ ,  $\lim f_k = c_3$ . By (60), we have  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := c''_i$  and

$$\lim \cosh l_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha_j = 0, \\ c''_k, & \text{if } \alpha_j = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $c''_i, c''_k$  are positive constants. If  $\alpha_j = 0$ , then  $l_{ij} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $L_2 \rightarrow +\infty$ . This implies  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $\alpha_j = 1$ , then by the assumption,  $\alpha_k = 0$ . According to the arguments in the case (ii), we still have  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ .

For the case (iv),  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_k = -\infty$ . By (60), we have  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} = 1$  and hence  $l_{ik} \rightarrow 0$ . Then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk} > L_2 \geq \frac{\cosh l_{ik}}{\sinh l_{ik}} \rightarrow +\infty$  and then  $\theta_i^{jk} \rightarrow +\infty$ . This completes the proof. Q.E.D.

**Remark 8.9.** According to the proof of the case (iii) in Lemma 8.8, if  $\alpha_j = \alpha_k = 1$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} = c_k''$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} = c_i''$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} = c_j'$ , then  $\cosh \theta_i^{jk}$ ,  $\cosh \theta_j^{ik}$  and  $\cosh \theta_k^{ij}$  all tend to finite constants, which are far away from 1 and  $+\infty$ .

**Lemma 8.10.** Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 8.5. For any constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , if one of the following conditions is satisfied

- (i):  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_i = c_1$ ,  $\lim f_k = +\infty$ ;
- (ii):  $\lim f_j = +\infty$ ,  $\lim f_i = c_2$ ,  $\lim f_k = c_3$ .

Then  $\lim \theta_j^{ik}(f_i, f_j, f_k) = 0$ .

*Proof.* For the case (i), by (59), we have  $\lim \cosh l_{ij} := \lim(c_k e^{f_j})$ ,  $\lim \cosh l_{ik} := c_j e^{f_k}$  and  $\lim \cosh l_{jk} := \lim(c_i e^{f_j + f_k})$ , where  $c_i, c_j, c_k$  are positive constants. Then

$$\cosh \theta_j^{ik} = \frac{\cosh l_{ik} + \cosh l_{ij} \cosh l_{jk}}{\sinh l_{ij} \sinh l_{jk}} \rightarrow \frac{c_j e^{f_k}}{c_k e^{f_j} \cdot c_i e^{f_j + f_k}} + 1 \rightarrow 1,$$

which implies  $\theta_j^{ik} \rightarrow 0$ . The proof of the case (ii) is similar, so we omit it here. Q.E.D.

**Proof of Theorem 8.5:** Let the image of  $K$  is  $X$ . The openness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$  follows from the injectivity of the map  $f$ . To prove the closeness of  $X$  in  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , we prove that if a sequence  $f^{(m)}$  in  $\Omega(\eta) = \bigcap_{\{ijk\} \in F} \Omega_{ijk}(\eta)$  satisfies  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ , then there exists a subsequence, say  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in  $\Omega(\eta)$ .

Suppose otherwise, there exists a subsequence  $f^{(m)}$ , such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} f^{(m)}$  is in the boundary of  $\Omega(\eta)$ . The boundary of the admissible space  $\Omega(\eta)$  in  $[-\infty, +\infty]^N$  consists of the following three parts:

- (i): There exists an ideal edge  $\{rs\} \in E$  such that  $l_{rs} = 0$ .
- (ii): There exists  $i \in B$  in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (49), such that  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .
- (iii): There exists  $j \in B$  in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (49), such that  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .
- (iv): There exists  $k \in B$  in a right-angled hyperbolic hexagon with edge lengths given by (49), such that  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ .

The proof of the case (i) is the same as that of Theorem 3.5, so we omit it here. We will prove that the above cases (ii), (iii) and (iv) can not hold on  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(n)}(\eta)$ ,  $n = 1, 2, 4, 5$ .

**(1):** For  $(0, 0, 0)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$  in (51), we have  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}$ . By Remark 2.23,  $u_j = f_j$  and  $u_k = f_k$ , then  $f_j + f_k$  has a lower bound. Hence,  $f_j, f_k$  can not tend to  $-\infty$  simultaneously.

If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $(\theta_i^{jk})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  by Lemma 8.6. If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . By Lemma 8.7 (i),  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . By swapping the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  in Lemma 8.7 (i), we have as  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $(\theta_j^{ik})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence as  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , either  $K_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  or  $K_s^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  for  $s \in \{j, k\}$ . They both contradict with the assumption that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} K^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.8, then  $(\theta_i^{jk})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Therefore, the subsequence  $f_i^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$ .

If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.7 (ii), then  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.10, then  $(\theta_j^{ik})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_j^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Swapping the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  in Lemma 8.7 (ii) gives  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and then  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence, the subsequence  $f_j^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$ .

By swapping the positions of  $j$  and  $k$ , the subsequence  $f_k^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$ .

**(2):** For  $(1, 0, 0)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(2)}(\eta)$  in (52), we have  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{2}{\eta_{jk}}$ . The proof is the same as that of  $(0, 0, 0)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(1)}(\eta)$ , so we omit it here.

**(3):** For  $(0, 0, 1)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(4)}(\eta)$  in (53), the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  are not interchangeable.

**(i):** In the admissible space (54), we have  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$ . By (50) and Remark 2.23,  $u_j = f_j \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $u_k = -\operatorname{arcsinh}(e^{-f_k}) \in \mathbb{R}_0$ , then  $f_j$  can not tend to  $-\infty$ .

If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.6, then  $(\theta_i^{jk})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_i^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ ,  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . By Lemma 8.7 (i),  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.8, then  $(\theta_i^{jk})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence, the subsequence  $f_i^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space (54).

If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.7 (ii), then  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.10, then  $(\theta_j^{ik})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_j^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, the subsequence  $f_j^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $+\infty$  in the admissible space (54).

If  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , by the above arguments,  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow c_1$  and  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow c_2$ , where  $c_1, c_2$  are constants. By swapping the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  in Lemma 8.10 (ii), we have  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . If  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $u_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $u_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , the case of which has been proved. Therefore, the subsequence  $f_k^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space (54).

**(ii):** In the admissible space (55), we have  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$ ,  $u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})$ . According to the case (i),  $f_j$  can not tend to  $-\infty$ . Similarly, combining (50) and Remark 2.23 gives  $u_i = -f_i$ . Then  $f_i$  can not tend to  $+\infty$ .

If  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.8, then  $(\theta_i^{jk})^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and hence  $K_i^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Hence, the subsequence  $f_i^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $-\infty$  in the admissible space (55).

If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  to ensure  $u_i + u_k > \log(-\eta_{ik})$ . This case has been included in the above arguments. If  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , by Lemma 8.10, then  $(\theta_j^{ik})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_j^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . Hence, the subsequence  $f_j^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $+\infty$  in the admissible space (55).

If  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , by the above arguments,  $f_i^{(m)} \rightarrow c_1$  and  $f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow c_2$ , where  $c_1, c_2$  are constants. By swapping the positions of  $j$  and  $k$  in Lemma 8.10 (ii), we have  $(\theta_k^{ij})^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$  and hence  $K_k^{(m)} \rightarrow 0$ . If  $f_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$ , then  $u_k^{(m)} \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $u_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then

$f_j^{(m)} \rightarrow +\infty$ , the case of which has been proved. Therefore, the subsequence  $f_k^{(m)}$  can not tend to  $\pm\infty$  in the admissible space (55).

**(4):** For  $(1, 0, 1)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(5)}(\eta)$  in (56), we have  $u_j + u_k > \log \frac{1}{\eta_{jk}}$ . The proof is the same as that of  $(0, 0, 1)$  type admissible space (54), so we omit it here. Q.E.D.

**Remark 8.11.** For  $(0, 1, 1)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(10)}(\eta)$  in (57) and  $(1, 1, 1)$  type admissible space  $\mathcal{U}_{ijk}^{(11)}(\eta)$  in (58), we are unable to prove the image of  $K$  is  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^N$ . The reasons follow from Remark 8.9.

#### APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF LEMMAS

For simplicity, we set  $h_t = h_{rs}$ ,  $q_t = q_{rs}$  and assume  $\|v_i\| = \|v_j\| = \|v_k\| = 1$ . Please refer to Figure 3.

**Lemma A.1.** If  $c_{ijk}$  is time-like, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sinh q_r &= \cosh h_s \cdot \sinh d_{rt} = \cosh h_t \cdot \sinh d_{rs}, \\ \sinh h_r &= \cosh q_s \cdot \sinh \theta_{rt} = \cosh q_t \cdot \sinh \theta_{rs}.\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume  $r = i$ ,  $s = j$ ,  $t = k$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_i$ , by Proposition 2.1 we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ik})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (i),  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_j$ . Moreover, by Proposition 2.2 (ii), if  $c_{ik}$  and  $v_i$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $v_i^\perp$ , then

$$v_i * c_{ik} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, v_i^\perp)) = +\sinh(-d_{ik}) = -\sinh d_{ik};$$

if  $c_{ik}$  and  $v_i$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $v_i^\perp$ , then

$$v_i * c_{ik} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, v_i^\perp)) = -\sinh(+d_{ik}) = -\sinh d_{ik}.$$

Thus  $v_i * c_{ik} = -\sinh d_{ik}$ . Similarly, if  $c_{ijk}$  and  $v_i$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $v_i^\perp$ , then  $v_i * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ijk}, v_i^\perp)) = +\sinh(-q_i) = -\sinh q_i$ ; if  $c_{ijk}$  and  $v_i$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $v_i^\perp$ , then  $v_i * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ijk}, v_i^\perp)) = -\sinh(+q_i) = -\sinh q_i$ . Thus  $v_i * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_i$ . Then  $\sinh q_i = \cosh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ij}) = -\cosh h_k \cdot (v_i * c_{ij})$ . Similar arguments can imply  $v_i * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ij}$ . Then  $\sinh q_i = \cosh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ik}) = -\cosh q_j \cdot (v'_i * c'_{ik})$ . Similarly,  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_i$  and  $v'_i * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ik}$ . Then  $\sinh h_i = \cosh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ij}) = -\cosh q_k \cdot (v'_i * c'_{ij})$ . Similarly,  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_i$  and  $v'_i * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ij}$ . Q.E.D.

**Proposition A.2.** If  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lies in the open domain  $D_V$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\cosh q_i &= -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik} = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}, \\ \cosh q_j &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk} = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}, \\ \cosh q_k &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj} = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}, \\ \cosh h_i &= \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}, \\ \cosh h_j &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}, \\ \cosh h_k &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj} = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}.\end{aligned}$$

If  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lies in the open domain  $D_{II}$ , then we swap  $h$  and  $q$ , and  $\theta$  and  $d$ .

*Proof. (1):* Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the domain  $D_V$ . In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_i$ , by Proposition 2.1, we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ik})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii),  $v_i * c_{ijk} = \cosh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_i^\perp, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = \cosh(-q_i) = \cosh q_i$ . Moreover, by Proposition 2.2 (ii),  $v_i * c_{ik} = +\sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_i^\perp, c_{ik}) = +\sinh(-d_{ik}) = -\sinh d_{ik}$ . If  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then

$$c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = +\sinh(-h_j) = -\sinh h_j.$$

If  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then

$$c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = -\sinh h_j.$$

Thus  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_j$ . Then  $\cosh q_i = -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik}$ . By Lemma 2.5, it is easy to check that  $d_{ik} < 0$ . Hence  $h_j > 0$ . Then  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^\perp) = h_j$ , which implies that  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ij}) = -\cosh q_i$ . Similarly,  $v_i * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ij}$ . If  $c_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ij}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = +\sinh(-h_k) = -\sinh h_k$ . If  $c_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ij}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = -\sinh h_k$ . Thus  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ . Then  $\cosh q_i = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}$ . Similarly,  $d_{ij} < 0$  by Lemma 2.5 and hence  $h_k > 0$ . So  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ij}, c_{ijk}^\perp) = h_k$ , which implies that  $c_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{jk})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii),  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_j^\perp, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = -\cosh q_j$ . Moreover, by Proposition 2.2 (ii),  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{jk}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = -\sinh h_i$ . Similarly,  $v_j * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{jk}$ . Then  $\cosh q_j = \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{ij})$ . Since  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_j$ ,  $v_j * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ji}$  and  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ , then  $\cosh q_j = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{jk})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{kj}$  and  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_i$ , then  $\cosh q_k = \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{ik})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{ik} = -\sinh d_{ki}$  and  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_j$ , then  $\cosh q_k = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_i$ ,  $v'_i * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ik}$  and  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ , then  $\cosh h_i = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ij})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_i$ ,  $v'_i * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ij}$  and  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ , then  $\cosh h_i = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{jk})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii),  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh(d_{\mathbb{H}}((v'_j)^\perp, c'_{ijk})) = -\cosh h_j$ . Since  $c'_{jk}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c'_{ijk}$ , then  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{jk}, c'_{ijk})) = -\sinh(-q_i) = +\sinh q_i$ . Due to  $v'_j * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{jk}$ , then  $\cosh h_j = -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{ij})$ . Note that  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_j$ ,  $v'_j * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ji}$  and  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ , then  $\cosh h_j = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{jk})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{kj}$  and  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = \sinh q_i$ , then  $\cosh h_k = -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ki}$  and  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ , then  $\cosh h_k = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}$ .

**(2):** Suppose  $c_{ijk}$  lies in the domain  $D_{\Pi}$ . In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ik})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii),  $v_i * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_i$  and  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_j$ . Since  $v_i * c_{ik} = -\sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_i^\perp, c_{ik}) = -\sinh(+d_{ik}) = -\sinh d_{ik}$ , then  $\cosh q_i = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ij}) = \cosh q_i$ . Similarly,  $v_i * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ij}$  and  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ . Then  $\cosh q_i = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{jk})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii), then  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_j^\perp, c'_{ijk})) = -\cosh q_j$ . Since  $c_{jk}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c'_{ijk}$ , then  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{jk}, c'_{ijk})) = -\sinh(-h_i) = +\sinh h_i$ . Due to  $v_j * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{jk}$ , then  $\cosh q_j = -\sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{ij})$ . Since  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_j$ ,  $v_j * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ji}$  and  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ , then  $\cosh q_j = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{jk})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{kj}$  and  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = \sinh h_i$ , then  $\cosh q_k = -\sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{ik})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{ik} = -\sinh d_{ki}$  and  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_j$ , then  $\cosh q_k = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = \cosh h_i$  and  $v'_i * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ik}$ . If  $c'_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c'_{ijk}$ , then  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ik}, c'_{ijk})) = +\sinh(-q_j) = -\sinh q_j$ . If  $c'_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c'_{ijk}$ ,



then  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ik}, c_{ijk}^{\perp})) = -\sinh(+q_j) = -\sinh q_j$ . Thus  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ . Then  $\cosh h_i = -\sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik}$ . By Lemma 2.6, it is easy to check that  $\theta_{ik} < 0$ . Hence  $q_j > 0$ . Then  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ik}, c_{ijk}^{\perp}) = q_j$ , which implies that  $c'_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ij})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = \cosh h_i$  and  $v'_i * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ij}$ . If  $c'_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ , then  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ij}, c_{ijk}^{\perp})) = +\sinh(-q_k) = -\sinh q_k$ . If  $c'_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ , then  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ij}, c_{ijk}^{\perp})) = -\sinh(+q_k) = -\sinh q_k$ . Thus  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ . Then  $\cosh h_i = -\sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}$ . Similarly,  $\theta_{ij} < 0$  by Lemma 2.6 and hence  $q_k > 0$ . Then  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{ij}, c_{ijk}^{\perp}) = q_k$ , which implies that  $c'_{ij}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{jk})$ . Since  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_j$ ,  $v'_j * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{jk}$  and  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_i$ . Then  $\cosh h_j = \sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{ij})$ . Since  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_j$ ,  $v'_j * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ji}$  and  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ , then  $\cosh h_j = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{jk})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{kj}$  and  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_i$ , then  $\cosh h_k = \sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ki}$  and  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ , then  $\cosh h_k = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}$ .

Q.E.D.

**Proposition A.3.** Let  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  lie in the open domain  $D_{vi}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh q_i &= \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik} = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}, \\ \cosh q_j &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk} = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}, \\ \cosh q_k &= \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj} = -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}, \\ \cosh h_i &= \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik} = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}, \\ \cosh h_j &= \sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk} = -\sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}, \\ \cosh h_k &= -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj} = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ik})$ . By Proposition 2.2 (iii),  $v_i * c_{ijk} = \cosh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_i^{\perp}, c_{ijk}^{\perp}) = \cosh q_i$ . By Proposition 2.2 (ii),  $v_i * c_{ik} = +\sinh d_{\mathbb{H}}(v_i^{\perp}, c_{ik}) = +\sinh(-d_{ik}) = -\sinh d_{ik}$ . If  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ , then  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^{\perp})) = +\sinh h_j$ ; If  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ , then  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^{\perp})) = -\sinh(-h_j) = +\sinh h_j$ . Thus  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = \sinh h_j$ . Then  $\cosh q_i = \sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ik}$ . By Lemma 2.5, it is easy to check that  $d_{ik} < 0$ . Then  $h_j < 0$  and hence  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c_{ik}, c_{ijk}^{\perp}) = -h_j$ , which implies that  $c_{ik}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^{\perp}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_i$ , we have  $-v_i * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_i * c_{ij})$ . Similarly,  $v_i * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ij}$  and  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ . Then  $\cosh q_i = -\sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ij}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{jk})$ . Since  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_j$ ,  $v_j * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{jk}$  and  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_i$ , then  $\cosh q_j = \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{jk}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ij}v_j$ , we have  $-v_j * c_{ijk} = (c_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v_j * c_{ij})$ . Since  $v_j * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_j$ ,  $v_j * c_{ij} = -\sinh d_{ji}$  and  $c_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_k$ , then  $\cosh q_j = \sinh h_k \cdot \sinh d_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{jk}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{jk})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{jk} = -\sinh d_{kj}$  and  $c_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh h_i$ , then  $\cosh q_k = \sinh h_i \cdot \sinh d_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c_{ik}v_k$ , we have  $-v_k * c_{ijk} = (c_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v_k * c_{ik})$ . Since  $v_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh q_k$ ,  $v_k * c_{ik} = -\sinh d_{ki}$  and  $c_{ik} * c_{ijk} = \sinh h_j$ , then  $\cosh q_k = -\sinh h_j \cdot \sinh d_{ki}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_i$ ,  $v'_i * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ik}$  and  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ , then  $\cosh h_i = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ik}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_i$ , we have  $-v'_i * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_i * c'_{ij})$ . Since  $v'_i * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_i$ ,  $v'_i * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ij}$  and  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ , then  $\cosh h_i = \sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ij}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{jk})$ . Since  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = \cosh h_j$  and  $v'_j * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{jk}$ . If  $c'_{jk}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on same sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = +\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{jk}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = +\sinh q_i$ ; If  $c'_{jk}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ , then  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh(d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{jk}, c_{ijk}^\perp)) = -\sinh(-q_i) = +\sinh q_i$ . Thus  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = \sinh q_i$ . Then  $\cosh h_j = \sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{jk}$ . By Lemma 2.6, it is easy to check that  $\theta_{jk} < 0$ . Then  $q_i < 0$  and hence  $d_{\mathbb{H}}(c'_{jk}, c_{ijk}^\perp) = -q_i$ , which implies that  $c'_{jk}$  and  $c_{ijk}$  are on opposite sides of the hyperplane  $c_{ijk}^\perp$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ij}v'_j$ , we have  $-v'_j * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ij} * c_{ijk})(v'_j * c'_{ij})$ . Since  $v'_j * c_{ijk} = \cosh h_j$ ,  $v'_j * c'_{ij} = -\sinh \theta_{ji}$  and  $c'_{ij} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_k$ , then  $\cosh h_j = -\sinh q_k \cdot \sinh \theta_{ji}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{jk}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{jk} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{jk})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{jk} = -\sinh \theta_{kj}$  and  $c'_{jk} * c_{ijk} = \sinh q_i$ , then  $\cosh h_k = -\sinh q_i \cdot \sinh \theta_{kj}$ .

In the generalized right-angled hyperbolic triangle  $c_{ijk}c'_{ik}v'_k$ , we have  $-v'_k * c_{ijk} = (c'_{ik} * c_{ijk})(v'_k * c'_{ik})$ . Since  $v'_k * c_{ijk} = -\cosh h_k$ ,  $v'_k * c'_{ik} = -\sinh \theta_{ki}$  and  $c'_{ik} * c_{ijk} = -\sinh q_j$ , then  $\cosh h_k = \sinh q_j \cdot \sinh \theta_{ki}$ . Q.E.D.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. C. de Verdière, *Un principe variationnel pour les empilements de cercles*, Invent. Math. 104(3) (1991) 655-669.
- [2] D. Glickenstein, *Discrete conformal variations and scalar curvature on piecewise flat two and three dimensional manifolds*. J. Differential Geom. 87 (2011), no. 2, 201-237.
- [3] D. Glickenstein, J. Thomas, *Duality structures and discrete conformal variations of piecewise constant curvature surfaces*, Adv. Math. 320 (2017), 250-278.
- [4] R. Guo, *Combinatorial Yamabe flow on hyperbolic surfaces with boundary*. Commun. Contemp. Math. 13 (2011), no. 5, 827-842.
- [5] R. Guo, F. Luo, *Rigidity of polyhedral surfaces, II*, Geom. Topol. 13 (2009), no. 3, 1265-1312.

- [6] S.Y. Li, X. Xu, Z. Zhou., *Combinatorial Yamabe flow on hyperbolic bordered surfaces*. arXiv:2204.08191v1[math.GT].
- [7] J.G. Ratcliffe, *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 149, xii+779 pp. Springer, New York (2006). ISBN: 978-0387-33197-3; 0-387-33197-2.
- [8] J. Thomas, *Conformal variations of piecewise constant two and three dimension manifolds*, Thesis (Ph.D.), The University of Arizona, 2015, 120 pp.
- [9] T. Wu, X. Xu, *Fractional combinatorial Calabi flow on surfaces*, arXiv:2107.14102[math.GT].
- [10] X. Xu, *A new proof of Bowers-Stephenson conjecture*. Math. Res. Lett. 28 (2021), no. 4, 1283-1306.
- [11] X. Xu, *A new class of discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 61 (2022), no. 4, Paper No. 141, 23 pp.
- [12] X. Xu, *Rigidity of discrete conformal structures on surfaces*. arXiv:2103.05272v3 [math.DG] .
- [13] X. Xu, *Deformation of discrete conformal structures on surfaces*. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 63 (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 38, 21 pp.
- [14] X. Xu, C. Zheng, *A new proof for global rigidity of vertex scaling on polyhedral surfaces*, Asian J. Math. 25 (2021), no. 6, 883-896.
- [15] X. Xu, C. Zheng, *Parameterized discrete uniformization theorems and curvature flows for polyhedral surfaces, II*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 375 (2022), no. 4, 2763-2788.
- [16] X. Xu, C. Zheng, *Discrete conformal structures on surfaces with boundary (I)—Classification*. arXiv:2401.05062v3[math.DG].

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, 430072, P.R.CHINA  
Email address: xuxu2@whu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN 430072, P.R. CHINA  
Email address: czheng@whu.edu.cn