

Nonsimple closed geodesics with given intersection number on hyperbolic surfaces

Wujie Shen

shenwj22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Yau Mathematical Sciences Center, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P.R. China

May 2, 2023

Abstract

The minimal length of closed geodesics among all finite-type hyperbolic surfaces with self-intersection number k is $2 \cosh^{-1}(1 + 2k)$ for k sufficiently large, i.e. $k > 10^{13350}$ by [11]. In the present paper we will give another proof independent of [11], and improve the lower bound $k > 10^{13350}$ to $k > 1750$.

1 Introduction

The study of nonsimple closed geodesics on hyperbolic surfaces plays an essential role on 2-dimensional hyperbolic geometry, spectral theory and Teichmüller theory. One interesting question is, a non-simple closed geodesic on a hyperbolic surface with self-intersection number k (called a k -geodesic for brevity), when k goes to infinity, does the minimal length of k -geodesics goes to infinity, and what is the growth rate.

There has been lots of works on the problem till now. Hempel showed in [7] that a nonsimple closed geodesic has a universal lower bound $2 \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$ and Yamada showed in [9] that $2 \cosh^{-1}(3) = 4 \log(1 + \sqrt{2})$ is the best possible lower bound and is attained on a pair of pants with ideal punctures. Basmajian showed in [3] that a nonsimple closed geodesic has a similar *stable neighborhood*, and the length of a closed geodesic gets arbitrarily large as its self-intersection number gets large ([3, Corollary 1.2]). In [2], Baribaud computed the minimal length of geodesics with given self-intersection number on pairs of pants.

It is interesting to study the minimal length of non-simple closed geodesics with respect to its self-intersection number k . Let ω be a closed geodesic or a geodesic segment on a hyperbolic surface. Denote its length by $\ell(\omega)$ and its self-intersection number by $|\omega \cap \omega|$. $|\omega \cap \omega|$ counts the intersection points of ω with multiplicity that an intersection point with n preimages contribute $\binom{n}{2}$ to $|\omega \cap \omega|$.

On a fixed hyperbolic surface, Basmajian showed in [4] that a k -geodesic on a closed hyperbolic surface has length no less than $C\sqrt{k}$, where C is a constant depending only on the hyperbolic surface. When k sufficiently large (depending on the surface) Hanh Vo computed the minimal length of k -geodesics in a fixed hyperbolic surface with at least one cusp in [12].

Define $I(k, X)$ is the self-intersection number of the shortest geodesic with at least k self-intersections on a hyperbolic surface X , by definition $I(k, X) \geq k$. Erlandsson and Parlier showed in [5] that $I(k, X)$ is bounded by a function depending only on k that grows linearly as k gets large. To the best of the author's knowledge, there is not a single surface X for which the equality $I(k, X) = k$ is known to hold for all k .

Let M_k be the infimum of lengths of geodesics of self-intersection number at least k among all finite-type hyperbolic surfaces, i.e. metric complete hyperbolic surfaces without boundary, and

have finite number of genres and cusps. Basmajian showed ([4, Corollary 1.4]) that

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{k}{2} \leq M_k \leq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1) \asymp 2 \log k \quad (1)$$

The notation $f(k) \asymp g(k)$ means that $f(k)/g(k)$ is bounded from above and below by positive constants. Basmajian also showed that M_k is realized by a k -geodesic on some hyperbolic surface.

Conjecture 1.1. *When $k \geq 1$,*

$$M_k = 2 \cosh^{-1}(1 + 2k) = 2 \log(1 + 2k + 2\sqrt{k^2 + k}) \quad (2)$$

and the equality holds when Γ is a corkscrew geodesic (See definition below) on a thrice-punctured sphere.

In [10, Theorem 1.1] Shen-Wang improved the lower bound of M_k , that M_k has explicit growth rate $2 \log k$, and for a closed geodesic of length L , the self intersection number is no more than $9L^2 e^{\frac{L}{2}}$. The exact value for M_k for sufficiently large k is computed in [11, Theorem 1.1]:

Theorem 1.2. *Conjecture 1.1 holds when $k > 10^{13350}$.*

In [11], the authors first noticed that when the length of a k -geodesic is smallest, it must lie on a cusped hyperbolic surface. And by direct use of main result of [12] to finish the proof.

In the present paper we give a different proof and a better result:

Theorem 1.3. *Conjecture 1.1 holds when $k > 1750$.*

We first give a thick-thin decomposition of the surface, and similar as [12, Lemma 2.5] we have a precise calculation of self-intersection number in the thin part. Since the injective radius on the thick part is bounded below, we can calculate the self-intersection in the thick part.

We give a quite better result since $1750 \ll 10^{13350}$. On the other hand, our result give a possibility of proving Conjecture 1.1 for all $k \leq 1750$ using computer programming, and prove $I(k, X) = k$ for all $k \geq 1$ on a thrice-punctured sphere.

Theorem 1.3 can be generalized to general orientable finite-type hyperbolic surfaces, possibly with geodesic boundaries, since they can be doubled to get a surface as in Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Professor Jiajun Wang for introducing me this question, Professor Shing-Tung Yau for giving some helpful discussions, and Yuhao Xue for his interest in the problem and pointing mistakes in the paper.

2 Neighborhoods of sufficiently short geodesics and cusps

Let $L \geq 4 \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) > 3.5$ be a constant. Let Σ be an oriented, metrically complete hyperbolic surface of finite type without boundary. Topologically Σ is an orientable surface of genus g with n punctures such that $2g + n \geq 3$. Denote the length of a curve c on Σ by $\ell(c)$.

Let Γ be a closed geodesic with length $L = \ell(\Gamma) \geq 4 \log(1 + \sqrt{2}) > 3.5$ on Σ . Suppose Γ is represented as a local isometry $f : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$, where S^1 is a circle with length L . Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \Sigma$ be the set of self-intersection points of Γ , that is,

$$\mathcal{D} = \{x \in \Sigma : \exists s, t \in S^1, f(s) = f(t) = x, s \neq t\}$$

The *self-intersection number* of Γ is defined as

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \binom{\#f^{-1}(x)}{2} \quad (3)$$

2.1 Additive definitions of neighborhoods

Similar as [10] we define the collection $\mathcal{X} = \{c_1, \dots, c_d\}$ of simple closed geodesics of length less than 1 and we have

Lemma 2.1. *The geodesics in \mathcal{X} are pairwise disjoint.*

Proof. If $c_i, c_j \in \mathcal{X}$ with $c_i \cap c_j \neq \emptyset$, the collar lemma [6, Lemma 13.6] implies that the collar

$$N(c_i) := \left\{ x \in \Sigma : d(x, c_i) < \sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sinh(\ell(c_i)/2)} \right) \right\}$$

is an embedded annulus. Suppose $y \in c_i \cap c_j$, for all $y' \in c_j$ we have

$$d(y', c_i) \leq d(y', y) \leq \frac{\ell(c_j)}{2} < \sinh^{-1}(1) < \sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sinh(\ell(c_i)/2)} \right)$$

hence $y' \in N(c_i)$, so $c_j \subseteq N(c_i)$, since $N(c_i)$ is an annulus, the only simple closed geodesic in $N(c_i)$ is c_i itself, a contradiction. □

For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ we define neighborhood

$$N_3(c_i) = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : d(x, c_i) < \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_i)} \right\} \quad (4)$$

Since for all $t > 0$

$$\sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sinh(t/2)} \right) \geq \log \frac{4}{t}$$

we have $N_3(c_i) \subseteq N(c_i)$ ([10, Lemma 2.1]). Additively we define

$$N_0(c_i) = \left\{ x \in \Sigma : d(x, c_i) < \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_i)} - \log 2 \right\} \quad (5)$$

$N_0(c_i), N_3(c_i)$ both an annulus, and $N_0(c_i) \subseteq N_3(c_i)$.

We also defined the set \mathcal{Y} of punctures of Σ in [10].

In the upper half-plane model for \mathbb{H}^2 , let Γ_0 be a cyclic group generated by a parabolic isometry of \mathbb{H}^2 fixing the point ∞ , assume $\Gamma_0(-1, 1) = (1, 1)$ in \mathbb{H}^2 . Let $H_c = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{H}^2 \mid y \geq c\}$ be a horoball. Each cusp can be modelled as H_c/Γ_0 for some c up to isometry, and is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times [c, \infty)$ so that each circle $S^1 \times \{t\}$ with $t \geq c$ is the image of a horocycle under p . Each circle is also called a *horocycle* by abuse of notation. The circle $S^1 \times \{t\}$ with $t \geq c$ is called an *Euclidean circle*. A cusp is *maximal* if it lifts to a union of horocycles with disjoint interiors such that there exists at least one point of tangency between different horocycles.

Each puncture c_i of Σ has a maximal cusp whose boundary Euclidean circle c has $\ell(c) \geq 4$ (Adams, [1]), and the cusp of area 4 that can be lifted to \mathbb{H}^2 . The projection p maps the triangle ∞PQ to the cusp of area 4 at c_i and p maps the interior of the triangle homeomorphically. Choose points A_0, A_3 on the ray from P to ∞ , and B_0, B_3 on the ray from Q to ∞ so that

$$d(P, A_3) = d(Q, B_3) = \log 2, \quad d(A_3, A_0) = d(B_3, B_0) = \log 2$$

(Similar as [10, Section 2.2])

For $j = 0, 3$, let $N_j(c_i)$ be the image of the triangle $\infty A_j B_j$ under p , $N(c_i)$ is the image of ∞PQ .

The following theorem is a generalization of the collar lemma, wherever the collar lemma in the compact case is proved in [6, Lemma 13.6]:

Lemma 2.2. *For distinct $c_i, c_j \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$, $N_3(c_i) \cap N_3(c_j) = \emptyset$.*




Figure 1: Neighborhoods of cusps.

Proof. For all $c_i, c_j \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ c_i and c_j are not homotopy equivalent, so we choose a pants decomposition that for each $c_i \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$, c_i is a boundary (or infinity boundary) of a pair of pants. Only to prove that if c_i, c_j are boundary components of same pair of pants P , then $N_3(c_i) \cap N_3(c_j) \neq \emptyset$ in P .

Suppose the boundary components of P are c_i, c_j, c_k . When c_i, c_j, c_k are all short geodesics, the proof is completed in [6]. So we only need to prove the case when one of c_i, c_j, c_k is a cusp, without loss of generality assume c_i is a cusp and we prove $N_3(c_i), N_3(c_j), N_3(c_k)$ pairwise disjoint in P . P can be constructed by gluing 2 hexagons along 3 nonadjacent boundary segments. In the upper half plane model of \mathbb{H}^2 , let $P_1(-1, 0)$, $P_2(1, 0)$, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 are the lines $x = -1$ and $x = 1$. Assume $A_1(-1, a_j)$, $B_1(1, a_k)$, γ_j and γ_k are the half circle centered at P_1, P_2 and of radius a_j, a_k (in Euclidean coordinate). A_2B_2 is the geodesic orthogonal to half circle γ_j and γ_k , $\tilde{c}_j \subseteq \gamma_j$ and $\tilde{c}_k \subseteq \gamma_k$ are the arcs A_1A_2 and B_1B_2 . Note that if c_j is a cusp, then $a_j = 0$ and $A_1 = A_2 = P_1$, similarly when c_k is a cusp. Then the segment ℓ_1 from ∞ to A_1 , \tilde{c}_j , geodesic arc A_2B_2 , \tilde{c}_k , and the segment ℓ_2 from B_1 to ∞ are boundary components of an ideal hexagon P' , P is constructed by gluing two copies of P' along $\infty A_1, A_2B_2, B_1\infty$.

Assume $C_1(-1, 2)$, $C_2(1, 2)$, then $\partial N_3(c_i)$ is by gluing 2 copies of Euclidean segment $C_1C_2 \subseteq P'$, and $N_3(c_i)$ is by gluing 2 copies of the region between ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and above C_1C_2 .

1. If $c_j \in \mathcal{X}$ is a short geodesic, let $Q_1(-b_j, 0), Q_2(b_k, 0)$ be the endpoints of the geodesic containing A_2B_2 , we have $-1 \leq b_j < b_k \leq 1$. \tilde{c}_j perpendicular to A_2B_2 implies that

$$\left(1 + \frac{b_k - b_j}{2}\right)^2 = \left(\frac{b_k + b_j}{2}\right)^2 + a_j^2$$

Assume Q is the midpoint of segment Q_1Q_2 and $\theta := \angle P_1QA_2$, we have

$$\frac{\ell(c_j)}{2} = d(A_1, A_2) = \ln \tan \left(\frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{\theta}{2} \right) = \ln \left(\frac{2a_j + \sqrt{4a_j^2 + (b_k + b_j)^2}}{b_k + b_j} \right)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sinh d(A_1, C_1) \sinh d(A_1, A_2) &\geq \sinh \log \frac{2}{a_j} \sinh \log \left(\frac{2a_j + \sqrt{4a_j^2 + (b_k + b_j)^2}}{b_k + b_j} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{a_j} - \frac{a_j}{4} \right) \cdot \frac{2a_j}{b_k + b_j} = 1 + \frac{(3 - b_j)(1 - b_k)}{2(b_k + b_j)} \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence $d(A_1, C_1) \geq w(\ell(c_j))$. Hence $N_3(c_i) \cap N_3(c_j) \cap P = \emptyset$.

2. If c_j is a cusp, then $Q_1(-1, 0)$. Let O' be the midpoint of C_1P_1 and C'_1 is the intersection of A_2B_2 and circle C $(x+1)^2 + (y-1)^2 = 1$. By gluing 2 copies of P' , 2 copies of the arc $C_1C'_1$ of C is a horocycle of c_j . Since the vertical coordinate of C'_1 is no more than 1, let $C''_1(0, 1)$ is on the arc $C_1C'_1$, hence we have

$$\ell(C_1C'_1) \geq \ell(C_1C''_1) \geq \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{1}{1 + \cos x} dx = 1$$

hence the length of the horocycle is no less than 2, hence $N_3(c_i) \cap N_3(c_j) = \emptyset$ in P , similarly $N_3(c_i) \cap N_3(c_k) = \emptyset$ in P .

3. Next we prove $N_3(c_j) \cap N_3(c_k) = \emptyset$. When one of c_j, c_k is cusp we already proved above, we only need to consider the case c_j, c_k are both short geodesics. Let l be the line $x = \frac{b_k - b_j}{2}$, we only need to prove: the half $N_3(c_j) \cap P'$ of $N_3(c_j) \cap P$ lies in the left half $\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{H}^2 : x < \frac{b_k - b_j}{2}, y > 0\}$ of \mathbb{H}^2 . Only to prove $d(A_1A_2, l) \geq w(\ell(c_j))$. In fact,

$$d(A_1A_2, l) = d(A_2, l) = -\log \tan \frac{\theta}{2} = \log \left(\frac{b_k + b_j + \sqrt{4a_j^2 + (b_k + b_j)^2}}{2a_j} \right)$$

Hence we have

$$\sinh d(A_1A_2, l) \sinh \frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} = \frac{b_k + b_j}{2a_j} \frac{2a_j}{b_k + b_j} = 1$$

Hence $N(c_j) \cap N(c_k) = \emptyset$, we proved the lemma. □




Figure 2: A hexagon of P

2.2 Thick-thin decomposition

Let $\mathcal{N}_t := \bigcup_{c \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}} N_0(c)$ be the thin part and $\mathcal{N}_T := \Sigma \setminus \mathcal{N}_t$ be the thick part. The injective radius of each point in \mathcal{N}_T has a universal lower bound.

Lemma 2.3. *For all $x \in \mathcal{N}_T$, the injective radius of x is no less than*

$$\ln \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right) > 0.48$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Let x be a point in the thick part $\Sigma \setminus \mathcal{N}_t$ and suppose that the injectivity radius r_0 at x satisfies $r_0 < \log \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$.

There exists a homotopically nontrivial simple closed curve γ through x with $\ell(\gamma) = 2r_0 < 1$. γ is freely homotopic to either a (unique) simple closed geodesic γ' , or a puncture c of Σ .

Suppose that γ is freely homotopic to a puncture c_i of Σ . Let \tilde{x}_1 and \tilde{x}_2 be lifts of x as in Lemma 2.5. Then $d(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2) = 2r_0 < 0.97$ and hence $x \in N_3(c_i)$. Now $x \notin N_0(c_i)$ and $d(x, \partial N_3(c_i)) \leq \ln 2$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $\sinh(r_0) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, hence $r_0 \geq \log \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$, contradiction.

Now suppose that γ is freely homotopic to a simple closed geodesic γ' . Then $\ell(\gamma') \leq 2r_0 < 0.97$ and hence γ' is a curve c_i in \mathcal{X} . There are two cases according to whether $c_i \cap \gamma = \emptyset$.

1. If $c_i \cap \gamma = \emptyset$, then c_i and γ co-bound an annulus since they are homotopic and disjoint in Σ . Since $x \notin N_0(c_i)$, we have $d(x, c_i) \geq \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}$. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\sinh(r_0) > \frac{1}{4} e^{d(x, c_i)} \ell(c_i) \geq \frac{1}{4} \exp \left(\log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)} \right) \ell(c_i) = \frac{1}{2}$$

$$\text{hence } r_0 \geq \ln \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$$

2. If $c_i \cap \gamma \neq \emptyset$, let $x_0 \in c_i \cap \gamma$. If $2r_0 < 0.97$, then $\ell(c_i) \leq \ell(\gamma) < 0.97$, then $\log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)} > \ln 2 > 0.69$. Hence

$$d(c_i, x) \leq d(x_0, x) \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{2} < 0.485 < 0.69 < \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}$$

It follows that $x \in N_0(c_i)$ and we get a contradiction. □

The proof of this lemma using the lemmas in [10]:

Lemma 2.4 ([10], Lemma 2.4). *Let A be an annulus in Σ with boundary circles γ_1 and γ_2 , where γ_1 is a geodesic and γ_2 is piecewise smooth. If there exists $x \in \gamma_2$ such that $d(\gamma_1, x) = d > 0$, then*

$$\sinh \left(\frac{\ell(\gamma_2)}{2} \right) > \frac{1}{4} e^d \ell(\gamma_1) \tag{6}$$

If we further have $\ell(\gamma_1) < e^{-d}$, then

$$\ell(\gamma_2) > \frac{12}{25} e^d \ell(\gamma_1). \tag{7}$$

Lemma 2.5 ([10], Lemma 2.5). *Let $x \in N_3(c_i)$ for a cusp c_i in \mathcal{Y} . If $d(x, \partial N_3(c_i)) = d$, then the injective radius at x is $\sinh^{-1}(e^{-d})$.*

Let $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma \cap \mathcal{N}_t$ be the part of Γ in the thin part and $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_2$ in the thick part. Note that Γ_2 could be empty. Let $L_1 = \ell(\Gamma_1)$ and $L_2 = \ell(\Gamma_2)$, then $L = L_1 + L_2$. The set \mathcal{D} of self-intersection points of Γ consists of the self-intersection points of Γ_1 and Γ_2 since $\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2 = \emptyset$. Let \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 be the sets of self-intersection points of Γ_1 and Γ_2 respectively. Then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_2$ and

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = |\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_1| + |\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2| \quad (8)$$

In the case $\gamma_2 \neq \emptyset$, since Γ is closed, suppose Γ_1 is a collection of arcs $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$, Γ_2 is a collection of arcs $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$ where m is the number of arcs. Since $d(x, \partial N_3(c_i))$ increases first and then decreases for each arc γ'_0 in $\Gamma \cap N_3(c_i)$, then $\gamma'_0 \cap N_0(c_i)$ is either empty or an embedded arc, hence $\Gamma \cap (\bigcup_{c_i \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}} N_3(c_i))$ is a collection of pairwise disjoint arcs $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n$ where $m \leq n$. And for $1 \leq k \leq m$, $\gamma_k \subseteq \gamma'_k$, for $m+1 \leq k \leq n$, $\gamma'_k \subseteq \Gamma_1$. $\Gamma \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^m \gamma'_j$ consists of m arcs $\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_m$, for $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\delta'_j \subseteq \delta_j$. Then if $\Gamma_2 \neq \emptyset$, Γ_1 is also a collection of m arcs. We also have

$$L_1 = \sum_{k=1}^m \ell(\delta_k) \quad L_2 = \sum_{k=1}^m \ell(\gamma_k)$$

We have two possibilities of each arc γ_k of Γ_2 :

1. *General case:* Γ intersects $N_0(c_i)$ for some $c_i \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ and Γ intersects only one boundary of $\partial N_0(c_i)$. Assume In this case, as x moves along γ_k , $d(x, \partial N_0(c_i))$ increases first and then decreases on arc γ_k , and $\gamma_k \cap c_i = \emptyset$.




Figure 3: The general case

2. *Special case:* Γ intersects some $N_0(c_i)$ and Γ intersects only both boundaries of $\partial N_0(c_i)$. In this case γ_k is an embedded arc in Σ . Note that the special case does not happen for cusps.




Figure 4: The special case

Proposition 2.6.

$$m \leq \frac{L}{2 \log 2}$$

Proof. For every $1 \leq k \leq m$, there uniquely exists $c_i \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\gamma_k \subseteq N_0(c_i)$. Suppose the endpoints of γ'_k are $a_k, b_k \in \partial N_3(c_i)$, and $x_k \in \gamma_k$, but $d(x_k, \partial N_3(c_i)) > \log 2$, so

$$\ell(\gamma'_k) \geq d(x_k, a_k) + d(x_k, b_k) \geq 2 \log 2$$

Since $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_m \subseteq \Gamma$ are disjoint arcs, so $m \leq \frac{L}{2 \log 2}$ holds. □

Similar as [10, Theorem 3.3] we have the estimate of self-intersection number of Γ_1 as follows.

Theorem 2.7.

$$|\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_1| < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 \quad (9)$$

Proof. Recall that Γ can be represented by local isometry $f : S^1 \rightarrow \Sigma$. For $1 \leq k \leq m$ divide δ_k into $M(k) := \left\lceil \frac{\ell(\delta_k)}{0.48} \right\rceil + 1$ short closed segments with equal length

$$\frac{\ell(\delta_k)}{M(k)} < 0.48 < \log \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)$$

Suppose M is the number of segments, then

$$M = \sum_{k=1}^m M(k) = \sum_{k=1}^m \left\lceil \frac{\ell(\delta_k)}{0.48} \right\rceil + 1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{\ell(\delta_k)}{0.48} + 1 = \frac{25}{12} L_1 + m$$

The set of these segments is S . Since \mathcal{P}_1 is finite, S can be chosen by small perturbing such that the endpoints of the segments do not contain points in \mathcal{P}_1 . $f(I_\alpha) \subset \Gamma_1$ is in the thick part and $\ell(I_\alpha) < 0.48$, hence $f(I_\alpha)$ has no self-intersections by Lemma 2.3.

We claim that any two distinct $I_\alpha, I_\beta \in S$ have at most one intersection. If there exist $s_1, s_2 \in I_\alpha$ ($s_1 \neq s_2$) and $t_1, t_2 \in I_\beta$ such that $f(s_1) = f(t_1)$ and $f(s_2) = f(t_2)$. Let γ_α be the segment in I_α between t_1 and t_2 , and γ_β be the segment in I_β between s_1 and s_2 . Then $f(\gamma_\alpha)$ and $f(\gamma_\beta)$ are two distinct geodesics between $f(s_1)$ and $f(s_2)$. Since the injectivity radius at $f(s_1) = f(t_1)$ is at least 0.48 and $\ell(f(\gamma_\alpha)), \ell(f(\gamma_\beta)) < 0.48$, the existence of $f(\gamma_\alpha)$ and $f(\gamma_\beta)$ contradicts the uniqueness of geodesics in \mathbb{H}^2 .

Since any two distinct $I_\alpha, I_\beta \in S$ contribute at most 1 to $|\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_1|$, we have

$$|\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} M(M-1) < \frac{1}{2} M^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2$$

In addition, from the proof we know when $\Gamma_2 = \emptyset$, we have

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = |\Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 1 \right)^2$$

□

3 Estimate of self-intersection number

We have

$$|\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2| = \sum_{p=1}^m |\gamma_p \cap \gamma_p| + \sum_{1 \leq p < q \leq m} |\gamma_p \cap \gamma_q|$$

Next we define the *winding number* $w(\gamma_p)$ of the arc γ_p for $1 \leq p \leq m$, the winding number $w(\gamma_0)$ of any arc $\gamma_0 \subseteq \gamma_p$, and $w(\gamma'_p)$ can be similarly defined. Assume $\gamma_p \subseteq N_0(c_i)$. The definitions are similar as [12] and [5].

1. When $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$ is a short geodesic, every point of γ_p projects orthogonally to a well-defined point of c_i . The winding number of γ_p is given by the quotient of the length of the projection of γ_p divided by $\ell(c_i)$.
2. When $c_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ is a cusp, every point of γ_p projects orthogonally to a well-defined point of the length h horocycle. The winding number of γ_p is given by the quotient of the length of the projection of γ_p divided by h .

If $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$ is a short geodesic, consider the Poincaré disk model of \mathbb{H}^2 , the universal covering $p : \mathbb{H}^2 \rightarrow \Sigma$ restricts to a universal covering $p : \Omega \rightarrow N_0(c_i)$ of $N_0(c_i)$. We may assume that $p^{-1}(c_i)$ is the horizontal line $\mathbb{H}^1 \subset \mathbb{H}^2$. Let $\tilde{\gamma}_p, \tilde{\gamma}'_p$ be a lift of γ_p, γ'_p . Assume $P_1, P_2 \in \tilde{\gamma}_p$ are endpoints of $\tilde{\gamma}_p$, $p(P_1), p(P_2) \in \partial N_0(c_i)$, and $P'_1, P'_2 \in \tilde{\gamma}'_p$ are endpoints of $\tilde{\gamma}'_p$, $p(P'_1), p(P'_2) \in \partial N_3(c_i)$. \tilde{x}' is the midpoint of P_1P_2 .

For $j = 1, 2$, define $Q_j, Q'_j \in \mathbb{H}^1$ are the unique points in \mathbb{H}^1 satisfies $d(P_j, Q_j) = d(P_j, \mathbb{H}^1) = \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}$ and $d(P'_j, Q'_j) = d(P'_j, \mathbb{H}^1) = \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_i)}$.




Figure 5: A covering of $N_0(c_i)$ when $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$

When c_i is a cusp, consider the projection map p from the upper half plane model of \mathbb{H}^2 to Σ , maps the ideal triangle $\infty A_0 B_0$ to $N_0(c_i)$. Assume $A_0(-1, 2)$, $B_0(1, 2)$, $A'_0(-1, 1)$, $B'_0(1, 1)$ in Euclidean coordinate. $\tilde{\gamma}_p, \tilde{\gamma}'_p$ is a lift of the arc γ_p, γ'_p . Assume $\tilde{\gamma}_p$ is the arc $x^2 + y^2 = R^2, y > 2$ in Euclidean coordinate and $\tilde{\gamma}'_p$ is the arc $x^2 + y^2 = R^2, y > 2$. $P_1(-\sqrt{R^2 - 4}, 2)$ $P_2(\sqrt{R^2 - 4}, 2)$ are endpoints of $\tilde{\gamma}_p$ and $P'_1(-\sqrt{R^2 - 1}, 1)$ $P'_2(\sqrt{R^2 - 1}, 1)$ are endpoints of $\tilde{\gamma}'_p$. The hyperbolic length of the arc P_1P_2 is $\ell(P_1P_2) = \ell(\gamma_p)$. \tilde{x}' is the midpoint of P_1P_2 and $x' = p(\tilde{x}')$.

Lemma 3.1. For $1 \leq p \leq m$, when γ_p is of general case, we have

$$|\gamma_p \cap \gamma_p| < w(\gamma_p)$$

When γ_p is of special case, $|\gamma_p \cap \gamma_p| = 0$.

Proof. Notice that when P goes from $p(P_1)$ to $p(P_2)$ along γ_p , then the function $d(P, \partial N_3(c_i))$ first increases and then decreases. Assume $P, P' \in \tilde{\gamma}_p$, if $p(P) = p(P')$, then γ_p must be of general case. $p(P) = p(P')$ if and only if the winding number of the arc $PP' \subseteq \gamma_p$ is a positive integer. Then the self intersection number of γ_p equals to the number of positive integers less than $w(\gamma_p)$. Hence the lemma holds. \square




Figure 6: A covering of $N_0(c_i)$ when $c_i \in \mathcal{Y}$

Lemma 3.2. 1. $w(\gamma_p) \leq 2 \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2}\right)$. Similarly $w(\gamma'_p) \leq \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(\gamma'_p)}{2}\right)$.

2. For any p such that $\gamma'_p \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset$ and γ'_p is of general case, then $\ell(\gamma'_p) \geq 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$.

3. For any p such that $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $\gamma_p \cap N_3(c_i) \neq \emptyset$, then $w(\gamma_p) \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{\ell(c_i)}$.

Proof. 1. If $c_i \in \mathcal{Y}$ is a cusp, we have

$$\frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2} = \log\left(\frac{\sqrt{R^2 - 4} + R}{2}\right) = \ln\left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{R}{2}\right)^2 - 1} + \frac{R}{2}\right)$$

Hence

$$w(\gamma_p) = \sqrt{R^2 - 4} = 2 \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2}\right)$$

On the other hand, when $\gamma_p = \gamma'_p \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset$, then $R > 2$, hence

$$\ell(\gamma'_p) = \ell(\tilde{\gamma}'_p) = \ell(P'_1 P'_2) = 2 \ln(R + \sqrt{R^2 - 1}) > 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$$

2. If $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and γ_p of general case, as in Figure 5, \tilde{x}' is the midpoint of $P_1 P_2$, since $p(P_1), p(P_2) \in \partial N_0(c_i)$, then $d(p(P), \mathbb{H}^1) = d(p(P), c_i) = \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}$. From the definition of winding number, $d(Q_1, O) = \frac{1}{2} d(Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} \cdot w(\gamma_p)$. The geodesic $P_1 Q_1$ from P_1 to Q_1 , horizontal line $Q_1 O$, vertical line $O \tilde{x}'$ and the left half of geodesic $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ form a Lambert quadrilateral, the property of Lambert quadrilateral gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sinh \frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2} &= \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} \cdot w(\gamma_p)\right) \cosh\left(\log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} \cdot w(\gamma_p) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{\ell(c_i)} + \frac{\ell(c_i)}{2}\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} w(\gamma_p) \end{aligned}$$

$w(\gamma_p) \leq \frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{\ell(c_i)}$ follows from

$$\sinh \frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2} = \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} \cdot w(\gamma_p)\right) \cosh\left(\log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}\right) \geq \sinh\left(\frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} \cdot w(\gamma_p)\right)$$

On the other hand, if $\gamma_p = \gamma'_p \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset$, then $d(P'_1, Q') = \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_i)}$ and $d(O, \tilde{x}') < \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}$. The property of Lambert quadrilateral gives

$$\cosh \frac{\ell(\gamma'_p)}{2} = \cosh d(P'_1, \tilde{x}') = \frac{\sinh d(P'_1, Q')}{\sinh d(O, \tilde{x}')} > \frac{\sinh \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_i)}}{\sinh \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)}} = \frac{16 - \ell(c_i)^2}{8 - 2\ell(c_i)^2} > 2$$

Hence $\frac{\ell(\gamma'_p)}{2} > \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$.

3. If $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and γ_p of special case, as in Figure 5, then $\tilde{\gamma}_p$ is the dashed line $P_1OP''_2$, and P''_2 is the symmetry point of P_2 , hence P_1, P_2 is on the same side of \mathbb{H}^1 and P''_2 is on the other side. We have

$$\ell(\gamma_p) = d(P_1, O) + d(O, P''_2) = d(P_1, O) + d(O, P_2) \geq d(P_1, P_2)$$

Hence from the proof of case 2 above

$$w(\gamma_p) \leq 2 \sinh \left(\frac{d(P_1, P_2)}{2} \right) \leq 2 \sinh \left(\frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{2} \right) \quad w(\gamma_p) \leq \frac{d(P_1, P_2)}{\ell(c_i)} < \frac{\ell(\gamma_p)}{\ell(c_i)}$$

□

If $\gamma_p, \gamma_q \subseteq N_0(c_i)$, we have conclusions about the intersection number $|\gamma_p \cap \gamma_q|$:

Lemma 3.3. *Let γ_1, γ_2 be two distinct curves of general case in Γ_2 and γ_3, γ_4 be two distinct curves of special case, and $w(\gamma_1) \leq w(\gamma_2)$, $w(\gamma_3) \leq w(\gamma_4)$. Then*

1. $|\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_3| \leq \lceil w(\gamma_1) \rceil$
2. $|\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_1| \leq \lceil w(\gamma_1) \rceil - 1$
3. $|\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2| \leq 2 \lceil w(\gamma_1) \rceil$
4. $|\gamma_3 \cap \gamma_4| \leq \lceil \frac{\ell(\gamma_3) + \ell(\gamma_4)}{\ell(c_i)} \rceil$

Proof. The first and the third inequality follows from [5, Lemma 3.2] and the second is from Lemma 3.1. We only need to prove the fourth. Suppose $\gamma_3 \subseteq N_0(c_i)$, $\gamma_4 \subseteq N_0(c_{i'})$. If $i \neq i'$ then $|\gamma_3 \cap \gamma_4| = 0$, next suppose $i = i'$.

Suppose P_3, P'_3 are endpoints of γ_3 , and P_4, P'_4 are endpoints of γ_4 , and P_3, P_4 are on the same boundary component of $\partial N_0(c_i)$ and P'_3, P'_4 are on the another. Suppose the self-intersection points are $R_1, \dots, R_t \in \gamma_3$ from P_3 to P'_3 , and define $\epsilon_k^3, \epsilon_k^4$ are the geodesic between R_k, R_{k+1} along γ_3, γ_4 . Since $\epsilon_k^3 \cup \epsilon_k^4 \subseteq N_0(c_i)$ is a closed curve freely homotopic to c_i , hence $\ell(\epsilon_k^3) + \ell(\epsilon_k^4) \geq \ell(c_i)$, hence

$$|\gamma_3 \cap \gamma_4| < 1 + \frac{\ell(\gamma_3) + \ell(\gamma_4)}{\ell(c_i)}$$

Since $|\gamma_3 \cap \gamma_4|$ is an integer, the fourth is proved.

□

By abuse of notation assume there are m_0 arcs $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{m_0}$ in Γ_2 with general case, suppose $w(\gamma_1) \leq \dots \leq w(\gamma_{m_0})$. And m_2 arcs $\gamma_{m_0+1}, \dots, \gamma_m$ of special case. Set $m = m_0 + m_2$. Define

$$\Gamma'_2 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m_0} \gamma_j \quad \Gamma''_2 = \bigcup_{j=m_0+1}^m \gamma_j \quad L'_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} \ell(\gamma_j) \quad L''_2 = \sum_{j=m_0+1}^m \ell(\gamma_j)$$

Clearly $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma'_2 \cup \Gamma''_2$, $L_2 = L'_2 + L''_2$. Similar as [12, Lemma 2.5] we have

Theorem 3.4.

$$|\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2| \leq (2m-1)w(\gamma_1) + \dots + (2m_2+1)w(\gamma_{m_0}) + L_2'' e^{\frac{L_2''}{4}} + m^2 - m \quad (10)$$

Proof. Suppose $C := \{c_1, \dots, c_l\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is the set $\{c \in \mathcal{X} : c \cap \Gamma_2'' \neq \emptyset\}$. For $1 \leq j \leq l$, define C_j is the collection of arcs in Γ_2'' intersecting c_j , assume $m_{2,j} := \#(C_j)$ and $\Gamma_{2,j}'' := \bigcup_{\gamma \in C_j} \gamma$, $L_{2,j}'' := \sum_{\gamma \in C_j} \ell(\gamma)$. Clearly $m_2 = m_{2,1} + \dots + m_{2,l}$ and $L_2'' = L_{2,1}'' + \dots + L_{2,l}''$. Notice that for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_{2,j}''$, since γ is of special case we have $\ell(\gamma) \geq 2 \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_j)}$, hence we have $\ell(c_j) \geq 2 \exp(-\frac{L_{2,j}''}{2m_{2,j}})$. By definition of \mathcal{X} we have $2 \log \frac{2}{\ell(c_j)} > 2 \log 2$, hence $2 \log 2 \cdot m_{2,j} \leq L_{2,j}''$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2| &= \sum_{j=1}^m |\gamma_j \cap \gamma_j| + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m} |\gamma_{j_1} \cap \gamma_{j_2}| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (\lceil w(\gamma_j) \rceil - 1) + \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq m, j_1 \leq m_0} 2\lceil w(\gamma_{j_1}) \rceil + \sum_{j=1}^l \sum_{\{\gamma', \gamma''\} \subseteq C_j} 1 + \frac{\ell(\gamma') + \ell(\gamma'')}{\ell(c_j)} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (2m+1-2j)(w(\gamma_j)+1) + \sum_{j=1}^l (m_{2,j}-1) \sum_{\gamma \in C_j} \frac{\ell(\gamma)}{\ell(c_j)} + \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{m_{2,j}(m_{2,j}-1)}{2} - m_0 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (2m+1-2j)w(\gamma_j) + m^2 - m_2^2 + \sum_{j=1}^l (m_{2,j}-1) \frac{L_{2,j}''}{\ell(c_j)} + m_2^2 - m_2 - m_0 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (2m+1-2j)w(\gamma_j) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq l, m_{2,j} \geq 2} \frac{m_{2,j}-1}{2} L_{2,j}'' e^{\frac{L_{2,j}''}{2m_{2,j}}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (2m+1-2j)w(\gamma_j) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq l, m_{2,j} \geq 2} L_{2,j}'' e^{\frac{L_{2,j}''}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{m_0} (2m+1-2j)w(\gamma_j) + L_2'' e^{\frac{L_2''}{4}} + m^2 - m \end{aligned}$$

The last but one inequality using the fact that when $x \geq 2$, $a \geq 2x \log 2$, then $(x-1)e^{\frac{a}{2x}} \leq 2e^{\frac{a}{4}}$. \square

4 Estimate of self-intersection in the thin part

In order to estimate the upper bound of $|\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2|$ we need to estimate (10). Define function $D : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$:

$$D(x_1, \dots, x_{m_0}) := (2m-1) \sinh x_1 + \dots + (2m_2+3) \sinh x_{m_0-1} + (2m_2+1) \sinh x_{m_0}$$

Lemma 4.1. *Define $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$:*

$$A := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_{m_0}) : 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_m \quad x_1 + \dots + x_{m_0} = L_2' \right\}$$

If function D attains its maximum on $x' = (x'_1, \dots, x'_{m_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, then there exists integer $1 \leq m_1 \leq m_0$, such that

$$x' = \left(0, 0, \dots, 0, \frac{L_2'}{m_1}, \dots, \frac{L_2'}{m_1} \right)$$

Here the number of 0 is $m_0 - m_1$.

Proof. Since A is compact, we know the maximum point x' of function D in A exists. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Otherwise there exists $2 \leq s \leq m_0$ such that $0 < x'_{s-1} < x'_s$. Let

$u, v \geq 1$ be maximal integers satisfying $0 < x'_{s-u} = \dots = x'_{s-1} < x'_s = \dots = x'_{s+v-1}$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$ small that $v\epsilon < x'_{s-u}$, $2uv\epsilon < x'_s - x'_{s-1}$, and if $s-u > 1$ then $v\epsilon < x'_{s-u} - x'_{s-u-1}$, if $s+v-1 < m_0$ then $u\epsilon < x'_{s+v} - x'_{s+v-1}$. For $0 \leq \delta \leq \epsilon$ define function

$$H(\delta) := \sum_{k=s-u}^{s-1} (2m+1-2k) \sinh(x'_k - v\delta) + \sum_{k=s}^{s+v} (2m+1-2k) \sinh(x'_k + u\delta)$$

Since x' is the maximal point of D , we have $H'(0) = 0$ and $H''(0) \leq 0$, but the function $f(x) = \sinh x$ is a convex function, we have $H''(0) > 0$, a contradiction. \square

As a simple corollary we have

Corollary 4.2. *If $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{N}_t \neq \emptyset$ and $m_2 = 0$, i.e. $m \geq 1$, then there exists $1 \leq m_1 \leq m_0$ that*

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + m_1^2 e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} + m^2 - m \quad (11)$$

If $m_2 \geq 1$ then

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + (m_1^2 + 2m_1 m_2) e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} + L_2'' e^{\frac{L_2''}{4}} + m^2 - m \quad (12)$$

Proof. When $m_2 = 0$, combining with Theorem 2.7 and Theorem 3.4 there exists such m_1 that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + 2D \left(\frac{\ell(\gamma_1)}{2}, \dots, \frac{\ell(\gamma_m)}{2} \right) + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + 2m_1^2 \sinh \frac{L_2}{2m_1} + m^2 - m < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + m_1^2 e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} + m^2 - m \end{aligned}$$

When $m_2 \geq 1$ the proof is same. \square

4.1 Case $m \geq 2$

Theorem 4.3. *When $k > 1750$ and $m \geq 2$, if $m_2 = 0$ and $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = k$, then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k+1)$.*

Proof. Consider the function

$$I(m, m_1, L_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - L_2) + m \right)^2 + m_1^2 e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} + m^2 - m$$

where $1 \leq m_1 \leq m < \frac{L}{2 \ln 2}$, $0 \leq L_2 \leq L - 2m \ln 2$, $L_1 + L_2 = L$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 I}{\partial m_1^2} &= \frac{\partial}{\partial m_1} \left(\left(2m_1 - \frac{L_2}{2} \right) e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} \right) = \left(2 - \frac{L_2}{2m_1^2} \left(2m_1 - \frac{L_2}{2} \right) \right) e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} \\ &= \left(1 + \left(\frac{L_2}{2m_1} - 1 \right)^2 \right) e^{\frac{L_2}{2m_1}} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

So $I(m, m_1, L_2)$ is a convex function of variable m_1 . Hence

$$I(m, m_1, L_2) \leq \max\{I(m, m, L_2), I(m, 1, L_2)\}$$

1. When $m_1 = 1$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 I(m, 1, L_2)}{\partial L_2^2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial L_2^2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - L_2) + m \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial L_2^2} e^{\frac{L_2}{2}} = \frac{625}{144} + \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{L_2}{2}} > 0$$

Using the fact $L_2 \leq L - 2m \log 2$, if $m \geq 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I(m, 1, L_2) &\leq \max\{I(m, 1, 0), I(m, 1, L - 2m \log 2)\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + m^2 - m + 1, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{6 + 25 \log 2}{6} m \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2^m} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + m^2 - m \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{6 + 25 \log 2}{2} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{8} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + 6 \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 75 + \frac{1}{8} e^{\frac{L}{2}}, 4.53 L^2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality using the fact that both two functions in "max" are convex on $m \in [3, \frac{L}{2 \log 2}]$. If $L < 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$ then $e^{\frac{L}{2}} < 4k + 2$, but when $L \geq 17.2$ we have $e^{\frac{L}{2}} > 18.12 L^2 + 2$, $302 + \frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{L}{2}} < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, contradiction with $4|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| + 2 > e^{\frac{L}{2}}$. Then $L < 17.2$, hence

$$\max \left\{ 4.46 L^2, 75 + \frac{1}{8} e^{\frac{L}{2}} \right\} < 1600$$

we get a contradiction.

If $m = 2$ and $L_2 \leq L - 2m \log 2 - 0.48$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
I(m, 1, L_2) &\leq \max\{I(m, 1, 0), I(m, 1, L - 4 \log 2 - 0.48)\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + m^2 - m + 1, \frac{1}{2^m e^{0.24}} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + 41 \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 4.46 L^2 + 3, \frac{0.79}{4} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + 41 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $4|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| + 2 \leq \max\{17.84 L^2 + 14, 166 + 0.79 e^{\frac{L}{2}}\} < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$ for $L > 17.7$ we get a contradiction. When $L \leq 17.7$, $\max\{4.46 L^2 + 3, 41 + \frac{0.79}{4} e^{\frac{L}{2}}\} < 1750$, contradiction.

If $m = 2$ and $L_2 > L - 4 \log 2 - 0.48$, assume $L'_1 := \ell(\gamma'_1)$, $L'_2 := \ell(\gamma'_2)$, $L' := L'_1 + L'_2$, $L'_1 \leq L'_2$. Since there exists $c_{i'}, c_i \in \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$, such that $\gamma'_1 \cap N_0(c_{i'}) \neq \emptyset$, $\gamma'_2 \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset$. if $L'_1, L'_2 \geq 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$, using Lemma 3.2 and [12, Lemma 2.5] we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4 \log 2 + 0.48}{0.48} + 2 \right)^2 + 3 \sinh \frac{L'_1}{2} + \sinh \frac{L'_2}{2} + 2 \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 41 + 4 \sinh \frac{L}{4}, 40.6 + 3 \sinh(\log(2 + \sqrt{3})) + \sinh \left(\frac{L}{2} - \log(2 + \sqrt{3}) \right) \right\} \\
&\leq \max \left\{ 41 + 2e^{\frac{L}{4}}, 46 + \frac{1}{7} e^{\frac{L}{2}} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $166 + 8e^{\frac{L}{4}} < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$ and $186 + \frac{4}{7} e^{\frac{L}{2}} < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$ holds for $L > 17$, contradicting $4|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| + 2 > e^{\frac{L}{2}}$. When $L \leq 17$, $\max\{41 + 2e^{\frac{L}{4}}, 46 + \frac{1}{7} e^{\frac{L}{2}}\} < 1600$, contradiction.

If $L'_1 < 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3})$, using Lemma 3.2, γ'_1 cannot be general case, it must be special case. Hence $2 \log \frac{4}{\ell(c_{i'})} \leq 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3}) < 4 \log 2$, we have $\ell(c_{i'}) > 1$, contradiction to the definition of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} .

2. When $m_1 = m$, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 I(m, m, L_2)}{\partial m^2} = 2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial m^2} m^2 e^{\frac{L_2}{2m}} = 2 + \left(1 + \left(\frac{L_2}{2m} - 1 \right)^2 \right) e^{\frac{L_2}{2m}} > 0$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 I(m, m, L_2)}{\partial L_2^2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial L_2^2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - L_2) + m \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial L_2^2} m^2 e^{\frac{L_2}{2m}} = \frac{625}{144} + \frac{1}{4} e^{\frac{L_2}{2m}} > 0$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} I(m, m, L_2) &\leq \max \left\{ I(2, 2, L_2), I\left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2}, \frac{L}{2 \log 2}, L_2\right) \right\} \\ &\leq \max \{ I(2, 2, 0), I(2, 2, L - 4 \log 2), I\left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2}, \frac{L}{2 \log 2}, 0\right), I\left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2}, \frac{L}{2 \log 2}, L - 4 \log 2\right) \} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + 4e^{\frac{L}{4}}, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + 3 \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max \{ 4.454L^2 + 4e^{\frac{L}{4}}, 5.5L^2 \} \end{aligned}$$

When $L > 17.7$, we have $4(4.454L^2 + 4e^{\frac{L}{4}}) + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, $22L^2 + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, a contradiction. When $L \leq 17.7$, we have $4.454L^2 + 4e^{\frac{L}{4}} < 1750$ and $5.5L^2 < 1750$, contradiction.

□

Note that when $m = 0$, i.e. $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{N}_t = \emptyset$, then Lemma 4.2 holds, hence we have

$$k = |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 1 \right)^2$$

Hence when $k > 1700$, then $L > 17$, hence $4k + 2 \leq 2 + 2 \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 1 \right)^2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, contradiction.

Theorem 4.4. *When $k > 1750$ and $m \geq 2$, if $m_0 = 0$ and $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = k$, then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$.*

Proof. When $m_0 = 0$ then $m = m_2$ and $m_2 \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k = |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| &< \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + L_2'' e^{\frac{L_2''}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + m \right)^2 + (L - 2m \log 2) e^{\frac{L - 2m \log 2}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 2 \right)^2 + (L - 4 \log 2) e^{\frac{L - 4 \log 2}{4}} + 2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} + \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 L^2 + \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 2 \right)^2 + \frac{L}{2} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 2, 4.46L^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The third inequality using the fact that the function before the inequality sign is convex on $m \in (2, \frac{L}{2 \log 2})$. When $L > 17.7$, we have $4k + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$. When $L \leq 17.7$ we have $k < 1750$, contradiction. □

Theorem 4.5. *When $k > 1750$ and $m \geq 2$, if $m_0, m_2 \geq 1$ and $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = k$, then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$.*

Proof. Recall that $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = I(L'_2, L''_2, m, m_1, m_2)$, where $L_1 = L - L_2 - L''_2$ and

$$I(L'_2, L''_2, m, m_1, m_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + (m_1^2 + 2m_1 m_2) e^{\frac{L'_2}{2m_1}} + L''_2 e^{\frac{L''_2}{4}} + m^2 - m$$

For $a > 0$ functions $f(x) = xe^{\frac{a}{x}}$ and $f(x) = x^2e^{\frac{a}{x}}$ are convex, hence $I(L'_2, L''_2, m, m_1, m_2)$ is a convex function for $m_1 \in (1, m_0)$. Hence one of the following holds:

$$I \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + (1 + 2m_2) e^{\frac{L'_2}{2}} + L''_2 e^{\frac{L''_2}{4}} + m^2 - m \quad (13)$$

$$I \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L_1 + m \right)^2 + (m_0^2 + 2m_0 m_2) e^{\frac{L'_2}{2m_0}} + L''_2 e^{\frac{L''_2}{4}} + m^2 - m \quad (14)$$

1. If (13) holds, since for $m_0 + 1 \leq j \leq m$, $\ell(\gamma_j) \geq 2 \log 2$, we have $L'_2 \leq L_2 - 2m_2 \log 2 \leq L - 2m \log 2 - 2m_2 \log 2$. then when $m \geq 7$ we have $m + m_2 \geq 8$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + m \right)^2 + \frac{1 + 2m_2}{2^{m+m_2}} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + L''_2 e^{\frac{L''_2}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + m \right)^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + (L - 2m \log 2) e^{\frac{L - 2m \log 2}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 7 \right)^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + L e^{\frac{L - 14 \log 2}{4}} + 42, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + \frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 7 \right)^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L}{8\sqrt{2}} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 42, \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + 4.46 L^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the fact that when $m > m_2 \geq 1$ and $m \geq 7$, then $\frac{1+2m_2}{2^{m+m_2}} \leq \frac{3}{256}$. The third inequality uses the convexity on $m \in (7, \frac{L}{2 \log 2})$. When $L > 17.7$ we have $4I + 2 \leq e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, and when $L \leq 17.7$ we have $4.46L^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} < 1700$ and $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 7 \right)^2 + \frac{3}{256} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L}{8\sqrt{2}} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 42 < 1700$, contradiction.

When $4 \leq m \leq 6$, using the convexity of $L_2 \in (0, L - 2m \log 2)$, and $L_2 \leq L - 2m \log 2 \leq L - 8 \log 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - L_2) + m \right)^2 + (1 + 2m_2) e^{\frac{L_2 - 2m_2 \log 2}{2}} + L_2 e^{\frac{L_2}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \max \left\{ m^2 - m + 2m_2 + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 6 \right)^2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25 \log 2}{6} m + m \right)^2 + \frac{3}{32} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L}{4} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + m^2 - m \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 44 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 6 \right)^2, 303 + \frac{3}{32} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L}{4} e^{\frac{L}{4}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{1+2m_2}{2^{m+m_2}} \leq \frac{3}{32}$ when $m \geq 4, m_2 \geq 1$. Hence when $L > 17.7$ then $4I + 2 \leq e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, when $L \leq 17.7$ then $I \leq 1750$, contradiction.

When $m = 3$, $m_1 \geq 1$ implies $\ell(\gamma'_1) \geq 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3}) > 2.62$ using Lemma 3.2, hence $L''_2 \leq L - 4 \log 2 - 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3}) \in (L - 5.41, L - 5.4)$. Using the convexity of $L_2 \in (0, L - 6 \log 2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - L_2) + 3 \right)^2 + (1 + 2m_2) e^{\frac{L_2 - 2m_2 \log 2}{2}} + L_2 e^{\frac{L_2 - 4 \log 2 - 2 \log(2 + \sqrt{3})}{4}} + 6 \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 13 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 6 \right)^2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25 \times 6 \log 2}{12} + 3 \right)^2 + \frac{3}{16} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L - 6 \log 2}{2\sqrt{2 + \sqrt{3}}} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 6 \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 13 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 6 \right)^2, 110 + \frac{3}{16} e^{\frac{L}{2}} + \frac{L - 6 \log 2}{3.86} e^{\frac{L}{4}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{1+2m_2}{2m+m_2} \leq \frac{3}{16}$ when $m \geq 3, m_2 \geq 1$. Hence when $L > 17.7$ then $4I + 2 \leq e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, when $L \leq 17.7$ then $I \leq 1750$, contradiction.

When $m_1 = m_2 = 1$, then suppose γ_1 is of general case and γ_2 is of special case, and $\gamma_1 \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset, \gamma_2 \cap N_0(c_{i'}) \neq \emptyset$. If $i \neq i'$ then $|\gamma_2 \cap \gamma_1| = |\gamma_1 \cap \gamma_2| = 0$, same as Theorem 4.3 to get the proof. Otherwise $i = i'$.

If $\ell(c_i) \geq 0.25$ then $w(\gamma_1) \leq \frac{L_2}{0.25} < 4L$, and $|\Gamma_2 \cap \Gamma_2| \leq 2w(\gamma_1) + 4$, hence

$$k = |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + 2 \right)^2 + 8L + 4$$

When $L > 17.7$ we have $4\left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + 2 \right)^2 + 8L + 4\right) + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, when $L \leq 17.7$ we have $k < 1750$, ontradiation.

If $\ell(c_i) < 0.25$, we have $\ell(\gamma_2) \geq 6 \log 2$, hence $\ell(\gamma_1) \leq L - 10 \log 2$. Hence using Lemma 3.2 we have $w(\gamma_1) \leq \frac{1}{32}e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, then

$$k = |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + 2 \right)^2 + \frac{1}{16}e^{\frac{L}{2}} + 4$$

When $L > 17.7$ we have $4k + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, when $L \leq 17.7$ we have $k < 1750$, ontradiation.

2. If (14) holds and $m_0 \geq 2$, then $\frac{L'_2}{2m_0} \leq \frac{L'_2}{4}$, hence when $L \geq 16.7$

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L_1 + m \right)^2 + m^2 e^{\frac{L'_2}{2m_0}} + L_2'' e^{\frac{L'_2}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + m \right)^2 + \frac{m^2 + L}{2^{\frac{m}{2}}} e^{\frac{L}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + 2 \right)^2 + (2 + \frac{L}{2})e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + \frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + 2 \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + L \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The third inequality using the convexity on $m \in (2, \frac{L}{2 \log 2})$, here when $L \geq 16.7$ the function $f(x) = \frac{x^2 + L}{2^{\frac{x}{2}}}$ is convex for $x \in (2, +\infty)$. When $L \geq 17.7$ then $4I + 2 \leq e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, and when $16.7 \leq L < 17.7$, $I < 1750$, contradiction.

When $L < 16.7$, since for $x > 1$, $\frac{x^2}{2^{\frac{x}{2}}} < 4.51$, then using the convexity on $m \in (2, \frac{L}{2 \log 2})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L_1 + m \right)^2 + (4.51 + \frac{L}{2^{\frac{m}{2}}})e^{\frac{L}{4}} + m^2 - m \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + 2 \right)^2 + (4.51 + \frac{L}{2})e^{\frac{L}{4}} + 2, \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12}L + \frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{L}{2 \log 2} \right)^2 + L + 4.51e^{\frac{L}{4}} \right\} \\ &< 1750 \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction.

□

As a corollary of above 3 theorems we summarize

Theorem 4.6. *When $k > 1750$ and $m \geq 2$, if $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| = k$, then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$.*

4.2 Case $m = 1$

Suppose $\Gamma \cap N_0(c_i) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\gamma = \gamma_1 = \Gamma \cap N_0(c_i)$ and $\delta = \delta_1 = \Gamma \setminus \gamma$.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose Γ is the shortest closed geodesic with $|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| \geq k \geq 1750$, $14 < L < 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$. If $\ell(\delta) < 1.44 + 2 \log 2$, then there is a pair of pants $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma$ with geodesic boundaries or punctures, that $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_0$, and Γ is a corkscrew geodesic, i.e. a geodesic in the homotopy class of a curve consisting of the concatenation of a simple arc and another that winds k times along the boundary, see [11].*




Figure 7: A corkscrew geodesic: the blue curve in the figure

Proof. The proof is similar as the proof of [11, Theorem 1.1(2)]. Let $P, Q \in \Gamma \cap \partial N_0(c_i)$ are endpoints of arc γ . Then γ and δ both have P, Q as endpoints. Suppose ϵ is one of two components of $\partial N_0(c_i)$ containing P, Q , then ϵ is a closed curve, is divided to 2 curves $\epsilon_1 \cup \epsilon_2$ and P, Q are both endpoints of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 as in Figure 7.

1. If δ has no self-intersection, then both $\delta \cup \epsilon_1$ and $\delta \cup \epsilon_2$ are closed curves with no self-intersection, hence homotopic to closed geodesics or cusps c' and c'' , and c_i, c', c'' is a boundary of a pair of pants Σ_0 .

We claim that $\Gamma \subseteq \Sigma_0$. If this fails, since clearly $\delta \cup \epsilon_1$ is freely homotopic to a simple closed curve contained in Σ_0 , then if $\delta \cup c' \neq \emptyset$ then $\delta \cup c'$ must create bigons, but both δ and c' are geodesics, a contradiction. Similarly $\delta \cup c'' = \emptyset$. Hence the claim holds.

2. If δ has self-intersection, choose a parametrization $\delta : [0, \ell(\delta)] \rightarrow \Sigma$ of δ and $\delta(0) = P, \delta(\ell(\delta)) = Q$. Let t_2 be the supremum of all t such that the restriction $\delta|_{[0, t]}$ is a simple arc, then there exists a unique $t_1 \in [0, t_2)$ with $\delta(t_1) = \delta(t_2)$. hence $\delta|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a simple loop in δ and denote it by v . The simple loop v is noncontractible so we only need to consider whether it is freely homotopic to c_i or not.
3. If v is freely homotopic to c_i , since $v \cap N_0(c_i) = \emptyset$, $v \cup c_i$ is the boundary of an open annulus $A \subseteq \Sigma$. Since $\delta|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a closed curve which is geodesic except $\delta(t_1) = \delta(t_2)$, $d(\delta(t), \epsilon)$ first decreases and then increases for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$. There exists t_3 such that t_3 is the infimum of t such that $\delta(t) \notin A$. Then $\delta(t_3) \in \delta|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ and $t_3 \leq t_1$. If $t_3 < t_1$ then there exists unique $t_4 \in [t_1, t_2)$ such that $\delta(t_4) = \delta(t_3)$, contradicts the definition of t_2 . Hence $t_3 = t_1$, and $\delta|_{[0, t_2]} \subseteq \overline{A}$. Hence the function $d_A(\delta(t), \epsilon)$ attains its maximum on $t = t_1$ in $[0, t_2]$, where d_A means the distance function in \overline{A} .

On the other hand, since $\delta|_{[t_1, t_2]}$ is a closed curve which is geodesic except $\delta(t_1) = \delta(t_2)$, and $d_A(\delta(t), \epsilon)$ first decreases and then increases for $t \in [t_1, t_2]$, hence $\frac{d}{dt}d_A(\delta(t), \epsilon)|_{t=t_1} < 0$, a contradiction.

4. If v is not freely homotopic to c_i , define closed curve $\chi = \Gamma \setminus v$, if χ is freely homotopic to a power of c_i (or a horocycle of c_i), then Γ is freely homotopic to a corkscrew geodesic and hence the theorem holds.
5. If v is not freely homotopic to c_i and χ is not freely homotopic to a power of c_i , define $x' \in \gamma$ as the unique point satisfying $d(x', \epsilon) = \max_{x \in \gamma} d(x, \epsilon)$. Since $|\delta \cap \delta| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1.44 + 2 \log 2}{0.48} + 1 \right)^2 < 25$, hence $k_0 := |\gamma \cap \gamma| \geq k - 25$, suppose all the self-intersection points are $x_1, \dots, x_{k_0} \in \gamma \cap \gamma$, and $d(x_1, \epsilon) < \dots < d(x_{k_0}, \epsilon)$. For $1 \leq j \leq k_0 - 1$, there exists geodesic segment $\gamma_j^1, \gamma_j^2 \subseteq \gamma$ connecting x_j, x_{j+1} , suppose $\gamma_j^0 = \gamma_j^1 \cup \gamma_j^2$ is a nontrivial closed curve. Clearly

$$\ell(\gamma_1^0) + \dots + \ell(\gamma_{k_0-1}^0) \leq \ell(\gamma) < L$$

Suppose $r(x_j), r(x')$ are the injective radius of x_j, x' , since when $x \in N_0(c_i)$, $r(x) = r'(d(x, \partial N_0(c_i)))$ is a decreasing function on $d(x, \partial N_0(c_i))$, then when $k \geq 1750$ we have

$$\ell(c_i) \leq 2r(x') \leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq k_0-1} 2r(x_j) \leq \min_{1 \leq j \leq k_0-1} \ell(\gamma_j^0) \leq \frac{L}{k_0 - 1} \leq \frac{2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)}{k - 50} < 0.011$$

Here if c_i is a cusp, $\ell(c_i) = 0$. Hence

$$\ell(\epsilon) = \left(\frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} + \frac{2}{\ell(c_i)} \right) \cdot \frac{\ell(c_i)}{2} < 1.01$$

Next we define another shorter closed geodesic Γ'' with more self-intersection to get a contradiction. Let δ_1 be the shortest orthogonal geodesic from ϵ to itself, clearly δ_1 has no self-intersection, its endpoints are $X, Y \in \epsilon$. We can choose a curve γ'' homotopic to c_i of length less than 0.011 such that $x' \in \gamma''$, define $k_1 \gamma''$ is the multicurve of γ'' of multiplicity k_1 . Since χ is not freely homotopic to a multiple of c_i we have $\ell(\delta_1) \leq \ell(\delta) - \ell(v) \leq \ell(\delta) - 2 \times 0.48$. Define the geodesic γ_0 with endpoints P, Q in the homotopy class of $\gamma \cup 30\gamma''$ (the curve obtained by following γ from Q to x' , then choose such orientation of γ'' and winding around γ'' for 30 times, finally following γ from x' to P). Clearly the winding number $w(\gamma_0) = w(\gamma) + 30$.

Define the geodesic $\gamma'_0 \subseteq N_0(c_i)$, with endpoints X, Y , such that γ'_0 winding around c_i with winding number $w(\gamma'_0) \in [w(\gamma) + 28, w(\gamma) + 29]$. Since $w(\gamma'_0) < w(\gamma_0)$ we have $\ell(\gamma'_0) < \ell(\gamma_0)$. Define Γ' is the closed geodesic freely homotopic to the closed curve $\gamma'_0 \cup \delta_1$.

Then $|\Gamma' \cap \Gamma'| \geq |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| - 25 + 28 > k$, but

$$\ell(\Gamma') \leq \ell(\delta_1) + \ell(\gamma'_0) \leq \ell(\delta) - \ell(v) + \ell(\gamma_0) < \ell(\delta) - 0.96 + \ell(\gamma) + 0.33 < \ell(\Gamma)$$

contradicting with the minimality of the length L .

□

Since the minimal length of all the corkscrew geodesics on pair of pants are computed in [4] and [2], we have:

Corollary 4.8. *If $L > 14$, $\ell(\delta) < 1.44 + 2 \log 2$, $k \geq 1750$ then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$ and the equality holds if Γ is a corkscrew geodesic on a thrice-punctured sphere.*

Theorem 4.9. *If $L \leq 14$ or $\ell(\delta) \geq 1.44 + 2 \log 2$, and $k > 1750$, then $L \geq 2 \cosh^{-1}(2k + 1)$.*

Proof. If $L > 14$ or $\ell(\delta) \geq 1.44 + 2 \log 2$, as we discussed before, let $l = \ell(\gamma)$, $L - l = \ell(\delta) \geq 1.44 + 2 \log 2$, using Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Gamma \cap \Gamma| &\leq 1 + 2 \sinh \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - l) + 1 \right)^2 \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 1 + 2 \sinh \left(\frac{L}{2} - 0.72 - \log 2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} \times (1.44 + 2 \log 2) + 1 \right)^2, 1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 1 \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ 25 + 0.244e^{\frac{L}{2}}, 2.2L^2 + 2.1L + 2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the fact that $1 + \sinh \frac{l}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} (L - l) + 1 \right)^2$ is a convex function on $l \in [0, L - 1.44 - 2 \log 2]$. When $k > 1750$, then $25 + 0.244e^{\frac{L}{2}} > 1750$ or $2.2L^2 + 2.1L + 2 > 1750$, both have $L > 17.7$. But when $L > 17.7$, $4(25 + 0.244e^{\frac{L}{2}}) + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$ and $4(2.2L^2 + 2.1L + 2) + 2 < e^{\frac{L}{2}}$, contradiction.

If $L \leq 14$, then we get a contradiction since

$$|\Gamma \cap \Gamma| \leq 1 + 2 \sinh \frac{L}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{25}{12} L + 1 \right)^2 < 1750$$

□

Hence we finished the proof of Theorem 1.3.

References

- [1] Colin C Adams. Maximal cusps, collars, and systoles in hyperbolic surfaces. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, Volume 47, Issue 2, 419–437, 1998.
- [2] Claire M Baribaud. Closed geodesics on pairs of pants. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 109, 339–347, 1999.
- [3] Ara Basmajian. The stable neighborhood theorem and lengths of closed geodesics. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 119, Number 1, 217–224, 1993.
- [4] Ara Basmajian. Universal length bounds for non-simple closed geodesics on hyperbolic surfaces. *Journal of Topology*, Volume 6, Issue 2, 513–524, 2013.
- [5] Viveka Erlandsson and Hugo Parlier. Short closed geodesics with self-intersections. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 169, Issue 3, 623–638, 2020.
- [6] Benson Farb and Dan Margalit. A Primer on Mapping Class Groups. *Princeton University Press*, 2012.
- [7] John Hempel. Traces, lengths, and simplicity for loops on surfaces. *Topology and its Applications*, Volume 18, Issue 2-3, 153–161, 1984.
- [8] Akira Yamada. On Marden’s universal constant of Fuchsian groups. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, Volume 4, Issue 2, 266–277, 1981.
- [9] Akira Yamada. On Marden’s universal constant of Fuchsian groups, II. *Journal d’Analyse Mathématique*, Volume 41, 234–248, 1982.
- [10] Wujie Shen and Jiajun Wang. Minimal length of nonsimple closed geodesics in hyperbolic surfaces, arXiv:2207.08360v1.

- [11] Ara Basmajian, Hugo Parlier and Hanh Vo. The shortest non-simple closed geodesics on hyperbolic surfaces, arXiv:2210.12966v2.
- [12] Hanh Vo. Short closed geodesics on cusped hyperbolic surfaces, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 318, 127-151, 2022.