

AFFINE EQUIVALENCE AND SADDLE CONNECTION GRAPHS OF HALF-TRANSLATION SURFACES

HUIPING PAN

ABSTRACT. To every half-translation surface, we associate a saddle connection graph, which is a subgraph of the arc graph. We prove that every isomorphism between two saddle connection graphs is induced by an affine homeomorphism between the underlying half-translation surfaces. We also investigate the automorphism group of the saddle connection graph, and the corresponding quotient graph.

Keywords: half-translation surfaces, affine homeomorphisms, saddle connection graphs, isomorphisms

AMS MSC2010: 30F60, 30F30, 54H15

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Arc complex. For a compact oriented topological surface with marked points (X, Σ) , an arc \underline{a} on (X, Σ) is called *properly embedded* if $\partial \underline{a} \subset \Sigma$ and the interior is disjoint from Σ . The *arc complex* is a simplicial complex whose k -simplices correspond to the set of $k + 1$ isotopy classes of properly embedded non-trivial arcs which can be realized pairwise disjointly outside the marked points. (In this paper, by an *isotopy* we mean an isotopy relative to the marked points.) The arc complex is an important and useful tool for the study of mapping class group ([5, 6]). Masur and Schleimer ([17]) proved that the arc complex is δ -hyperbolic (see also [8]). Later, Hesel-Przytycki-Webb ([7]) proved that the arc complex is uniformly 7-hyperbolic.

The mapping class group acts naturally on the arc complex. Irmak-McCarthy ([13]) proved that every injective simplicial map from the arc complex is induced by a self-homeomorphism. Based on this, they described completely the automorphism group of the arc complex. (These results also hold for the arc complex of non-orientable surface, [11, 12].)

1.2. Saddle connection graph. A half-translation surface is a pair (X, ω) where X is a closed Riemann surface and ω is a meromorphic quadratic differential on X which contains no poles of order greater than one. In parallel with the arc graph, which is the 1-skeleton of the arc complex for a topological surface with marked points, we can consider the saddle connection graph for a half-translation surface with marked points.

Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points Σ which contains all the zeros and poles of ω . The meromorphic quadratic differential ω induces a singular flat metric $|\omega|$ on X whose singular points are exactly the zeros and poles of ω . A *saddle connection* is an $|\omega|$ -geodesic segment on $X \setminus \Sigma$ with endpoints in Σ . The *saddle connection graph* of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, denoted by $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, is a graph such that the vertices are saddle connections and the edges are pairs of interiorly disjoint saddle connections. This graph has infinite diameter (see Proposition 2.5). Moreover, it follows from an observation due to Minsky-Taylor ([18]) that the saddle connection graph is isometrically embedded into the arc graph. In particular, it is connected and δ -hyperbolic (see Section 2).

1.3. Statement of Results. The aim of this paper is to investigate isomorphisms between two saddle connection graphs, and the automorphism group of the saddle connection graph. A homeomorphism between two half-translation surfaces with marked points is called *affine* if it is affine outside the set of the marked points with respect to the coordinates defined by integrating one of the square roots of the corresponding quadratic differential. Every affine homeomorphism induces an isomorphism between the corresponding saddle connection graphs. The main result of this paper shows that the converse is also true.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma), (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be two half-translation surfaces with marked points. Then every isomorphism $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ is induced by an affine homeomorphism $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.*

Remark 1. A direct consequence of Theorem 1.1 is that every saddle connection graph determines a Teichmüller disk. In other words, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of isomorphism classes of saddle connection graphs and the set of Teichmüller disks.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points.*

- (i) *If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, then the automorphism group of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is isomorphic to the group of affine homeomorphisms of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.*
- (ii) *If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point, then the automorphism group of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is an index two subgroup of the group of affine homeomorphisms of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.*

Remark 2. For a generic half-translation surface, the group of affine homeomorphisms is trivial. As a consequence, the corresponding saddle connection graph has no nontrivial automorphisms, which is different from the arc graph.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points. Let $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be the quotient of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ by its automorphism group.*

- (i) *If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a translation surface, then $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has infinitely many edges if and only if $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point.*

(ii) *If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a Veech surface, then $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finitely many vertices.*

Remark 3. We don't know whether the converse to the second statement in Theorem 1.3 is true or not (see Question 1).

1.4. Related results. To each Teichmüller disk, Smillie-Weiss ([22]) introduced the spine graph, which is a tree in the hyperbolic plane. They proved that the spine graph has compact quotient by the Veech group if and only if the Veech group is a lattice. The dual of the spine graph is a graph whose vertices are the directions of saddle connections and whose edges are pairs of directions which are the directions of the shortest saddle connections of some half-translation surface in the Teichmüller disk. Nguyen studied the graph of degenerate cylinders for translation surfaces in genus two ([20]) and the graph of periodic directions for translation surface satisfying the Veech dichotomy ([21]). He proved that both of them are hyperbolic, and that every automorphism which comes from the mapping class group is induced by an affine self-homeomorphism. Moreover, based on the graph of periodic directions, Nguyen ([21]) gave an algorithm to determine a coarse fundamental domain and a generating set for the Veech group of a Veech surface.

Valentina Disarlo, Anja Randecker, and Robert Tang proved a similar result independently ([3]) under the condition that all marked points are zeros or simple poles. The overall strategy of Disarlo-Randecker-Tang is similar to ours. But the ideas in proving the triangle preserving property are quite different. They prove the triangle preserving property via developing the “triangle test”, which is a combinatorial criterion that can detect the simplicies on the saddle connection complex that bound triangles on the underlying half-translation surfaces.

1.5. Outline. In Section 2, we collect some basic properties of the saddle connection graph including the connectedness, hyperbolicity and infinite diameter. In Section 3-7, we prove Theorem 1.1. The proof consists of three steps:

- Step 1. (§3-5) Based on the existence of many “admissible pentagons” (see §3), we prove that the isomorphism F preserves triangles (Theorem 5.1).
- Step 2. (§6) Fix a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. The correspondence between triangles obtained in step 1 induces an affine map between triangles. We show that these affine maps have orientation consistency (Proposition 6.5), which allows us to glue these affine maps between triangles to obtain a homeomorphism from $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ to $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ (Theorem 6.1). It then follows from the connectedness of the triangulation graph that the isotopy class of the

resulting homeomorphism is independent of the choices of triangulations (Proposition 6.7).

Step 3. (§7) We prove that the induced homeomorphism obtained in step 2 is isotopic to an affine homeomorphism (Proposition 7.1).

Step three is a standard argument (see [4, 20, 21]). The novel part of this paper is step one and step two. In Section 7, we also prove Theorem 1.2. In Section 8, we prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 9, we propose two questions.

Acknowledgements. We thank Duc-Manh Nguyen for pointing out a mistake in the proof of Theorem 1.3 in an earlier version and for informing us the references [2, 10]. We thank Robert Tang for comments for an earlier version. We thank Kasra Rafi for informing us the reference [18]. We also thank Lixin Liu and Weixu Su for useful discussions. We are grateful to the referees for careful reading of the manuscript, with many corrections and comments. This work is supported by NSFC 11901241.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Arc graph. An arc \underline{a} on (X, Σ) is called *properly embedded* if $\partial \underline{a} \subset \Sigma$ and the interior is disjoint from Σ . A properly embedded arc is said to be *trivial* if it is isotopic to a single point (i.e. the endpoint). Otherwise, it is said to be *non-trivial*. The *arc graph* of (X, Σ) , denoted by $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$, is a graph such that the vertices $\mathcal{A}^0(X, \Sigma)$ are isotopy classes of properly embedded non-trivial arcs on (X, Σ) , the edges $\mathcal{A}^1(X, \Sigma)$ are pairs of isotopy classes of properly embedded non-trivial arcs which can be realized interiorly disjoint. (In this paper, by an *isotopy* we mean an isotopy relative to the marked points.)

Let each edge in $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$ be of length one. This induces a metric $d_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$. Recall that a geodesic metric space (\mathbb{X}, d) is called δ -*hyperbolic* if for every geodesic triangle $[xy] \cup [yz] \cup [zx]$, each geodesic in $\{[xy], [yz], [zx]\}$ is contained in the δ -neighbourhood of the union of the other two.

Theorem 2.1 ([17, 8, 7]). *The arc graph $(\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma), d_{\mathcal{A}})$ is δ -hyperbolic.*

Remark 4. In fact, Hesel-Przytycki-Webb ([7]) show that $(\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma), d_{\mathcal{A}})$ is 7-hyperbolic.

2.2. Half-translation surfaces.

Definition 1 (half-translation surface). A *half-translation surface* is a pair (X, ω) where X is a closed Riemann surface and ω is a meromorphic quadratic differential on X which contains no poles of order greater than one. An *half-translation surface with marked points* is a triple $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ such that (X, ω) is a half-translation surface, and Σ is a finite subset of X which contains the zeros and poles of ω .

The meromorphic quadratic differential ω induces a singular flat metric $|\omega|$ on X , which is flat outside the zeroes and poles of ω . The zeros and poles of ω are called *singular points*. The cone angle at each singular point of ω is a multiple of π .

Definition 2 (Saddle connection). A *saddle connection* is an $|\omega|$ -geodesic segment on $X \setminus \Sigma$ with endpoints in Σ .

For an oriented saddle connection α , the integral $\int_{\alpha} \sqrt{\omega}$ is called the *holonomy* of α , where $\sqrt{\omega}$ is one of the square roots of ω . Since there is no canonical choice of square roots of ω , we see that the holonomies of (oriented) saddle connections belong to $\mathbb{R}^2 / \{\pm 1\}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points.*

- *The set of holonomies of saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 / \{\pm 1\}$.*
- *The set of directions of saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{S}^1 / \{\pm 1\}$.*

Remark 5. The first statement can be found in [9, Proposition 1]. The second statement is [16, Theorem 2].

Definition 3 (Cylinder). A *cylinder* on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is an open subset disjoint from Σ , which is isometric to $(\mathbb{R}/c\mathbb{Z}) \times (0, h)$ with $c, h \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and not properly contained in any other subset with the same property. A boundary component of a cylinder is called *simple* if it consists of only one saddle connection. A cylinder is called *semisimple* if it contains at least one simple boundary component. A cylinder is called *simple* if both of its boundary components are simple.

By a simple closed curve on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, we mean a simple closed curve on $X \setminus \Sigma$.

Definition 4 (Cylinder curve). A simple closed curve on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is called a *cylinder curve* if it is isotopic to a core curve of some cylinder on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

For our purpose, we need the following theorem which is stated as Lemma 22 in [4].

Theorem 2.3 ([4]). *Let $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be a homeomorphism preserving marked points, such that for each simple closed curve α , α is a cylinder curve on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ if and only if $f(\alpha)$ is a cylinder curve on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. Then f is isotopic to an affine homeomorphism.*

2.3. Saddle connection graph.

Definition 5. The *saddle connection graph* of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, denoted by $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, is a graph such that the vertices $\mathcal{S}^0(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ are saddle connections and the edges $\mathcal{S}^1(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ are pairs of disjoint saddle connections.

Convention. In this paper, whenever we mention the intersection between two saddle connections, we mean the intersection in the interior.

Notice that the saddle connection graph $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a subgraph of $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$. For any topological arc $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}^0(X, \omega)$, the $|\omega|$ -geodesic representative consists of several saddle connections. It follows from [18, Theorem 1.4] that $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a geodesically connected subset of $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$, in the sense that any two points in $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ are connected by a geodesic of $\mathcal{A}(X, \Sigma)$ that lies in $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. This implies that $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is *connected* and *δ -hyperbolic*.

Definition 6 (Triangulation). A triangulation $\Gamma = \{\gamma_i\}$ of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a set of saddle connections $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{6g-6+3p}\}$, where $p = |\Sigma|$ and g is the genus of X , such that

- for any $i \neq j$, γ_i and γ_j are disjoint;
- any saddle connection $\gamma \notin \Gamma$ intersects γ_i for some $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be an isomorphism between two saddle connection graphs. Let $\Gamma := \{\gamma_i\}$ be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Then $F(\Gamma) := \{F(\gamma) : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.*

Proof. By definition, we see that for any pair of different saddle connections $\gamma_i, \gamma_j \in \Gamma$, $F(\gamma_i)$ and $F(\gamma_j)$ are disjoint. If $F(\Gamma)$ is not a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, then there exists a saddle connection $\gamma' \notin F(\Gamma)$ of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which is disjoint from $F(\gamma_i)$ for all $\gamma_i \in F(\Gamma)$. Correspondingly, $F^{-1}(\gamma') \notin \Gamma$ is a saddle connection of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which is disjoint from all $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$. This is a contradiction which proves the lemma! □

2.4. $\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ action. Let $\kappa = (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1, \dots, 4g-4\}^n$ be a partition of $4g-4$, i.e. $k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_n = 4g-4$. Denote by $\mathcal{Q}(\kappa)$ the moduli space of meromorphic quadratic differentials with marked points $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contain n zeros of multiplicities (k_1, \dots, k_n) , where a zero of multiplicity -1 is a pole of order one and a zero of multiplicity zero is a regular marked point. There is a natural $\mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ action on $\mathcal{Q}(\kappa)$, which acts on $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \in \mathcal{Q}(\kappa)$ by post-composition with the atlas maps of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ (see [18, §1.8]). More precisely, let $\{(U_i, \phi_i), i \in I\}$ be an atlas of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, covering X except the marked points of ω . Then for $a \in \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, $a \cdot (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is defined by the atlas $\{(U_i, a \circ \phi_i), i \in I\}$. Therefore, the identity map between $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $a \cdot (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is isotopic to an affine homeomorphism, which induces an isomorphism between $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}(a \cdot (X, \omega; \Sigma))$.

For each $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1/\{\pm 1\}$, the straight lines in that direction induce a directional flow on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. By [14, Theorem 1], for almost every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1/\{\pm 1\}$, the induced directional flow is *uniquely ergodic* on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

2.5. Infinite diameter.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points. The saddle connection graph $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has infinite diameter.*

Proof. We use an argument of F. Luo as explained in [15, §4.3]. Suppose to the contrary that the diameter of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is finite.

By [14, Theorem 1], for almost every $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1 / \{\pm 1\}$, the induced directional flow is uniquely ergodic on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. After rotation, we may assume that the horizontal flow of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is uniquely ergodic. Fix a non-horizontal saddle connection α . Let $\{\beta_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of saddle connections, such that the limit of the directions is horizontal. This implies that for every non-horizontal segment I , there exists $T > 0$, such that β_i intersects I for all $i > T$.

By assumption, the diameter of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is finite, there is a subsequence, still denoted by $\{\beta_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ for convenience, such that $d_{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha, \beta_i) = N$ for some $N < \infty$. For each i , consider a geodesic $\beta_i^0 = \alpha, \beta_i^1, \dots, \beta_i^{N-1}, \beta_i^N = \beta_i$ in the saddle connection graph from α to β_i . On the other hand, for every non-horizontal segment I , β_i intersects I for all large enough i . Therefore, the limit of the directions of β_i^{N-1} has to be horizontal. Otherwise, $\beta_i = \beta_i^N$ would intersect β_i^{N-1} for large enough i . Inductively, we obtain that the limit of the directions of β_i^1 has to be horizontal. As a consequence, β_i^1 would intersect the non-horizontal saddle connection $\alpha = \beta_i^0$ for large enough i , which contradicts that $d_{\mathcal{S}}(\alpha, \beta_i^1) = 1$. □

3. ADMISSIBLE POLYGONS

Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points. The goal of this section is to find “admissible polygons” on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Let us start with the following definition.

Definition 7 (admissible map). Let $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polygon. A continuous map $\mathcal{J} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is called *admissible* if

- (1) it is a local half-translation, i.e. the derivative is $\pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$;
- (2) it is an embedding in the interior of \mathbf{Q} ;
- (3) $\mathcal{J}(P)$ is a marked point if and only if P is a vertex of \mathbf{Q} .

A polygon is called *admissible* if it admits an admissible map into $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

In particular, an admissible map is a local isometry sending sides and diagonals (interior to \mathbf{Q}) to saddle connections.

We will use the notation $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m)$ to represent a polygon $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with counterclockwise labeled vertices A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m .

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, then for any pair of sides $\overline{A_i A_{i+1}}$ and $\overline{A_j A_{j+1}}$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_j A_{j+1}})$ are either equal or disjoint.*

Proof. It follows directly from the definition of admissible maps. □

Definition 8. A convex polygon on \mathbb{R}^2 is called *strictly convex* if it is strictly convex at each vertex, i.e. the interior angle at each vertex is strictly less than π .

Lemma 3.2. *Let \mathbf{P} be a convex polygon in \mathbb{R}^2 . Let $\mathcal{J} : \mathbf{P} \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a local half-translation such that $\mathcal{J}(P) \in \Sigma$ only if P is a vertex. Let $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathbf{P}$ be such that $\text{int}(\overline{Q_1 Q_2})$ contains no vertices of \mathbf{P} . If $\mathcal{J}(Q_1) = \mathcal{J}(Q_2)$, then the holonomy corresponding to the closed curve $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1 Q_2})$ is a translation.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that the holonomy is a strict half-translation, i.e. Q_1 and Q_2 are identified by a strict half-translation. Let $Q \in \mathbf{P}$ be the midpoint of Q_1, Q_2 . Then $\mathcal{J}(Q)$ would be a marked point of cone angle π . Hence, Q is a vertex of \mathbf{P} . This is a contradiction which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3 (Admissible extension I). *Let $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a polygon without self-intersections. Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} : (A_1 A_n \cdots A_m) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be two admissible maps, $3 \leq n \leq m - 1$, such that*

- $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$;
- $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) \neq \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\overline{A_j A_{j+1}})$ for all $n \leq j \leq m$;
- for $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \forall n \leq j \leq m$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\overline{A_j A_{j+1}})$ are either equal or disjoint.

Then the map $\hat{\mathcal{J}} : (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ defined by

$$\hat{\mathcal{J}}|_{(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)} = \mathcal{J}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{J}}|_{(A_1 A_n \cdots A_m)} = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}$$

is admissible.

Proof. To show that $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ is admissible, it suffices to show that $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ is an embedding in the interior. Suppose to the contrary that there exist $Q_1, Q_2 \in \text{int}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_m)$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{J}}(Q_1) = \hat{\mathcal{J}}(Q_2)$. Moreover, we may assume that $Q_2 \in \text{int}(A_1 A_n \cdots A_m) \cup \text{int}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$ and $Q_1 \in \text{int}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) \cup \text{int}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$. Since $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a half-translation surface, the identification between Q_1 and Q_2 by $\hat{\mathcal{J}}$ is a half-translation of \mathbb{R}^2 . Let ζ be the induced half-translation sending Q_2 to Q_1 . Let $(A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m)$ be the image of $(A_1 A_n \cdots A_m)$ by ζ . Then

$$\mathcal{J}(P) = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\zeta^{-1}(P)), \quad \forall P \in (A_1 A_n \cdots A_m) \cap (A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m).$$

Notice that

$$Q_1 \in \text{int}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) \cap \text{int}(A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m).$$

Combined with the third assumption in the setting, this implies that

$$(A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m) \subset (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) \text{ or } (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n) \subset (A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m) \subset (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)$. Then $\overline{A'_1 A'_n} = \overline{A_i A_j}$ for some side or diagonal of $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)$ (because both $(A'_1 A'_n \cdots A'_m)$ and $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)$ are admissible polygons of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$).

Hence, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_1 A'_n}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_j})$. Since \mathcal{J} is admissible, it follows that $\overline{A_i A_j}$ can not be a diagonal. Then $\overline{A_i A_j}$ must be a side. It then follows from the second assumption in the setting that $\overline{A_i A_j} = \overline{A_1 A_n}$. Therefore, $\zeta(\overline{A_1 A_n}) = \overline{A'_1 A'_n} = \overline{A_1 A_n}$. Consequently, ζ is a strict half-translation, and the midpoint of $\overline{A_1 A_n}$ is marked point of cone angle π . This contradicts to the assumption that \mathcal{J} is admissible. \square

Let $\mathcal{H} := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -r < y < r\}$ be a horizontal strip with upper boundary $\partial_+ \mathcal{H}$ and lower boundary $\partial_- \mathcal{H}$. Let $A_i = (a_i, b_i) \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, such that

- $b_n = -r \leq b_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq b_2 \leq b_1 = r$;
- $a_1 = a_n = 0$, $a_i < 0$ for all $i = 2, \dots, n-1$.

Lemma 3.4 (Admissible extension II). *Let $\mathcal{H}, A_1, A_2 \dots A_n$ be as above. Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \dots A_n) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map such that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then there exists $A_{n+1} \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}$ on the right side of $\overline{A_1 A_n}$, such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extend to $(A_1 A_2 \dots A_n A_{n+1})$. Moreover, if the image of $(A_1 A_2 \dots A_n)$ by \mathcal{J} is not contained in any horizontal cylinder, then we have $A_{n+1} \in \mathcal{H}$.*

Proof. Let $P_t \in \partial_+ \mathcal{H}$ and $Q_t \in \partial_- \mathcal{H}$ such that $\overrightarrow{A_1 P_t} = \overrightarrow{A_n Q_t} = t(1, 0)$, where $t > 0$. For $t > 0$ small, by following the horizontal lines on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ through points in $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$, we can extend \mathcal{J} to the polygon $(A_1 A_2 \dots A_n Q_t P_t)$ which remains to be a local half-translation. In fact, the extension fails only if some interior point of $\overline{P_t Q_t}$ is mapped to a marked point by \mathcal{J} . The assumptions that $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \dots A_n) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is an admissible map and that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) \neq$




FIGURE 1. Admissible extension of polygons.

$\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ imply that for small $t > 0$, the extension $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n Q_t P_t) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is an embedding in the interior.

Now, let us consider the horizontal rays $\{L_P : P \in \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n})\}$ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which emanate from the points of $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$ and which flow away from $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)$. Since $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is of finite area and $\{\mathcal{J}(A_1), \mathcal{J}(A_n)\} \subset \Sigma$, it follows that some of such rays would meet marked points during the flowing process. Let L_T , $T \in \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n})$ be a ray which meet marked points first (if there are more than one candidates, we choose the one closer to A_1). Denote by a the distance it travels from T to the first marked point. Let $A_{n+1} = (a_{n+1}, b_{n+1}) \in \overline{P_a Q_a}$ be such that $\mathcal{J}(A_{n+1})$ is the marked point met by L_T (see Figure 1). Then $a_{n+1} = a > 0$ and $b_{n+1} \geq -r$.

We claim that $i : (A_1 A_n A_{n+1}) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is admissible. Suppose to the contrary that there exist $M = (x, y)$, $\hat{M} = (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in \mathbf{int}(A_1 A_n A_{n+1})$ such that $\mathcal{J}(M) = \mathcal{J}(\hat{M})$. By Lemma 3.2, the identification between \hat{M} and M by \mathcal{J} is a translation. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $x \geq \hat{x}$. Furthermore, we assume that $y \geq \hat{y}$. (The proof for the case $y \leq \hat{y}$ is similar.) Let \mathbf{k} and k be respectively the slopes of $\overline{A_n A_{n+1}}$ and $\hat{M}M$. Then $\mathbf{k}, k \geq 0$. If $k \leq \mathbf{k}$, then $\exists \tilde{M} \in \mathbf{int}(A_1 A_n A_{n+1}) \setminus \{A_1, A_n, A_{n+1}\}$ such that $\overrightarrow{\tilde{M} A_{n+1}} = \overrightarrow{\hat{M} M}$. Then $\mathcal{J}(\tilde{M}) = \mathcal{J}(A_{n+1}) \in \Sigma$, which contradicts to the construction of $\overrightarrow{A_{n+1}}$. If $k > \mathbf{k}$, then $\exists \tilde{M} \in \mathbf{int}(A_1 A_n A_{n+1}) \setminus \{A_1, A_n, A_{n+1}\}$ such that $\overrightarrow{A_n \tilde{M}} = \overrightarrow{\hat{M} M}$. Then $\mathcal{J}(\tilde{M}) = \mathcal{J}(A_n) \in \Sigma$, which also contradicts to the construction of $\overrightarrow{A_{n+1}}$.

By Lemma 3.3, to show that $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 \cdots A_{n+1}) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is admissible, it suffices to show that for $\forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\forall n \leq j \leq n+1$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_j A_{j+1}})$ are either equal or disjoint. In the following, we shall consider $\overline{A_{n+1} A_1}$. The proof for $\overline{A_n A_{n+1}}$ is similar.

Suppose to the contrary that there exists $2 \leq k \leq n$ such that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{n+1} A_1})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k})$ but $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{n+1} A_1}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k})$. Let $S \in \mathbf{int}(\overline{A_{n+1} A_1})$ and $\hat{S} \in \mathbf{int}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k})$ such that $\mathcal{J}(S) = \mathcal{J}(\hat{S})$. Since $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a half-translation surface, the identification between S and \hat{S} by \mathcal{J} has two cases: translation or strict half-translation.

- **Case 1.** The identification between S and \hat{S} is a translation. Let $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be the translation such that $\Theta(S) = \hat{S}$. Let $(\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a \hat{A}_{n+1} \hat{Q}_a \hat{A}_n)$ be the image of $(A_1 P_a A_{n+1} Q_a A_n)$ under the translation Θ . In particular, $(\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a \hat{Q}_a \hat{A}_n)$ is a parallelogram with $\overline{\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a}$ horizontal and $\overline{\hat{P}_a \hat{Q}_a}$ vertical. Moreover,

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{int}(\overline{\hat{A}_1 \hat{A}_{n+1}}) \cap \mathbf{int}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}) = \{\hat{S}\}.$$

By the construction of A_{n+1} , we see that

$$(2) \quad A_{k-1}, A_k \notin \mathbf{int}(\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a \hat{A}_{n+1} \hat{Q}_a \hat{A}_n) \cup \mathbf{int}(\overline{\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a}) \cup \mathbf{int}(\overline{\hat{A}_n \hat{Q}_a}).$$

Since $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k})$ and $\mathcal{J} : (\overline{A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n}) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is admissible, it follows that $\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}$ and $\overline{A_1 A_n}$ are disjoint. Combining (1), (2), and the assumption about the y -coordinates of A_{k-1} and A_k , we see that $\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}$ intersects both $\overline{\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a}$ and $\overline{\hat{P}_a \hat{Q}_a}$ (see Figure 1(a)), or it intersects both $\overline{\hat{A}_n \hat{Q}_a}$ and $\overline{\hat{P}_a \hat{Q}_a}$ (see Figure 1(b)). Without loss of generality, we assume that $\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}$ intersects both $\overline{\hat{A}_1 \hat{P}_a}$ and $\overline{\hat{P}_a \hat{Q}_a}$.

Let $U, V \in \overline{A_1 A_n}$ such that $\overline{A_{k-1} U}$ and $\overline{A_k V}$ are horizontal. Then

$$\hat{A}_{n+1} \in \mathbf{int}(A_{k-1} A_k V U) \subset \mathbf{int}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n),$$

which contradicts with the assumption that $(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n)$ is an admissible polygon.

- **Case 2.** The identification between S and \hat{S} is a strict half-translation. Let $\tilde{\Theta}$ be the half-translation of \mathbb{R}^2 such that $\tilde{\Theta}(S) = \hat{S}$. Let $(\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{P}_a \tilde{A}_{n+1} \tilde{Q}_a \tilde{A}_n)$ be the image of $(A_1 P_a A_{n+1} Q_a A_n)$ by $\tilde{\Theta}$. Then

$$(\tilde{A}_1 \tilde{P}_a \tilde{A}_{n+1} \tilde{Q}_a \tilde{A}_n) \cap \overline{\mathcal{H}} \subset \{(x, y) \in \overline{\mathcal{H}} : x \geq 0\}.$$

(Otherwise, some ray in $\{L_P : P \in \overline{A_1 A_n}\}$ would meet the marked point $\mathcal{J}(A_n)$ before L_T meet $\mathcal{J}(A_{n+1})$.) In particular, we have $\hat{S} \in (A_1 A_{n+1} A_n)$. It then follows from Lemma 3.2 that the identification between S and \hat{S} by \mathcal{J} is a translation, which contradicts to the assumption of this case.

If in addition, $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{int}(A_1 A_2 \cdots A_n))$ is not contained in any horizontal cylinder, we consider the family of rays $\{L_P : P \in \mathbf{int}(\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_n}))\}$ instead of $\{L_P : P \in \overline{A_1 A_n}\}$. It then follows that $A_{n+1} \in \mathcal{H}$. \square

Let $\mathcal{H}_1 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < y < d_1\}$, $\mathcal{H}_2 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -d_2 < y < 0\}$. Let $\partial_+ = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = d_1\}$, $\partial_0 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = 0\}$, $\partial_- = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = -d_2\}$. Let $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ be a strictly convex pentagon such that

$$A_1 \in \partial_+, A_2 \in \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \partial_+, \overline{A_3 A_5} \subset \partial_0, A_4 \in \partial_-.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$, $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \partial_+, \partial_0, \partial_-$ be as above. Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map. Suppose that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1})$.*

- If $d_1 \geq d_2$, then there exists $A_6 \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_1}$ such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_6)$. If in addition, $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{int}(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_5))$ is not contained in any horizontal cylinder, then $A_6 \in \mathcal{H}_1$.
- If $d_1 \leq d_2$, then there exist $A_7 \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_2}$ such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_7 A_5)$, and $A_8 \in \overline{\mathcal{H}_2}$ such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_8 A_4 A_5)$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.4. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ be three saddle connections bounding a triangle Δ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which is not contained in any cylinder. Then there exist a convex pentagon $\mathcal{P} = (P_1P_2P_3P_4P_5) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ which is strictly convex at each vertex, and an admissible map $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ (see Figure 2), such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(\overline{P_1P_3}) = \gamma_1, \mathcal{J}(\overline{P_1P_4}) = \gamma_2, \mathcal{J}(\overline{P_3P_4}) = \gamma_3.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ are arranged in the counterclockwise order with respect to Δ . After applying the $GL(2, R)$ action, we may assume that γ_2 is horizontal. Let $(A_1A_3A_4)$ be a triangle in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ an admissible map such that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3}) = \gamma_1$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4}) = \gamma_2$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_1}) = \gamma_3$.

Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the horizontal strip which contains A_1, A_3, A_4 in the boundary. Since Δ is not contained in any cylinder, by Lemma 3.4, there exists $A_2 \in \text{int}(\mathcal{M})$ on the left side of $\overline{A_1A_3}$ such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to $(A_1A_2A_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Consider the quadrilateral $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$. It is not contained in any cylinder. Again, it follows from Lemma 3.4 that there exists $A_5 \in \text{int}(\mathcal{M})$ on the right side of $\overline{A_1A_4}$ such that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Since A_1, A_3, A_4 belong to the boundary of \mathcal{M} while A_2 and A_5 belong to interior, we see that $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is strictly convex at each vertex. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ be three saddle connections bounding a triangle Δ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which is contained in a non-simple cylinder \mathcal{C} . Suppose that γ_3 is contained in the boundary of \mathcal{C} . Then there exist a convex pentagon $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and an admissible map $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$, such that*

- $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3}) = \gamma_1, \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4}) = \gamma_2, \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4}) = \gamma_3;$
- *the interior angle at A_1 is π while the other interior angles are less than π (see Figure 3(a)), or the interior angle of at A_4 is π while the other interior angles are less than π (see Figure 3(b)).*

Proof. There exist a parallelogram $(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4)$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , and an admissible map $\mathcal{J} : (Q_1M_1 \cdots M_nQ_2Q_3N_1 \cdots N_kQ_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ whose image is \mathcal{C} ,




FIGURE 2. Pentagon-extension of triangles I: the triangle $(A_1A_3A_4)$ is not contained in any cylinder.




FIGURE 3. Pentagon-extension of triangles II: the triangle $(A_1A_3A_4)$ is contained in some non-simple cylinder.

where $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \overline{Q_1Q_2}$ and $N_1, \dots, N_k \in \overline{Q_3Q_4}$. By assumption, \mathcal{C} is not simple. It follows that $\max\{n, k\} \geq 1$.

- If $n \geq 1$, we may choose the polygon $(Q_1M_1 \cdots M_nQ_2Q_3N_1 \cdots N_kQ_4)$ such that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{M_1Q_3}) = \gamma_1$. Let $A_1 = M_1$, $A_3 = Q_3$, $A_5 = Q_1$, $A_2 = M_2$ if $n > 1$ or $A_2 = Q_2$ if $n = 1$, and $A_4 = Q_4$ if $k = 0$ or $A_4 = N_1$ if $k \geq 1$.
- If $k \geq 1$, we may choose the polygon $(Q_1M_1 \cdots M_nQ_2Q_3N_1 \cdots N_kQ_4)$ such that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_3}) = \gamma_1$. Let $A_1 = Q_1$, $A_3 = Q_3$, $A_4 = N_1$, $A_2 = Q_2$ if $n = 0$ or $A_2 = M_1$ if $n \geq 1$, and $A_5 = N_2$ if $k > 1$ or $A_5 = Q_4$ if $k = 1$.

Then the resulting pentagon $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ and the associate admissible map $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ satisfy all the properties we want. \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, where $(A_1A_2A_3A_4) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is strictly convex at A_2, A_3, A_4 . If $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 , then there exists a sequence of admissible maps $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_k : (A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_kA_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$, where $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and $\hat{A}_0 = A_2$, such that*

- (i) \mathcal{J} and $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_k$ coincide on the triangle $(A_1A_3A_4)$;
- (ii) $(A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_kA_3)$ is strictly convex at each vertex for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$;
- (iii) $(A_1\hat{A}_m A_3A_4)$ is strictly convex at each vertex.

Proof. After apply an action of $\text{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$, we may assume that $(A_1A_3A_4)$ is an equilateral triangle (see Figure 4(a)). We shall proceed by induction. The algorithm is as following.

Consider the strip \mathcal{H}_1 directed by $\overrightarrow{A_4A_3}$ which contains A_2, A_3, A_4 in the boundary (see Figure 4(a)). Since $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 , it follows that $A_1 \in \mathbf{int}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ and that $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{int}(A_1A_2A_3A_4))$ by \mathcal{J} is not contained in any cylinder in the direction of $\overrightarrow{A_4A_3}$. By Lemma 3.4, there exist $\hat{A}_1 \in \mathbf{int}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ below $\overline{A_2A_3}$ and an admissible $\hat{\mathcal{J}}_1 : (A_1A_2\hat{A}_1A_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which coincides with \mathcal{J} on $(A_1A_3A_4)$, such that




FIGURE 4. Constructing a strictly convex admissible quadrilateral $(A_1\hat{A}_m A_3 A_4)$ from an arbitrary admissible quadrilateral $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$.

$(A_1\hat{A}_0\hat{A}_1 A_3)$ is strictly convex at each vertex, where $\hat{A}_0 = A_2$. Let $\hat{\theta}_{13}$ be the interior angle of $(A_1\hat{A}_0\hat{A}_1 A_3)$ at A_3 . Then

$$\hat{\theta}_{03} < \hat{\theta}_{13} < 2\pi/3,$$

where $\hat{\theta}_{03}$ is the interior angle of $(A_1 A_2 A_3)$ at A_3 and $2\pi/3$ is the exterior angle of $(A_1 A_3 A_4)$ at A_3 .

If $(A_1\hat{A}_1 A_3 A_4)$ is strictly convex at \hat{A}_1 , the algorithm terminates. Otherwise, we repeat the construction above for $(A_1\hat{A}_1 A_3 A_4)$.

We now show that the algorithm will terminate after finitely many steps. Suppose to the contrary that the algorithm will never terminate. In each step, we construct an admissible map $\hat{J}_k : (A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_k A_3 A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$, where $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$ and $\hat{A}_0 = A_2$, such that

- (i) \mathcal{J} and \hat{J}_k coincide on the triangle $(A_1 A_3 A_4)$;
- (ii) $(A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_k A_3)$ is strictly convex at each vertex for $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$;
- (iii) $(A_1\hat{A}_m A_3 A_4)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 .

Let $\hat{\theta}_{k3}$ be the interior angle of $(A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_k A_3)$ at A_3 . Then $\hat{\theta}_{03} < \hat{\theta}_{k3} < \hat{\theta}_{k+1,3} < 2\pi/3$ for all $k \geq 1$. In particular, $\mathcal{J}(A_3\hat{A}_k) \neq \mathcal{J}(A_3\hat{A}_j)$ for all $k > j > 1$. Since $\mathcal{J} : (A_1\hat{A}_{k-1}\hat{A}_k A_3) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is an admissible map, we have

$$\mathbf{Area}(A_1\hat{A}_k A_3) = \frac{1}{2} |\overline{A_1 A_3}| \cdot |\overline{A_3 \hat{A}_k}| \sin \hat{\theta}_{k3} < \mathbf{Area}(X, \omega),$$

which implies that

$$|\overline{A_3 \hat{A}_k}| < 2\mathbf{Area}(X, \omega) |\overline{A_1 A_3}|^{-1} (\min\{|\sin \hat{\theta}_{03}|, \sqrt{3}/2\})^{-1}.$$

Let $\mathbf{T} := 2\mathbf{Area}(X, \omega) |\overline{A_1 A_4}|^{-1} (\min\{|\sin \hat{\theta}_{03}|, \sqrt{3}/2\})^{-1}$. On the other hand, there are only finitely many saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ whose length are less than \mathbf{T} . This is a contradiction which proves the lemma. \square

4. SIMPLE CYLINDER PRESERVING

In the remaining of this paper, we assume that $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ are half-translation surfaces with marked points, and that

$$F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$$

is an isomorphism. The goal of this section is to prove that F preserves simple cylinders (see Proposition 4.3). Let us start with the following two lemmas, which will be frequently used in the sequel.

Lemma 4.1 (Triangle lemma). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, where $(A_1 A_2 A_3)$ is a triangle. Then $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_1})$ are pairwise different.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{i-1} A_i}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_{i+1}})$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a half-translation surface, it then follows that the interior angle of $(A_1 A_2 A_3)$ at A_i is π . This is a contradiction which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.2 (Quadrilateral lemma). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, where $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ is a strictly convex quadrilateral. Then there exist a strictly convex quadrilateral $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4)$, and an admissible map*

$$\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$$

such that

- (i) $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_4})$;
- (ii) for any triangulation Γ of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_1})$, $F(\Gamma)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_1})$.

If in addition, \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to a pentagon $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ which contains a diagonal $\overline{A_5 A_2}$, then $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_i A'_{i+1}})$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $A'_5 = A'_1$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, $F(\Gamma)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$. Therefore, there exists an admissible map $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ such that

- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3})$ and
- $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{i-1} A'_i}) \in F(\Gamma)$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $A'_0 = A'_4$.

Notice that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3})$ and intersects no other saddle connections from Γ . Therefore, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_3})$ and intersects no other saddle connections from $F(\Gamma)$. Then $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4)$ is strictly convex, and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$.

If in addition, \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extended to a pentagon $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ which contains a diagonal $\overline{A_5A_2}$, let Γ_1 be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3})$, and all images of sides of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ by \mathcal{J} . Then $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_2})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3})$ but intersects no other saddle connections from Γ_1 . Correspondingly, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_2})$ intersects both $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_3})$ but intersects no other saddle connections from $F(\Gamma_1)$. Consequently, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_iA'_{i+1}})$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $A'_5 = A'_1$. □

Proposition 4.3 (Simple cylinder). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map such that $\mathcal{J}(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4)$ is a simple cylinder which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_4})$ as boundary components. Then there exists an admissible map $\mathcal{J}' : (Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ such that*

- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_iQ_j}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_iQ'_j})$ for all diagonals and sides
- $\mathcal{J}'(Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4)$ is a simple cylinder which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4})$ as boundary components.

Proof. Let Γ be triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_4Q_1})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_1})$. By Lemma 4.2, there exist a strictly convex quadrilateral $(Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4)$, and an admissible map

$$\mathcal{J}' : (Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$$

such that

- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_3})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_4})$;
- $F(\Gamma)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4})$, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_4Q'_1})$.




FIGURE 5. Correspondence between Simple cylinders.

If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point, then $\Gamma_1 := \{\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_3})\}$ is a triangulation. Therefore, $F(\Gamma_1) := \{F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2}), F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3}), F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_3})\}$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. Then $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_4Q'_1})$. The proposition follows.

In the following, we assume that $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point. Let η_1, η_2, η_3 be three different interior saddle connections of \mathcal{C} such that each of them intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3})$. Then each of $\{F(\eta_1), F(\eta_2), F(\eta_3)\}$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_3})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3})$ while disjoint with other saddle connections from $F(\Gamma)$. Therefore, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_{i-1}Q'_i})$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $Q'_0 = Q'_4$. Up to relabelling, we may suppose that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_2Q_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$. By Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2}), \quad \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4}).$$

If $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_4})$, consider the triangles from the complement of $F(\Gamma)$ on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. Let Δ' be the one which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$ as a boundary and which is not contained in the image of $(Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4)$ under the admissible map \mathcal{J}' (see Figure 5(b)). The other two boundary saddle connections of Δ' can not be $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$. In this case, there are at most two saddle connections of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which intersects both $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_3})$ while disjoint with other saddle connections from $F(\Gamma)$, where the maximum holds only if $\Delta' \cup (Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4)$ is a pentagon strictly convex at each vertex. Therefore, $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_2Q'_3})$. In particular, the image of $(Q'_1Q'_2Q'_3Q'_4)$ by \mathcal{J}' is a simple cylinder on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.

Next, we consider $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_4})$. Since $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, it follows that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1Q_2}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_4})$. By Lemma 3.4, we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a convex pentagon $(Q_1Q_5Q_2Q_3Q_4)$ which is strictly convex at Q_5 (see Figure 5(a)). By Lemma 4.2, this implies that $F(\overline{Q_1Q_2})$ is $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2})$ or $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4})$, say $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_1Q'_2})$. Similarly, it can be shown that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_3Q_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_3Q'_4})$. \square

5. TRIANGLE PRESERVING

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ be three saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which bound a triangle. Then $F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_2), F(\gamma_3)$ also bound a triangle on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.*

Our strategy is to show that F preserves convex pentagons.

Theorem 5.2 (Pentagon preserving). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, where $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is a convex pentagon strictly convex at A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5 . Then there exists an admissible map*

$$\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma'),$$

where $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ is strictly convex at A'_2, A'_3, A'_4, A'_5 , such that

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_iA_j}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_iA'_j})$$




FIGURE 6. Correspondence between pentagons. In (a) and (b), the pentagons are not strictly convex at A_1 and A'_1 . In (c) and (d), the pentagons are strictly convex at each vertex.

for all sides and diagonals.

Proof of Theorem 5.1 assuming Theorem 5.2. Let Δ be a triangle bounded by $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$. If Δ is contained in some simple cylinder, the theorem follows from Proposition 4.3. If Δ is not contained in any simple cylinder, it then follows from Lemma 3.7 and Corollary 3.6 that there exists an admissible map $J : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$, where $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is a convex pentagon strictly convex at A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5 , such that Δ is contained in the image of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ by J . By Theorem 5.2, there exists an admissible map $J' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, where $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is a convex pentagon, strictly convex at A'_2, A'_3, A'_4, A'_5 , such that $F \circ J(\overline{A_i A_j}) = J'(\overline{A'_i A'_j})$ for all diagonals and sides $\overline{A_i A_j}$. Since $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ bound a triangle which is contained in the image $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ by J , then $F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_2), F(\gamma_3)$ also bound a triangle which is contained in the image of $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ by J' . In particular, $F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_2), F(\gamma_3)$ bound a triangle on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. \square

The remainder of this section is to prove Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.3 (Pentagon lemma I). *Let $J : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map, where $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is a convex pentagon strictly convex at A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5 . Then there exists an admissible map*

$$J' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma'),$$

where $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is strictly convex at A'_2, A'_3, A'_4, A'_5 satisfy the following.

- (i) If $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is strictly convex at each vertex, so is $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$.
- (ii) $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_j}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_i A'_j})$ for all diagonals $\overline{A_i A_j}$.
- (iii) For any triangulation Γ of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_5})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1})$, $F(\Gamma)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})$.

Proof. Let Γ be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{i-1} A_i})$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, where $A_0 = A_5$. Then by Lemma 2.4, $F(\Gamma)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}), F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{i-1} A_i})$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, where $A_0 = A_5$.

Consider the admissible quadrilateral $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$. By Lemma 4.2, there exists a strictly convex quadrilateral $(B'_1 B'_2 B'_3 B'_4)$, and an admissible map $\mathcal{J}' : (B'_1 B'_2 B'_3 B'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ (see Figure 6), such that

- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_1 B'_3})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_2 B'_4})$;
- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_{i-1} B'_i})$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, say $\overline{B'_1 B'_2}$;
- $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_{i-1} B'_i}) \in F(\Gamma)$ for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $B'_0 = B'_4$;

Next, we consider the admissible pentagon $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$. Let Δ' be the triangle in $(X', \omega'; \Sigma') \setminus F(\Gamma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_1 B'_2})$ in the boundary and which is not contained in $\mathcal{J}'(B'_1 B'_2 B'_3 B'_4)$. Then we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J}' to the pentagon $(B'_1 B'_4 B'_3 B'_2 B'_5)$ such that

- $\mathcal{J}'(B'_1 B'_2 B'_5) = \Delta'$;
- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_3 B'_5}), F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_1 B'_2})$;
- $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_5 B'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{B'_5 B'_1}) \in F(\Gamma)$,

where for the second claim we use the fact that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_5})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4})$ while disjoint from other saddle connections in $F(\Gamma)$, for the third claim we apply Lemma 4.2 for the convex quadrilateral $(A_1 A_3 A_4 A_5)$.

In particular, $(B'_1 B'_4 B'_3 B'_2 B'_5)$ is strictly convex at B'_5, B'_2, B'_3, B'_4 . By relabeling $A'_1 = B'_1, A'_2 = B'_4, A'_3 = B'_3, A'_4 = B'_2, A'_5 = B'_5$ (see Figure 6(b)(d)), we get the desired admissible map $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.

If in addition, $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is also strictly convex at A_1 , then $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_5})$ intersects only $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_4})$ and disjoint with any other saddle connections in $\mathcal{J}'(\text{int}(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5))$. Therefore, $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is also strictly convex at A'_1 and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_5})$. \square

Next, we deal with the sides of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$. For each diagonal $\overline{A_{i-1} A_{i+1}}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_{i-1} A_{i+1}}) \\ := & \max\{d(A_i, \overline{A_{i-1} A_{i+1}}), d(A_{i-2}, \overline{A_{i-1} A_{i+1}}), d(A_{i+2}, \overline{A_{i-1} A_{i+1}})\} \end{aligned}$$

where $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ represents the Euclidean distance on \mathbb{R}^2 , and where $A_{-1} = A_4, A_0 = A_5, A_6 = A_1$, and $A_7 = A_2$.

Lemma 5.4 (Pentagon lemma II). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Suppose further that $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is also strictly convex at A_1 .*

(i) *If $d(A_3, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, then*

$$F(\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4})\}) = \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3A'_4})\}.$$

(ii) *If $d(A_5, \overline{A_2A_4}) = d(A_1, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4}) > d(A_3, \overline{A_2A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(A_1A_2A_4A_5)$ is contained in a cylinder \mathcal{C} whose boundary contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, then $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})$, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_5})$.*

(iii) *If $d(A_1, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(A_1A_2A_4A_5)$ is not contained in any cylinder whose boundary contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, then $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})$.*

(iv) *If $d(A_5, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(A_1A_2A_4A_5)$ is not contained in any cylinder whose boundary contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, then $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_5})$.*

Similar results also hold for $\overline{A_3A_5}$, $\overline{A_1A_3}$, $\overline{A_1A_4}$, and $\overline{A_2A_5}$.

Proof. The overall strategy is to admissibly extend \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{J}' to hexagons by using Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5. Since $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is strictly convex at each vertex, by relabeling the vertices of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$, we see that the cases of $\overline{A_3A_5}$, $\overline{A_1A_3}$, $\overline{A_1A_4}$, and $\overline{A_2A_5}$ are all equivalent to the case of $\overline{A_2A_4}$. In the following, we prove the case of $\overline{A_2A_4}$.

(i). By Lemma 3.5, we see that \mathcal{J} can be admissibly extend a hexagon $(A_1A_2A_6A_3A_4A_5)$ such that $(A_2A_6A_3A_4)$ is a strictly convex quadrilateral (see Figure 7(a)). Consider $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$(3) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_1})\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_6A_4})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3})$ while disjoint from $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_5})$. Correspondingly, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_6A_4})$ intersects $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3})$ while disjoint from $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_1A'_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_2A'_5})$. Therefore, (3) is reduced to

$$(4) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3A'_4})\}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$(5) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3A'_4})\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4})$ by Lemma 4.1, it then follows that

$$F(\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3A_4})\}) = \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3A'_4})\}.$$

(ii). If $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_5})$, then \mathcal{C} is a simple cylinder. It then follows from Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 5.3 that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_5})$. In the following, we assume that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) \neq \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_5})$. By Lemma 3.5, we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a hexagon $(A_1A_7A_2A_3A_4A_5)$




FIGURE 7. Identifying edges of strictly convex pentagons I:
 $d(A_3, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4})$

such that $(A_1A_7A_2A_4A_5)$ is a convex pentagon which is strictly convex at A_7 . It then follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$(6) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_1}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})\}.$$

Since $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$, it then follows from Lemma 4.1 that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$. Then (6) is reduced to

$$(7) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_1}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})\}.$$

Let us consider $\overline{A_5A_1}$. There are two subcases: $|\overline{A_5A_1}| > |\overline{A_2A_4}|$ and $|\overline{A_5A_1}| \leq |\overline{A_2A_4}|$.

Subcase 1. $|\overline{A_5A_1}| \leq |\overline{A_2A_4}|$. It follows that \mathcal{C} is not a semisimple cylinder which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_1})$ as a simple boundary component. Therefore, we can admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}|_{(A_1A_2A_4A_5)}$ to a convex pentagon $(A_1A_8A_2A_4A_5)$, (see Figure 8(a)), such that

- $(A_1A_8A_2A_4A_5)$ is strictly convex at A_2 , and
- $\mathcal{J}(A_1A_8A_2A_4A_5) \subset \mathcal{C}$.

Recall that $d(A_5, \overline{A_2A_4}) = d(A_1, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4}) > d(A_3, \overline{A_2A_4})$. Then $\mathcal{J}(\text{int}(A_2A_3A_4)) \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$. Consequently, $\mathcal{J} : (A_1A_8A_2A_3A_4A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is admissible (by Lemma 3.3).

- **Subcase 1a.** $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_1})$. Let Γ be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, and the images of sides of $(A_1A_8A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ by \mathcal{J} . Then by Lemma 5.3, we can also admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}'|_{(A'_1A'_2A'_4A'_5)}$ to a convex pentagon $(A'_1A'_2A'_4A'_5A'_8)$ which is strictly convex at A'_5 . (see Figure 8(b)) such that

- $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_8A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_8A'_4})$, and
- $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_8}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_8}) \in F(\Gamma)$,

where we use the fact that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4A_8})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_2})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_5})$ while disjoint from any other saddle connections in Γ for the

first claim. Together with Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 5.3, this implies that $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5 A'_8) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ is also admissible. Then $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_8 A'_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3})$ are disjoint on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, which contradicts to that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_8 A_4})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

- **Subcase 1b.** $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$. Similarly as in Subcase 1a, we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J}' to a hexagon $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_9 A'_5)$, (see Figure 8(c)), such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_8 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_9 A'_1})$. Then $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_9 A'_1})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3})$ are disjoint on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, which contradicts to that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_8 A_4})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

Consequently, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})$ by (7).

Subcase 2. $|\overline{A_5 A_1}| > |\overline{A_2 A_4}|$. Consider the strip in the direction of $\overline{A_4 A_5}$ which contains A_1, A_4, A_5 in the boundary. It then follows from Lemma 3.4 that $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ can be admissibly extended to a strictly convex hexagon $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_9)$ (see Figure 8(d)). Then $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_9 A_2})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4})$ while disjoint from both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_5})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$. Correspondingly, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_9 A_2})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_4})$ while disjoint from both $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_5})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_4})$. This implies that

$$(8) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})\}.$$

Similarly, by considering $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_9 A_4})$ instead of $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_9 A_2})$, we see that

$$(9) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})\}.$$

There are two more subcases depending on whether $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$ or not.

- **Subcase 2a.** $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$. Then by Proposition 4.3, we see that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}) = F^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})) = F^{-1} \circ (\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_5})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1})$, which contradicts the assumption that $|\overline{A_5 A_1}| > |\overline{A_2 A_4}|$.
- **Subcase 2b.** $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$. Then

$$(10) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1}).$$

Since $|\overline{A_5 A_1}| > |\overline{A_2 A_4}|$, it follows that \mathcal{C} is not a semisimple cylinder which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$ as a simple boundary component. Similarly as in subcase 1a, we can admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}|_{(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)}$ to a hexagon $(A_1 A_{10} A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ such that $(A_1 A_{10} A_2 A_4 A_5)$ is convex and strictly convex at A_1 (see Figure 8(e)). Notice that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{10} A_5})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4})$ while disjoint from $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_5})$. Correspondingly, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{10} A_5})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_4})$ while disjoint from $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_5})$. Therefore, (6) is reduced to

$$(11) \quad F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})\}.$$

Combined with (10), this implies that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})$.




FIGURE 8. Identifying edges of strictly convex pentagons II: $\mathcal{J}(A_1A_2A_4A_5)$ is contained in a cylinder whose boundary contains $\mathcal{J}(A_2A_4)$

Similarly, it can be shown that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$.

(iii). By Lemma 3.5, we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a hexagon

$$(A_1 A_{11} A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$$

such that $(A_1 A_{11} A_2 A_4 A_5)$ is a strictly convex pentagon. The remaining of the proof is similar to that of subcase 1a and subcase 1b in case (ii).

(iv). By interchanging the labels of A_2 and A_4 , A_1 and A_5 , we see that this case is equivalent to the case (iii). □

If $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 , we need to modify Lemma 5.4. In this case, by interchanging the labels A_2 and A_5 , A_3 and A_4 , we see that $\overline{A_1 A_3}$ and $\overline{A_1 A_4}$ are equivalent, $\overline{A_2 A_4}$ and $\overline{A_3 A_5}$ are equivalent. But $\overline{A_1 A_3}$ and $\overline{A_2 A_4}$ are not equivalent in general.

Lemma 5.5 (Pentagon lemma III). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Suppose that $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 .*

- $(\overline{A_2 A_4}$ and $\overline{A_3 A_5})$

(i) *If $d(A_3, \overline{A_2 A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$, then*

$$F(\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4})\}) = \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4})\}.$$

(ii) *If $d(A_5, \overline{A_2 A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$, then*

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_4}).$$

Similar results also hold for $\overline{A_3 A_5}$.

- $(\overline{A_1 A_3}$ and $\overline{A_1 A_4})$

(iii) *If $d(A_2, \overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$, then*

$$F(\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_2}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3})\}) = \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3})\}.$$

(iv) *If $d(A_5, \overline{A_1 A_3}) = d(A_4, \overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$, then*

$$\{F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}), F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_5})\} \subset \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})\}.$$

(v) *If $d(A_5, \overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) > d(A_4, \overline{A_1 A_3})$, then*

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_5}).$$

(vi) *If $d(A_4, \overline{A_1 A_3}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) > d(A_5, \overline{A_1 A_3})$, then*

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4}).$$

Similar results also hold for $\overline{A_1 A_4}$.

Proof. The proofs of cases (i) and (iii) are similar to the proof of case (i) in Lemma 5.4. It remains to consider (ii), (iv), (v), and (vi).

(ii). Notice that $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is strictly convex at A'_2, A'_3, A'_4, A'_5 . If $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is also strictly convex at A'_1 , then it is a strictly convex pentagon. It then follows from the first conclusion of Lemma 5.3 that $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is also a strictly convex pentagon, which contradicts the




FIGURE 9. Identifying edges of non-strictly convex pentagons.

assumption that $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 . Consequently, $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ is not strictly convex at A'_1 .

By Lemma 3.5, we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a hexagon $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_7A_5)$ such that $(A_1A_2A_4A_7A_5)$ is convex and strictly convex at A_2, A_4, A_7, A_5 (see Figure 9(a)). Let Γ_1 be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$, and the images of all sides of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_7A_5)$ by \mathcal{J} . By Lemma 5.3, we see that $F(\Gamma_1)$ contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_1A'_4})$, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$ and all images of sides of $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ by \mathcal{J}' . Notice that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_7})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$ while disjoint from any other saddle connections in Γ_1 . Correspondingly, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_7})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_4})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$ while disjoint from any other saddle connections in $F(\Gamma_1)$. This implies that

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_1}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_7})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$ while disjoint from both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_4})$, it follows that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_7})$ intersects $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$ while disjoint from both $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$. This implies that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4}) \neq \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})$. If $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5A'_1})$, then by Lemma 5.3, we can admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}'|_{(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)}$ to a pentagon $(A'_1A'_2A'_4A'_5A'_7)$ such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_7}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2A'_7})$ (since $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2A_7})$ intersects both $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1A_4})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5A_4})$). This implies that $(A'_1A'_2A'_4A'_5)$ is strictly convex at A'_1 , which contradicts to the

assumption that $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5)$ is also not strictly convex at A'_1 . Consequently, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_4})$.

(iv) If $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1})$, then the claim follows from Proposition 4.3. Otherwise, it follows directly from Lemma 3.5, Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.1.

(v) It follows from Lemma 3.5 that we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a hexagon $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_8)$ such that $(A_1 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_8)$ is a strictly pentagon (see Figure 9(b)). It then follows Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.1 that

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})\}.$$

On the other hand, $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_8})$ intersects $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1})$ while disjoint from $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3})$ and $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})$. Therefore,

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})\}.$$

If $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$, it follows from Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 3.3 that \mathcal{J}' can be admissibly extended to a hexagon $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_8 A'_5)$ such that $(A'_1 A'_3 A'_4 A'_8 A'_5)$ is a strictly convex pentagon. Therefore, $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_8 A'_5)$ is a convex hexagon strictly convex at $A'_2, A'_3, A'_4, A'_8, A'_5$. Let Γ_2 be a triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_5})$ and all images of sides of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_8)$ by \mathcal{J} . Then by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 5.3, $F(\Gamma_2)$ is a triangulation of $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ which contains $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$ and all images of sides of $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_8 A'_5)$ by \mathcal{J}' . Notice that $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_8})$ intersects each of $\{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_3}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})\}$ while disjoint from any other saddle connection in $F(\Gamma_2)$. Therefore, $F^{-1} \circ \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_8})$ intersects each of $\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_4}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_5})\}$ while disjoint from any other saddle connection in Γ_2 . This implies that $(A_1 A_2 A_4 A_5 A_8)$ is strictly convex at A_1 . In particular, $(A_1 A_2 A_4 A_5)$ is strictly convex at A_1 , which contradicts the assumption that $(A_1 A_2 A_4 A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 .

(vi) It follows from Lemma 3.5 that we can admissibly extend \mathcal{J} to a hexagon $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_9 A_4 A_5)$ such that $(A_1 A_3 A_9 A_4 A_5)$ is a strictly convex pentagon. It then follows Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.1 that

$$F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}) \in \{\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5}), \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})\}.$$

Notice that $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_9})$ intersects each of $\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_5}), \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4})$. Therefore, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4})$. Otherwise, $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_9})$ would be disjoint from $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_4})$ or $\mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_5})$. \square

Based on Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.5, we now prove the following.

Lemma 5.6 (Pentagon lemma IV). *Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be as in Lemma 5.3. Then there exist two adjacent sides of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$, say $\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}$ and $\overline{A_k A_{k+1}}$, such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{k-1} A_k}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{k-1} A'_k})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_k A_{k+1}}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_k A'_{k+1}})$. Moreover, if $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 , then k can be chosen to be different from 1.*

Diagonals	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
$\overline{A_2A_4}$	$F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$	$F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_4$	$F(\{\gamma_2, \gamma_3\}) = \{\gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$
$\overline{A_3A_5}$	$F(\gamma_2) = \gamma'_2$	$F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5$	$F(\{\gamma_3, \gamma_4\}) = \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4\}$
$\overline{A_1A_3}$	$F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5$	$F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$	$F(\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}) = \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2\}$
$\overline{A_4A_1}$	$F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$	$F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$	$F(\{\gamma_4, \gamma_5\}) = \{\gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$
$\overline{A_5A_2}$	$F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_4$	$F(\gamma_2) = \gamma'_2$	$F(\{\gamma_1, \gamma_5\}) = \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_5\}$

(a)

Case	Sides Identified	Case	Sides Identified	Case	Sides Identified
(111)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_5$	(112)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$	(113)	γ_1, γ_2
(121)	γ_5, γ_1	(122)	$\gamma_5, \gamma_1, \gamma_3$	(123)	$\gamma_5, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
(131)	γ_5, γ_1	(132)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$	(133)	γ_1, γ_2
(211)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$	(212)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$	(213)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_4$
(221)	γ_4, γ_5	(222)	$\gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$	(223)	γ_4, γ_5
(231)	$\gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$	(232)	γ_3, γ_4	(233)	γ_3, γ_4
(311)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_5$	(312)	γ_2, γ_3	(313)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$
(321)	γ_5	(322)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_5$	(323)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_5$
(331)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$	(332)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$	(333)	$\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$

(b)

TABLE 1. In table (a), we list all three possibilities for each diagonal. In table (b), we list all 27 possibilities for $\overline{A_2A_4}$, $\overline{A_3A_5}$ and $\overline{A_1A_3}$, where the triple (ijk) represents the possibility corresponding to case i for $\overline{A_2A_4}$, case j for $\overline{A_3A_5}$, and case k for $\overline{A_1A_3}$.

Proof. For convenience, let $\gamma_i := \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_iA_{i+1}})$, $\gamma'_i := \mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_iA'_{i+1}})$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, where $A_6 = A_1$ and $A'_6 = A'_1$. γ_i is said to be *identified* if $F(\gamma_i) = \gamma'_i$. The proof will be split into two cases depending on whether $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is strictly convex at A_1 .

Case I: $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is strictly convex at A_1 .

Consider the diagonals $\overline{A_2A_4}$, $\overline{A_3A_5}$ and $\overline{A_1A_3}$. By Lemma 5.4, there are three cases for each diagonal as listed in Table 1(a). Therefore, there are 27 possibilities in total. Let us denote by the triple (ijk) the possibility corresponding to case i for $\overline{A_2A_4}$, case j for $\overline{A_3A_5}$, and case k for $\overline{A_1A_3}$. We list all possibilities in Table 1(b), where γ_i is said to be identified by F if $F(\gamma_i) = \gamma'_i$. (For cases (331), (332) and (333), we have $F(\{\gamma_2, \gamma_3\}) = \{\gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$ and $F(\{\gamma_3, \gamma_4\}) = \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4\}$. To show that all of $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$ are identified, it suffices to show that γ_3 is identified. Suppose to the contrary that γ_3 is not identified, then $F(\gamma_2) = F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_3$. Therefore $\gamma_2 = \gamma_4$. It then

follows from Proposition 4.3 that $\mathcal{J}'(A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ is a simple cylinder which contains γ'_3 as an interior saddle connection, which contradicts the fact that $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ is an admissible strictly convex pentagon.)

We see that for each possibility $(ijk) \neq (321)$, there exists some m such that $F(\gamma_m) = \gamma'_m$ and $F(\gamma_{m+1}) = \gamma'_{m+1}$, where $\gamma_6 = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma'_6 = \gamma'_1$. To finish the proof of this case, it remains to consider the possibility (321). Notice that in this possibility, we have

$$(12) \quad F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5, F(\{\gamma_2, \gamma_3\}) = \{\gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}.$$

Let us consider one more diagonal $\overline{A_1A_4}$. There are three subcases.

- If $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$, then by Equation (12), we also have $F(\gamma_2) = \gamma'_2$. The proof completes.
- If $F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$, the proof completes.
- If $F(\{\gamma_4, \gamma_5\}) = \{\gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$, then by Equation (12), we also have $F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_4$. The proof completes.

Diagonals	Case 1	Case 2
A_2A_4	$F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_4$	$F(\{\gamma_2, \gamma_3\}) = \{\gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$
A_3A_5	$F(\gamma_2) = \gamma'_2$	$F(\{\gamma_3, \gamma_4\}) = \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4\}$

(a)

Case	Sides Identified	Case	Sides Identified
(11)	γ_2, γ_4	(12)	γ_3, γ_4
(21)	γ_2, γ_3	(22)	$\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$

(b)

TABLE 2. In table (a), we list all possibilities for diagonals $\overline{A_2A_4}$ and $\overline{A_3A_5}$. In table (b), we list all four possibilities for the combination of $\overline{A_2A_4}$, $\overline{A_3A_5}$, where the pair (ij) represents the possibility corresponding to case i for $\overline{A_2A_4}$ and case j for $\overline{A_3A_5}$.

Case II: $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$ is not strictly convex at A_1 .

In this case, for each diagonal, there are two or four cases by Lemma 5.5 (see Table 2(a)) Consider the diagonals $\overline{A_2A_4}$ and $\overline{A_3A_5}$. There are 4 possibilities in total. Let us denote by the triple (ij) the possibility corresponding to case i for $\overline{A_2A_4}$ and case j for $\overline{A_3A_5}$. We list all possibilities in Table 2(c). For case (22), we have $F(\{\gamma_2, \gamma_3\}) = \{\gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$ and $F(\{\gamma_3, \gamma_4\}) = \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4\}$. To show that all of $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$ are identified, it suffices to show that γ_3 is identified. Suppose to the contrary that γ_3 is not identified, then $F(\gamma_2) = F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_3$. Hence $d(A_5, \overline{A_2A_4}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_2A_4})$. It

then follows from the second statement of Lemma 5.5 that γ_4 is identified. This is a contradiction which proves that all of $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4$ are identified.

We see that for each possibility $(ij) \neq (11)$, there exists some m such that $F(\gamma_m) = \gamma'_m$ and $F(\gamma_{m+1}) = \gamma'_{m+1}$, where $\gamma_6 = \gamma_1$ and $\gamma'_6 = \gamma'_1$. To finish the proof of this case, it remains to consider the possibility (11). Notice that in this possibility, we have

$$(13) \quad F(\gamma_2) = \gamma'_2, F(\gamma_4) = \gamma'_4.$$

Let us consider the diagonal $\overline{A_1A_3}$. By Lemma 5.5, there are four cases.

- (C1) $F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5$;
- (C2) $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$;
- (C3) $F(\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}) = \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2\}$;
- (C4) $\{F(\gamma_3), F(\gamma_5)\} \subset \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$, $\overline{A_1A_3}$ and $\overline{A_4A_5}$ are parallel.

If $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$ or $F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5$, then the proof completes. If $F(\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}) = \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2\}$, then by Equation (13), it follows that $F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$. The proof also completes. If $\{F(\gamma_3), F(\gamma_5)\} \subset \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$, together with (13), this reduces to

$$\{F(\gamma_3), F(\gamma_5)\} = \{\gamma'_3, \gamma'_5\}.$$

If $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$ and $F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_5$, then the proof completes. It remains to consider the case

$$(14) \quad F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_5, F(\gamma_5) = \gamma'_3.$$

Similarly, let us consider the diagonal $\overline{A_1A_4}$. By Lemma 5.5, there are four more possibilities.

- (C5) $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$;
- (C6) $F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$;
- (C7) $F(\{\gamma_4, \gamma_5\}) = \{\gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$;
- (C8) $\{F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_3)\} \subset \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$, $\overline{A_1A_4}$ and $\overline{A_2A_3}$ are parallel.

If $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$, $F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$, or $F(\{\gamma_4, \gamma_5\}) = \{\gamma'_4, \gamma'_5\}$, then the proof completes as discussed above. If $\{F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_3)\} \subset \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \gamma'_3\}$, together with (13), this reduces to

$$\{F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_3)\} = \{\gamma'_1, \gamma'_3\}.$$

If $F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_3$ and $F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_1$, the proof completes. It remains to consider the case

$$(15) \quad F(\gamma_1) = \gamma'_3, F(\gamma_3) = \gamma'_1.$$

Next, let us consider the case where both (C4) and (C8) hold. In this case, we have $\gamma_5 = F^{-1}(\gamma'_3) = \gamma_1$. Recall that $\overline{A_1A_3}$ and $\overline{A_4A_5}$ are parallel for (C4), and that $\overline{A_1A_4}$ and $\overline{A_2A_3}$ are parallel for (C8). Then

$$d(A_2, \overline{A_1A_3}) = d(A_5, \overline{A_1A_3}) = \mathcal{D}(\overline{A_1A_3}),$$

which reduces this case to case (C3). The proof completes. \square




FIGURE 10. Caption to Figure 10: Identifying edges of strictly convex quadrilaterals.

5.1. Quadrilaterals. A direct consequence of Lemma 5.6 is that we can improve Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $J : (A_1A_2A_3A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $J' : (A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be two admissible maps, where $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ and $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4)$ are strictly convex quadrilaterals. Suppose that*

- $F \circ J(\overline{A_1A_3}) = J'(\overline{A'_1A'_3})$, $F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_4}) = J'(\overline{A'_2A'_4})$,
- $F \circ J(\overline{A_1A_2}) = J'(\overline{A'_1A'_2})$, $F \circ J(\overline{A_1A_4}) = J'(\overline{A'_1A'_4})$,
- $F \circ J(\overline{A_3A_4}) = J'(\overline{A'_3A'_4})$.

Then $F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_3}) = J'(\overline{A'_2A'_3})$.

Proof. If the image of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ by J is a simple cylinder, then the lemma follows from Proposition 4.3. In the following, we assume that the image of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ by J is not a simple cylinder. In particular, $J(\overline{A_1A_2}) \neq J(\overline{A_3A_4})$ and $J(\overline{A_1A_4}) \neq J(\overline{A_2A_3})$.

Let θ_i be the interior angle of $(A_1A_2A_3A_4)$ at A_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. If $\theta_2 + \theta_3 \leq \pi$, it then follows from Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 4.2 that $F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_3}) = J'(\overline{A'_{i-1}A'_i})$ for some $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, where $A'_0 = A'_4$. Since $J(\overline{A_1A_4}) \neq J(\overline{A_2A_3})$, it follows that $F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_3}) \neq J'(\overline{A'_1A'_4})$. It then follows from Lemma 4.1 that $F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_3}) = J'(\overline{A'_2A'_3})$.

Suppose that $\theta_2 + \theta_3 > \pi$. Consider the algorithm below.

Since $\theta_2 + \theta_3 > \pi$, then $\theta_1 + \theta_4 < \pi$. By Lemma 3.4, we can admissibly extend J to a strictly convex pentagon $(A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5)$. It then follows from Lemma 5.3 that we can also admissibly extend J' to a strictly convex pentagon $(A'_1A'_2A'_3A'_4A'_5)$ such that

$$F \circ J(\overline{A_2A_5}) = J'(\overline{A'_2A'_5}), \quad F \circ J(\overline{A_3A_5}) = J'(\overline{A'_3A'_5}).$$

By Lemma 5.6, there exists

$$\overline{A_m A_n} \in \{\overline{A_1 A_5}, \overline{A_4 A_5}, \overline{A_2 A_3}\}$$

such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_m A_n}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_m A'_n})$.

- If $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3})$. The algorithm terminates.
- Otherwise, we may assume that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_5})$.
Let us relabel the quadrilaterals $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_5)$ and $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_5)$ by setting $A_{11} = A_1, A_{21} = A_2, A_{31} = A_3, A_{41} = A_5$ and $A'_{11} = A'_1, A'_{21} = A'_2, A'_{31} = A'_3, A'_{41} = A'_5$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{21} A_{31}}) &= \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}), & \mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_{21} A'_{31}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3}) \\ F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{11} A_{31}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{11} A'_{31}}), & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{21} A_{41}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{21} A'_{41}}), \\ F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{11} A_{21}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{11} A'_{21}}), & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{11} A_{41}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{11} A'_{41}}), \\ & & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{31} A_{41}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{31} A'_{41}}). \end{aligned}$$

Let θ_{21} and θ_{31} be respectively the interior angles of $(A_{11} A_{21} A_{31} A_{41})$ at A_{21} and A_{31} . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \theta_{21} &\leq \theta_2, & 0 < \theta_{31} &< \theta_3 \\ 0 < \theta_{21} + \theta_{31} &< \theta_2 + \theta_3 &< 2\pi. \end{aligned}$$

If $\theta_{21} + \theta_{31} \leq \pi$, the algorithm terminates. Otherwise, we repeat the construction above for $(A_{11} A_{21} A_{31} A_{41})$.

We now show that the algorithm will terminate after finitely many steps. Suppose to the contrary that the algorithm will never stop. Then in each step, we construct two admissible maps $\mathcal{J} : (A_{1i} A_{2i} A_{3i} A_{4i}) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_{1i} A'_{2i} A'_{3i} A'_{4i}) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{2i} A_{3i}}) &= \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3}), & \mathcal{J}(\overline{A'_{2i} A'_{3i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3}) \\ F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{1i} A_{3i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{1i} A'_{3i}}), & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{2i} A_{4i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{2i} A'_{4i}}), \\ F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{1i} A_{2i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{1i} A'_{2i}}), & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{1i} A_{4i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{1i} A'_{4i}}), \\ & & F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{3i} A_{4i}}) &= \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_{3i} A'_{4i}}). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (16) \quad 0 < \theta_{2,i+1} &\leq \theta_{2i} \leq \theta_2, & 0 < \theta_{3,i+1} &\leq \theta_{3i} \leq \theta_2 \\ (17) \quad \pi < \theta_{2,i+1} + \theta_{3,i+1} &< \theta_{2i} + \theta_{3i} &< 2\pi, \end{aligned}$$

where for the third inequality, we use the observation that either $\theta_{2,i+1} < \theta_{2i}$ or $\theta_{3,i+1} < \theta_{3i}$ for each $i \geq 1$. Consequently, either $\{\theta_{2i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ or $\{\theta_{3i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ has a strictly decreasing subsequence, say $\{\theta_{2i}\}_{i \geq 1}$. For convenience, we also denote by $\{\theta_{2i}\}_{i \geq 1}$ the decreasing subsequence. In particular, the corresponding saddle connections $\{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_{1i} A_{2i}})\}_{i \geq 1}$ are pairwise different. On the other hand, it follows from (16) and (17) that

$$(18) \quad \pi - \theta_3 < \theta_{2i} \leq \theta_2, \quad \pi - \theta_2 < \theta_{3i} \leq \theta_3.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{J}(|\overline{A_1 A_2}|) = |\overline{A_1 A_2}| = \frac{2\mathbf{Area}(A_{1i}A_{2i}A_{3i})}{|\overline{A_{2i}A_{3i}}| \sin \theta_{2i}} \leq \frac{2\mathbf{Area}(X, \omega; \Sigma)}{|\overline{A_2 A_3}| \min\{\sin \theta_2, \sin \theta_3\}} := \mathbf{L}.$$

Recall that there are finitely many saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ with length at most \mathbf{L} . This is a contradiction which proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. By Lemma 5.3, there exists an admissible map

$$\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4 A'_5) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$$

such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_j}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_i A'_j})$ for all diagonals $\overline{A_i A_j}$. By Lemma 5.6, we may assume that $F \circ \overline{(A_1 A_2)} = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_1 A'_2})$ and $F \circ \overline{(A_2 A_3)} = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_2 A'_3})$. Consider the quadrilateral $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$, it follows from Lemma 5.7 that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_3 A_4}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_3 A'_4})$. Similarly, by considering $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_5)$ and $(A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5)$, we see that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_4 A_5}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_4 A'_5})$ and $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_5 A_1}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_5 A'_1})$. \square

6. HOMEOMORPHISM

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Every isomorphism $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ is induced by a homeomorphism $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, such that*

- (i) $f(\Sigma) = \Sigma'$, and
- (ii) for any saddle connection γ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, $f(\gamma)$ is isotopic to $F(\gamma)$.

Moreover, if $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, then such a homeomorphism is unique up to isotopy. If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point, then there are two such homeomorphisms up to isotopy.

6.1. Triangulation graphs.

Definition 9. Two triangulations Γ_1 and Γ_2 of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ differ by an *elementary move* if

- there exist $\beta_1 \in \Gamma_1$ and $\beta_2 \in \Gamma_2$ such that $\Gamma_1 \setminus \beta_1 = \Gamma_2 \setminus \beta_2$, and
- there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4 \in \Gamma_1 \setminus \{\beta_1\} = \Gamma_2 \setminus \{\beta_2\}$ such that they bound a strictly convex quadrilateral on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ which contains β_1, β_2 as diagonals.

Definition 10. The *triangulation graph* of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, denoted by $\mathcal{T}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, is a graph whose vertices are triangulations of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, and whose edges are pairs of triangulations which differ by an elementary move.

Proposition 6.2 ([2, 10, 19, 23]). *For any half-translation surface with marked points $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, the triangulation graph $\mathcal{T}(X, \omega)$ is connected.*

Remark 6. The above proposition holds for general flat surfaces (simplicial surfaces) (see [2, Proposition 11,12],[10, Theorem 1],[23, Theorem 1.5]). Nguyen ([19, Theorem 6.2]) provides an elementary proof for the case of half-translation surfaces.

6.2. Orientation consistency. By Theorem 5.1, we know that if the saddle connections $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$ bound a triangle Δ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, their images $F(\gamma_1), F(\gamma_2), F(\gamma_3)$ also bound a triangle on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, which is denoted by Δ' . This correspondence induces an affine homeomorphism between Δ and Δ' , which is called the *F-induced affine homeomorphism* and denoted by f_Δ . Our goal is to “glue” these *F*-induced affine homeomorphisms between triangles according to some triangulation of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ to obtain a globally well defined homeomorphism from $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ to $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. To do this, we need to clarify the orientation consistency among affine homeomorphisms between triangles.

Definition 11. Two triangles Δ_1 and Δ_2 on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ are called *coconvex* if there exists an admissible map $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ such that

- $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ is strictly convex at each vertex;
- both Δ_1 and Δ_2 are contained in the image of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ by \mathcal{J} .

Lemma 6.3. *Let Δ and $\hat{\Delta}$ be two coconvex triangles on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Suppose that the *F*-induced affine homeomorphism for Δ is orientation preserving. Then the *F*-induced affine homeomorphism for $\hat{\Delta}$ is also orientation preserving.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be an admissible map whose image contains both Δ and $\hat{\Delta}$. In particular, $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ is strictly convex at each vertex. Suppose that $\mathcal{J}(A_1 A_2 A_4) = \Delta$. By Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 5.1 there exists an admissible map $\mathcal{J}' : (A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, where $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4)$ is a strictly convex quadrilateral, such that $F \circ \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_i A_j}) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{A'_i A'_j})$ for all $i \neq j$. Suppose that the vertices of $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ are labeled in the counterclockwise order. Then the vertices of $(A_1 A_2 A_4)$ is also labeled in the counterclockwise order. Since the *F*-induced affine homeomorphism on $\mathcal{J}(A_1 A_2 A_4)$ is orientation preserving, we see that the vertices of $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_4)$ is also labeled in the counterclockwise order. Therefore, the vertices of $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_3 A'_4)$ are labeled in the counterclockwise order. (Otherwise, the vertices of $(A'_1 A'_2 A'_4)$ would be labeled in the clockwise order.) As a consequence, the *F*-induced affine homeomorphism on the image of any triangle in $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ is also orientation preserving. In particular, the *F*-induced affine homeomorphism for $\hat{\Delta}$ is also orientation preserving. \square

Lemma 6.4. *For any two triangles Δ_1 and Δ_2 on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, there exists a sequence of triangles $\Delta_0 = \Delta, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_{m+1} = \Delta_2$ such that Δ_k and Δ_{k+1} are coconvex for each $0 \leq k \leq m$.*

Proof. Notice that each triangle is a connected component of $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma$ for some triangulation Γ . To prove the lemma, by Proposition 6.2, it suffices to consider the case that

$$\Delta_1 \subset (X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma_1, \quad \Delta_2 \subset (X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma_2,$$

where Γ_1 and Γ_2 are two triangulations differing by an elementary move.

By definition, there exists an admissible map $\mathcal{J} : (A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$, where $(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4)$ is a strictly convex quadrilateral, such that

$$\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3}) \in \Gamma_1, \quad \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4}) \in \Gamma_2, \quad \Gamma_1 \setminus \{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_1 A_3})\} = \Gamma_2 \setminus \{\mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_4})\}.$$

Let $\hat{\Delta}_1 = \mathcal{J}(A_1 A_2 A_3)$ and $\hat{\Delta}_2 = \mathcal{J}(\overline{A_2 A_3 A_4})$. Then $\hat{\Delta}_1$ and $\hat{\Delta}_2$ are coconvex.

Consider the triangles in $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma_1$ and $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma_2$. There exist triangles $\tilde{\Delta}_{1,j}$ ($0 \leq j \leq m_1$) and $\tilde{\Delta}_{2,j}$ ($0 \leq j \leq m_2$), such that

- $\tilde{\Delta}_{1,0} = \Delta_1, \tilde{\Delta}_{1,m_1} = \hat{\Delta}_1, \tilde{\Delta}_{2,0} = \hat{\Delta}_2, \tilde{\Delta}_{2,m_2} = \Delta_2;$
- $\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1} \subset (X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \Gamma_i, \forall i = 1, 2, \forall 0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1;$
- $\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1}$ share a common boundary, $\forall i = 1, 2, \forall 0 \leq j \leq m_i - 1.$

Next, consider the pair $(\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1})$. By Lemma 3.8, there exists a sequence of triangles $\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,0} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,1}, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,n_{ij}} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1}$, such that each pair of adjacent triangles are coconvex.

Now, let us replace each pair $(\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1})$ by the sequence $\tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,0} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j}, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,1}, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j,n_{ij}} = \tilde{\Delta}_{i,j+1}$. Then for the new sequence which starts at Δ_1 and ends at Δ_2 , any adjacent pair of triangles are coconvex. □

Combining Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be an isomorphism. Then either*

- (i) *for every triangle on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, the induced affine homeomorphism between triangles is orientation preserving, or*
- (ii) *for every triangle on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, the induced affine homeomorphism between triangles is orientation reversing.*

Corollary 6.6. *Let $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be an isomorphism. Then any triangulation Γ of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ induces a homeomorphism f_Γ between $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ and $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, such that*

- (1) $f_\Gamma(\Sigma) = \Sigma'$, and
- (2) for any saddle connection $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $f_\Gamma(\gamma) = F(\gamma)$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 5.1 and Proposition 6.5. □

The homeomorphism f_Γ obtained in Corollary 6.6 is called the F -induced homeomorphism with respect to Γ . In the following, we prove that the isotopy class of f_Γ relative to Σ and Σ' is independent of the choices of triangulations.

Proposition 6.7. *Let $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be an isomorphism. For any two triangulations Γ_1 and Γ_2 , the F -induced homeomorphisms f_{Γ_1} and f_{Γ_2} are isotopic.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.2, it suffices to prove it for the case that Γ_1 and Γ_2 differ by an elementary move. Let $\Gamma_1 = \{\alpha_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ and

$\Gamma_2 = \{\beta_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ such that $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$ bound a strictly convex quadrilateral Q on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ whose diagonals are α_1, β_1 . Correspondingly, $F(\gamma_2), F(\gamma_3), F(\gamma_4), F(\gamma_5)$ bound a strictly convex quadrilateral Q' on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ whose diagonals are $F(\alpha_1), F(\beta_1)$. By construction, $f_{\Gamma_1}|_{X_1 \setminus Q} = f_{\Gamma_2}|_{X_1 \setminus Q}$. Notice that α_1 and β_1 divide Q into four triangles. Let f_Q be the piecewisely affine map from Q to Q' whose restriction to each of these four triangles is affine. Let $f_{12} : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be a homeomorphism such that $f_{12}|_{X_1 \setminus Q} = f_{\Gamma_1}|_{X_1 \setminus Q} = f_{\Gamma_2}|_{X_1 \setminus Q}$ and $f_{12}|_Q = f_Q$. Then both f_{Γ_1} and f_{Γ_2} are isotopic to f_{12} . Therefore, f_{Γ_1} and f_{Γ_2} are isotopic. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1. If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, they every triple of saddle connections bound at most one triangle. Then the theorem follows from Corollary 6.6 and Proposition 6.7.

If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point. Then every triangulation Γ consists of three saddle connections, which bound two triangles on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Therefore, the F -induced homeomorphisms with respect to Γ has two choices, which results in two isotopy classes of homeomorphisms satisfying the condition in the theorem. \square

7. AFFINE HOMEOMORPHISM

Our goal in this section is to prove the following proposition, which is the last piece for proving the main theorem.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ be a homeomorphism which induces an isomorphism $f_* : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. Then f is isotopic to an affine homeomorphism.*

Proof. Recall that a simple closed curve on a half-translation surface with marked points is called a cylinder curve if it is isotopic (relative to marked points) to the core curve of some cylinder.

By Theorem 2.3, it suffices to prove that for each simple closed curve α , α is a cylinder curve on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ if and only if $f(\alpha)$ is a cylinder curve on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. Since f_* is an isomorphism, it suffices to prove that if α is a cylinder curve on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, then $f(\alpha)$ is a cylinder curve on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.

Let \mathcal{C} be an cylinder on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ with core curve α . Let

$$\mathcal{J} : (Q_1 Q_2 \cdots Q_n Q_{n+1} \cdots Q_m) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$$

be an admissible map such that

- $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_n Q_{n+1}}) = \mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_m Q_1})$ is an interior saddle connection of \mathcal{C} ;
- $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_i Q_{i+1}})$ is a boundary saddle connection for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $n+1 \leq i \leq m-1$.

If \mathcal{C} is a simple cylinder, it then follows from Proposition 4.3 that $f(\alpha)$ is a cylinder curve on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$.

If \mathcal{C} is not a simple cylinder, consider a triangulation of

$$(Q_1 Q_2 \cdots Q_n Q_{n+1} \cdots Q_m).$$

By Theorem 5.1, there exists an admissible map

$$\mathcal{J}' : (Q'_1 Q'_2 \cdots Q'_n Q'_{n+1} \cdots Q'_m) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$$

such that $f_*(\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_i Q_j})) = \mathcal{J}'(\overline{Q'_i Q'_j})$ for all sides and diagonals $\overline{Q_i Q_j}$.

To show that $f(\alpha)$ is a cylinder curve on $(X', \omega'; \Sigma')$, it is equivalent to show that $\overline{Q'_i Q'_{i+1}}$ and $\overline{Q'_j Q'_{j+1}}$ are parallel for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $n+1 \leq j \leq m-1$.

Consider the quadrilateral $(Q'_1 Q'_2 Q'_{n+1} Q'_{n+2})$. Let $\theta'_1, \theta'_2, \theta'_{n+1}, \theta'_{n+2}$ be the interior angles at Q'_1, Q'_2, Q'_{n+1} and Q'_{n+2} respectively. If $\overline{Q'_1 Q'_2}$ and $\overline{Q'_{n+1} Q'_{n+2}}$ are not parallel, then either $\theta'_2 + \theta'_{n+1} > \pi$ or $\theta'_{n+2} + \theta'_1 > \pi$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\theta'_2 + \theta'_{n+1} > \pi$. It then follows from Lemma 3.4 that we can admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}'|_{(Q'_1 Q'_2 Q'_{n+1} Q'_{n+2})}$ to a strictly convex pentagon $(Q'_1 Q'_2 Q'_{n+1} Q'_{n+2} B')$. Correspondingly, by Theorem 5.2, we can also admissibly extend $\mathcal{J}|_{(Q_1 Q_2 Q_{n+1} Q_{n+2})}$ to a strictly convex pentagon $(Q_1 Q_2 Q_{n+1} Q_{n+2} B)$, which contradicts to the assumption that $\mathcal{J}(Q_1 Q_2 Q_{n+1} Q_{n+2})$ is contained in the cylinder \mathcal{C} whose boundary is parallel to $\mathcal{J}(\overline{Q_1 Q_2})$. Therefore, $\overline{Q'_1 Q'_2}$ and $\overline{Q'_{n+1} Q'_{n+2}}$ are parallel. Similarly, we can show that $\overline{Q'_i Q'_{i+1}}$ and $\overline{Q'_j Q'_{j+1}}$ are parallel for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $n+1 \leq j \leq m-1$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 6.1, there exists a homeomorphism $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$ such that for any saddle connection γ on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, $f(\gamma)$ is isotopic to $F(\gamma)$. It then follows from Proposition 7.1 that f is isotopic to an affine homeomorphism $\tilde{f} : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X', \omega'; \Sigma')$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma))$ be the automorphism group of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Let $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be the group of affine self-homeomorphisms of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Since each affine self-homeomorphism of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ induces an automorphism of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$, there exists a natural group homomorphism

$$\mathbb{F} : \text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)).$$

By Theorem 1.1, \mathbb{F} is surjective. Moreover, it follows from Theorem 6.1 that if $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point, then \mathbb{F} is two-to-one. Otherwise, \mathbb{F} is injective. □

8. QUOTIENT GRAPH

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. Recall that for two vectors $\vec{a} = (x_1, y_1)$ and $\vec{b} = (x_2, y_2)$ on \mathbb{R}^2 , $\vec{a} \wedge \vec{b} := x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1$. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 8.1. *If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a translation surface which is not a torus with one marked point, then there are saddle connections $\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots$, such that β_i is disjoint from α for all $i \geq 1$, and that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\int_\alpha \omega \wedge \int_{\beta_i} \omega| = \infty$.*




FIGURE 11. The red region represents a simple cylinder determined by γ_1^\pm and the saddle connection connecting the left endpoints of γ_1^\pm .

Proof. It follows from [16, Theorem 2] that $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has infinitely many cylinders.

First, we claim that there exists a cylinder C_0 such that the closure is a proper subset of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Indeed, let $C \subset (X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a cylinder. Without loss generality, we may assume that C is horizontal. If $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \neq \overline{C}$, the claim follows. If $(X, \omega; \Sigma) = \overline{C}$, then for every saddle connection δ^+ in the upper boundary component of C , there is a corresponding saddle connection δ^- in the lower boundary component, such that $\int_{\gamma^+} \omega = \int_{\gamma^-} \omega$ (see Figure 11). Let (γ_1^+, γ_1^-) be such a pair, they determine a simple cylinder C_1 as illustrated in Figure 11. By assumption, $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, each boundary component of C contains at least two saddle connections. In particular, $\overline{C_1}$ is a proper subset of $\overline{C} = (X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

Next, let α be a non-horizontal saddle connection on $(X, \omega; \Sigma) \setminus \overline{C_0}$, let $\{\beta_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a sequence of interior saddle connections of C_0 . Then β_i is disjoint from α for all $i \geq 1$, and that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} |\int_{\alpha} \omega \wedge \int_{\beta_i} \omega| = \infty$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. (i) Notice that every edge in the saddle connection graph is represented by a pair of disjoint saddle connections.

If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a torus with one marked point, the group $\text{Aff}^+(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ of orientation-preserving affine homeomorphisms of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, and the set of pairs of disjoint saddle connections has one $\text{Aff}^+(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ -orbit. In particular, $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has one vertex and one edge.

If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is not a torus with one marked point, let $\{\alpha_1, \beta_1\}, \{\alpha_2, \beta_2\}$ be two pairs of non-parallel, disjoint saddle connections on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. They represent two edges e_1, e_2 of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. Suppose that there is an automorphism F of $\mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ such that $F(e_1) = e_2$. By Theorem 1.1, there is an affine homeomorphism f of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ such that $f(\{\alpha_1, \beta_1\}) = \{\alpha_2, \beta_2\}$. Therefore, $|\int_{\alpha_1} \omega \wedge \int_{\beta_1} \omega| = |\int_{\alpha_2} \omega \wedge \int_{\beta_2} \omega| \neq 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 8.1, the set

$$\left\{ \left| \int_{\alpha} \omega \wedge \int_{\beta} \omega \right| : \alpha, \beta \text{ are disjoint saddle connections} \right\}$$

is an infinite set. As a consequence, $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has infinitely many edges.

(ii) If $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is Veech surface, it follows from [24, Theorem 6.8] (see also [22, Theorem 1.3]) that the set of triangles on $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finitely many $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ -orbits, where $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is the group of affine homeomorphisms of $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. This implies that the set of saddle connections has finitely many $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ -orbits, since each saddle connection is contained in at least one triangle. In particular, $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finitely many vertices. \square

9. QUESTIONS

In this section, we propose two questions. The first question concerns Theorem 1.3.

Question 1. (i) Characterize those half-translation surfaces whose quotient graph have finitely many edges. (ii) Is it true that the quotient graph has finitely many vertices if and only if the underlying half-translation surface is a Veech surface?

Remark 7. Let $\mathbb{T}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be the spine tree defined by Smillie-Weiss (see [22, §4] for the definition). Suppose that $\mathcal{G}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finite vertices. Then the set of directions of saddle connections has finite $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ -orbits, which implies that the set of components of $\mathbb{H}^2 \setminus \mathbb{T}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finite $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ -orbits. To prove that $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is a Veech surface, it suffices to prove that every component of $\mathbb{H}^2 \setminus \mathbb{T}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ has finite quotient area by $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$. This is equivalent to show that every saddle connection has non-trivial stabilizers in $\text{Aff}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$.

Irmak-McCarthy ([13]) proved that every injective simplicial map from an arc graph to itself is induced by some self-homeomorphism of the underlying surface (see also [1, 11, 12]). We may ask a similar question for the saddle connection graph.

Question 2. Let $(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ be a half-translation surface with marked points. Is it true that every injective simplicial map $F : \mathcal{S}(X, \omega, \Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(X, \omega; \Sigma)$ is induced by some affine homeomorphism $f : (X, \omega; \Sigma) \rightarrow (X, \omega; \Sigma)$?

REFERENCES

- [1] Aramayona J., Simplicial embeddings between pants graphs, *Geom. Dedicata* 144 (2010), 115-128.
- [2] Bobenko A. I. and B. A. Springborn, A discrete Laplace-Beltrami operator for simplicial surfaces, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 38:4 (2007), 740-756.
- [3] Disarlo V., Randecker A. and R. Tang, Rigidity of the saddle connection complex, arXiv:1810.00961.
- [4] Duchin M., Leininger C. and K. Rafi, Length spectra and degeneration of flat metrics, *Invent math.* 182(2010), 231-277.
- [5] Harer J. L., Stability of the homology of the mapping class groups of orientable surfaces. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 121 (1985), no. 2, 215-249.
- [6] Harer J. L., The virtual cohomological dimension of the mapping class group of an orientable surface. *Invent. Math.* 84 (1986), no. 1, 157-176.

- [7] Hensel S., Przytycki P. and R. C. H. Webb, 1-slim triangles and uniform hyperbolicity for arc graphs and curve graphs. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 17 (2015), no. 4, 755–762.
- [8] Hilion A. and C. Horbez, The hyperbolicity of the sphere complex via surgery paths. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 730 (2017), 135–161.
- [9] Hubert P. and T. A. Schmidt, An introduction to Veech surfaces. *Handbook of dynamical systems*. Vol. 1B, 501–526, Elsevier B. V., Amsterdam, 2006.
- [10] Indermitte C., Th. M. Liebling, M. Troyanov, and H. Clemenon, Voronoi diagrams on piecewise flat surfaces and an application to biological growth. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 263, 263–274 (2001).
- [11] Irmak E., Injective Simplicial Maps of the Arc Complex on Nonorientable Surfaces, *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 9 (2009) 2055–2077.
- [12] Irmak E., Injective Simplicial Maps of the Complexes of Curves of Nonorientable Surfaces, *Topology Appl.* 153 (2006), no. 8, 1309–1340.
- [13] Irmak E. and J. D. McCarthy, Injective Simplicial Maps of the Arc Complex, *Turkish J. Math.* 34 (2010), no. 3, 339–354.
- [14] Kerckhoff S., Masur H. and J. Smillie, Ergodicity of Billiard Flows and Quadratic Differentials, *Ann. of Math.*, Vol. 124, No. 2 (1986), pp. 293–311.
- [15] Masur H. and Y. Minsky, Geometry of the complex of curves I: Hyperbolicity, *Invent. math.* 138, 103–149 (1999).
- [16] Masur H., Closed trajectories for quadratic differentials with an application to billiards. *Duke Math. J.* 53 (1986), no. 2, 307–314.
- [17] Masur H. and S. Schleimer, The geometry of the disk complex. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 26 (2013), no. 1, 1–62.
- [18] Minsky Y. and S. J. Taylor, Fibered faces, veering triangulations, and the arc complex. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 27 (2017), no. 6, 1450–1496.
- [19] Nguyen D.-M., Triangulations and volume form on moduli space of flat surfaces, *Geom. Funct. Anal.* Vol. 20 (2010) 192–228.
- [20] Nguyen D.-M., Translation surfaces and the curve graph in genus two. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 17 (2017), no. 4, 2177–2237.
- [21] Nguyen D.-M., Veech dichotomy and tessellations of the hyperbolic plane, preprint, arXiv:1808.09329.
- [22] Smillie J. and B. Weiss, Characterizations of lattice surfaces. *Invent. Math.* 180 (2010), no. 3, 535–557.
- [23] Tahar G., Geometric triangulations and flip, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 357 (2019), no. 7, 620–623.
- [24] Vorobets Y. B., Plane structures and billiards in rational polygons: the Veech alternative. (Russian) *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 51 (1996), no. 5(311), 3–42; translation in *Russian Math. Surveys* 51 (1996), no. 5, 779–817.

HUIPING PAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, JINAN UNIVERSITY, 510632, GUANGZHOU, CHINA

E-mail address: panhp@jnu.edu.cn