

Bounding Shortest Closed Geodesics with Diameter on compact 2-dimensional Orbifolds Homeomorphic to S^2

JINXUAN CHEN

Length bounded sweepouts give a way to bound the length of the shortest closed geodesic of a closed manifold. In this paper, we generalized to the case of compact 2-dimensional orbifolds homeomorphic to S^2 as well as compact 2-dimensional orbifolds with finite orbifold fundamental groups. We proved an inequality for the length of the shortest closed orbifold geodesic in terms of the diameter.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	Orbifolds	5
2.2	The Proper Riemannian Groupoid of Germs of Change of Chart . . .	5
2.3	1-Cocycles, Morphisms, and Homotopies	6
2.4	Orbifold Covering and Exceptional Stratum	8
2.5	Orbifold Free Loop Space	8
2.6	Orbifold geodesic	12
2.7	local \mathcal{G} -homotopy	12
2.8	Concatenations	13

3	Orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments	14
3.1	The Space Γ of Orbifold 1-Cycles with 2 Segments	14
3.2	The Tangent Space and the Exponential Map on Γ	15
3.3	The Topology on Γ	18
3.4	The Length Functional and Stable 1-cycles	19
4	The Birkhoff Curve Shortening Process	21
4.1	Defining the Birkhoff Process Ψ	21
4.2	Constructing the Birkhoff Homotopy	22
5	Deformations Results	24
5.1	Descent on the Steepest Direction and the Birkhoff Process	25
5.1.1	The Subspaces of Ordered Piecewise-Geodesic Orbifold 1-cycles $\hat{\Gamma}_N$	26
5.1.2	Multiple Points, Double Points, and Clusters	27
5.1.3	Defining the Descent Vectors	28
5.1.4	The First Variation of Length on the Descent vectors	30
5.1.5	The Principal Point and Singular Point of $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$	33
5.1.6	The Descent Vector Fields	34
5.1.7	The Continuity of the First Variation of Length	36
5.1.8	Lower Bound for Descent Vectors	38
5.1.9	The Modified Birkhoff Process	41
5.2	Deformation Retract from $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq \epsilon}$	43
5.3	Construction of a homotopy $\tilde{H} : [0, 3] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}$	45
6	Proof of Theorem	48
6.1	A Triangulation of $ \mathcal{O} $	48
6.2	Construction of a family $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$	51
6.3	Construction of the map $\mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow \mathcal{O} $	54

Bounding Shortest Closed Geodesics 3

Appendices 57

A Continuity of the Birkhoff Process 57

1 Introduction

Given a Riemannian manifold, its closed geodesics are critical points for the energy functional on the space of free loops. Lusternik and Fet [Fet52] used this observation together with Morse theory to connect the topology of the free loop space to existence of closed geodesics. This was later improved by Gromoll, Meyer [GM69], Viguère-Poirrier, and Sullivan [VS76] to prove the existence of infinitely many geodesics on almost all manifolds. Similar arguments were developed for more quantitative results, for example, on bounding the length of the shortest closed geodesics $l(M)$, especially in dimension 2. It is easy to see that given a non-simply-connected Riemannian manifold M , $l(M) \leq 2D(M)$, where $D(M)$ denotes the diameter of M . In the harder cases of Riemannian 2-sphere, Croke [Cro88] proved that $l(M) \leq 9D(M)$ and $l(M) \leq (25 + 4\sqrt{2})\sqrt{A(M)}$ where $A(M)$ denote the area of M . The first inequality was later improved by Maeda [Mae94] to $l(M) \leq 5D(M)$. This Morse theory method was generalized by Calabi and Cao [CC92] by noting that closed geodesics appear as critical points of the mass functional in the space of 1-cycles. This new approach allowed Nabutovsky and Rotman [NR02] to improve the previous bounds to $l(M) \leq 4D(M)$ and $l(M) \leq 8\sqrt{A(M)}$. Croke conjectured that $l(M) < (12)^{\frac{1}{4}}\sqrt{A(M)}$. The bound $(12)^{\frac{1}{4}}$ can be achieved by a Riemannian orbifold $S_{3,3,3}^2$ (can be thought of as two equilateral triangles glued together). It is conjectured that this bound can only be achieved in orbifolds.

In the case of Riemannian orbifolds, orbifold geodesics can be defined similarly, and the questions above on existence and bounds of closed orbifold geodesics can be asked as well. Guruprasad and Haefliger [GH06] defined the orbifold free loop space as an infinitely dimensional orbifold, and they showed that the orbifold topology is related to the existence and the number of closed orbifold geodesics. However, the problem of producing quantitative estimates like the ones by Nabutovsky and Rotman hasn't been attacked yet, and it is the topic of this paper.

Theorem A *For any compact Riemannian 2-orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 , denoted by \mathcal{O} , $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$, where $l(\mathcal{O})$ is the length of the shortest non-trivial closed orbifold geodesic, and $D(\mathcal{O})$ is the diameter.*

Corollary B *For any compact Riemannian 2-orbifold with finite orbifold fundamental group, denoted by \mathcal{O} , $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 8D(\mathcal{O})$.*

Generalizing to the orbifold case is non-trivial because geodesics are not critical points of the length functional, and we do not have a defined orbifold 1-cycle space that detects closed orbifold geodesics. The rough idea of the proof for the main result is the following: We define a space of orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments in a way that takes inspiration from Guruprasad and Haefliger’s orbifold loop space, and on this space we generalize the Birkhoff curve shortening process and the so-called descent on the steepest direction. Closed orbifold geodesics appear as fixed points of these two processes. Using these as ingredients, we prove that we can deform 1-parameter families of orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments shorter than $l(\mathcal{O})$ to 1-parameter families of constant orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments. At last, we construct a specific 1-parameter family of orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments with length bounded above by $4D(\mathcal{O})$ that does not deform all the way to zero length. Then the non-contractibility of the family implies $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$.

The manifold version of the deformation result on 1-cycles is dimension-free and global. In our case, the main issue we encounter is that the 1-cycle space is non-Hausdorff thus creating some complications. We circumvent this problem by controlling the amount of non-Hausdorffness and apply the deformation process only for 1-parameter families of orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments.

The paper is organized as follows.

In §2, the basic definitions and known results of orbifolds as groupoids, the orbifold loop spaces will be recalled.

In §3, we define the space of orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments.

In §4, we define an orbifold version of the Birkhoff curve shortening process on the space of piecewise-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments and prove its continuity.

In §5, we define and prove properties of the “descent on the steepest direction”, and then combine it with the Birkhoff process to prove two deformation theorems on spaces of cycles. §5 contains the technical heart of the paper.

In §6, we construct the specific family of orbifold cycles and combine it with the deformation results from §5 to prove the main theorem as well as a corollary.

Acknowledgement

This work would not have been possible without the professional guidance and personal support of my supervisor, Marco Radeschi. I am heavily indebted to Marco for his dedication to share his expertise, as well as his unwavering encouragement.

2 Preliminaries

We will review and set the notations for the concepts we will use throughout the paper. For deeper investigation, we refer interested reader to [GH06], [Moe02].

2.1 Orbifolds

Let $|\mathcal{O}|$ be a paracompact Hausdorff topological space.

Orbifolds are defined in a similar way as manifolds, starting with charts, atlases, and their compatibility.

An **orbifold chart** on $|\mathcal{O}|$ is a 4-tuple (X, q, V, Γ) , where X is an open connected differentiable manifold, V is an open neighborhood on $|\mathcal{O}|$, Γ is a finite subgroup of $\text{Diff}(X)$, and $q : X \rightarrow V$ is a continuous Γ -equivariant map which induces a homeomorphism $X/\Gamma \rightarrow V$. For simplicity a chart (X, q, V, Γ) is sometimes referred to as q .

Two orbifold charts $(X_1, q_1, V_1, \Gamma_1)$ and $(X_2, q_2, V_2, \Gamma_2)$ are said to be **locally compatible** if for any $x_1 \in X_1$ and $x_2 \in X_2$ with $q_1(x_1) = q_2(x_2)$, there exist an open connected neighborhood $W_1 \ni x_1$, a neighborhood $W_2 \ni x_2$, and a diffeomorphism $h : W_1 \rightarrow W_2$ such that $q_1 = q_2 \circ h$. Such an h is called a **change of chart** from q_1 to q_2 .

An **orbifold atlas** is a collection of locally compatible orbifold charts $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I}$ such that $\cup_{i \in I} V_i = |\mathcal{O}|$. Two orbifold atlases $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I_1}$ and $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I_2}$ on a topological space A are said to be **equivalent** if their union $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I_1 \cup I_2}$ is an orbifold atlas.

An **orbifold structure** is defined to be an equivalence class of orbifold atlases. An **orbifold** \mathcal{O} is $|\mathcal{O}|$, called the **underlying topological space** of \mathcal{O} , along with an orbifold structure. A **Riemannian orbifold** is an orbifold with a choice of Riemannian metric on X_i such that the change of charts and Γ_i 's are isometries. Note that on any paracompact orbifold one can induce a Riemannian orbifold structure.

2.2 The Proper Riemannian Groupoid of Germs of Change of Chart

There is an alternative way of defining orbifolds, which is to treat it as groupoids.

Definition 2.1 A **groupoid** $\mathcal{G} \rightrightarrows X$ is a small category \mathcal{G} , with set of objects X , and all morphisms being invertible.

Recall that as a small category, \mathcal{G} is equipped with five **structure maps**: The set of objects X can be identified with the set of units of \mathcal{G} by the **unit map** associating to an object x the unit $1_x \in \mathcal{G}$. Each morphism $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is considered as an arrow with source $\alpha(g) \in X$ and target $\omega(g) \in X$. $\alpha : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow X$ is called the **source map**, and $\omega : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow X$ is called the **target map**. The **composition map** $Comp : \mathcal{G} \times_X \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ maps (g_1, g_2) to $g_1 \circ g_2$ where $\mathcal{G} \times_X \mathcal{G} = \{(g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} : \alpha(g_1) = \omega(g_2)\}$. The **inverse map** sends $g \in \mathcal{G}$ to g^{-1} .

Definition 2.2 A **groupoid** is a **topological groupoid** if \mathcal{G} and X are topological spaces and the structural maps are all continuous. A **topological groupoid** is **étale** if \mathcal{G} and X are smooth manifolds and the structural maps are local diffeomorphisms. A **topological groupoid** is **Riemannian** if \mathcal{G} and X are Riemannian manifolds and the structural maps are local isometries. A **groupoid** is **proper** if the map $(\alpha, \omega) : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow X \times X$ is proper.

There is a 1-1 correspondence between proper étale groupoids and orbifold atlases that define an orbifold. Similarly, there is a 1-1 correspondence between proper Riemannian groupoids and orbifold atlases that define a Riemannian orbifold. Namely, given an orbifold atlas $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I}$ of a Riemannian orbifold, we can define a **Riemannian Groupoid** $\mathcal{G} \rightrightarrows X$ where \mathcal{G} consists of all germs of all change of charts and X is the disjoint union of all X_i 's.

Let E be a topological space and $\alpha_E : E \rightarrow X$ be a continuous map, called the **action map**. Let $E \times_X \mathcal{G}$ be the subspace of $E \times \mathcal{G}$ consisting of pairs (e, g) such that $\alpha_E(e) = \omega(g)$. A **continuous right action of \mathcal{G} on E with respect to the action map α_E** , is a map from $E \times_X \mathcal{G}$ to E that sends (e, g) to $e.g$ such that $e.1_{\alpha_E(e)} = e$, $\alpha_E(e.g) = \alpha(g)$, and $(e.g).g' = e.(gg')$.

For $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $x, y \in X$ with $\alpha(g) = x$ and $\omega(g) = y$, sometimes we also write $y = g \cdot x$. We can define an equivalence relationship on X by setting $x \sim y$ if there exists a $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $y = g \cdot x$. The space of equivalence classes will be denoted by X/\mathcal{G} , and the point inside that corresponds to the equivalence class of x will be denoted $\mathcal{G} \cdot x$, which can be thought of as the orbit of x by the \mathcal{G} -action.

2.3 1-Cocycles, Morphisms, and Homotopies

1-cocycles and morphisms are ways of describing maps into \mathcal{O} as a groupoid.

Let K be a topological space. Let $\mathcal{U} = \{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an open cover of K . Let $\mathcal{G} \rightrightarrows X$ be an étale groupoid with source map α and target map ω .

Definition 2.3 A **1-cocycle** over \mathcal{U} with value in \mathcal{G} is a collection of continuous maps $\{f_{ij} : U_i \cap U_j \rightarrow \mathcal{G}\}_{i,j \in I}$ such that for each $x \in U_i \cap U_j \cap U_k$ we have

$$f_{ij}(x) \circ f_{jk}(x) = f_{ik}(x)$$

in particular this implies that f_{ii} maps to units and that $f_i := f_{ii}$ can be thought of as a continuous map $U_i \rightarrow X$. Also $f_{ij} = f_{ji}^{-1}$.

Definition 2.4 Two 1-cocycles on two open covers of K with value in \mathcal{G} are **equivalent** if there is a 1-cocycle on the disjoint union of the two open covers with value in \mathcal{G} that extends both 1-cocycles.

Definition 2.5 Given a 1-cocycle $\{f_{ij}\}$ over an open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$, its **restriction** to K' , a subset of K , is defined to be the 1-cocycle $\{f'_{ij}\}$ over the open cover $\{U'_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $U'_i = U_i \cap K'$ and $f'_{ij} = f_{ij}|_{U'_i \cap U'_j}$.

Definition 2.6 An equivalence class of 1-cocycles over an open cover of K with value in \mathcal{G} is called a **morphism** from K to \mathcal{G} . The set of equivalence class of 1-cocycles is denoted $H^1(K, \mathcal{G})$. The morphism corresponds to the equivalence class of a 1-cocycle $\{f_{ij}\}$ is denoted $[\{f_{ij}\}]$.

If \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' are two groupoids of change of charts of two different atlases of an orbifold \mathcal{O} , then there is a natural bijection between $H^1(K, \mathcal{G})$ and $H^1(K, \mathcal{G}')$. Hence we can also think of a morphism from K to \mathcal{G} as a morphism from K to \mathcal{O} . The restriction of a morphism is defined to be the equivalence class of the restriction of the 1-cocycles representing it.

For a morphism $f = [\{f_{ij}\}]$ from K to \mathcal{G} with representative $\{f_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}$ over an open cover $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of K and with value in \mathcal{G} , we denote by $|f|$ the **projection** of f on the underlying topological space $|X/\mathcal{G}|$, or simply the underlying topological space of the orbifold $|\mathcal{O}|$, such that $|f|$ maps x to $\mathcal{G} \cdot f_i(x)$ if $x \in U_i$. The map is well-defined and continuous.

Definition 2.7 Two morphisms from K to \mathcal{G} are **homotopic** if there exists a morphism from $K \times [0, 1]$ to \mathcal{G} such that its restriction to $K \times \{0\}$ and to $K \times \{1\}$ are the two original morphisms.

It is easy to see that the projection of two homotopic morphisms on $|\mathcal{O}|$ is a homotopy of the projections of the two homotopic morphisms.

2.4 Orbifold Covering and Exceptional Stratum

Let \mathcal{O} be an orbifold. Let $x \in \mathcal{O}$. Let (X, q, V, Γ) be an orbifold chart such that $x \in V$. Let \tilde{x} be a preimage of x by q . The **local group** of x is defined to be the isotropy group $\Gamma_{\tilde{x}}$. It can be checked that the local group is independent of choice of chart and \tilde{x} . Given two points $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$, if they are both in the same chart (X, q, V, Γ) with preimages $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in X$ and $\Gamma_{\tilde{x}} = \Gamma_{\tilde{y}}$, then the local groups of x and y are said to have the **same type**. This generates an equivalence relation for local groups of all points on \mathcal{O} . The points with the same type of local groups are called a **stratum**, which creates a partition of \mathcal{O} called a **stratification**. All strata have manifold structure. A stratum is called **principal** if the points inside have trivial local group. There is always only one principal stratum, and it is a manifold of the same dimension as \mathcal{O} . A stratum is called **exceptional** if it is codimensional-1. A stratum is called **singular** if it has codimension great than 1.

Definition 2.8 *An orbifold covering $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_2$ is a continuous map $|\mathcal{O}_1| \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}_2|$ such that, for each point $x \in |\mathcal{O}_2|$, there exists a neighborhood of x that has an orbifold chart $V = U/\Gamma$ such that each component V_i of $f^{-1}(V)$ has an orbifold chart $V_i = U/\Gamma_1$ where $\Gamma_1 < \Gamma$.*

By Lange [Lan20], The metric double of a Riemannian orbifold along the closure of its exceptional strata is a Riemannian orbifold without exceptional stratum, and its natural projection to \mathcal{O} is a double-cover of Riemannian orbifolds.

2.5 Orbifold Free Loop Space

Let x, y be two points of X . A continuous **\mathcal{G} -path** from x to y over a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_k = 1$ of $[0, 1]$ is a sequence $(g_0, c_1, g_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ such that

- (i) c_i is a continuous map: $[t_i, t_{i+1}] \rightarrow X$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$.
- (ii) $g_i \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies $\omega(g_i) = c_i(t_{i+1})$, $\alpha(g_i) = c_{i+1}(t_{i+1})$ for all i , and $\omega(g_0) = x$, $\alpha(g_k) = y$.

For simplicity, the sequence $(g_0, c_1, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ sometimes will be referred as (c_i, g_i) when there is no confusion.

Among \mathcal{G} -paths parametrized by $[0, 1]$, we define an equivalence relation generated by the following two operations:

(i) (Refining subdivision) Given a \mathcal{G} -path $(g_0, c_1, g_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, g_k)$, we can add a point t' such that $t_i < t' < t_{i+1}$ and $g' = 1_{c_i(t')}$, getting a new \mathcal{G} -path $(g_0, c_1, g_1, c_2, \dots, g_{i-1}, c'_i, g', c''_i, g_i, \dots, c_k, g_k)$, where $c'_i = c_i|_{[t_i, t']}$ and $c''_i = c_i|_{[t', t_{i+1}]}$.

(ii) (Transition of segment) Given a \mathcal{G} -path $(g_0, c_1, g_1, c_2, \dots, c_k, g_k)$, we can change a segment c_i to c'_i if there exists a continuous map $h : [t_i, t_{i+1}] \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ such that $\alpha(h(t)) = c_i(t)$ and $\omega(h(t)) = c'_i(t)$, resulting in a \mathcal{G} -path $(g_0, c_1, g_1, c_2, \dots, g'_{i-1}, c'_i, g'_i, \dots, c_k, g_k)$, where $g'_{i-1} = g_{i-1}h^{-1}(t_i)$ and $g'_i = h(t_{i+1})g_i$.

The equivalence class of a \mathcal{G} -path c from x to y , denoted by $[c]_{x,y}$, is called a **based orbifold path**. The equivalence class of a \mathcal{G} -path from x to x will be called a **based orbifold loop** based at x . The set of all equivalence classes of \mathcal{G} -path from x to y will be denoted $\Omega_{x,y}(\mathcal{G})$, or simply $\Omega_{x,y}$. The set of all equivalence classes of \mathcal{G} -paths from x to x will be denoted Ω_x , and the union of all Ω_x for $x \in X$ is denoted Ω_X , called the **orbifold based loop space**. We will be especially interested in the orbifold based loop space of H^1 -loops. An orbifold based loop $[c]_x$ is H^1 if for all representative c of $[c]_x$, each segments c_i is absolutely continuous, and c satisfies that

$$E(c) = \sum_i^k E(c_i) = \sum_i^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} ((c_i)'(t))^2 dt < \infty$$

where $E(c)$ is called the **energy** of c , which is simply computed by summing up the energy of all c_i 's. The space of orbifold based loop space of H^1 -loops is homotopic to the space of orbifold based loop space, and since in this paper we only care about the former, we will denote it as Ω_X as well. The collection of all orbifold based path are called the **space of orbifold based paths**, or the **space of orbifold based curves**.

By Guruprasad and Haefliger, the based loop space of H^1 -class Ω_X has a Riemannian Hilbert manifold structure, defined in the following way:

- Let $H^1(c^*TX)$ be the space of H^1 -sections on c^*TX , where c^*TX is the vector bundle $\sqcup c_i^*TX / \sim$ where the equivalence relationship is defined by gluing together c_i^*TX and c_{i+1}^*TX with g_i^* . $T_{[c]_x}\Omega_X$ **the tangent space at** $[c]_x$ is the equivalence class of $H^1(c^*TX)$, where the equivalence class is induced by the natural isomorphism between c^*TX and $(c')^*TX$ where c and c' are two \mathcal{G} -loop representative of $[c]$. Sometimes we identify $T_{[c]_x}\Omega_X$ and $H^1(c^*TX)$ when there is no confusion.
- Let $[v]$ be any vector in $T_{[c]_x}\Omega_X$ represented by $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ where $v_i \in c_i^*TX$, and the superscript $\epsilon > 0$ is the pointwise bound for $|v_i(t)|$. **The exponential map** $\exp_{[c]_x}^\epsilon : T_{[c]_x}^\epsilon\Omega_X \rightarrow \Omega_X$ sends $[v]$ to $[\exp_c v]$, where $\exp_c v = (d_i, \bar{g}_i|_{d_{i+1}(t_i)})$ such that $d_i(t) = \exp_{c_i(t)} v_i(t)$ for all t , and \bar{g}_i is a local isometry generated by

g_i , for all i . It can be checked that this map is well-defined and bijective for ϵ small enough. It can be checked that $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ can be identified with $\exp_{[c]_x} T_{[c]_x}^\epsilon \Omega_X$ for ϵ small. We call $\exp_{[c]_x} T_{[c]_x}^\epsilon \Omega_X$ **a modeling neighborhood on Ω_X** for such small ϵ , for it can be locally modeled by Riemannian Hilbert manifold $H^1(c^*TX)$. We call $\exp_c v$ **the modeling representative** of $[\exp_c v]$ (with respect to c).

- For $[v], [w] \in T_{[c]_x} \Omega_X$. The Riemannian metric (\cdot, \cdot) at $[c]_x$ is defined by

$$(v, w) = \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \left(\langle v_i(t), w_i(t) \rangle + \left\langle \frac{D}{dt} v_i(t), \frac{D}{dt} w_i(t) \right\rangle \right) dt$$

Remark 2.9 The ϵ we used is the pointwise bound on H^1 -sections, namely, for $v \in H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$, $|v_i(t)| \leq \epsilon$ for any $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$ and for all i . We restricted ϵ to be small so that \exp_c^ϵ can be defined. But in fact we can also consider ϵ to be the H^1 -bound, namely, if we define $H^1(c^*TX)$ to be the set that consist of all v 's such that $\|v\| = \sqrt{(v, v)} \leq \epsilon$, $\exp_c^{\epsilon'}$ will still be well-defined for some ϵ' , if ϵ is small. This is due to the following lemma ($W^{1,2}$ close implies C^0 close).

Lemma 2.10 For $v \in H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ represented by (v_1, \dots, v_k) , $|v_i(t)| \leq 2\sqrt{\|v\|}$ for all i .

Proof Since $\|v\|$ is computed by integrating/averaging $|v(t)|^2 + |\frac{D}{dt}v(t)|^2$ over $[0, 1]$, which is greater or equal to $|v(t)|^2$, there exists a $\bar{t} \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$ for some i such that $|v_i(\bar{t})| \leq \|v\|$.

Next, we write $v_i(t) = r(t)w_i(t)$ for all i where $r(t) = |v_i(t)|$ and $w_i(t) = \frac{v_i(t)}{|v_i(t)|}$. We do not have a definition for $w_i(t)$ when $|v_i(t)| = 0$, so we assume first $v_i(t)$ is non-zero everywhere. Then $\langle w_i(t), w_i(t) \rangle \equiv 1$ and $\frac{d}{dt} \langle w_i(t), w_i(t) \rangle \equiv 0$. Therefore for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$ (wlog assume $\tau \leq \bar{t}$),

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|^2 &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} \left\langle \frac{D}{dt} v_i(t), \frac{D}{dt} v_i(t) \right\rangle dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (r'(t))^2 \langle w_i(t), w_i(t) \rangle + (r(t))^2 \left\langle \frac{D}{dt} w_i(t), \frac{D}{dt} w_i(t) \right\rangle dt \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (r'(t))^2 \langle w_i(t), w_i(t) \rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (r'(t))^2 = \int_0^1 (r'(t))^2 \geq \left(\int_\tau^{\bar{t}} |r'(t)| \right)^2 \geq |r(\tau) - r(\bar{t})|^2 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $r(\tau) \leq r(\bar{t}) + \|v\| \leq 2\|v\|$ for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Thus $|v_i(\tau)| \leq 2\|v\|$ for any i and for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$.

If v is not non-zero everywhere, we do the above over the domain A where v is non-zero. Let t' be the first t with $v(t) = 0$ on (τ, \bar{t}) , t'' be the last t with $v(t) = 0$ on (τ, \bar{t}) . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\| &\geq \left(\int_{[0,1] \cap A} |r'(t)| \right)^2 \geq \left(\int_{\tau}^{t'} |r'(t)| \right)^2 + \left(\int_{t''}^{\bar{t}} |r'(t)| \right)^2 \\ &\geq |r(\tau)|^2 + |r(\bar{t})|^2 \geq |r(\tau) - r(\bar{t})|^2 \end{aligned}$$

□

The groupoid \mathcal{G} acts on Ω_X naturally from the right by perturbing the base points. Namely, the action map is defined as $\alpha_{\Omega_X} : \Omega_X \rightarrow X$ sending an orbifold based loop $[c]_x$ to its basepoint x , and the action is defined by $\Omega_X \times_X \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \Omega_X$ sending $([c]_x, g)$, with $c = (g_0, c_1, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ being a representative of $[c]_x$, to $[c']_{\alpha(g)}$, where $c' = (g^{-1}g_0, c_1, \dots, c_k, g_k g)$. The quotient space Ω_X/\mathcal{G} is denoted $\Lambda\mathcal{O}$, called the **orbifold free loop space** on \mathcal{O} . The element of the free loop space that is represented by the based loop $[c]_x$ will be denoted $[c]$. The orbifold free loop space $\Lambda\mathcal{O}$ is itself an infinite dimensional Riemannian orbifold by [GH06], with orbifold tangent space $T_{[c]}\Lambda\mathcal{O}$ at $[c]$ being isomorphism classes of $H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$, exponential map $\exp_{[c]}$ being the map sending $[v] \in H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ to $[\exp_{[c]}[v]]$ where $[c]_x$ is a orbifold based loop representative of $[c]$ and the equivalence class is quotient by transition of basepoints. $\exp_{[c]} T_{[c]}^\epsilon \Lambda\mathcal{O}$ is called a **modeling neighborhood on $\Lambda\mathcal{O}$** for ϵ small enough so that $\exp_{[c]}$ is well-defined.

It can be checked that $\exp_{[c]} T_{[c]}^\epsilon \Lambda\mathcal{O}$ can be identified with $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)/\mathcal{G}_x$, where the \mathcal{G}_x action is by permuting the basepoint x of c . Note that, for ϵ small, the \mathcal{G}_x action might only be defined for a subgroup of \mathcal{G}_x that fix $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. For $v \in H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$, we say that $\exp_c v$ is a **modeling representative with respect to c** for $\exp_{[c]}[v]$ if $[\exp_c v] = \exp_{[c]}[v]$. Note that modeling representative might not be unique if the \mathcal{G}_x action is non-trivial on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$.

The projection of $[c]$ on the underlying topological space is a loop on $|\mathcal{O}|$, denoted by $|[c]|$. Denote $|[c]|(t)$ the evaluation of $|[c]|$ at t , by $[c](t)$.

Similarly, we can define **the orbifold free path space** by quotienting the \mathcal{G} -action on endpoints.

Remark 2.11 *There is a 1-1 correspondence between orbifold free loops and morphisms from S^1 to \mathcal{G} . Namely, given an orbifold free loop $[c]$ represented by a*

$c = (g_0, c_1, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ over a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = 1$, let \bar{g}_i be the local isometry on X generated by g_i defined on $B_\epsilon(\alpha(g_i))$ for some small ϵ for all i . Let \bar{c}_i be an extension of c_i on the open domain $(t_{i-1} - \epsilon, t_i + \epsilon)$ (we consider $[0, 1]/0 \sim 1 = S^1$) such that $\bar{c}_i|_{(t_{i-1} - \epsilon, t_{i-1})} = \bar{g}_{i-1}^{-1}c_{i-1}|_{(t_{i-1} - \epsilon, t_{i-1})}$ and $\bar{c}_i|_{(t_i, t_i + \epsilon)} = \bar{g}_i c_i|_{(t_i, t_i + \epsilon)}$. Then we can define a 1-cocycle $\{f_{ij}\}$ over $\{(t_{i-1} - \epsilon, t_i + \epsilon)\}_{i=0,1,\dots,k}$ by setting $f_i = \bar{c}_i$ and $f_{ij}(t) = \bar{g}_j|_{\bar{c}_i(t)}$ for $j = i + 1$ and for any $t \in (t_j - \epsilon, t_j + \epsilon)$. The morphism $[\{f_{ij}\}]$ is the corresponding morphism from S^1 to \mathcal{G} . It can also be checked that a morphism from S^2 to \mathcal{G} gives rise to an orbifold free loop and that the composition of these two processes is the identity map.

Although we have a natural topology induced by the Riemannian metric (\cdot, \cdot) on Ω_X and $\Lambda\mathcal{O}$, it is not easy to use. Therefore we will instead use the following pointwise topology that corresponds to pointwise convergence.

Definition 2.12 $[c^j] \rightarrow [c]$ in the **pointwise topology** if there exists a subsequence of $[c^j]$, still denoted as $[c^j]$, such that $[c^j]$'s are all in a modeling neighborhood $\exp_{[c]}^\epsilon H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ with respect to some representative c of $[c]$ and there exists modelling representatives c^j satisfy that $c_i^j(t) \rightarrow c_i(t)$ for all i and for all t as $j \rightarrow \infty$.

2.6 Orbifold geodesic

Definition 2.13 An orbifold free loop $[c]$ from $[0, 1]$ to \mathcal{G} is **geodesic at a point** $t \in (0, 1)$ if there exists a representative $c = (c_i, g_i)$ such that t is in the domain of some segment c_i in c , and c_i is a geodesic. $[c]$ is **geodesic at 0** (and at 1) if there exists a representative $c = (c_i, g_i)$ such that the first segment c_1 and the last segment c_k are geodesics, and g_0 is a unit, and $c_1'(0) = c_k'(1)$.

We say that $[c]$ is **geodesic on a domain** $A \subset [0, 1]$ if $[c]$ is geodesic at all t in A . We say that $[c]$ is a **closed orbifold geodesic** if it is geodesic on the whole domain. We say that $[c]$ is a **piecewise-orbifold-geodesic free loop** if it is geodesic everywhere except for a finite set. We say that $[c]$ is a **piecewise orbifold geodesic free loop with N breaks** for N a positive integer if it is geodesic everywhere except at N points (multiplicity is allowed).

2.7 local \mathcal{G} -homotopy

Definition 2.14 Two \mathcal{G} -paths $c = (g_0, c_1, g_1, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ and $d = (h_0, d_1, h_1, \dots, d_k, h_k)$ over a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k = 1$ are **locally \mathcal{G} -homotopic** if there

exists a sequence $H = (l_0, e_1, l_1, \dots, e_k, l_k)$ where $l_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ are continuous maps such that $l_i(0) = g_i$, $l_i(1) = h_i$, $e_i : [0, 1] \times [t_{i-1}, t_i] \rightarrow X$ are continuous maps such that $e_i|_0 = c_i$, $e_i|_1 = d_i$, and $\alpha(l_i(s)) = e_{i+1}(s, t_i)$, $\omega(l_i(s)) = e_i(s, t_i)$ for $s \in [0, 1]$. We denote the homotopy relation between c and d by $c \overset{H}{\sim}_{\mathcal{G}} d$, or simply $c \sim_{\mathcal{G}} d$.

Proposition 2.15 *For any orbifold based loop $[c]_x$, there exists a neighborhood U of $[c]$ such that for any $[d]_y \in U$, there exist representatives $c \in [c]_x$ and $d \in [d]_y$ such that c and d are locally \mathcal{G} -homotopic.*

Proof Consider a modeling neighborhood $U = \exp_{[c]}^{\epsilon} H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ around $[c]_x$. For any $[d]_y \in U$, there exists a $v \in H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ such that $\exp_{[c]}^{\epsilon} v = [d]$. Then $\exp_{[c]}^{\epsilon}(sv)$ for $s \in [0, 1]$ is the required \mathcal{G} -homotopy connecting $[c]$ and $[d]$. From the proof, we can see that in fact, any two orbifold based loops in this neighborhood have \mathcal{G} -homotopic representatives. \square

From the proof we also get that, for any orbifold free loop $[c]$, there exists a neighborhood U around $[c]$ such that for any $[d] \in U$, there exist representatives $c \in [c]_x$ and $d \in [d]_y$ such that c and d are local \mathcal{G} -homotopic.

Proposition 2.16 *If two \mathcal{G} -paths c and d are locally \mathcal{G} -homotopic, then $[c]$ and $[d]$ are homotopic.*

Proof According to Remark 2.5.3, $[c]$ and $[d]$ can be viewed as morphisms from S^1 to \mathcal{G} . The homotopy between them can be constructed using the local \mathcal{G} -homotopy. \square

2.8 Concatenations

For orbifold free path $[c]$ over the domain $[0, 1]$ with representative $(g_0, c_1, \dots, c_k, g_k)$ and orbifold free path $[d]$ over the domain $[1, 2]$ with representative $(h_0, d_1, \dots, d_l, h_l)$, their concatenation $[c * d]$ can be defined as $[(g_0, \dots, c_k, \text{id}_{c_k(1)}, d_1, \dots, h_l)]$, if $[c](1) = [d](1)$ is a regular point on the orbifold.

This is well-defined since the choice of the groupoid element connecting c_k and d_1 is unique by regularity of $[c](1)$.

3 Orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments

3.1 The Space Γ of Orbifold 1-Cycles with 2 Segments

We will define orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments taking inspiration from the definition of orbifold free loops as well as observations on its manifold counterpart. All the orbifold 1-cycles and orbifold loops in this section as well as in the rest of the paper will be at least H^1 .

In the manifold case, Calabi and Cao [CC92] considered the space of 1-cycles with 2 segments:

$$\Gamma = \{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : \gamma_1, \gamma_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow M, \{\gamma_1(0), \gamma_2(0)\} = \{\gamma_1(1), \gamma_2(1)\}\}$$

There are three possible types for a 1-cycle (γ_1, γ_2) :

- $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_1(1) \neq \gamma_2(0) = \gamma_2(1)$, called the type of two loops.
- $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_2(1) \neq \gamma_2(0) = \gamma_1(1)$, called the type of one single loop.
- $\gamma_1(0) = \gamma_1(1) = \gamma_2(0) = \gamma_2(1)$, called the type of a figure “8”.

Let \mathcal{O} be an orbifold, and let (X, \mathcal{G}) be an induced groupoid structure of \mathcal{O} .

- Let Γ_1 be the space $(\Lambda\mathcal{O})^2$, corresponding to the type of two loops.
- Let Γ_2 be the space $\Lambda\mathcal{O}_{[0,2]}$, corresponding to the type of single loop, where the subscript $[0, 2]$ signifies the domain of parametrization.

The space corresponding to the type of figure “8” is relatively harder to describe. We will start by defining \mathcal{G} -cycles of figure “8” on (X, \mathcal{G}) .

Definition 3.1 A \mathcal{G} -cycle of figure “8” over a subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{n-1} < 1 = t_n < \dots < t_m = 2$ ($0 < n < m$) is defined to be a sequence $c = (c_1, g_1, c_2, g_2, \dots, g_{n-1}, c_n, c_{n+1}, g_{n+1}, \dots, g_{m-1}, c_m)$ for some positive integer n and m such that

- c_i is a H^1 -map from $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ to X for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$.
- $c_1(0) = c_n(1) = c_{n+1}(1) = c_m(2)$
- g_i is in \mathcal{G} with $\alpha(g_i) = c_{i+1}(t_i)$ and $\omega(g_i) = c_i(t_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1, n+1, \dots, m-2, m-1$.

For simplicity, sometimes \mathcal{G} -cycles are referred to as (c_i, g_i) if there is no confusion, and (c_i, g_i) will always be (c_1, \dots, c_m) over the subdivision $0 = t_0 < \dots < 1 = t_n < \dots < t_m = 2$ unless stated otherwise. Following the idea in the definition of orbifold free loops, we define orbifold free 1-cycles of figure “8” as an equivalence classes of \mathcal{G} -cycles of figure “8”. The equivalence relations are the following:

- (Subdivision) $c \sim c'$ if

$$c' = (c_1, \dots, g_{k-1}, c'_k, g'_k, c''_k, g_k, \dots, c_m)$$

is a \mathcal{G} -cycle of figure “8” over subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k-1} < t'_k < t_k < \dots < t_m = 2$ with $c'_k = c_k|_{[t_{k-1}, t'_k]}$, $c''_k = c_k|_{[t'_k, t_k]}$, and $g'_k = id_{c_k(t'_k)}$.

- (Transition of Segment for $k \neq 1, n, n+1, m$) $c \sim c'$ if

$$c' = (c_1, \dots, c_{k-1}, g'_{k-1}, c'_k, g'_k, c_{k+1}, \dots, c_m)$$

for $k \neq 1, n, n+1, m$ where for some local isometry \bar{g} generated by some $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $c'_k = \bar{g} \circ c_k$, $g'_{k-1} = g_{k-1} \circ (\bar{g}|_{c_k(t_{k-1})})^{-1}$, and $g'_k = \bar{g}|_{c_k(t_k)} \circ g_k$.

- (Transition of Segment for $k = 1, n, n+1, m$) (or Perturbing Basepoint) $c \sim c'$ if,

$$c' = (c'_1, g'_1, \dots, c_{n-1}, g'_{n-1}, c'_n, g'_n, c'_{n+1}, g'_{n+1}, c_{n+2}, \dots, c_{m-1}, g'_{m-1}, c'_m)$$

where for some local isometry \bar{g} generated by some $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $c'_k = \bar{g} \circ c_k$ for $k = 1, n, n+1, m$, $g'_k = \bar{g}|_{c_k(t_k)} \circ g_k$ for $k = 1, n+1$, and $g'_k = g_k \circ (\bar{g}|_{c_{k+1}(t_k)})^{-1}$ for $k = n-1, m-1$.

We define the equivalence classes generated by the first two equivalence relations as **orbifold based 1-cycles of figure “8”**. We define the equivalence classes generated by all three as **free orbifold 1-cycles (in short, orbifold 1-cycle) of figure “8”**, the space of which from now on will be denoted as Γ_3 .

The space of orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments Γ is defined as $\Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2 \sqcup \Gamma_3$. The orbifold free cycle represented by a \mathcal{G} -cycle c will be denoted $[c]$. In this paper, we will only consider L -Lipschitz orbifold free 1-cycles for some positive L . By L -Lipschitz, we mean that for any representative c of $[c]$, any segment c_i is L -Lipschitz.

3.2 The Tangent Space and the Exponential Map on Γ

For $[c] \in \Gamma_1 \cap \Gamma_2$, $T_{[c]}\Gamma$ is simply $T_{[c]}\Gamma_1$ or $T_{[c]}\Gamma_2$, the exponential map at $[c]$ will be the exponential map taken from Γ_1 and Γ_2 . For $[c] \in \Gamma_3$ it is more complicated:

Let $c = (c_i, g_i)$ be a \mathcal{G} -cycle representative for $[c]$. Let c^*TX be the vector bundle $\sqcup c_i^*TX / \sim$ glued by g_i 's. We consider the space consisting of tuples $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$ where $v_i \in H^1(c_i^*TX)$ is the space of H^1 -sections on vector bundle c_i^*TX for all i , and the differential of g_i maps $v_{i+1}(t_i)$ to $v_i(t_i)$ for $i \neq n, m$, and $\{v_1(0^+), v_{n+1}(1^+)\} = \{v_m(2^-), v_n(1^-)\}$. This space is a subset of the space $H^1(c^*TX)$ of H^1 -sections on c^*TX with possible discontinuity at $t = 0, 1, 2$.

Note that it is not a linear subspace of $H^1(c^*TX)$. We will abuse notations and call this space $T_c\Gamma$. It is an abuse of notation since c is not an element in Γ .

The \mathcal{G} -cycle of figure "8" c represents $[c] \in \Gamma_3$. Given another representative c' of $[c]$, there is a natural isomorphism induced by local isometries from vector bundle c^*TX to $(c')^*TX$. Therefore the tangent space $H^1(c^*TX)$ is isomorphic to $H^1((c')^*TX)$. This isomorphism induces a bijection from $T_c\Gamma$ to $T_{c'}\Gamma$. Hence we can define **the tangent space** $T_{[c]}\Gamma$ of $[c]$ as the equivalence class of $T_c\Gamma$ induced by the said bijections. The tangent vectors of $[c]$ will be denoted by $[v]$ represented by some $v \in T_c\Gamma$.

Note that, although we use the notation $T_c\Gamma$ as if it were a tangent space, but it is in fact not a linear space. However it is a union of two linear subspaces of $H^1(c^*TX)$: $V_1 = \{v \in T_c\Gamma : v_1(0^+) = v_n(1^-), v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_m(2^-)\}$, $V_2 = \{v \in T_c\Gamma : v_1(0^+) = v_m(2^-), v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_n(1^-)\}$. We divide $T_c\Gamma$ into three disjoint sets and denote them as the following: $T_c^1\Gamma := V_1 \setminus V_2$, $T_c^2\Gamma := V_2 \setminus V_1$, and $T_c^3\Gamma := V_1 \cap V_2$. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, and c' another representative of $[c]$, $T_c^i\Gamma$ can be identified with $T_{c'}^i\Gamma$ via the bijection between c^*TX and $(c')^*TX$, for that equations $v_1(0^+) = v_n(1^-)$, $v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_m(2^-)$, $v_1(0^+) = v_m(2^-)$, and $v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_n(1^-)$ are preserved by local isometries. Therefore we can denote by $T_{[c]}^i$ the equivalence class of $T_c^i\Gamma$ induced by the said bijections.

The exponential map \exp_c at a \mathcal{G} -cycle of figure "8" c can be defined for a short distance as following: for $v \in T_c\Gamma$, $\exp_c v$ is a sequence

$$d = (d_1, h_1, \dots, d_n, d_{n+1}, \dots, h_{m-1}, d_m)$$

over the same subdivision as c such that, for all i (here i is taken modulo m) and for all $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$:

- $d_i(t) = \exp_{c_i(t)} v_i(t)$.
- $h_i = \bar{g}_i|_{d_{i+1}(t_i)}$ where \bar{g}_i is the local isometry generated by g_i .

This sequence satisfies that d_i 's are H^1 for all i , $h_i \in \mathcal{G}$ with $\alpha(h_i) = d_{i+1}(t_i)$ and $\omega(h_i) = d_i(t_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, n+1, \dots, m-2, m-1$, and $\{d_1(0), d_{n+1}(1)\} = \{d_m(2), d_n(1)\}$.

Here are the three possible outcomes of the exponential map:

- If $v \in T_c^3\Gamma$, then $v_1(0^+) = v_m(2^-) = v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_n(1^-)$, which means $d_1(0) = d_m(2) = d_n(1) = d_{n+1}(1)$. Therefore $\exp_c v$ is a \mathcal{G} -cycle of figure “8”.
- If $v \in T_c^1\Gamma$, then $v_1(0^+) = v_n(1^-) \neq v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_m(2^-)$, which means $d_1(0^+) = d_n(1^-) \neq d_{n+1}(1^+) = d_m(2^-)$. In this case sequence $d = (d_1, h_1, \dots, d_m)$ induces two \mathcal{G} -loops $d' = (h_0, d_1, \dots, h_{n-1}, d_n, h_n)$ and $d'' = (h'_n, d_{n+1}, \dots, d_m, h_m)$, where $h_0 = id_{d_1(0)} = h_n$ $h'_n = id_{d_m(2)} = h_m$. Then the pair (d', d'') represents an element in Γ_1 .
- If $v \in T_c^2\Gamma$, then $v_1(0^+) = v_m(2^-) \neq v_{n+1}(1^+) = v_n(1^-)$, which means $d_0(0^+) = d_m(2^-) \neq d_{n+1}(1^+) = d_n(1^-)$. In this case d induces a \mathcal{G} -loop parametrized over interval $[0, 2]$, $d' = (h_0, d_1, h_1, \dots, d_n, h_n, d_{n+1}, \dots, d_m, h_m)$ where $h_0 = h_m = id_{d_1(0)}$ and $h_n = id_{d_n(1)}$. Therefore it represents an element in Γ_2 .

To summarize the above discussion, the map \exp_c defined on $T_c^\epsilon\Gamma$ sends $v \in T_c\Gamma$ to a sequence $d = \exp_c v$ representing an element in Γ .

Now we can define **the exponential map** $\exp_{[c]} : T_{[c]}^\epsilon\Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ by setting $\exp_{[c]}[v] = [\exp_c v]$ for $v \in T_c\Gamma$. It is well-defined since a subdivision on c induces a subdivision on $\exp_c v$, a transition of segment induces a transition of segment on $\exp_c v$, and a change of basepoint on c induces a change of basepoint on $\exp_c v$.

The following two maps will be useful in the future. We define $p_1 : \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Gamma_1$ as the map sending $[c] \in \Gamma_3$ with representative $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n, \dots, c_m)$, to the pair of orbifold free loops $[(c', c'')]$, where c' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(id_{c_1(0)}, c_1, \dots, c_n, id_{c_1(0)})$ and c'' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(id_{c_{n+1}(1)}, c_{n+1}, \dots, c_m, id_{c_{n+1}(1)})$. We define $p_2 : \Gamma_3 \rightarrow \Gamma_2$ as the map sending $[c] \in \Gamma_3$ with representative $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n, \dots, c_m)$, to the orbifold free loop parametrized over $[0, 2]$ $[c']$, where c' is the \mathcal{G} -loop parametrized over $[0, 2]$ written as $(id_{c_1(0)}, c_1, \dots, c_n, id_{c_n(1)}, c_{n+1}, \dots, c_m, id_{c_m(2)})$.

$\exp_{[c]} T_{[c]}^\epsilon\Gamma$ is called **a modeling neighborhood on Γ** if ϵ is small so that $\exp_{[c]}$ is well-defined. For $[c] \in \Gamma_2 \sqcup \Gamma_3$, similar to the orbifold free loop space, $\exp_{[c]} T_{[c]}^\epsilon\Gamma$ can be identified with $\exp_c T_c^\epsilon\Gamma/\mathcal{G}_x$, where x is the basepoint of c , and \mathcal{G}_x acts on $\exp_c T_c^\epsilon\Gamma$ by permuting basepoints. For $[c] \in \Gamma_1$, $\exp_{[c]} T_{[c]}^\epsilon\Gamma$ can be identified with $\exp_c T_c^\epsilon\Gamma/(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$, where x_1 is the basepoint of the first \mathcal{G} -loop component of c , x_2 is the second \mathcal{G} -loop component of c , and \mathcal{G}_{x_1} and \mathcal{G}_{x_2} act on $\exp_c T_c^\epsilon\Gamma$ by permuting the first and the second basepoint respectively. These identifications give rise to modeling representatives (with respect to specific representatives c of $[c]$).

3.3 The Topology on Γ

The topology on Γ will be defined by the following: $[c^j] \rightarrow [c]$ if in a modelling neighborhood around $[c]$, there exists modeling representatives c^j for $[c^j]$ and c for $[c]$ such that $c_i^j \rightarrow c_i$ pointwise for all i .

Note that pointwise convergence for Lipschitz curves is the same as uniform pointwise convergence. Therefore the collection of metric balls is a basis for the topology on Γ .

Note that this topology is in fact not Hausdorff. For example, for any $[c] \in \Gamma_3$, it can not be separated from $p_1[c] \in \Gamma_1$ by two disjoint open sets.

In fact, the amount of non-Hausdorffness of this topology can be controlled by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2 *For any $[c] \in \Gamma_3$, it cannot be separated from its Γ_1 counterpart $p_1[c]$ and its Γ_2 counterpart $p_2[c]$. Also, for any $[c] \neq [d] \in \Gamma_3$ with $p_1[c] = p_1[d]$ or $p_2[c] = p_2[d]$, they cannot be separated from each other. The above are the only cases where Γ is non-Hausdorff.*

Proof Consider $[c] \neq [d] \in \Gamma_3$ with $p_1[c] = p_1[d]$. Let $c = (c_i, g_i)$ be a representative for $[c]$ and $v = (v_i) \in T_c^1\Gamma$ be a representative for any $[v] \in T_{[c]}^1\Gamma$. By definition (c', c'') is a representative of $p_1[c]$, where c' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(\text{id}_{c_1(0)}, c_1, \dots, c_n, \text{id}_{c_1(0)})$ and c'' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(\text{id}_{c_{n+1}(1)}, c_{n+1}, \dots, c_m, \text{id}_{c_{n+1}(1)})$. Denote (v^1, \dots, v^n) by v' , and (v^{n+1}, \dots, v^m) by v'' . Then $\exp_{c_i} \frac{v_i}{j} \rightarrow c_i$ pointwise as $j \rightarrow \infty$, which means that $\exp_{[c]} \frac{[v]}{j} \rightarrow [c]$ and $(\exp_{[c']} \frac{[v']}{j}, \exp_{[c'']} \frac{[v'']}{j}) \rightarrow ([c'], [c''])$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $[c]$ cannot be separated from $p_1[c]$.

At the same time, since $p_1[d] = p_1[c] = ([c'], [c''])$, $[d]$ cannot be separated from $p_1[d]$ as well. Let $d = (d_1, \dots, d'_n, \dots, d'_m)$ over the subdivision $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_{n'} = 1 < \dots < t_{m'} = 2$ for some n', m' be a representative for $[d]$, then (d', d'') is another representative of $([c], [c'])$, where d' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(\text{id}_{d_1(0)}, d_1, \dots, d_{n'}, \text{id}_{d_1(0)})$ and d'' is the \mathcal{G} -loop $(\text{id}_{d'_{n'+1}(1)}, d'_{n'+1}, \dots, d'_{m'}, \text{id}_{d'_{n'+1}(1)})$. Let $w' = (w_1, \dots, w_{n'})$ be the representative of $[v']$ in $T_{d'}\Lambda\mathcal{O}$, and

$w'' = (w_{n'+1}, \dots, w_{m'})$ be the representative of $[v'']$ in $T_{d''}\Lambda\mathcal{O}$, then w defined by $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{m'})$ is in $T_d\Gamma$. Therefore $\exp_{[d]} \frac{[w]}{j} \rightarrow [d]$, but $\exp_{[d]} \frac{[w]}{j}$ is exactly $\exp_{[c]} \frac{[v]}{j}$. Therefore $[c]$ and $[d]$ cannot be separated.

The same argument applies for p_2 .

On the other hand, if $[c]$ and $[d]$ from Γ cannot be separated, then they cannot be both in Γ_1 or Γ_2 since Γ_1 and Γ_2 are Hausdorff. Also, it cannot be the case that one is in

Γ_1 while the other is in Γ_2 since Γ_1 and Γ_2 are disjoint open sets in Γ . Therefore one of them has to be in Γ_3 . Say $[c] \in \Gamma_3$. If $[d] \in \Gamma_1 \setminus \{p_1[c]\}$, suppose that $U \ni [d]$ and $V \ni p_1[c]$ separate $[d]$ and $p_1[c]$ where U, V are both metric balls with radius ϵ , then the metric ball W with radius ϵ has projection $p_1(W)$ being exactly V . Therefore U and W separate $[d]$ and $[c]$ since $U \subset \Gamma_1$ and the Γ_1 component of W is not touching U . The same argument applies if $[d] \in \Gamma_2 \setminus \{p_2[c]\}$.

Suppose that $[c]$ and $[d]$ are both in Γ_3 , and their p_1 and p_2 projection do not coincide. The ϵ ball around $[c]$ and the ϵ_3 ball around $[d]$ are disjoint for ϵ small, since their Γ_1 , Γ_2 , and Γ_3 components are all disjoint for ϵ small. Namely, their Γ_1 components are ϵ balls around $p_1[c]$ and $p_1[d]$, their Γ_2 components are ϵ balls around $p_2[c]$ and $p_2[d]$, and their Γ_3 components are ϵ balls around $[c]$ and $[d]$ under subspace topology from Γ (which can be easily verified to be Hausdorff). \square

We also have the following lemma regarding the topology of Γ .

Lemma 3.3 *If $[c^i] \rightarrow [c] \in \Gamma$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, then for any $t \in [0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2]$, $[c^i](t) \rightarrow [c](t) \in |\mathcal{O}|$.*

The proof follows directly from the definition.

3.4 The Length Functional and Stable 1-cycles

For any $[c] \in \Gamma$ with representative $c = (c_i, g_i)$, the **length** of $[c]$ is defined by

$$\text{Length}[c] = \sum_1^m \text{Length}(c_i) = \sum_1^n \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} |(c_i)'(t)| dt$$

The length functional might not be continuous in general in terms of the pointwise topology. However this will not be a problem for us since we confine ourself only to piecewise-geodesic orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments that are L -Lipschitz.

Denoted by $\Gamma^{\leq L}$ for all orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments of length less or equal to L , Γ^0 for all orbifold 1-cycles with 2 segments of zero length.

The following function e is introduced for notation's sake. $e : TX \rightarrow TX$ maps $v \in TX$ to $e(v) = \frac{v}{|v|}$ if $|v| \neq 0$, $e(v) = 0$ if $|v| = 0$.

Definition 3.4 *An orbifold 1-cycle $[c]$ with 2 segments is **stable** if,*

- $[c]$ is a pair of orbifold closed geodesic if $[c] \in \Gamma_1$.

- $[c]$ is an orbifold closed geodesic over the domain $[0, 2]$ if $[c] \in \Gamma_2$.
- $[c]$ is geodesic everywhere except at $t = 0$ and $t = 1$ and

$$e(c'_1(0^+)) - e(c'_m(2^-)) - e(c'_n(1^-)) + e(c'_{n+1}(1^+)) = 0$$

in $T_{c_0(0)}X$ for any representative $c = (c_0, g_0, \dots, c_n, g_n, \dots, g_m)$ of $[c]$ if $[c] \in \Gamma_3$.

Lemma 3.5 *There exists a non-trivial stable orbifold 1-cycle $[c]$ if and only if there exists an non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic of a non-higher length.*

Proof For $[c] \in \Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2$, it is obvious.

Let $c = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$ be a representative of $[c]$. If $[c] \in \Gamma_3$, then it is an easy Euclidean geometry exercise that either $e(c'_1(0^+)) = e(c'_m(2^-))$ and $e(c'_n(1^-)) = e(c'_{n+1}(1^+))$, or $e(c'_1(0^+)) = e(c'_n(1^-))$ and $e(c'_{n+1}(1^+)) = e(c'_m(2^-))$.

Note that since $[c]$ is everywhere geodesic but at $0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-$, we have that $|c'_1| = |c'_2| = \dots = |c'_n|$ and $|c'_{n+1}| = |c'_{n+2}| = \dots = |c'_m|$. Also, since $[c]$ is non-trivial, $|c'_1|$ and $|c'_m|$ cannot both be 0, WLOG we may assume $|c'_m| \neq 0$. If $e(c'_1(0^+)) = e(c'_m(2^-))$ and $e(c'_n(1^-)) = e(c'_{n+1}(1^+))$, then if we rescale the parametrization on $[c]|_{[0,1]}$ by a factor of $\frac{|c'_1(0^+)|}{|c'_m(2^-)|}$, we get a $[d]$ which is an orbifold cycle over a slightly different interval, p_2 can still be defined in the same manner as in Γ , then $p_2[d]$ is a closed orbifold geodesic of the same length as $[c]$. If $e(c'_1(0^+)) = e(c'_n(1^-))$ and $e(c'_{n+1}(1^+)) = e(c'_m(2^-))$, then we compose $c|_{[0,1]}$ with the backtrack of $c|_{[1,2]}$ and denote the composition by d , which also represents an orbifold cycle. Then after rescaling the parametrization on $[d]|_{[0,1]}$ by a factor of $\frac{|c'_1(0^+)|}{|c'_m(2^-)|}$, the p_2 projection of the end result is a closed orbifold geodesic of the same length as $[c]$. \square

Let $[c]$ be a piecewise-orbifold-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments. We say that $[c]$ has **break number** n if the orbifold curves $[c]|_{[0,1]}$ and $[c]|_{[1,2]}$ are geodesic except at $n-1$ points (multiplicity is allowed). Denoted by Γ_N the **space of piecewise-orbifold-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments with break number N** . A **choice of breakpoints** of $[c]$ is a collection of point in the domain of $[c]$ with multiplicity allowed, such that $[c]$ is geodesic on the complement of these points. For any $[c] \in \Gamma_N$, there are more than one choices of breakpoints. A choice of breakpoints can be different from another by extra geodesic points (fake breakpoints), as well as by multiplicity.

4 The Birkhoff Curve Shortening Process

For the manifold version of the Birkhoff curve shortening process (Birkhoff process in short), we refer interested readers to [CM11]. In this section, we will define the orbifold version of the Birkhoff process on $\Gamma^{\leq L}$, where $\Gamma^{\leq L}$ denotes the subspace of Γ consisting of L -Lipschitz orbifold 1-cycles with two segments with length upper bound L . Note that the Lipschitz constant L and the length bound L are chosen to be the same L . We point out here that while the manifold version of the Birkhoff process consists of four different steps, the one presented here only covers the first two, as these will be the only ones we will be using.

4.1 Defining the Birkhoff Process Ψ

For a 2-dimensional compact Riemannian orbifold \mathcal{O} , we will choose an orbifold atlas $\{(X_i, q_i, V_i, \Gamma_i)\}_{i \in I}$ with X_i 's being convex metric balls (hence V_i 's will be convex metric balls as well) with the property that any two points can be connected via a unique minimizing geodesic segment. This can be achieved by first taking an arbitrary finite orbifold atlas and then restricting to small convex metric balls with the property that their injectivity radius in the ambient space is less than its radius. Let $X = \sqcup_{i \in I} X_i$. Let δ be the Lebesgue number of $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$. This δ could serve as an analogue of "injectivity radius" on the orbifold. Consider the corresponding Riemannian groupoid of germs of change of chart $\mathcal{G} \rightrightarrows X$ equipped with a Riemannian structure inherited from the orbifold.

We fix an integer N such that $N\delta > L$. This will be the "break number" of the Birkhoff process.

The Birkhoff process Ψ is a map from $\Gamma^{\leq L}$ to $\Gamma^{\leq L}$ given in two steps:

For step one, denoted by Ψ^1 , we reparametrize $[c]$ to get the $[c']$ such that $[c']|_{[0,1]}$ and $[c']|_{[1,2]}$ are both orbifold free curves of constant speed.

For step two, denoted by Ψ^2 , we do the following:

Given $[c] \in \Psi^1(\Gamma^{\leq L})$, consider a \mathcal{G} -cycle representative for $[c']$

$$c' = (c'_1, h_1, \dots, h_{N-1}, c'_N, c'_{N+1}, h_{N+1}, \dots, h_{2N-1}, c'_{2N})$$

where each c'_i is defined on $[\frac{i-1}{N}, \frac{i}{N}]$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2N$. Since $[c']|_{[0,1]}$ and $[c']|_{[1,2]}$ are constant speed and $\text{Length}[c'] \leq L$, each segment has length no larger than $\frac{L}{N}$, which

is less than the Lebesgue number of $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$. Therefore such a \mathcal{G} -loop representative c' can indeed be found.

WLOG, assume $c'_i \subset X_i$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Replace each interval c'_i by the unique minimizing geodesic, denoted by \bar{c}'_i , connecting the two endpoints of c'_i in X_i . This can be done according to our choice of X_i 's. We call \bar{c}'_i a ‘‘geodesic replacement’’ of c'_i . Therefore we get a piecewise geodesic \mathcal{G} -loop $\bar{c}' = (\bar{c}'_1, h_1, \dots, h_{2N-1}, \bar{c}'_{2N})$, which represents a $[\bar{c}'] \in \Gamma^{\leq L}$. It is straightforward to check that Ψ^2 does not depend on the choice of representative.

Lemma 4.1 *Ψ is well-defined. $\Psi([c])$ is homotopic to $[c]$ as morphisms.*

Proof $\Psi([c])$ is homotopic to $[c]$ as morphisms since c is \mathcal{G} -homotopic to \bar{c}' . To make sure that Ψ is well-defined, we need to check that for any $[c] \in \Gamma^{\leq L}$, $\Psi[c]$ still has length bound L and is still L -Lipschitz. The first assertion follows from the length non-increasing property of Ψ^1 and Ψ^2 . The second assertion follows from the fact that $\Psi^1[c]$ has constant speed on $[0, 1]$ and $[1, 2]$, thus it has Lipschitz constant no greater than L and that geodesic replacement procedure in Ψ^2 does not increase the Lipschitz constant. \square

Although the Birkhoff process can be defined for any H^1 orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments, we are particularly interested in the case of piecewise-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments.

Note that, the Birkhoff process can also be defined on the orbifold free loop space.

4.2 Constructing the Birkhoff Homotopy

For each step Ψ^i of the Birkhoff shortening process and each $[c]$ in the domain of Ψ^i , we can define a continuous homotopy Φ^i from $[0, 1] \times \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ to $\Gamma_{3N}^{\leq L}$ such that $\Phi^i(0, [c]) = [c]$ and $\Phi^i(1, [c]) = \Psi^i[c]$ for $i = 1, 2$.

For Φ^1 : Let $[c] \in \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$. Then there exists a unique piecewise-linear non-decreasing map $P_{[c]} : [0, 2] \rightarrow [0, 2]$ such that $[c] = \Psi^1[c] \circ P_{[c]}$. We denote by $f_s^{[c]}$ a function from $[0, 2]$ to $[0, 2]$ sending t to $st + (1-s)P_{[c]}(t)$. This function will be used in the next section extensively. Set $\Phi^1(s, [c])$ to be $\Psi^1[c] \circ f_s^{[c]}$. It is easy to see that Φ^1 is a homotopy between $[c]$ and $\Psi^1[c]$, and that $\Phi^1(s, [c])$ is an orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments. The continuity will be checked in the next section.

Lemma 4.2 For any $[c] \in \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$, $\text{Length}(\Phi^1(\cdot, [c]))$ is monotonely non-increasing, and $\Phi^1(s, [c])$ still has Lipschitz constant L .

Proof The first assertion follows from the fact that rescalings does not change the length. As for the second assertion:

For any $\tau \in [0, 2]$ such that τ is a geodesic point, WLOG we may assume $\tau \in [0, 1]$. Let $\tau_s := f_s^{[c]}(\tau)$ for $s \in [0, 1]$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c] \circ f_s^{[c]})}{dt}(\tau) \right| &= \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c])}{dt}(\tau_s) \right| \cdot |(f_s^{[c]})'(\tau)| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c])}{dt}(\tau_s) \right| \cdot (s + (1-s)P'_{[c]}) \\ &\leq \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c])}{dt}(\tau_s) \right| \cdot \max\{1, P'_{[c]}\} \\ &\leq \max_{[0,2]} \left\{ \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c])}{dt} \right|, \left| \frac{d\Psi^1[c]}{dt}(P_{[c]}(t)) \right| \cdot P'_{[c]}(t) \right\} \\ &\leq \max_{[0,2]} \left\{ \left| \frac{d(\Psi^1[c])}{dt} \right|, \left| \frac{d[c]}{dt}(t) \right| \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We know that the derivative of $[c]$ and $\Psi^1[c]$ at any geodesic point must be less than L since they are L -Lipschitz. Also, there are only finitely many non-geodesic points. Therefore $\Phi^1(s, [c])$ is L -Lipschitz. \square

Φ^2 is constructed as follows: Let $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_{2N})$ be a representative of a constant-speed piecewise-orbifold-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments $[c]$, where c_i is defined on $[\frac{i-1}{N}, \frac{i}{N}]$. For simplicity, set $t_i = \frac{i}{N}$ for all i . We define $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2(s, c)$ to be the \mathcal{G} -cycle $(c_1^s, g_1, \dots, c_{2N}^s)$ for $s \in [0, 1]$ where

$$c_i^s = \bar{c}_i^s * c_i|_{[(1-s)t_{i-1} + st_i, t_i]}$$

is the concatenation of \bar{c}_i^s a geodesic replacement of c_i on the domain $[t_{i-1}, (1-s)t_{i-1} + st_i]$ with restriction of the original c_i on the domain $[(1-s)t_{i-1} + st_i, t_i]$.

Set $\Phi^2(s, [c]) := [\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2(s, c)]$. Note that $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2$ is a local \mathcal{G} -homotopy between c and $\Psi^1(c)$, hence Φ^2 is a homotopy between $[c]$ and $\Psi^2[c]$.

Lemma 4.3 For any $[c] \in \Psi^1(\Gamma_N^{\leq L})$, $\text{Length}(\Phi^2(\cdot, [c]))$ is monotonely non-increasing, and $\Phi^2(s, [c])$ still has Lipschitz constant L .

Proof The first assertion follows from the fact that replacing a segment with minimizing geodesic does not increase the length. For the second assertion, we only have to check for each i and each s , the Lipschitz constant of c_i^s is less than that of c^i . This reduces to check that the Lipschitz constant of \bar{c}_i^s is less than that of $c^i|_{[t_{i-1}, (1-s)t_{i-1}+st_i]}$. Since \bar{c}_i is a geodesic, we only have to check that the length of \bar{c}_i divided by the length of the domain of \bar{c}_i is less than or equal to L . However this is true since

$$\frac{\text{Length}(\bar{c}_i)}{s(t_i - t_{i-1})} \leq \frac{\text{Length}(c_i|_{[t_{i-1}, (1-s)t_{i-1}+st_i])}}{s(t_i - t_{i-1})} \leq L$$

□

We can then define a map, called the **Birkhoff homotopy** Φ , from $[0, 2] \times \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ to $\Gamma_{\frac{3N}{2}}^{\leq L}$ such that $\Phi(s, [c]) = \Phi^1(s, [c])$ if $s \in [0, 1]$, $\Phi(s, [c]) = \Phi^2(s - 1, \Psi^1[c])$ if $s \in (1, 2]$.

In Appendix A, we prove the continuity of the Birkhoff process as well as the Birkhoff homotopy for Lipschitz orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments.

5 Deformations Results

In this chapter we need the following space $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ of **ordered piecewise geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments with break number N** , which is defined as a subspace of $\Gamma_N \times [0, 2]^{2N}$ consisting of element $([c], t_1, \dots, t_{2N})$ such that $[c] \in \Gamma_N$ and $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_N = 1 \leq \dots \leq t_{2N} = 2$ is a choice of breakpoints of $[c]$. This space adopts the subspace topology of the product topology on $\Gamma_N \times [0, 2]^{2N}$. Denote by p_o the natural projection map from $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ to Γ , where “o” stands for ordered. When there is no confusion, we also refer to $([c], t_1, \dots, t_{2N}) \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$ as $[c]_o$.

Comparing to Γ_N the space of piecewise geodesic orbifold 1-cycles with break number N we defined at the end of chapter 3, this ordered space is needed since it keeps track of choices of break points. Later in this chapter we will see that, it is necessary to specify the choice of break points in order to perform descent on the steepest direction on a neighborhood of piecewise-geodesic orbifold cycles.

We define four types for elements in $\hat{\Gamma}_N$. For $[c] \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$:

- For $[c]_o$ with $p_o[c]_o \in \Gamma_i$, denote by $\hat{\Gamma}_N^i$ the collection of all such $[c]_o$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$. We say $[c]_o$ is of type $\hat{\Gamma}_N^i$.
- For $[c]_o$ with $p_o[c]_o \in \Gamma^0$ the projection under p_o being orbifold 1-cycle of trivial length, denote by $\hat{\Gamma}^0$ the collection of all such $[c]_o$. We say $[c]_o$ is of type $\hat{\Gamma}^0$.

We also define $\tilde{\Gamma}$ the space of 1-cycle with 2 segments on $|\mathcal{O}|$ as the collection of continuous map $c : [0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2] \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ such that $\{c(0), c(1^+)\} = \{c(1^-), c(2)\}$. Here we used 1^- to indicate the 1 in $[0, 1]$ and 1^+ to indicate the 1 in $[1, 2]$. The space $\tilde{\Gamma}$ equips with a pointwise topology. We can also define four types for elements in $\tilde{\Gamma}$. For $c \in \tilde{\Gamma}$:

- For c with $c(0) = c(1^-)$ and $c(1^+) = c(2)$, denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}^1$ the collection of all such c . We say this kind of c is of type $\tilde{\Gamma}^1$.
- For c with $c(0) = c(1^+)$ and $c(1^-) = c(2)$, denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}^2$ the collection of all such c . We say this kind of c is of type $\tilde{\Gamma}^2$.
- For c with $c(0) = c(1^+) = c(1^-) = c(2)$, denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}^3$ the collection of all such c . We say this kind of c is of type $\tilde{\Gamma}^3$.
- For c with $c(t) = c(0)$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$, and $c(s) = c(2)$ for any $s \in [1, 2]$, denote by $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$ the collection of all such c . We say this kind of c is of type $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$.

Note that the intersections between these four types are non-empty.

For any $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$ with representative $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$ over $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_n = 2$, we can define a map $\tilde{c} : [0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2] \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ by sending $\tilde{c}(t)$ to $\mathcal{G} \cdot c_i(t)$ for any $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$ for all i . It can be verified that the map \tilde{p} from $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ to $\tilde{\Gamma}$ sending $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$ to \tilde{c} via the above process is well-defined. Also, the map \tilde{p} is continuous since we are using pointwise topology on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ as well as on $\hat{\Gamma}_N$. Geometrically, \tilde{p} is the projection that sends an orbifold 1-cycle to an 1-cycle on the underlying topological space $|\mathcal{O}|$. It is straightforward to verify that $\tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}_N^i) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}^i$. For simplicity, we can also denote $\tilde{p}[c]_o$ by $||c||$ since it is consistent with the notation we use for projections of orbifold free loops.

Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$. In this chapter, under the assumption that L is less than $l(\mathcal{O})$ the length of the shortest (non-trivial) orbifold geodesic loop on \mathcal{O} , we prove two results:

- (i). f can be deformed continuously into $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq \epsilon}$ for ϵ arbitrarily small in a “type-invariant” way.
- (ii). The projection image of f on the underlying topological space $|\mathcal{O}|$, denoted by $|f|$, representing a family of 1-cycles in the usual sense, can be deformed continuously into a constant map in a “type-invariant” way.

5.1 Descent on the Steepest Direction and the Birkhoff Process

The following theorem is the actual statement of “deformation result (i)” mentioned above.

Theorem 5.1 *Let \mathcal{O} be a compact 2-orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 . Let L be a positive number less than the length of the shortest non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic on \mathcal{O} . Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}^{\leq L}$ be a continuous map, then a continuous homotopy $H : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ can be constructed, such that $p_o \circ H(\cdot, 0) = f$ and $H(\cdot, 1) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.*

This theorem is inspired by [NR04, Lemma 3]. Roughly speaking, the deformation is constructed using two ingredients, the Birkhoff curve shortening process and the so-called “the descent on the steepest direction” (descent process in short). In this section, we define and discuss the properties of the descent process, and discuss the slight modifications needed for the Birkhoff process in our case.

The idea of the descent process is as follows: For an ordered piecewise-geodesic 1-cycle, at each endpoint, we compute the sum of all outward pointing unit tangent vectors originated from this endpoint to get a vector, called the descent vector at this endpoint. We flow the endpoints along their corresponding descent vectors for a short period of time, then rejoin the new endpoints with unique minimizing geodesics to get a new ordered piecewise-geodesic 1-cycle.




Figure 1: Descent Process

Despite the simple idea (as shown in figure 1), the formal definition of the descent process requires somewhat tedious notations, which will be explained in detail in the following subsections.

5.1.1 The Subspaces of Ordered Piecewise-Geodesic Orbifold 1-cycles $\hat{\Gamma}_N$

We consider the following two subspaces of $\hat{\Gamma}_N$:

- Denoted by $G_N^{\leq L}$, is the subspace of $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ such that for any $([c], t_1, \dots, t_{2N}) \in G_N^{\leq L}$, there exists a representative $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_N, c_{N+1}, \dots, g_{2N-1}, c_{2N})$ for $[c]$ over the subdivision $0 = t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_N = 1 \leq \dots \leq t_{2N} = 2$ such that c_i is a geodesic

and $\text{Length}(c_i) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ for all i (Recall that δ is the Lebesgue number of the orbifold atlas we have chosen). In other words, $G_N^{\leq L}$ is the space of ordered piecewise geodesic orbifold cycles with break number N with each geodesic segment bounded above by $\frac{\delta}{2}$.

- We will define $g_N^{\leq L}$ the same way as $G_N^{\leq L}$ except that the length of each segments are bounded above by $\frac{\delta}{4}$.

For $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$, we define its i -th geodesic segment $[c_i]$ as the restriction $[c]|_{[t_{i-1}, t_i]}$, a free orbifold (geodesic) path in \mathcal{O} for $i = 1, 2, \dots, 2N$, where t_i 's are breakpoints of $[c]_o$.

We will only define the descent process on $G_N^{\leq L}$. This is because for $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N \setminus G_N^{\leq L}$, if a geodesic segment $[c_i]$ is too long (longer than δ), after flowing its endpoints, the choice of rejoining the flowed endpoints via a minimizing geodesic might not be unique.

5.1.2 Multiple Points, Double Points, and Clusters

Let $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq L}$ and \mathcal{G} -cycle $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_N, \dots, c_{2N})$ over $0 = t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_N = 1 \leq \dots \leq t_{2N} = 2$ representing $[c]$ with each c_i being geodesic.

- We call the following subset of $[0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2]$

$$\{0^+, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{N-1}, 1^-, 1^+, t_{N+1}, t_{N+2}, \dots, t_{2N-1}, 2^-\}$$

the collection of endpoints of $[c]_o$. Here we use 1^- to denote the 1 in $[0, 1]$, and 1^+ to denote the 1 in $[1, 2]$, and 0^+ to denote 0, and 2^- to denote 2.

- We call t_i 's for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1, N+1, \dots, 2N-1$ **the double points of $[c]_o$.**
- We call $0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-$ **the multiple points of $[c]_o$.**

We also define the merging of multiple points and double points:

- We say multiple points 0^+ and 1^- are merged, and multiple points 1^+ and 2^- are merged if $[c] \in \Gamma_1$. Note that in this case, $c_1(0^+) = c_N(1^-)$ and $c_{N+1}(1^+) = c_{2N}(2^-)$ on X by definition, hence they are literally “merged”.
- We say multiple points 0^+ and 2^- are merged, and multiple points 1^- and 1^+ are merged if $[c] \in \Gamma_2$. Note that in this case $c_1(0^+) = c_{2N}(2^-)$ and $c_N(1^-) = c_{N+1}(1^+)$.
- We say all four multiple points are merged if $[c] \in \Gamma_3$. Note that in this case $c_1(0^+) = c_{2N}(2^-) = c_N(1^-) = c_{N+1}(1^+)$.

- Two double points t_i, t_j are said to be adjacent if $|i - j| = 1$, two adjacent double points t_i, t_{i+1} are merged if the $(i + 1)$ -th geodesic segment $[c_{i+1}]$ has zero length.
- A multiple point and a double point are said to be adjacent if they are the two endpoints of geodesic segment c_1 , or c_N , or c_{N+1} , or c_{2N} . They are said to be merged if the geodesic segment connecting them has trivial length.

An equivalence relation can be defined via the merging pairs of endpoints, whose equivalence classes will be called **clusters** (of $[c]_o$). More specifically, we will call the clusters only consisting of double points **double point clusters**, the clusters containing multiple points **multiple point clusters**. Consider the set $\{0^+, 1, 2, \dots, N - 1, 1^-, 1^+, N + 1, \dots, 2N - 1, 2^-\} := \hat{\Gamma}$. There is a bijection from $\hat{\Gamma}$ to the endpoints of $[c]_o$, sending i to t_i , 0^+ to 0^+ , 1^- to 1^- , 1^+ to 1^+ , and 2^- to 2^- . The bijection then induces a partition of $\hat{\Gamma}$ based on the cluster partition of endpoints. This partition of $\hat{\Gamma}$ will be called **the type of $[c]_o$** . We will also refer to the bijection images of multiple/double point clusters as multiple/double point clusters.

The following partial order can be defined on $G_N^{\leq L}$:

- $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq L}$ is higher than $[d]_o \in G_N^{\leq L}$ if, $\text{Length}[d_i] = 0$ implies $\text{Length}[c_i] = 0$ for all i , and $\text{Length}[d_i] \neq 0$ while $\text{Length}[c_i] = 0$ for some i .
- $[c]_o$ with $[c] \in \Gamma_3$ is higher than any $[d]_o$ with $[d]$ in $\Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2$.

It is easy to see that $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq L}$ is higher than $[d]_o \in G_N^{\leq L}$ if and only if the partition of multiple points and double points into clusters is “finer” in $[d]_o$ than in $[c]_o$. Therefore we have a partial order on the types in $G_N^{\leq L}$.

5.1.3 Defining the Descent Vectors

Let $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$ and \mathcal{G} -cycle $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_N, \dots, c_{2N})$ over $0 = t_0 \leq \dots \leq t_N = 1 \leq \dots \leq t_{2N} = 2$ representing $[c]$ with each c_i being geodesic. A tangent vector $V = (V_1, \dots, V_{2N}) \in T_c \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ can be restricted to a system of vectors (at endpoints) v represented by

$$(V_1(t_0), V_1(t_1), V_2(t_2), \dots, V_N(t_N), V_{N+1}(t_N), V_{N+1}(t_{N+1}), V_{N+2}(t_{N+2}), \dots, V_{2N}(t_{2N}))$$

consisting of a total of $2N + 2$ vectors in TX . We will call $V_i(t_i)$ the i -th vector v_i of v for $i \neq 0, N, 2N$, $V_1(t_0)$ the 0^+ -th vector v_{0^+} of v , $V_N(t_N)$ the 1^- -th vector v_{1^-} of v , $V_{N+1}(t_N)$ the 1^+ -th vector v_{1^+} of v , $V_{2N}(t_{2N})$ the 2^- -th vector v_{2^-} of v .

The following notations will be useful:

- Let p_I be a map from \hat{I} to $\{0, 1, \dots, 2N\}$ sending 0^+ to 0, 1^- and 1^+ to N , 2^- to $2N$, and everything else to itself. Let g_0, g_N, g_{2N} be identities on X .
- For $i \in \{0^+, 1, 2, \dots, N-1, 1^-\}$, let l_i be the largest among $1, 2, \dots, p_I(i)$ such that $[c]_{l_i}$ is not constant. If such maximum does not exist, set $l_i = 0^+$. Denote $(g_{l_i} \circ g_{l_i+1} \circ \dots \circ g_{p_I(i)-1})^{-1}$ by $g_{l,i}$ (“l” for left). If $l_i = i$, let $g_{l,i}$ be id_X .
- For $i \in \{0^+, 1, 2, \dots, N-1, 1^-\}$, let r_i be the smallest among $p_I(i) + 1, p_I(i) + 2, \dots, N$ such that $[c]_{r_i}$ is not constant. If such minimum does not exist, set $r_i = 1^-$. Denote $g_{p_I(i)} \circ g_{p_I(i)+1} \circ \dots \circ g_{r_i-1}$ by $g_{r,i}$ (“r” for right).
- For $i \in \{1^+, N+1, N+2, \dots, 2N-1, 2^-\}$, let l_i be the largest among $N+1, N+2, \dots, p_I(i)$ such that $[c]_{l_i}$ is not constant. If such maximum does not exist, set $l_i = 1^+$. Denote $(g_{l_i} \circ g_{l_i+1} \circ \dots \circ g_{p_I(i)-1})^{-1}$ by $g_{l,i}$. If $l_i = i$, let $g_{l,i}$ be id_X .
- For $i \in \{1^+, N+1, N+2, \dots, 2N-1, 2^-\}$, let r_i be the smallest among $p_I(i) + 1, p_I(i) + 2, \dots, 2N$ such that $[c]_{r_i}$ is not constant. If such minimum does not exist, set $r_i = 2^-$. Denote $g_{p_I(i)} \circ g_{p_I(i)+1} \circ \dots \circ g_{r_i-1}$ by $g_{r,i}$.

To summarize, these $g_{l,i}$ ’s and $g_{r,i}$ ’s are the groupoid elements that connects the i -th endpoints with either the nearest non-constant segment, or the multiple points.

We now define the (left and right) outward pointing unit tangent vectors of c .

- For $i \in \hat{I}$, if $l_i \neq 0^+, 1^+$, then its left outward pointing unit tangent vector $v_{l,i}$ is given by

$$v_{l,i} = -\frac{d(g_{l,i})c'_{l_i}(t_{l_i})}{|d(g_{l,i})c'_{l_i}(t_{l_i})|}$$

- For $i \in \hat{I}$, if $l_i = 0^+$ or 1^+ , we set $v_{l,i}$ to be 0.
- For $i \in \hat{I}$, if $r_i \neq 1^-, 2^-$, then its right outward pointing unit tangent vector $v_{r,i}$ is given by

$$v_{r,i} = \frac{d(g_{r,i})c'_{r_i}(t_{r_i-1})}{|d(g_{r,i})c'_{r_i}(t_{r_i-1})|}$$

- For $i \in \hat{I}$, if $r_i = 1^-$ or 2^- , we set $v_{r,i}$ to be 0.

The descent on the steepest direction (descent vector) $v(c)$ for \mathcal{G} -cycle c is a system of vectors $v(c) = (v(c)_i)_{i \in \hat{I}}$ such that $v(c)_i$ ’s are computed by the following rules:

- For $i \in \hat{I}$ such that i is inside a double point cluster, $v(c)_i = v_{l,i} + v_{r,i}$. This covers all the i ’s such that l_i and r_i are not multiple points.
- If $[c] \in \Gamma_1$, $v(c)_{0^+} = v(c)_{1^-} = v_{r,0^+} + v_{l,1^-}$, $v(c)_{1^+} = v(c)_{2^-} = v_{r,1^+} + v_{l,2^-}$.
- If $[c] \in \Gamma_2$, $v(c)_{0^+} = v(c)_{2^-} = v_{r,0^+} + v_{l,2^-}$, $v(c)_{1^+} = v(c)_{1^-} = v_{r,1^+} + v_{l,1^-}$.

- If $[c] \in \Gamma_3$, $v(c)_{0+} = v(c)_{1-} = v(c)_{1+} = v(c)_{2-} = v_{r,0+} + v_{l,1-} + v_{r,1+} + v_{l,2-}$.
- For $i \in \hat{I} \setminus \{0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-\}$ such that $l_i = 0^+$, $v(c)_i = d(g_{l,i})v(c)_{0+}$.
- For $i \in \hat{I} \setminus \{0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-\}$ such that $r_i = 1^-$, $v(c)_i = d(g_{r,i})v(c)_{1-}$.
- For $i \in \hat{I} \setminus \{0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-\}$ such that $l_i = 1^+$, $v(c)_i = d(g_{l,i})v(c)_{1+}$.
- For $i \in \hat{I} \setminus \{0^+, 1^-, 1^+, 2^-\}$ such that $r_i = 2^-$, $v(c)_i = d(g_{r,i})v(c)_{2-}$.

In short, the descent vectors are computed by summing up non-trivial outward pointing unit tangent vectors. Note that merged endpoints share “the same” descent vectors (only different by a groupoid element).

For c and c' both representing $[c]_o$, the descent on the steepest direction $v(c)$ is mapped bijectively to $v(c')$ by the isomorphism that maps $T_c\Gamma$ to $T_{c'}\Gamma$. Therefore the descent on the steepest direction $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o$ is well-defined.

Given a descent on the steepest direction $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in g_N^{\leq L}$ represented by a \mathcal{G} -cycle c , we can define a variation $c^s = (c_1^s, g_1^s, \dots, c_N^s, \dots, c_{2N}^s)$ over the same subdivision as c for $s \geq 0$ small, where c_i^s is the “shifted geodesic on the direction of descent vectors”. Namely, it connects the exponential of s times the descent vector at the two endpoint of c_i . The variation c^s for \mathcal{G} -cycle c can be lifted to variation $[c^s]$ for $[c]$ since the exponential map commutes with groupoid elements. Notice that we can define $[c^s]_o$ to be the ordered piecewise geodesic cycle with the same breakpoints as $[c]_o$. Also, for s small enough, $[c^s]_o$ is at least still in $G_N^{\leq L}$ (but might not be in $g_N^{\leq L}$ anymore).

5.1.4 The First Variation of Length on the Descent vectors

Let $[c]_o \in g_N^{\leq L}$ with a representative $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_{2N})$. We first introduce the following notations for later use. Let $\mathcal{T} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_j, M_1, M_1\}$ be the type of $[c]_o$, where D_i 's are double point clusters, and M_1 and M_2 are multiple point clusters (one of them could be empty if $[c] \in \Gamma_3$). We know that D_i 's consist of consecutive integers, therefore we have $D_i = \{k_i, k_i + 1, \dots, m_i\}$ for some k_i and m_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, j$. We will also keep the notation $r_{0+} \ l_{1-} \ r_{1+} \ l_{2-} \ g_{r,0+} \ g_{l,1-} \ g_{r,1+} \ g_{l,2-}$ from last subsection. Note that m_i is exactly $r_{k_i} - 1$.

The following functions computing the unit tangent vectors at endpoints of c is useful for notation sake:

$$e_{i,1}(c) = \begin{cases} \frac{c'_i(t_{i-1})}{|c'_i(t_{i-1})|} & c'_i(t_{i-1}) \neq 0 \\ 0 & c'_i(t_{i-1}) = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$e_{i,2}(c) = \begin{cases} \frac{c'_i(t_i)}{|c'_i(t_i)|} & c'_i(t_i) \neq 0 \\ 0 & c'_i(t_i) = 0 \end{cases}$$

Let $v = (v_{0+}, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{2-})$ be a vector system for $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots, c_N, c_{N+1}, g_{N+1}, \dots, c_{2N})$. Then we have the following first variation of length on the direction of v for c , simply by adding together the first variation of length for each c_i :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v} = & \sum_{i \neq 0, N, 2N} \langle v_i, e_{i,2}(c) - dg_i e_{i+1,1}(c) \rangle - \langle v_{0+}, e_{1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{1-}, e_{N,2}(c) \rangle \\ & - \langle v_{1+}, e_{N+1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{2-}, e_{2N,2}(c) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Notice that, in the first variation of length above, $e_{i,1}$ and $e_{i,2}$ vanish for i such that $[c_i]$ is constant. The only non-constant segments are k_i -th segment, m_i -th segment for $i = 1, 2, \dots, j$, and segment r_{0+} l_{1-} r_{1+} and l_{2-} . After collecting the non-vanishing terms, we have the following first variation of length:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v} = & \sum_{i=1}^j (\langle v_{k_i}, e_{k_i,2}(c) \rangle - \langle v_{m_i}, dg_{m_i} e_{m_i+1,1}(c) \rangle) \\ & - \langle v_{r_{0+}}, dg_{r_{0+}} e_{r_{0+}+1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{l_{1-}}, e_{l_{1-},2}(c) \rangle \\ & - \langle v_{r_{1+}}, dg_{r_{1+}} e_{r_{1+}+1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{l_{2-}}, e_{l_{2-},2}(c) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

However it makes little sense to consider the first variation of length on the direction of an arbitrary vector system v , for that the exponential on the direction of v might not represent an orbifold cycle anymore. Also, we want to restrict v so that the variation on the direction of v does not change the type. In other words, the v_i 's for i indexing multiple point/double point in the same cluster will have to be related via groupoid elements connecting their segments in the \mathcal{G} -cycle. To be exact, we require that for $i = 1, 2, \dots, j$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{k_i} &= d(g_{r,k_i})v_{m_i} \\ v_{0+} &= d(g_{r,0+}) \circ d(g_{r_{0+}})^{-1}v_{r_{0+}}, \quad v_{1-} = d(g_{l,1-})v_{l_{1-}} \\ v_{1+} &= d(g_{r,1+}) \circ d(g_{r_{1+}})^{-1}v_{r_{1+}}, \quad v_{2-} = d(g_{l,2-})v_{l_{2-}} \end{aligned}$$

We call such vector systems v a **type invariant vector system** of c , and its equivalence class counterpart $[v]$ a **type invariant vector system** of $[c]$. From now on we shall only consider first variation of length on the direction of type invariant vector systems.

Therefore the first variation of length on the direction of type invariant vector systems can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v} &= \sum_{i=1}^j \left\langle v_{k_i}, \frac{c'_{k_i}(t_{k_i})}{|c'_{k_i}(t_{k_i})|} - \frac{d(g_{r,k_i})c'_{m_i+1}(t_{m_i})}{|d(g_{r,k_i})c'_{m_i+1}(t_{m_i})|} \right\rangle \\ &- \left\langle v_{0+}, \frac{d(g_{r,0+})c'_{r_{0+}}(t_{r_{0+}-1})}{|d(g_{r,0+})c'_{r_{0+}}(t_{r_{0+}-1})|} \right\rangle + \left\langle v_{1-}, \frac{d(g_{l,1-})c'_{l_{1-}}(t_{l_{1-}})}{|d(g_{l,1-})c'_{l_{1-}}(t_{l_{1-}})|} \right\rangle \\ &- \left\langle v_{1+}, \frac{d(g_{r,1+})c'_{r_{1+}}(t_{r_{1+}-1})}{|d(g_{r,1+})c'_{r_{1+}}(t_{r_{1+}-1})|} \right\rangle + \left\langle v_{2-}, \frac{d(g_{l,2-})c'_{l_{2-}}(t_{l_{2-}})}{|d(g_{l,2-})c'_{l_{2-}}(t_{l_{2-}})|} \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

The i -th term in the sum equals $\langle v_i, -v(c)_{k_i} \rangle$. The last four terms in the formula equal $-\langle v_{0+}, v(c)_{0+} \rangle$ if $[c] \in \Gamma_3$, equal $-\langle v_{0+}, v(c)_{0+} \rangle - \langle v_{1+}, v(c)_{1+} \rangle$ if $[c] \in \Gamma_1 \sqcup \Gamma_2$. We can interpret the first variation of length formula as such: the first variation of length of c on the direction of v is computed by taking the negative of the sum of the inner product $\langle v_i, v(c)_i \rangle$ for i in a subset A of \hat{T} , such that there is exactly one i from each (non-empty) cluster of $[c]_o$ that is contained by A . This interpretation also provides an easy way to see that the first variation of length $\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial [v]}$ for $[c]_o$ on the direction of a type invariant vector system $[v]$ of $[c]_o$ is well-defined.

Here are some immediate properties of type-invariant first variation of length:

- If $v[c]$ is trivial, that is, all of $v[c]_i$ are trivial, then $[c]$ is a critical point of the first variation of length.
- If we plug in $[v] = v[c]_o$, then

$$\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial [v]} = \sum_{i \in A} -\|v[c]_i\|^2$$

for a subset $A \subset \hat{T}$ such that there is exactly one i from each cluster of $[c]_o$ that is contained by A .

- We call $\sum_{i \in A} \|v[c]_i\|^2$ **the norm of** $v[c]$, denoted by $\|v[c]_o\|$. Then

$$\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v[c]_o} = -\|v[c]_o\|$$

which implies that, the variation along the descent vector $v[c]_o$ is length non-increasing for $[c]_o$, and it does not change the length if and only if $v[c]_o$ is trivial. Therefore this norm measures how fast the length is decreased along the descent vector.

- The norm can be defined for any type-invariant vector systems $[v]$ of $[c]_o$ by summing the norm of v_i 's for $i \in A$. It only requires elementary algebra to check that for all type-invariant vector systems with norm $\|v[c]_o\|$, $v[c]_o$ achieves the minimum of the first variation of length. This is why the descent process is called “the descent on the steepest direction”.
- By directly checking the definition, $v[c]_o$ is trivial if and only if $[c]$ is a stable orbifold 1-cycle.

5.1.5 The Principal Point and Singular Point of $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$

Let $\hat{\Gamma}^S$ be the subspace of $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ that consists of $[c]_o$ with $[c] = ([c_1], [c_2]) \in \Gamma^1$ such that either $[c^1]$ or $[c^2]$ is a constant orbifold loop at a singular point on \mathcal{O} . $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$ can be divided into a disjoint union of $(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0) \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^S$ and $(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0) \cap \hat{\Gamma}^S$. For simplicity, we denote $(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0) \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^S$ by g^P , and $(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0) \cap \hat{\Gamma}^S$ by g^S , where “P” stands for “Principal”, and “S” stands for “Singular”, which will be explained next.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $[c]_o$ be in g^P with a representative c . There exists a small neighborhood U around $[c]_o$, such that there exists a unique modeling representative d for any $[d] \in \hat{p}(U)$.*

Proof Since $\hat{p}(U)$ for any neighborhood U of $[c]_o$ is contained by a neighborhood V of $[c] = \hat{p}([c]_o)$, we only need to show that there exists a neighborhood V of $[c]$ such that, for any $[d] \in V$, there exists a unique modeling representative d for $[d]$.

A modeling neighborhood for $[c] \in \Gamma_2 \sqcup \Gamma_3$ can be identified with $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)/\mathcal{G}_x$ where c is a \mathcal{G} -representative of $[c]$, x is the basepoint of c , and the \mathcal{G}_x action is by permuting the basepoint. A modeling neighborhood for $[c] \in \Gamma_1$ can be identified with $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)/(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ where $c = (c^1, c^2)$ is a \mathcal{G} -representative of $[c]$ and the $(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ action by permuting the two basepoints x_1 and x_2 . We only need to show that for $[c] \in \hat{p}(g^P)$, the above actions are trivial.

First we consider the case $[c] \in \Gamma^2 \cup \Gamma^3$. If x is a principal point in X , then the \mathcal{G}_x action is trivial on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. Therefore the \mathcal{G} acts trivially on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. As for the case where x is a singular point: Since we are dealing with a 2-dimensional orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 , x is an isolated singularity. WLOG, assume c_1 is non-constant and $c_1(t) \neq x$ for some t , then non-trivial elements in \mathcal{G}_x can at most fix one point (and that is x). We restrict ϵ to be smaller than $\frac{1}{2} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}_x} \{d_X(g \cdot c_1(t), c_1(t))\}$. This makes sure that for any $\exp_{c_1(t)} T_{c_1(t)}^\epsilon X \cap \exp_{g \cdot c_1(t)} T_{g \cdot c_1(t)}^\epsilon X = \emptyset$ for any non-trivial

$g \in \mathcal{G}_x$. Therefore the actions of all the non-trivial elements in \mathcal{G}_x on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ exit $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. Therefore \mathcal{G}_x acts trivially on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$.

Now let's consider the case $[c] \in \Gamma^1$. Let $[c] = ([c^1], [c^2])$ be in g^P with a representative (c_1, c_2) . Since $[c] \in \hat{p}(g^P)$, $[c^1]$ and $[c^2]$ are either non-constant or based at a principal point. By the same argument as last paragraph, the $(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ action must be trivial. \square

Note that, a point in an orbifold is principal, if and only if, there exists a orbifold chart around it that is actually a manifold chart, which is exactly why we call $[c]_o \in g^P$ principal. On the other hand, from the proof of the above lemma, it is easy to see that the \mathcal{G}_x action or $(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ action on $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ is non-trivial, therefore $[c] \in \hat{p}(g^S)$ corresponds to a singular point in Γ .

5.1.6 The Descent Vector Fields

In this subsection, for each $[c]_o \in g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$, we construct from $v[c]_o$ a descent vector field $V[c]_o$ at a neighborhood around $[c]_o$ in $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$. A local vector field around a principal $[c]$ corresponds to a local vector field on the modeling neighborhood $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ since there is a 1-1 correspondence between any $[d]$ near $[c]$ and its modeling representatives. However, a local vector field around a singular $[c]$ corresponds to \mathcal{G}_x -invariant or $(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ -invariant local vector field on the modeling neighborhood $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. Therefore we have to split into two cases. We will first construct for the principal case.

Let $[c]_o$ be an element in g^P . Let $[c]_o = ([c], t_1, \dots, t_{2N})$ where t_i 's are the breakpoints. Let U be a small neighborhood around $[c]_o$ such that no element in U is of higher type than $[c]_o$. This can be done since some of the multiple points and the double points of an element in U that weren't merged will have to merge to get a higher type orbifold cycle, but if U is small enough, we can make sure that for elements in U the un-merged multiple points and double points move so little that they always distance from each other. Let $c = (c_1, g_1, \dots)$ be a representative of $[c]$ over the subdivision $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_{2N} = 2$. If U is small enough, since $[c]_o \in g^P$, according to our discussion earlier, any element inside U can be represented by a unique element of $\exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$ for some ϵ and a representative c of $[c]$. Also, we require that U is small enough so that for any $[d]_o = ([d], s_1, \dots, s_{2N}) \in U$ satisfies that $|t_i - s_i| < \epsilon$.

For any $[d]_o \in U$, it can be represented by a $d \in \exp_c H^{1,\epsilon}(c^*TX)$. $d_i(t_{i-1})$'s and $d_i(t_i)$'s are the endpoints of d_i 's, but they are not necessarily the breakpoints of $[d]_o$.

However since $|t_i - s_i| < \epsilon$, if we require that $\epsilon \ll \delta$, we can use local isometries \bar{g}_i 's generated by g_i 's to move segments of to get another representative d' for $[d]$ over the subdivision $0 \leq s_1 \leq \dots \leq s_{2N}$ such that d'_i is in the same component as c_i . Each $v(c)_i$ is a tangent vector in $T_{c_i(t_i)}X$ and can be parallel transported to any point in the same connected component of X along a geodesic (since all components of X are convex). Denote $V(c)_i|_{d'_i(s_i)}$ the result of the parallel transport of $v(c)_i$ along the unique minimizing geodesic connecting $c_i(t_i)$ and $d'_i(s_i)$. Suppose that X_i is the component of X where c_i lies, $V(c)_i$ is a smooth vector field on X_i by elementary Riemannian geometry. Denote by $V(c)|_d$ the vector system with i -th component being $V(c)_i|_{d'_i(s_i)}$ for $i = 0^+, 1, \dots, 2^-$. It is straightforward to check that for a short period $[0, \epsilon')$, the exponential $\exp_{d'} \tau V(c)|_d$ for $\tau \in [0, \epsilon')$, constructed by flowing $d'_i(s_i)$ on the direction of $V(c)_i|_d$ and then rejoin the endpoints by unique minimizing geodesic, is still a \mathcal{G} -cycle. In fact, below we prove that it will be of the same type as d :

Lemma 5.3 *For $\tau \in [0, \epsilon')$ for some $\epsilon' \ll \delta$, the exponential $\exp_{d'} \tau V(c)|_d$ constructed about is of the same type as d' .*

Proof We only have to prove that they have the same cluster partitions.

Let J be any double point cluster of c . Then $c_i(t_i) = g \cdot c_j(t_j)$ for $i, j \in J$ for $g = g_i \circ g_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ g_{j-1}$ (assuming $i < j$). By definition of the descent vectors, we have $v(c)_i = dg \cdot v(c)_j$ and $V(c)_i = d\bar{g} \cdot V(c)_j$ for a local isometry \bar{g} generated by g (\bar{g} can be chosen to be $\bar{g}_i \circ \bar{g}_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ \bar{g}_{j-1}$ where \bar{g}_k is a local isometry generated by g_k for $k = i, \dots, j-1$).

If c and d' are of the same type, the i -th double point and the j -th double point for $i, j \in J$ are merged for c and d' . Therefore $d'_i(s_i) = \bar{g}|_{d'_j(s_j)} \cdot d'_j(s_j)$. Therefore $V(c)_i|_{d'_i(s_i)} = d\bar{g} \cdot V(c)_j|_{d'_j(s_j)}$ since $V(c)_i = d\bar{g} \cdot V(c)_j$. Therefore for an exponential on the direction of $V(c)|_{d'}$ at d' , its i -th double point which is $\exp_{d'_i(s_i)} \tau V(c)_i|_{d'_i(s_i)}$ is exactly $\bar{g}(\exp_{d'_j(s_j)} \tau V(c)_j|_{d'_j(s_j)})$ which is the \bar{g} image of its j -th double point, in other words, these two double points are merged. The same argument can be made for a multiple point cluster, we only have to prove that all endpoints in a multiple point cluster are related to a multiple point in the cluster via the groupoid elements connecting them.

If d is of a lower type than c (we have already ruled out the case of d is of a higher type than c by choice of U), it means that for some cluster J of c and for some $i, j \in J$, $d'_i(s_i)$ does not coincide with $\bar{g} \cdot d'_j(s_j)$, and they are flowed respectively by smooth vector field $V(c)_i = d\bar{g} \cdot V(c)_j$ and $V(c)_j$. Since different integral trajectories of the same smooth vector field does not intersect, $\exp_{d'_i(s_i)} \tau V(c)_i|_{d'_i(s_i)}$ has to stay separated from $\exp_{\bar{g} \cdot d'_j(s_j)} \tau V(c)_j|_{\bar{g} \cdot d'_j(s_j)}$ for $\tau \in [0, \epsilon')$. But the latter is also $\bar{g} \cdot \exp_{d'_j(s_j)} \tau V(c)_j|_{d'_j(s_j)}$.

In other words, the i -th endpoint of the exponential stays separated from the image of the j -th endpoint by \bar{g} . Therefore for a short period of time, the flow of $V(c)$ on U do not change the types. \square

$V[c]_o$ can be defined by setting $V[c]_o|_{[d]_o}$ at $[d]_o \in U$ to be the equivalence class of $V(c)|_{d'}$. This is well-defined since $[c]_o \in g^P$ is “principal”.

For $[c]_o \in g^S$, we need to check that $V(c)$ is invariant under the $(\mathcal{G}_{x_1} \times \mathcal{G}_{x_2})$ basepoint perturbing action. Let $c = (c^1, c^2)$ be a representative of $[c]$. Since $[c]_o \in g^S$, one of c^1 and c^2 is constant at a singular point on X while the other is not. Let V be a modeling neighborhood around $[c]$ which is the product of a modeling neighborhood V^1 around $[c^1]$ and a modeling neighborhood V^2 around $[c^2]$. WLOG assume that c^2 is constant, then $V(c)|_i \equiv 0$ since $v(c)_i = 0$ for $i = 1^+, N+1, \dots, 2N-1, 2^-$. Therefore $V(c)|_i$ is invariant under perturbing basepoints. Therefore we can define a $V[c^2]_o$ on U^2 as the equivalence class of $V(c)|_{c^2} \equiv 0$. Since c^1 is non-constant, the modeling neighborhood U_1 around $[c^1]$ is actually a manifold neighborhood, therefore we can define $V[c^1]_o$ on U^1 as the equivalence class of $V(c)|_{c^1}$, and $V[c]_o$ as $(V[c^1]_o, V[c^2]_o)$.

It is easy to see that the flow of $V[c]_o$ does not exceed $G_N^{\leq L}$ for a short period of time since it starts from $g_N^{\leq L}$. In fact, for a short period of time the exponential at a $[d]$ near $[c] \in g_N^{\leq L}$ in any direction does not exceeds $G_N^{\leq N}$.

5.1.7 The Continuity of the First Variation of Length

In this and the next subsection, we will explain two great properties of the descent on the steepest direction. The first property is that, the descent vector field we constructed in the last subsection is length non-increasing. (Next subsection we will show that there is a lower bound on the first variation of length on $v[c]_o$ for all non-constant $v[c]_o$.)

Recall the first variation of length formula for c on the direction v :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v} = & \sum_{i \neq 0, N, 2N} \langle v_i, e_{i,2}(c) - dg_i e_{i+1,1}(c) \rangle - \langle v_{0+}, e_{1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{1-}, e_{N,2}(c) \rangle \\ & - \langle v_{1+}, e_{N+1,1}(c) \rangle + \langle v_{2-}, e_{2N,2}(c) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Plug in $v = V(c)|_{d'}$. If $[d]_o$ and $[c]_o$ are of the same type, as $[d]_o \rightarrow [c]_o$, we have that:

- $V(c)_i|_{d'} \rightarrow v(c)_i$ for all i .
- For i such that $[c_i]$ is constant, $e_{i,1}(d') = e_{i,2}(d') = e_{i,1}(c) = e_{i,2}(c) = 0$.
- For i such that $[c_i]$ is non-constant, since $d'_i(s_i) \rightarrow c_i(t_i)$ and $d'_i(s_{i-1}) \rightarrow c_i(t_{i-1})$, it is elementary Riemannian geometry exercise that the tangent vector at $d'_i(s_i)$ such that its exponential is $d'_i(s_{i-1})$ converges to the tangent vector at $c_i(t_i)$ such that its exponential is $c_i(t_{i-1})$. In other words, $e_{i,1}(d') \rightarrow e_{i,1}(c)$ and $e_{i,2}(d') \rightarrow e_{i,2}(c)$.

In this case $\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial V(c)|_{d'}} \rightarrow \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v(c)}$ as $[d]_o \rightarrow [c]_o$, since all the terms in the first variation formula for d' converges to the corresponding terms for c .

If $[d]_o$ and $[c]_o$ are not of the same type, then there is a c_i of c is trivial while d'_i in d' is not for some i . Then we have $e_{i,1}(d') \neq 0$, $e_{i,2}(d') \neq 0$, $e_{i,1}(c) = 0$, and $e_{i,2}(c) = 0$. The extra non-zero terms in the first variation of length corresponds to this i will be

$$\langle V(c)_i|_{d'_i(t_i)}, -e_{i,2}(d') \rangle + \langle V(c)_{i-1}|_{d'_{i-1}(t_{i-1})}, dh_{i-1}e_{i,1}(d') \rangle$$

Since c_i is trivial, we have $\bar{g}_i \cdot V(c)_i = V(c)_{i-1}$ and $\bar{g}_i \cdot c_i(t_i) = c_{i-1}(t_{i-1})$. Note that h_{i-1} is a restriction of a local isometry \bar{g}_i generated by g_{i-1} . Therefore the extra non-zero terms can be written as

$$\langle V(c)_i|_{d'_i(t_i)}, -e_{i,2}(d') \rangle + \langle V(c)_i|_{\bar{g}^{-1}(d'_{i-1}(t_{i-1}))}, e_{i,1}(d') \rangle$$

Denote by \tilde{d} the normalized d'_i with domain $[0, 1]$. In this case, \tilde{d} lifts to a horizontal geodesic in TX , therefore the distance between $\tilde{d}'(0)$ (which is also $e_{i,1}(d')$) and $\tilde{d}'(\text{Length } d_i)$ (which is also $e_{i,2}(d')$) is bounded above by $\text{Length}(d_i)$ which converges to 0 as $d \rightarrow c$. Let X_i be the component of X where c_i lives in. Since function $\langle V(c)_i|_{\pi(\cdot)}, \cdot \rangle$ is a smooth function on TX_i where $\pi : TX_i \rightarrow X_i$ is the projection from the tangent bundle to the manifold, it is L' -Lipschitz for some $L' > 0$ on any precompact neighborhood in TX_i . As $d \rightarrow c$, we can assume the said neighborhood contains $e_{i,1}(d)$ and $e_{i,2}(d)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle V(c)_i|_{d_i(t_i)}, -e_{i,2}(d) \rangle + \langle V(c)_{i-1}|_{d_{i-1}(t_{i-1})}, dh_{i-1}e_{i,1}(d) \rangle \\ & = -\langle V(c)_i|_{d_i(t_i)}, e_{i,2}(d) \rangle + \langle V(c)_i|_{d_{i-1}(t_{i-1})}, e_{i,1}(d) \rangle \\ & < L \cdot \text{dist}(e_{i,2}(d), e_{i,1}(d)) \\ & \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the extra non-zero terms in the first variation of length does not affect the convergence. Therefore $\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial V(c)|_d} \rightarrow \frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial v(c)}$ as $[d]_o \rightarrow [c]_o$ for $[d]_o \in U$. We conclude that, there exists a neighborhood U of $[c]_o$ such that $2\|v[c]_o\| \geq -\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial V[c]_o|_{[d]_o}} \geq \frac{\|v[c]_o\|}{2}$ for any $[d]_o \in U$.

5.1.8 Lower Bound for Descent Vectors

The second great property of the Descent on the Steepest Direction is that, it is possible to find a lower bound for the norm of $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$.

We will prove the above statement in two parts: for some ϵ small enough, we will find a lower bound for the norm of $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq \epsilon} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$, and a lower bound for the norm of $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq L} \setminus G_N^{\leq \epsilon}$.

When ϵ is small enough, we can reduce to the case that a representative c can be chosen such that all of its segments c_i 's are contained in one component X' of X (for $[c] \in \Gamma_1$ possibly two components, but the argument would be the same). Also since ϵ is small, we can restrict X' to a smaller neighborhood that is ‘‘almost’’ Euclidean. We will first prove for the Euclidean case.

In the Euclidean case, we can rescale any piecewise-geodesic orbifold cycle without changing any vectors between the segments. Assume that there exists a sequence of non-trivial orbifold cycles $[c^j]_o$ with $\|v[c^j]_o\| \rightarrow 0$, rescale all $[c^j]_o$ such that the maximal length of a segment of $[c^j]_o$ equals 1, still denoted the rescaled $[c^j]_o$ as $[c^j]_o$. Note that rescaling in the Euclidean case does not change the norm of the descent vectors. We have the following lemma for such $[c^j]_o$ sequence.

Lemma 5.4 *Let $[c^j]_o$ be a sequence such that the length of its longest segment is 1, and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|v[c^j]_o\| = 0$. Then there exists a converging sequence $[d^j]_o$ satisfying the same conditions.*

Proof $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ is a disjoint union of bounded closed finite dimensional orbifold with boundaries. Let $\tilde{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ be the ‘‘Hausdorffication’’ of $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$. Namely, let $\tilde{\Gamma}_N = \hat{\Gamma}_N/p_1[c]_o \sim p_2[c]_o \sim [c]_o$ with the quotient topology from $\hat{\Gamma}_N$. As we pointed out in chapter 3, the only non-Hausdorff pair of points are those with the same p_1 p_2 projection and their projection images. A straightforward case by case verification can be made to show that $\tilde{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ is Hausdorff. Since Hausdorff space $\tilde{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ is a quotient of a bounded

closed finite dimensional orbifold, it is compact. Let \tilde{p} be the projection map from $\hat{\Gamma}_N$ to $\tilde{\Gamma}_N$. Therefore $\tilde{p}[c^j]_o$ has a convergent subsequence which converges at some $\tilde{p}[c]_o$ for some $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N$.

If $\tilde{p}[c]_o$ is in $\tilde{\Gamma} \setminus \tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}^3)$ the projection of the Hausdorff part of $\hat{\Gamma}$, then there is only one choice of $[c]_o$ and there exists a Hausdorff neighborhood U around $[c]_o$ and a subsequence of $[c^j]_o$ in it, such that $[c^j]_o \rightarrow [c]_o$ (still denote the subsequence $[c^j]_o$).

If $\tilde{p}[c]_o \in \tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}^3)$, consider a new sequence $[d^j]_o$ such that, if $\tilde{p}[d^j]_o \notin \tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}^3)$ or $[c^j]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}^3$, $[d^j]_o$ is chosen to be $[c^j]_o$, and if $[c^j] \in (\hat{\Gamma}^1 \sqcup \hat{\Gamma}^2) \cap \tilde{p}^{-1} \circ \tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}^3)$, $[d^j]_o$ is $[c^j]_o$ with its multiple points merged (there is choice involved but it turns out later that it does not matter). Since $[d^j]_o$ is either $[c^j]_o$ or $[c^j]_o$ with its multiple points merged, $\|v[d^j]_o\| \leq 2\|v[c^j]_o\|$, therefore $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|v[d^j]_o\| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|v[c^j]_o\| = 0$. The set $\tilde{p}^{-1}\tilde{p}[c]_o$ is finite, with its element denoted by $[c^{a,1}]_o, [c^{a,2}]_o, \dots, [c^{b,1}]_o, [c^{b,2}]_o, \dots, [c^{c,1}]_o, [c^{c,2}]_o, \dots$ where $[c^{a,i}]_o$'s are in $\hat{\Gamma}^1$, $[c^{b,i}]_o$'s are in $\hat{\Gamma}^2$, and $[c^{c,i}]_o$'s are in $\hat{\Gamma}^3$. Around each choice of $[c]_o$ we choose a small neighborhood around it, denoted by $U^{a,i}, U^{b,i}, U^{c,i}$ for all i , such that the \tilde{p} projections restricted on each of these neighborhoods are injective (hence bijective, in fact homeomorphic). Then the intersection of \tilde{p} projection of these neighborhood covers a V where V is a neighborhood of $\tilde{p}[c]$ in the Hausdorffification $\tilde{\Gamma}_N$. A subsequence of $\tilde{p}[d^j]_o$, still denoted by $\tilde{p}[d^j]_o$, is entirely contained in V , therefore the $[d^j]_o$'s we chose earlier are entirely contained in $\tilde{p}^{-1}(V) \cap (\cup_i U^{a,i} \cup_i U^{b,i} \cup_i U^{c,i})$. Since $[d^j]_o \notin (\hat{\Gamma}^1 \cup \hat{\Gamma}^2) \cap \tilde{p}^{-1} \circ \tilde{p}(\hat{\Gamma}^3)$, $[d^j]_o \in \tilde{p}^{-1}(V) \cap (\cup_i U^{c,i})$. Since there are only finitely many of $U^{c,1}, U^{c,2}, \dots$, there exists a subsequence of $[d^j]_o$, still denoted by $[d^j]_o$, such that $[d^j]_o$ is entirely contained in one of the neighborhood in $\cup_i U^{c,i}$, WLOG assume it is $U^{c,1}$, thus $[d^j]_o \in U^{c,1} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(V)$. Since $U^{c,1} \cap \tilde{p}^{-1}(V)$ is homeomorphic to V via \tilde{p} and $\tilde{p}[d^j]_o \rightarrow \tilde{p}[c^{c,1}]_o$, therefore $[d^j]_o \rightarrow [c^{c,1}]_o$ in $U^{c,1}$. \square

We also have the following lemma for converging sequences.

Lemma 5.5 *Let $[c^j]$ be a sequence in $\Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ such that $\|v[c^j]\| \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$. If $[c^j]_o \rightarrow [c]_o$ in $\Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ for some non-constant $[c]_o$, then*

$$\|v[c]\| \leq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} 2^{2N+1} \|v[c^j]\| = 0$$

Proof First we restrict U to a smaller neighborhood and $[c^j]_o$ to a subsequence, such that there is no element of higher type than $[c]_o$ in U or among $[c^j]_o$'s. We further restrict to a subsequence of $[c^j]_o$, still denoted as $[c^j]_o$, such that all of $[c^j]_o$'s are of the same type. We further restricted $[c^j]_o$ to a subsequence in a modeling neighborhood

of $[c]_o$, still denoted as $[c^j]_o$, such that we can find modeling representatives c^j with respect to a representative c such that $c^j \rightarrow c$ pointwise.

If $[c]_o$ is of the same type as $[c^j]_o$ then $\|v[c]_o\| = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|v[c^j]_o\| = 0$ since the descend of steepest direction is continuous on orbifold cycles of the same type. If $[c]_o$ is of a higher type than $[c^j]_o$, and suppose that exactly one pair of endpoint clusters in $[c^j]_o$ merges as $j \rightarrow \infty$, say there is an endpoint indexed by k in one cluster of the two, and an endpoint indexed by l in the other cluster, suppose that in c , c_k and c_l are related by $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and \bar{g} is a local isometry generated by g , it is elementary Euclidean geometry practice to check that as $j \rightarrow \infty$, $v(c^j)_k + d\bar{g} \cdot v(c^j)_l \rightarrow v(c)_j$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|v[c]_o\| &= \left(\sum_{i \neq k} |v(c)_i|^2 \right) + |v(c)_k|^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \neq k} |v(c)_i|^2 + \left| \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v(c^j)_k + dg \cdot \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} v(c^j)_l \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i \neq k} |v(c)_i|^2 + 2 \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |v(c^j)_k| + 2 \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} |v(c^j)_l|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|v[c^j]_o\| \end{aligned}$$

There are finitely many pair of un-merged endpoints that can merge (in fact at most $2N + 1$ pairs: we can at most collapse all $2N$ segments and merge multiple points once), thus $\|v[c]\| \leq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} 2^{2N+1} \|v[c^j]\| = 0$.

□

By the above two lemmas, if there is a sequence $[c^j]_o$ with its norm converging to 0, then there exists a sequence $[d^j]_o$ converges to a $[c]_o$ with $\|v[c]_o\| = 0$. However, this means $[c]$ is a stationary orbifold cycle. Also, we have that $\text{Length}[c] \geq \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Length}[c^j] \geq 1$. But it be can shown that there is no non-trivial orbifold cycle in Euclidean case. Indeed, the Riemannian groupoid elements in our Euclidean case are restrictions of elements in $O(2)$, suppose that there is a stable orbifold geodesic cycle, we can always find a non-trivial geodesic segment in it and travel along this segment from an end in the direction that is moving away from the origin, we will be farther and farther away from the origin and a tranformation by an element of $O(2)$ is not helping in any way to prevent that. Therefore this cycle can never close up. Therefore we have a contradiction. Therefore, in the Euclidean case, there is no sequence

$[c^j]_o$ such that $\|v[c^j]_o\| \rightarrow 0$. Therefore there is some positive lower bound δ' for $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq \epsilon} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$ in the Euclidean case.

Now look back to our Riemannian case where $[c]_o$ can be thought of as an orbifold cycle in a single component X' of X . Since ϵ can be made small, X' can be made small as well, and the Riemannian metric on X' can be arbitrarily close to the Euclidean metric. Thus the norm of vectors in X' can be arbitrarily close to the norm in the Euclidean case. We can fix an ϵ small so that the norm of vectors in X' is bounded below by half the norm in the Euclidean case. In this case there is a positive lower bound $\frac{\delta'}{2}$ for $v[c]_o$ for $[c]_o \in G_N^{\leq \epsilon} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$.

Now we are left with proving that for the above fixed $\epsilon > 0$, for any $[c]_o$ in $G_N^{\leq L} \setminus G_N^{\leq \epsilon}$, there exists a $\delta' > 0$ such that $\|v[c]_o\| > \delta' > 0$. The argument will be essentially the same as the Euclidean case. Note that the two lemmas above does not depend on the Euclidean-ness. In this case, since we always have $\text{Length}[c]_o \geq \epsilon$, we do not need the Euclidean-ness to rescale the orbifold cycles anymore. By the two lemmas above, a sequence $[c^j]_o$ with $\|v[c^j]_o\| \rightarrow 0$ also yields a convergence sequence $[d^j]_o$ converging to a $[c]_o$ such that $\|[c]_o\| = 0$. Therefore $[c]_o$ is a stationary orbifold 1-cycle with length bounded above by L , and below by ϵ , which contradicts the assumption in the deformation result Theorem 5.1.

Therefore there is a positive lower bound δ' for $v[c] \in G_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$.

5.1.9 The Modified Birkhoff Process

Recall that the Birkhoff process and the Birkhoff homotopy in Section 4 is defined on $\Gamma_N^{\leq L}$, in this subsection we define them on $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$. The definition of the new Birkhoff process and the new Birkhoff flow follow the exact same ideas as the old ones. The extra work is to construct the movement of the endpoints for ordered orbifold 1-cycles, and it is a bit tedious on the notations since we want to make sure that the construction is continuous.

We will define the Birkhoff flow $\hat{\Phi} : [0, 4] \times \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L} \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ in four steps:

First we define $\hat{\Phi}^1 : [0, 1] \times \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L} \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ which corresponds to Φ^1 in the Birkhoff flow. Let $[c]_o = ([c], t_1, \dots, t_{2N})$ be an element of $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$, $s \in [0, 1]$. Let F be a sorting map from $[0, 2]^{6N}$ to $[0, 2]^{6N}$ sending (s_1, \dots, s_{6N}) to (r_1, \dots, r_{6N}) such that $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^{6N} = \{r_i\}_{i=1}^{6N}$ and $r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_{6N}$. We set $\hat{\Phi}^1(s, [c]_o)$ to be

$$\left(\Phi^1(s, [c]), F(t_1, \dots, t_{2N}, t_1, \dots, t_{2N}, (f_s^{[c]})^{-1} \circ P_{[c]}(t_1), \dots, (f_s^{[c]})^{-1} \circ P_{[c]}(t_{2N})) \right)$$

Here recall $f_s^{[c]} = s \cdot \text{id} + (1-s)P_{[c]}$ does not have an inverse if $s = 0$, in that case, we set $(f_s^{[c]})^{-1} \circ P_{[c]}(t_i)$ to be t_i for all i .

It is straightforward to check that $\hat{\Phi}^1(s, [c]_o) \in \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ and that it is continuous since Φ^1 is continuous. Denote $\hat{\Phi}^1(1, [c]_o)$ by $[c^1]_o$. Denote $\Phi^1(1, \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L})$ by A_1 for now for simplicity.

Next we define $\hat{\Phi}^2$ from $[0, 1] \times A_1$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$. In this step we do nothing but moving break points. The breakpoints at the end of last step are t_i 's and $P_{[c]}(t_i)$'s. However, $P_{[c]}(t_i)$'s are the "real" breakpoints, while $[c]$ is geodesic at t_i 's (unless $t_i = P_{[c]}(t_i)$ for some i and j). In fact,

$([c], F(s_1, \dots, s_{4N}, P_{[c]}(t_1), \dots, P_{[c]}(t_{2N}))$ is an ordered piecewise geodesic orbifold cycle with $3N$ breaks for any random $s_i \in [0, 2]$. Therefore we can set $\hat{\Phi}^2(s, [c^1]_o)$ to be

$$\left([c^1], F\left(P_{[c]}(t_1), \dots, P_{[c]}(t_N), (1-s)t_1 + s\frac{1}{N}, \dots, (1-s)t_N + s\frac{2N}{N}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. (1-s)t_1 + s\frac{0}{N}, \dots, (1-s)t_N + s\frac{2N-1}{N} \right) \right)$$

It is straightforward to check that $\hat{\Phi}^2$ is continuous. Denote $\hat{\Phi}^2(1, [c^1]_o)$ by $[c^2]_o$. Denote $\Phi^2(1, A_1)$ by A_2 for now for simplicity.

Next we define $\hat{\Phi}^3 : [0, 1] \times A_2 \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$. Set $\hat{\Phi}^3(s, [c^2]_o)$ to be

$$\left(\Phi((1+s), [c]), F\left(\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}, (1-s)\frac{0}{N} + s\frac{1}{N}, \dots, (1-s)\frac{2N-1}{N} + s\frac{2N}{N}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. P_{[c]}(t_1), \dots, P_{[c]}(t_{2N}) \right) \right)$$

Denote $\hat{\Phi}^3(1, [c^2]_o)$ by $[c^3]_o$. Denote $\Phi^3(1, A_2)$ by A_3 for now for simplicity.

At last we do another step of moving break points. In the end of last step, $\frac{i}{N}$'s are real breakpoints while $P_{[c]}(t_i)$'s are not. Hence we define $\hat{\Phi}^4$ to be the map from $[0, 1] \times A_3$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ sending $(s, [c^3]_o)$ to

$$\left([c^3], F\left(\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}, s\frac{1}{N} + (1-s)P_{[c]}(t_1), \dots, s\frac{2N}{N} + (1-s)P_{[c]}(t_{2N}) \right) \right)$$

Denote $\hat{\Phi}^4(1, [c^3]_o)$ by $[c^4]_o$. Denote $\Phi^4(1, A_3)$ by A_4 for now for simplicity.

With four steps of $\hat{\Phi}$ defined, we can just glue them together to get $\hat{\Phi}$.

Note that, although $A_4 \subset \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$, there exists a natural map from it to $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ simply by sending $[c^4]_o = ([c^4], F(\frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}, \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N}))$ to $([c^4], \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{2N}{N})$.

5.2 Deformation Retract from $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq \epsilon}$

With all the ingredients prepared, now we are finally ready to prove Theorem 5.1.

For a given $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$, the goal to construct the continuous homotopy $H : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ such that $H(0, \cdot) = f$ and $H(1, \cdot) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^{2\epsilon}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small. Here we identify a $[c]_o$ in $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ with a $[d]_o$ in $\hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$, if $[c] = [d]$ and the breakpoints of $[d]_o$ are exactly three copies of the break points of $[c]_o$.

The rough idea is to construct a homotopy H^1 using the Birkhoff homotopy on f , then construct a homotopy H^2 using the descent flow, the combination will reduce the maximal length of orbifold 1-cycle in f by a certain fixed constant. Then we iterate this process until the maximal length is below 2ϵ .

Fix an $\epsilon > 0$. $H^1 : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ is simply constructed via restriction of the Birkhoff homotopy on f where the construction of the Birkhoff flow is already established in §5.1.9. H^1 homotopes $f(t) \in \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$ into $g_N^{\leq L}$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$ so H^2 will only have to be constructed with the assumption that $f(t) \in g_N^{\leq L}$ for any $t \in [0, 1]$.

The following lemma is crucial to the construction of H^2 :

Lemma 5.6 *There exists a finite collection of neighborhoods W_j 's that covers $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^{< \epsilon}$ such that for any j , a descent vector field V_j can be defined on W_j , and for any $[c]_o \in W_j$, we can flow $[c]$ along any unit vector field for a fixed amount of time without exiting $G_N^{\leq L}$.*

Proof In §5.1 we established that, for any $[d]_o \in g_N^{\leq L} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}^0$, there exists a small neighborhood $U_{[d]_o} \subset \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$ of $[d]_o$ and a descent vector field $V[d]_o$ on $U_{[d]_o}$ such that the flow of $V[d]_o$ is length decreasing with first variation of length satisfying that $2\|v[d]_o\| \geq -\frac{\partial \text{Length}}{\partial V[d]_o|_{[e]_o}} \geq \frac{\|v[d]_o\|}{2}$ for any $[e]_o \in U_{[d]_o}$. We refine $U_{[d]_o}$ to a smaller neighborhood $W_{[d]_o}$ so that the first variation of length on any normalized type-invariant vector field on $W_{[d]_o}$ for a certain time $s_{[d]_o}$ does not exceeds $U_{[d]_o}$ and does not exceed $G_N^{\leq L}$.

It is clear that the union of all $W_{[d]_o}$ covers $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$, and the union of all $\tilde{p}(W_{[d]_o})$ covers $\tilde{p}(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus g_N^{\leq \epsilon})$. Since the Hausdorffication $\tilde{p}(g_N^{\leq L} \setminus g_N^{\leq \epsilon})$ is compact, there exists finite cover $\{\tilde{p}W_{[d^i]_o}\}_{i \in I}$ for some finite index set I . There is no guarantee that $\{W_{[d^i]_o}\}_{i \in I}$ covers $g_N^{\leq L} \setminus g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$. But like in Lemma 5.4, $\tilde{p}^{-1}\tilde{p}(W_{[d^i]_o})$ is covered by the union of neighborhoods of elements in $\tilde{p}^{-1}\tilde{p}([d^i]_o)$. Let J be the index set such that $\{[d^j]_o\}_{j \in J} = \{[d]_o \in g_N^{\leq L} \setminus g_N^{\leq \epsilon} : \exists i \in I, \tilde{p}[d]_o = \tilde{p}[d^i]_o\}$. Let J_i be the subset of J

such that $J_i = \{j : [d^j]_o \in \tilde{p}^{-1}\tilde{p}[d^i]_o\}$. Let $W_{[d^i]_o}$ be the intersection of $W_{[d^j]_o}$ and the neighborhood around $[d^i]_o$ for $j \in J_i$ for all $i \in I$. Since I is finite and J_i is finite for all $i \in I$, J is also finite.

For simplicity, we write $W_{[d^i]_o}$ as W_j , $U_{[d^i]_o}$ as U_j , $V_{[d^i]_o}$ as V_j , and $s_{[d^i]_o}$ as s_j . Now we are ready to construct H^2 . Take $s_m = \min_{j \in J} s_j$, this is the amount of time we can flow along a normalized type-invariant vector field without exceeding $U_j \cap G_N^{\leq L}$. \square

There exists a partition $t_{-1} = -1 < t_0 = 0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_{2M+1} = 1 < t_{2M+2} = 2$ for some interger M such that all $t \in [0, 1]$. Denote $I_i = (t_{2i-1}, t_{2i+2}) \cap [0, 1]$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$, an open set in $[0, 1]$. We can further require the partition of $[0, 1]$ into I_i 's to be fine enough so that for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ $f(I_i) \subset W_{j_i}$ for some $j_i \in J$. There exists a partition of unity $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1, \dots, M}$ subordinate to open cover $\{I_i\}_{i=1, \dots, M}$. It is easy to see that $\xi_i(t) = 1$ for $t \in [t_{2i}, t_{2i+1}]$, and only ξ_i and ξ_{i-1} can be non-zero on $[t_{2i-1}, t_{2i}]$ for all i .

Denote the flow Φ_j^s of V_j on U_j with time variable s . By our assumption, since $f(I_i) \subset W_{j_i}$, V_{j_i} can be used to flow all of $f(I_i)$ for at least time $\frac{s_m}{\max_{t,i} \|V_{j_i}\|}$ without leaving $G_N^{\leq L}$ and with first variation of length $< \frac{\|v[d^j]\|}{2}$. The time $\frac{s_m}{\max_{t,i} \|V_{j_i}\|}$ is bounded below by $\frac{s_m}{\max_{t,j \in J} \|V_j\|}$, which is bounded below by $\frac{s_m}{2 \max_j \|v[d^j]\|}$, which is a fixed number, denoted by s' . Therefore we can define a homotopy $H_{2i}^2 : [0, s'] \times [t_{2i}, t_{2i+1}] \rightarrow G_N^{\leq L}$ by setting $H_{2i}^2(t, s) = \Phi_{j_i}^s f(t)$.

For any $t \in I_i \cap I_{i+1} = (t_{2i+1}, t_{2i+2})$, $\xi_i V_{j_i} + \xi_{i+1} V_{j_{i+1}}$ can be used to flow $f(t)$ for at least time $\frac{s_m}{\max_{t,i} \{\|\xi_i V_{j_i} + \xi_{i+1} V_{j_{i+1}}\|\}}$, which is bounded below by $\frac{s_m}{\max_{t,j \in J} \|V_j\|}$, which is bounded below by $\frac{s_m}{2 \max_j \|v[d^j]\|}$, which is s' . By linearity of the first variation of length, the first variation of length on the direction of $\xi_i V_{j_i} + \xi_{i+1} V_{j_{i+1}}$ is still bounded above by $-\frac{\delta}{2}$. We can define a flow Ψ_{2i+1} for at least time s' by integrating $\xi_i V_{j_i} + \xi_{i+1} V_{j_{i+1}}$. Therefore we can define a homotopy $H_{2i+1}^2 : [0, s'] \times [t_{2i+1}, t_{2i+2}] \rightarrow G_N^{\leq L}$ by setting $H_{2i+1}^2(t, s) = \Psi_{2i+1}^s f(t)$.

It is easy to see that $H_{2i}^2|_{[0, s'] \times \{t_{2i+1}\}} = H_{2i+1}^2|_{[0, s'] \times \{t_{2i+1}\}}$, and $H_{2i-1}^2|_{[0, s'] \times \{t_{2i}\}} = H_{2i}^2|_{[0, s'] \times \{t_{2i}\}}$ for all i . Therefore we can glue together all H_{2i}^2 's and H_{2i+1}^2 's to get the $H^2 : [0, s'] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow G_N^{\leq L}$.

Since Φ_{2i} 's and Ψ_{2i+1} 's decrease the length by at least $\frac{\delta}{2}s'$ after time s' , $H^2|_{[0,1] \times \{s'\}} \subset G_N^{\leq L - \frac{s'\delta}{2}}$. We cannot directly iterate the construction of H^2 since the constructed flow Φ_{2i} and Ψ_{2i+1} has to start from $g_N^{\leq L}$ but they might flow $f[0, 1]$ outside of $g_N^{\leq L}$ so we are in no position to construct new Φ_{2i} and Ψ_{2i+1} for the next step. However we are still in $G_N^{\leq L}$. To get back inside $g_N^{\leq L}$, we use the Birkhoff homotopy to get back to $g_N^{\leq L}$ without increasing the length. Then we can do another step of H^2 . We iterate the above process (Birkhoff flow followed by H^2) until some $H(s, t)$ reaches $g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$ (In fact we might begin with an f with $f(t) \in g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$). Since this $H(s, t)$ might not be covered by some U_k , we will have to alter our strategy slightly to continue. Suppose that $H(s, t)$ reaches $g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$, we will still do the $\{I_i\}$ partition except now some I_k with $H(s, t) \in f(I_k)$ is probably not contained by any W_k due to the fact that their length is below ϵ , but we require that $f(I_k)$ is small that the length difference between orbifold cycles within it is at most ϵ , therefore $f(I_k) \subset g_N^{\leq 2\epsilon}$. We construct the next $H^{2,s'}$ with Φ_{2i} 's and Ψ_{2i+1} 's the same way as before except that now the vector field V_{j_i} is defined to be 0. By our construction, all of $f(t_{2k}, t_{2k+1})$ will be unchanged by $H^{2,s'}$ and all of $f(t_{2k+1}, t_{2k+2})$ and $f(t_{2k-1}, t_{2k})$ will be shrunk by some distance that we do not care about (they are already inside $g_N^{\leq 2\epsilon}$ since $f(I_k) \subset g_N^{\leq 2\epsilon}$), and all the other $f(I_k)$ will continue to shrink by at least $\frac{s'\delta}{2}$. Then we use the Birkhoff flow again and then we iterate until such I_k with some elements inside $g_N^{\leq \epsilon}$ and all elements inside $g_N^{\leq 2\epsilon}$ covers the whole interval $[0, 1]$. We know that we can do this in finitely many steps since each time the maximal length is decreased by a fixed number $\frac{s'\delta}{2}$ if there are still elements with length greater or equal to 2ϵ .

This completes the proof of the first deformation result. Therefore we have a deformation $H : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ such that $H(0, \cdot) = f$ and $H(1, \cdot) \subset \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq 2\epsilon}$.

5.3 Construction of a homotopy $\tilde{H} : [0, 3] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}$

In this section we prove the deformation result (ii) mentioned in the beginning of this chapter.

Theorem 5.7 *Let \mathcal{O} be a compact 2-orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 . Let L be a positive number less than the length of the shortest non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic on \mathcal{O} . Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}^{\leq L}$ be a continuous map. Then there exists a homotopy $\tilde{H} : [0, 3] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\tilde{H}(0, \cdot) = \tilde{p} \circ f$ and $\tilde{H}(3, \cdot) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}^0$.*

The rough idea for the proof is to construct \tilde{H} in three steps:

- The first step \tilde{H}^1 is simply $\tilde{p} \circ H$ where H is the homotopy from Theorem 5.1.
- The second step \tilde{H}^2 is a small perturbation of the end product of the first step, so that, all the 1-cycles in the family do not intersect a point p on $|\mathcal{O}|$.
- The third step \tilde{H}^3 flow the end product of the second step to a constant point q , using some deformation retract of $S^2 \setminus p$ to q .

Proof \tilde{H}^1 is simply $\tilde{p} \circ H$. Denote $H(1, \cdot)$ by h . $\tilde{p}h([0, 1]) \subset \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq \epsilon}$ (for simplicity of notations, we replace the 2ϵ in the statement of Theorem 5.1 with ϵ).

For \tilde{H}^2 . At each $t \in [0, 1]$ the cycle $\tilde{p}(h(t))$ has image $\tilde{p}(h(t))([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2])$ on the underlying topological space $|\mathcal{O}|$, which is contained in $B_\epsilon(\tilde{p}(h(t))(0^+)) \sqcup B_\epsilon(\tilde{p}(h(t))(1^+))$ since the length of $\tilde{p}(h(t))$ is bounded above by ϵ . Hence the set $\cup_{r \in [0, 1], t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(r)$ on the underlying topological space $|\mathcal{O}|$ is contained in $\cup_{t \in [0, 1]} B_\epsilon(\tilde{p}(h(t))(0^+)) \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} B_\epsilon(\tilde{p}(h(t))(1^+))$ (with the shape of two stripes). Since the center of the two stripes $\cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(0^+) \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(1^+)$ is a compact 1-dimensional set, it does not covers any dense subset of $|\mathcal{O}|$, we can pick a regular point $p \in |\mathcal{O}|$ with $p \notin \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(0^+) \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(1^+)$ and we require that p is at least 3ϵ away from any singular point on $|\mathcal{O}|$. The construction of \tilde{H}^2 will mainly take place in $B_{3\epsilon}(p)$.

Let's first assume that we are in the Euclidean case. Let $U_p = \{(r, \theta) : 0 \leq r \leq r(\theta), \theta \in [0, 2\pi)\}$ be a small radial neighborhood around p contained by $B_\epsilon(p)$ that does not intersect $\cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(0^+) \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} \tilde{p}(h(t))(1^+)$. On $B_{3\epsilon}(0)$, there exists a homotopy F^ϵ that deforms the radial coordinate without changing the angular coordinate, such that U_p is enlarged by the flow till it equals $B_\epsilon(p)$, and everything outside $B_{2\epsilon}$ is unchanged. WLOG, assume that F^ϵ is defined for time $[0, 1]$. Let $\Gamma_{a,b}$ for $a, b \in B_{3\epsilon}(p)$ the linear transformation that maps x to $x + b - a$ for any $x \in B_{3\epsilon}(p)$.

Now we are ready to construct \tilde{H}^2 : The idea is that, we push the center of the two stripes (basepoints of 1-cycles) away from p using F^ϵ , and then move the 1-cycles whose basepoints have been moved using linear transformation. Namely, for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in [0, 1]$, we set $\tilde{H}^2(s, t)(r)$ for to be $\Gamma_{h(t)(0^+), F_s^\epsilon(h(t)(0^+))} h(t)(r)$ for $r \in [0, 1]$, and we set $\tilde{H}^2(s, t)(r)$ to be $\Gamma_{h(t)(1^+), F_s^\epsilon(h(t)(1^+))} h(t)(r)$ for $r \in [1, 2]$. It is routine to check that \tilde{H}^2 is well-defined. Since all the basepoints of 1-cycles after the homotopy is now ϵ away from p and all the 1-cycles has length bound ϵ , the points in the 1-cycles is at least $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ away from p .

The above construction can be done for non-Euclidean case as well. What we can do is to map $\tilde{p}(h(t)) \cap B_{3\epsilon}(p)$ with \exp_p^{-1} to get a family of orbifold 1-cycle in $B_{3\epsilon}(0)$, and do the Euclidean version of construction to get a homotopy for t with $h(t)(0^+) \in B_{2\epsilon}(p)$, then map the homotopy back to the $B_{3\epsilon}$ with \exp_p , then extend to a homotopy \tilde{H}^2 for

all $t \in [0, 1]$ where $h(t)$ is left unchanged if its basepoints are not in $B_{2\epsilon}(p)$. Since $B_{3\epsilon}(p)$ is a precompact set in the manifold part of \mathcal{O} , there exists a bound for the absolute value of sectional curvature everywhere, say $|sec| < R$. Then we know that the exponential map \exp_p exists on $B_{3\epsilon}(0)$ since p is at least 3ϵ away from any singular points, and \exp_p is $(1 + R(3\epsilon)^2)$ -bi-lipschitz on $B_{3\epsilon}(0)$. Since ϵ can be arbitrarily small, the length distortion of the exponential map is small. Namely, the points in the 1-cycles is at least $\epsilon - \frac{(1+R(3\epsilon)^2)\epsilon}{2}$ away from p , which is a positive distance if ϵ is small.

For the next step, we construct a homotopy $\tilde{H}^3 : [2, 3] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}$ so that $\tilde{H}^3(2, \cdot) = \tilde{H}^2(2, \cdot)$ and $\tilde{H}^3(3, t) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}^0$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

Since $\cup_{t \in [0, 1]} B_\epsilon(\tilde{H}^2(2, t)(0^+)) \cup_{t \in [0, 1]} B_\epsilon(\tilde{H}^2(2, t)(1^+))$ does not include p , it does not cover the entirety of $|\mathcal{O}| = S^2$, therefore lies in a subset of $|\mathcal{O}|$ that is homeomorphic to \mathbb{D}^2 , hence contractible. Using the rescale deformation on \mathbb{D}^2 we can construct a deformation retract $\tilde{H}^3 : [2, 3] \times [0, 1]$ such that $\tilde{H}^3(2, \cdot) = \tilde{H}^2(2, \cdot)$ and $\tilde{H}^3(3, \cdot) = p_0$ for some fixed point $p_0 \in |\mathcal{O}|$. We glue together \tilde{H}^1 and \tilde{H}^2 and \tilde{H}^3 to get \tilde{H} . \square

We claim that \tilde{H} we constructed above is type-invariant. This can be done by proving \tilde{H}^1 and \tilde{H}^2 and \tilde{H}^3 are all type-invariant. For the \tilde{H}^3 part, it is easy to see that it is type-invariant since for any t , $\tilde{H}^3(\cdot, t)$ is essentially a rescaling homotopy to one point p_0 . For the \tilde{H}^2 part, it is type-invariant since it is also essentially a rescaling homotopy, except that it is pushing away from one point p . For the \tilde{H}^1 part, since we know that H is type invariant from the end of last section, it is straightforward to verify that \tilde{H} is also type-invariant.

The following corollary follows easily from the proof of Theorem 5.7.

Corollary 5.8 *Let L be a positive number less than the length of the shortest non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic on \mathcal{O} . For any $[c]_o \in \hat{\Gamma}_N^{\leq L}$, there exists a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}$ such that $H(1) = \tilde{p}[c]_o$ and $H(0) \in \tilde{\Gamma}^0$.*

A similar corollary can be stated for ordered piecewise-geodesic orbifold free loops.

Corollary 5.9 *Let L be a positive number less than the length of the shortest non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic on \mathcal{O} . For any $[c]_o \in \hat{\Lambda}_N^{\leq L}$, there exists a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $H(1) = \tilde{p}[c]_o$ and $H(0) \in \tilde{\Lambda}^0$. Here we use $\hat{\Lambda}_N^{\leq L}$ to denote the ordered piecewise-geodesic orbifold free loop with N breaks with length less or equal to L , and we use $\tilde{\Lambda}$ to denote the free loop space on $|\mathcal{O}|$.*

In fact, we have the following corollary as well.

Corollary 5.10 *Let L be a positive number less than the length of the shortest non-trivial orbifold closed geodesic on \mathcal{O} . For any $[c]_o \in \hat{\Lambda}_{3N}^{\leq L}$, there exists a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Lambda}_{3N}^{\leq L}$ such that $H(1) = [c]_o$ and $H(0) \in \hat{\Lambda}^0$.*

Proof We first use Theorem 5.1 to homotope $[c]_o$'s to arbitrary short so that there exists a representative staying within one orbifold chart. We further homotope by moving all the breakpoints to the basepoint of $[c]_o$ to get a constant orbifold free loop. It is straightforward to verify that this homotopy does not depend on choices of representatives. \square

6 Proof of Theorem

In this chapter we prove the main theorem.

Theorem *For any compact Riemannian 2-orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 , denoted by \mathcal{O} , $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$, where $l(\mathcal{O})$ is the length of the shortest non-trivial closed orbifold geodesic, and $D(\mathcal{O})$ is the diameter.*

The idea of the proof is the following: Using topological property of simply compact Riemannian 2-orbifolds, we construct a family of ordered piecewise-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments with length bounded above by $4D(\mathcal{O})$. Assume the length of the shortest geodesic $l(\mathcal{O})$ is greater than $4D(\mathcal{O})$, by deformation results of the last chapter, we can homotope the family of 1-cycles to a fixed point on $|\mathcal{O}|$. This turns out to be contradictory to the topological property we started with, proving that $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$.

6.1 A Triangulation of $|\mathcal{O}|$

In this section, we construct a specific 2-simplex on $|\mathcal{O}|$ that is not null-homotopic. This 2-simplex will be used in the next section for the construction of the family $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})}$.

We first choose a fine triangulation on the underlying topological space $|\mathcal{O}|$ of \mathcal{O} with the length of each edge of triangles less than δ for any $\delta > 0$. We will define a simplicial complex on $|\mathcal{O}|$. The 0-simplices of $|\mathcal{O}|$ are vertices, denoted x_i for $i \in I$ for an index set I . They can also be thought of as a map $\Delta^0 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ where Δ^n is the delta simplex in \mathbb{R}^n . We choose the triangulation such that none of x_i 's are singular points of \mathcal{O} .

Lemma 6.1 *For any two regular points on an n -orbifold, a minimizing geodesic between them cannot travel through a singular point.*

Proof Suppose not, then there exists a minimizing geodesic c between two regular point travels through a singular point p of an orbifold with $c(0) = p$ and c defined on $(-2\epsilon, 2\epsilon)$ for some small ϵ with $c(\epsilon)$ $c(-\epsilon)$ regular. Let (X, q, V, Γ) be an orbifold chart around p where Γ is a non-trivial subgroup of $O(n)$, X is a convex ball with radius 2ϵ around q satisfying that minimizing geodesics between any two points in X is contained in X . The geodesic c lifts to a geodesic \tilde{c} on X with the same length. Let g be any non-trivial element of Γ , and \tilde{d} be the minimizing geodesic connecting $\tilde{c}(\epsilon)$ and $g \cdot \tilde{c}(-\epsilon)$. By triangle inequality, for any $g \cdot \tilde{c}(\epsilon)$,

$$\text{Length}(\tilde{d}) \leq \text{Length}(\tilde{c}|_{[-\epsilon, 0]}) + \text{Length}(g \cdot \tilde{c}|_{[0, \epsilon]}) \leq \epsilon + \epsilon$$

The equality does not hold since the concatenation of $\tilde{c}|_{[-\epsilon, 0]}$ and $\tilde{c}|_{[0, \epsilon]}$ is not a geodesic. Therefore $g \circ \tilde{d}$ is a shorter geodesic connecting $c(\epsilon)$ and $c(-\epsilon)$, which contradicts our assumption. \square

According to the above lemma and by our assumption that all x_i 's are regular points, any minimizing geodesic between x_i and x_j stays on the principal stratum of the orbifold. Since $|\mathcal{O}|$ is a compact metric space, minimizing paths always exist, and by first variation of length, local lifts of minimizing paths have to be geodesic everywhere. Therefore we can assume that the triangulation we started with has the property that all the edges of triangles are minimizing paths (therefore minimizing geodesics). The 1-simplices of $|\mathcal{O}|$ are the minimizing geodesic edges of triangles, denoted $x_i x_j$ for some x_i, x_j with $i, j \in I$ such that x_i and x_j are in a triangle. $x_i x_j$ can also be represented by a geodesic segment $\Delta^1 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ such that the image is edge $x_i x_j$.

Lemma 6.2 *For any curve $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ that stays within the principal stratum, there exists a unique orbifold free curve $[\tilde{c}]$ such that $||[\tilde{c}]|| = c$*

Proof We break c into n small pieces c_i such that each piece is defined on $[t_{i-1}, t_i]$, and $c_i[t_{i-1}, t_i]$ is contained by V_i for an orbifold chart $(X_i, V_i, q_i, \Gamma_i)$. Let \tilde{c}_i be a lift of c_i on X_i for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Since $q_i \circ \tilde{c}_i(t_{i-1}) = q_{i-1} \circ \tilde{c}_{i-1}(t_{i-1}) = c_i(t_{i-1})$, there exists an element $g_{i-1} \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\alpha(g_{i-1}) = \tilde{c}_i(t_{i-1})$ and $\omega(g_{i-1}) = \tilde{c}_{i-1}(t_{i-1})$. However since $c_i(t_{i-1})$ is regular, such g_i is unique. Therefore we can define a \mathcal{G} -curve \tilde{c} as $(\text{id}_{\tilde{c}_1(0)}, \tilde{c}_1, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}, \tilde{c}_n, \text{id}_{\tilde{c}_n(1)})$, which gives us an orbifold free curve $[\tilde{c}]$. Then what is left is to verify that a different choice of subdivision of c into c_i corresponds to a representative of $[\tilde{c}]$ with different subdivision, a different choice of lift of c_i to c'_i

corresponds to a representative of $[\tilde{c}]$ with \tilde{c}_i segment moved. These verifications are straightforward and simple. Thus $[\tilde{c}]$ does not depend on choices we made.

As for the uniqueness: if there exists a curve d on $|\mathcal{O}|$ such that $[\tilde{d}] = [\tilde{c}]$, then $|\tilde{d}| = |\tilde{c}|$, or in other words, $d = c$. \square

According to the lemma above, since $x_i x_j$ stays within the principal stratum of \mathcal{O} , we have a unique orbifold curve $[x_i x_j]$ for 1-simplex $x_i x_j$. Since all the vertices are regular, we can concatenate $[x_i x_j]$ $[x_j x_k]$ $[x_k x_i]$ to get an orbifold free loop, denoted by $[c_{ijk}]$. Note that $[c_{ijk}]$ can be viewed as a piecewise geodesic orbifold free loop with N breaks. Let $[c_{ijk}]_o$ be any ordered piecewise geodesic orbifold free loop with N breaks with its image under the projection p_o is $[c_{ijk}]$. By Corollary 5.9, we have an homotopy, denoted by $H_{ijk} : [0, 1] \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ such that $H_{ijk}(0) = \tilde{p}[c_{ijk}]_o$ and $H_{ijk}(1) = q_{ijk}$ for some $q_{ijk} \in |\mathcal{O}|$. The 2-simplex $x_i x_j x_k$ is constructed by filling the interior of $x_i x_j + x_j x_k + x_k x_i =: \partial(x_i x_j x_k)$ with homotopy H_{ijk} .

Next we try to extend the simplicial complex structure. First fix a regular point x_0 on $|\mathcal{O}|$. x_0 will now be an extra 0-simplex on $|\mathcal{O}|$. The minimizing geodesics from x_0 to x_i 's will be the extra 1-simplices on \mathcal{O} .

For extra 2-simplices: For any $x_i x_j$ 1-simplex, consider the concatenation of $[x_i x_j]$, $[x_j x_0]$, and $[x_0 x_i]$. By section 2.8, this concatenation can be considered as an ordered piecewise-geodesic orbifold free loop, denoted by $[c_{ij0}]_o$ since x_i , x_j and x_0 are all regular. The length of $[c_{ij0}]_o$ is less than $2D(\mathcal{O}) + \delta$. Under the assumption that $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$, by Corollary 5.9, there exists a length non-increasing homotopy H_{ij0} that sends $\tilde{p}[c_{ij0}]_o$ to a constant loop on $|\mathcal{O}|$, which will be used to define an extra 2-simplex $x_i x_j x_0$.

Next we try to extend to the 3-skeleton. For $x_i x_j x_k$ a 1-simplex, a 3-simplex, denoted by $x_i x_j x_k x_0$, if exists, will be a map from $\Delta^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ with faces $x_i x_j x_k$, $x_j x_k x_0$, $x_i x_k x_0$ and $x_i x_j x_0$, where Δ^3 is the standard 3-simplex in \mathbb{R}^3 . We will prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3 *There exists a 2-simplex $x_i x_j x_k$ such that there exists no 3-simplex $x_i x_j x_k x_0$ with faces $x_i x_j x_k$, $x_j x_k x_0$, $x_i x_k x_0$ and $x_i x_j x_0$.*

Proof Suppose that for any 2-simplex $x_i x_j x_k$, there exists a 3-simplex $x_i x_j x_k x_0$, gluing together all such 3-simplices gives a simplicial complex $\mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$, where each piece $x_i x_j x_k x_0$ is identified with a map from a radial 3-simplex in \mathbb{D}^3 to $|\mathcal{O}|$ as shown in Figure 2.





Figure 2: Extension of Skeleton

The simplicial complex has boundary $S^2 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$, which is also $\sum x_i x_j x_k$, which can be viewed as the identity map of S^2 . However \mathbb{D}^3 is contractible. There is a contradiction. \square

According to the lemma, there exists a 2-simplex $x_i x_j x_k$, such that $\partial(x_i x_j x_k x_0)$ have a non-trivial homotopy type. For simplicity, WLOG, set $i = 1$ $j = 2$ and $k = 3$.

6.2 Construction of a family $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$


 Figure 3: Family f

In this section, we use the triangulation from last section to construct the family $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$, as shown in figure 3. We will construct f in five stages $f_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$ and then glue them together.

For stage 1: Recall that $[c_{012}]$ is the orbifold free loop obtained by concatenating orbifold curves $[x_0 x_1]$ $[x_1 x_2]$ $[x_2 x_0]$ with total length bounded above by $2D(\mathcal{O}) + \delta$. In $[c_{012}]$, we treat $[x_0 x_1]$ as an orbifold geodesic defined on $[0, \frac{1}{3}]$, $[x_1 x_2]$ as an orbifold geodesic defined on $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$, and $[x_2 x_0]$ as an orbifold geodesic defined on $[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$. Likewise we have $[c_{ijk}]$ for $i, j, k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. $[c_{ijk}]$ gives rise to an ordered piecewise-geodesic orbifold free loop $[c]_o = ([c], \frac{1}{N}, \dots, \frac{N}{N})$ of N break for a sufficiently large N such that $N\delta < L$ ($N \equiv 0$ modulo 3), where δ is the Lebesgue number of the orbifold atlas $\{X_i\}$.

By Corollary 5.10 and the assumption that $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$, there exists a homotopy $H_{ijk} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Lambda}_{3N}^{\leq 2D+\delta}$ such that $H_{ijk}(0) = [c_{ijk}]_o$ and $H_i(1) \in \hat{\Lambda}^0$ is a constant orbifold free loop.

The space $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^1$ of piecewise-geodesic orbifold 1-cycle of type “two loops” of break number N is exactly $(\hat{\Lambda}_{3N})^2$. Denote by π_i the projection from $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^1$ to the i -th $\hat{\Lambda}_{3N}$ for $i = 1, 2$. We use $H_{ijk} \sqcup H_{lmn}$ to denote the homotopy from $[0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 2D(\mathcal{O})+\delta} \cap \hat{\Gamma}^1$ such that $\pi_1 \circ (H_{ijk} \sqcup H_{lmn}) = H_{ijk}$ and $\pi_2 \circ (H_{ijk} \sqcup H_{lmn}) = H_{lmn}$ for $i, j, k, l, m, n = 0, 1, 2, 3$. We define f_1 on $[0, 1)$ as the map from $[0, 1)$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$ sending t to $H_{102} \sqcup H_{123}(1-t)$ for $t \in [0, 1)$.

For $t = 1$: Recall that there is a map p_j from $\hat{\Gamma}^3$ to $\hat{\Gamma}^j$ for $j = 1, 2$. We set $f_1(1)$ to be $(p_1)^{-1}(H_{102} \sqcup H_{123}(0))$, which is also $(p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$. Recall that p_1 is not necessarily injective nor surjective. However since the basepoints of $[c_{102}]_o$ and $[c_{123}]_o$ coincides (they are both x_1), $(p_1)^{-1}$ is non-empty. Since the basepoint x_i is a regular point, there is only one element in $(p_1)^{-1}$. Therefore $(p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$ is well-defined.

The map f_1 is continuous on $[0, 1)$ since H_{102} and H_{123} are continuous. It is continuous at $t = 1$ since any neighborhood of $[c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o$ is the p_1 part of a neighborhood of $(p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$.

For stage 2: $p_2 \circ (p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$ is an ordered orbifold 1-cycle with 2 segments of type “one loop over $[0, 2]$ ”, which can be thought of as the concatenation of $[x_1x_0]$ $[x_0x_2]$ $[x_2x_1]$ $[x_1x_2]$ $[x_2x_3]$ and $[x_3x_1]$. Note that there is a backtrack along $[x_1x_2]$ in the middle. Let x_t be the point $(x_1x_2)(t)$ where x_1x_2 is the geodesic on the principal stratum of $|\mathcal{O}|$ defined on domain $[1, 2]$ with starting point x_1 and endpoint x_2 . Then x_t is regular for all $t \in [0, 1]$. We define f_2 as the map from $[0, 1]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_1x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_{t+1}] * [x_{t+1}x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_1]$ for $t \in (0, 1]$ and $f_2(0) = (p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$, where $*$ denotes the concatenation between orbifold curves. Geometrically this is a “backtrack” homotopy and its continuity under the pointwise topology is obvious. The continuity at $t = 0$ follows from the fact that any neighborhood of $p_2 \circ (p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$ is the p_2 part of a neighborhood of $(p_1)^{-1}([c_{102}]_o \sqcup [c_{123}]_o)$.

For stage 3: After stage 2, we are left with $[x_1x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_2] * [x_2x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_1]$. Let $x_{ij,t}$ be the point $(x_ix_j)(t)$ where x_ix_j is the geodesic on the principal stratum of $|\mathcal{O}|$ defined on domain $[0, 1]$ with starting point x_i and endpoint x_j for $i, j = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Like before, $x_{ij,t}$ is regular for any t, i, j . Then we can define $f_3|_{[0,1]}$ as the map from $[0, 1]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_1x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_{23,t}] * [x_{23,t}x_{23,t}] * [x_{23,t}x_3] * [x_3x_1]$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Next we define $f_3|_{[1,2]}$ as the map from $[1, 2]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_1x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_3] * [x_3x_{31,t-1}] * [x_{31,t-1}x_1]$ for $t \in [1, 2]$. Next we define $f_3|_{[2,3]}$ as the map from $[2, 3]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_{10,t-2}x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_{10,t-2}]$ for $t \in [2, 3]$. Next we define $f_3|_{[2,3]}$ as the map from $[3, 4]$

to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_{10,t-3}x_0] * [x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_{10,t-3}]$ for $t \in [3, 4]$. Next we define $f_3|_{[4,5]}$ as the map from $[4, 5]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_0x_{02,t-4}] * [x_{02,t-4}x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_0]$ for $t \in [4, 5]$. Next we define $f_3|_{[5,6]}$ as the map from $[5, 6]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_0x_2] * [x_2x_{23,t-5}] * [x_{23,t-5}x_3] * [x_3x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_0]$ for $t \in [5, 6]$.

Geometrically, what we are doing in stage 3 is change the parametrization so that now x_0 is the basepoint and the multiplicity is moved from x_2 to x_3 . We change the parametrization in a way that does not add break points. It is easy to see that f_3 is continuous.

For stage 4: We are doing the opposite of stage 2 by creating a “backtrack” along $[x_3x_0]$. Namely, we define f_4 as the map from $[0, 1]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $[x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_{30,t}] * [x_{30,t}x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_0]$ for $t \in [0, 1)$ and $f_4(1) = (p_2)^{-1}([x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_0] * [x_0x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_0])$.

For stage 5: We are doing the opposite of stage 1. For $t = 0$, we define $f_5(0)$ as $p_1 \circ (p_2)^{-1}([x_0x_2] * [x_2x_3] * [x_3x_0] * [x_0x_3] * [x_3x_1] * [x_1x_0])$, which is also $[c_{023}]_o \sqcup [c_{031}]_o$. We define f_5 as the map from $[0, 1]$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ sending t to $H_{023} \sqcup H_{031}(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1]$ and $[c_{023}]_o \sqcup [c_{031}]_o$ for $t = 0$.

In the end we glue together f_i for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ and reparametrize to get $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{3N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ so that $f|_{[0, \frac{1}{3}]}$ corresponds to stage 1, $f|_{[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]}$ corresponds to stage 2, 3, and 4, $f|_{[\frac{2}{3}, 1]}$ corresponds to stage 5. Then we have that $f(0), f(1) \in \hat{\Gamma}^0$, $f((0, \frac{1}{3}) \cup (\frac{2}{3}, 1)) \subset \hat{\Gamma}^1$, $f(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}) \subset \hat{\Gamma}^2$, $f(\frac{1}{3}), f(\frac{2}{3}) \in \hat{\Gamma}^3$.

By assumption that $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$ and by Theorem 5.1, there exists a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{9N}^{\leq 4D+2\delta}$ such that $H(0, \cdot) = \tilde{p} \circ f(\cdot)$ and $H(1, \cdot)$ is constant at some $q \in |\mathcal{O}|$.

We would also like to construct a family of 1-cycles g on $\partial\Delta^3$ following the same steps as f . This will be needed later.

First we need to introduce some notations. Let y_i be the 0-simplex in $\partial\Delta^3$ such that $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3)|_{y_i} = x_i$. Let y_iy_j be the 1-simplex in $\partial\Delta^3$ such that $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3)|_{y_iy_j} = x_ix_j$. Let $y_iy_jy_k$ be the 2-simplex in $\partial\Delta^3$ such that $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3)|_{y_iy_jy_k} = x_ix_jx_k$. Let $i_0 : \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Delta^3$ be the inclusion map such that $i_0 \circ \partial(x_1x_2x_3x_0) = x_1x_2x_3$, $i_1 : \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Delta^3$ be the inclusion map such that $i_1 \circ \partial(x_1x_2x_3x_0) = x_2x_3x_0$, $i_2 : \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Delta^3$ be the inclusion map such that $i_2 \circ \partial(x_1x_2x_3x_0) = x_1x_3x_0$, $i_3 : \Delta^2 \rightarrow \Delta^3$ be the inclusion map such that $i_3 \circ \partial(x_1x_2x_3x_0) = x_1x_2x_0$. Denote $i_0(p_{123})$ the image of the interior point p_{123} of Δ^2 we used in the construction of 2-simplex $x_1x_2x_3$ under inclusion i_0 by p_0 . Likewise we denote by p_1, p_2, p_3 $i_1(p_{023}), i_2(p_{013}), i_3(p_{123})$ respectively. Denote by γ_{ijk} the

concatenation of $y_i y_j y_j y_k$ and $y_k y_i$. Denote by G_{ijk} for $i, j, k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ the linear homotopy shrinking γ_{ijk} to a point in $y_i y_j y_k$. Let $y_{ij,t}$ be $(1-t)y_i + ty_j$.

A family of 1-cycles g on $\partial\Delta^3$ can be constructed in the same way as f by replacing x_i above with y_i , $[c_{ijk}]_o$ with γ_{ijk} , $x_{ij,t}$ with $y_{ij,t}$, and H_{ijk} with G_{ijk} .

6.3 Construction of the map $\mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$

In this section we will construct using f a map $F : \mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ such that $F|_{S^2}$ is not null-homotopic, which should not be possible, concluding that the assumption $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$ is false.

Before we get to the construction of the map $\mathbb{D}^2 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$, we need to introduce some notations. Consider S^2 in \mathbb{R}^3 , we are going to introduce a peculiar parametrization for S^2 .

Consider the space $\{(t, r) \in [0, 1] \times ([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2])\} / \sim$, where the equivalence relationship is defined as follows: $(0, r_1) \sim (0, r_2)$ for any $r_1, r_2 \in [0, 1]$, $(0, r_1) \sim (0, r_2)$ for any $r_1, r_2 \in [1, 2]$, $(t, 0) \sim (t, 1^-)$ and $(t, 1^+) \sim (t, 2)$ for any $t \in (0, \frac{1}{3}) \cup (\frac{2}{3}, 1)$, $(t, 0) \sim (t, 1^-) \sim (t, 1^+) \sim (t, 2)$ for $t = \frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}$, $(t, 0) \sim (t, 2)$ and $(t, 1^-) \sim (t, 1^+)$ for $t \in (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3})$.

Next we construct a bijective map B from $\{(t, r) \in [0, 1] \times ([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2])\} / \sim$ to S^2 . Choose two points $p_1, p_2 \in S^2$ that are $2\epsilon_1$ away from each other for some small ϵ_1 , $B_{\epsilon_1}(p_1)$ touches $B_{\epsilon_1}(p_2)$ at a point q_1 . Choose two points $p_3, p_4 \in S^2$ that are also $2\epsilon_1$ away from each other, $B_{\epsilon_1}(p_3)$ touches $B_{\epsilon_1}(p_4)$ at a point q_2 , and we require that p_3 and p_4 are at least $3\epsilon_1$ away from p_1 and p_2 so that the ϵ_1 balls of the first pair does not touch the ϵ_1 balls of the second pair. For the i -th ball ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), we parametrized its closure by radial coordinates $\phi_i = (t_i, r_i)$ where $t_i \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ is the radius times $\frac{1}{3\epsilon_1}$, and $r_i \in [0, 1]/0 \sim 1$ for $i = 1, 3$ is the angle times $\frac{1}{\pi}$, and $r_i \in [1, 2]/1 \sim 2$ is the angle times $\frac{1}{\pi}$ then add 1, and we require that r_i all goes clockwise and $\phi_1(\frac{1}{3}, 0) = \phi_2(\frac{1}{3}, 0) = q_1$ and $\phi_3(\frac{1}{3}, 0) = \phi_4(\frac{1}{3}, 0) = q_2$. S^2 subtracted by the closure of these four balls are homeomorphic to a cylinder which can be parametrized by $(t_5, r_5) \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}] \times ([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2]/0 \sim 2, 1^- \sim 1^+)$, denote the parametrization $\phi_5 = (t_5, r_5)$, and we require that $\phi_5(t, r) = \phi_i(t, r)$ for $i = 1, 2$ $t = \frac{1}{3}$ and $r \in [0, 2]$, and $\phi_5(t, r) = \phi_i(1-t, r)$ for $i = 3, 4$ $t = \frac{2}{3}$ and $r \in [0, 2]$. Now we are ready to construct the bijection B . We set $B[t, r] = \phi_1(t, r)$ for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $r \in [0, 1]$, $B[t, r] = \phi_2(t, r)$ for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $r \in [1, 2]$, $B[t, r] = \phi_5(t, r)$ for $t \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$ and $r \in [0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2]$, $B[t, r] = \phi_3(1-t, r)$ for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $r \in [0, 1]$,

$B[t, r] = \phi_4(1 - t, r)$ for $t \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ and $r \in [1, 2]$. B is well-defined bijection from $[0, 1] \times ([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2]) / \sim$ to S^2 .

Next we will extend this parametrization to \mathbb{D}^3 . Consider set $\{(s, [t, r]) : B[t, r] \in S^2, s \in [0, 1]\} / \sim$ where the equivalence relationship is defined by $(1, [t_1, r_1]) = (1, [t_2, r_2])$ for any $B[t_1, r_1], B[t_2, r_2] \in S^2$. \mathbb{D}^3 can be parametrized using the radial coordinates $\phi_{\mathbb{D}^3} = (s_{\mathbb{D}^3}, q_{\mathbb{D}^3})$ where $s_{\mathbb{D}^3}$ is the radius in \mathbb{D}^3 and $q_{\mathbb{D}^3}$ is a point in S^2 , or the space of directions in \mathbb{D}^3 . Now we construct bijection B_1 from $\{(s, [t, r]) : B[t, r] \in S^2, s \in [0, 1]\} / \sim$ to \mathbb{D}^3 : $B_1[s, [t, r]] = \phi_{\mathbb{D}^3}(1 - s, B[t, r])$. B_1 is well-defined and bijective.

Now we are ready to define the map: The map $F : \mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ is defined by $F(B_1[s, [t, r]]) = H(s, t)(r)$, where $H(s, t)$ is the homotopy from \tilde{p} to $\tilde{\Gamma}^0$.

Lemma 6.4 *The map $F : \mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ constructed above is well-defined and continuous, and $F|_{S^2}$ is not null-homotopic.*

Proof It can be checked straightforwardly that the map is well-defined: We only need to check that $H(s, t)(r) = H(s', t')(r')$ if $[s, [t, r]] = [s', [t', r']]$.

We also need to check the continuity of F , that is, if $[s_i, [t_i, r_i]] \rightarrow [s_0, [t_0, r_0]]$, then $H(s_i, t_i)(r_i) \rightarrow H(s_0, t_0)(r_0)$.

If $s_0 = 1$, $[s_i, [t_i, r_i]] \rightarrow [s_0, [t_0, r_0]]$ implies that $s_i \rightarrow 1$. In the construction of H , the last step is to use a deformation retract from $|\mathcal{O}|$ subtracted by a point to one single point p_0 to deform all the 1-cycles. Therefore there exists a s_i that is close to 1 such that $H(\{s_i\} \times [0, 1])([0, 1] \sqcup [1, 2])$ is contained in an arbitrarily small neighborhood around p_0 . Therefore $H(s_i, t)(r)$ is close to $H(1, t)(r) = p_0$ for any t, r .

If $s_0 \neq 1$, then $[s_i, [t_i, r_i]] \rightarrow [s_0, [t_0, r_0]]$ implies that $B[t_i, r_i] \rightarrow B[t_0, r_0]$ and $s_i \rightarrow s_0$. Note that $B[t, r] \rightarrow t$ is in fact a continuous function, therefore $t_i \rightarrow t_0$. By continuity of H , $H(s_i, t_i) \rightarrow H(s_0, t_0)$. Since $H(s, t)$ are all Lipschitz, $H(s_i, t_i)(r_i) \rightarrow H(s_0, t_0)(r_0)$.

We still have to check that $F|_{S^2}$ is not null-homotopic. Recall that the map $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3) : \partial\Delta^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ is not null-homotopic. We will prove that $F|_{S^2}$ is the composition of a continuous map $G : S^2 \rightarrow \partial\Delta^3$ with $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3)$.

We can define this G by setting $G([t, r]) = g(t)(r)$ where g is the family of 1-cycles we constructed on $\partial\Delta^3$ in the end of §6.2 following the same steps as that of f . G is well-defined and is a surjective map from $\partial\Delta^3$ to S^2 , which is essentially a surjective map from S^2 to S^2 . Therefore G is not null-homotopic.

Since $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3)$ is also not null-homotopic, the composition $\partial(x_0x_1x_2x_3) \circ G$ is not null-homotopic. Therefore $F|_{S^2}$ is not null-homotopic. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem.

Theorem *Let \mathcal{O} be a compact Riemannian 2-orbifold homeomorphic to S^2 . Then $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof Suppose that $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$, then there exists small $\delta > 0$ such that $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O}) + 2\delta$. Then we can construct a family $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \hat{\Gamma}_{\frac{1}{3N}}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$ as in previous section. Therefore by Theorem 5.7, there exists a homotopy $H : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \rightarrow \tilde{\Gamma}_{\frac{1}{9N}}^{\leq 4D(\mathcal{O})+2\delta}$ such that $H(0, \cdot) = \tilde{p} \circ f$ and $H(1, \cdot)$ is a constant family of constant loops. Then by Lemma 6.4, we construct a continuous map $F : \mathbb{D}^3 \rightarrow |\mathcal{O}|$ from f such that $F|_{S^2}$ is not null-homotopic, which contradicts the fact that F is contractible (since its domain is \mathbb{D}^3). Therefore the assumption $l(\mathcal{O}) > 4D(\mathcal{O})$ is false. Therefore $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 4D(\mathcal{O})$. \square

Using the argument in the theorem, we also have the following corollary.

Corollary 6.5 *Let \mathcal{O} be a compact Riemannian 2-orbifold with a finite orbifold fundamental group, $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 8D(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof The corollary follows from the classification of 2-orbifolds. According to the classification of 2-orbifolds, a 2-orbifold with a finite orbifold fundamental group, either is homeomorphic to S^2 , or admits a metric double which is homeomorphic to S^2 .

Let $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ be the metric double of \mathcal{O} . Denote by p the orbifold covering map from $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ to \mathcal{O} . The length of the shortest closed orbifold geodesic on $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is non-greater than $4D(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$. Denote this closed orbifold geodesic by $[\hat{c}]$. $[\hat{c}]$ projects down to a closed orbifold geodesic $[c]$ on \mathcal{O} by p . Therefore $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq \text{Length}[c] \leq \text{Length}[\hat{c}] = l(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$.

On the other hand, we will prove that $D(\hat{\mathcal{O}}) \leq 2D(\mathcal{O})$.

This reduces to proving that for any \hat{x} and \hat{y} on $|\hat{\mathcal{O}}|$, $\text{dist}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \leq 2D(\mathcal{O})$. Denote $p(\hat{x})$ by x and $p(\hat{y})$ by y . Let z be any point in the exceptional stratum of \mathcal{O} . Then $p^{-1}(z)$ only contains one point, denote by \hat{z} . $\text{dist}(x, z) \leq D(\mathcal{O})$ and $\text{dist}(y, z) \leq D(\mathcal{O})$. Therefore for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a path $c_{x,z}$ on $|\mathcal{O}|$ connecting x and z with length less than $D(\mathcal{O}) + \epsilon$, and a path $c_{z,y}$ on $|\mathcal{O}|$ connecting z and y with length less than $D(\mathcal{O}) + \epsilon$. $c_{x,z}$ lifts to $\hat{c}_{x,z}$ a unique path on $|\hat{\mathcal{O}}|$ connecting \hat{x} and \hat{z} . $c_{z,y}$ lifts to $\hat{c}_{z,y}$ a unique path on $|\hat{\mathcal{O}}|$ connecting \hat{z} and \hat{y} . $\hat{c}_{x,z}$ and $\hat{c}_{z,y}$ then glue together to be a path connecting \hat{x} and \hat{y} with length less than $2D(\mathcal{O}) + 2\epsilon$. Therefore $D(\hat{\mathcal{O}}) \leq 2D(\mathcal{O})$. Combining with $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq l(\hat{\mathcal{O}})$, we get $l(\mathcal{O}) \leq 8D(\mathcal{O})$ for any 2-orbifold \mathcal{O} with finite orbifold fundamental group. \square

Appendices

A Continuity of the Birkhoff Process

We will prove that, the Birkhoff process Ψ and the Birkhoff homotopy Φ we defined are continuous on $\Gamma_N^{\leq L}$. This check is somewhat tedious because the topology on the orbifold free loop space needs to go through \mathcal{G} -loop representatives.

We will first prove for the rescaling step Φ^1 .

Let $s^j \rightarrow s^0$ in $[0, 1]$ and $[c^j] \rightarrow [c^0]$ in $\Gamma_N^{\leq L}$, in other words, $(s^j, [c^j]) \rightarrow (s^0, [c^0])$ in $[0, 1] \times \Gamma_N^{\leq L}$. Then for j large enough, there exists $c^j = (c_i^j, g_i^j)$ modeling representative of $[c^j]$ with respect to the representative $c^0 = (c_i^0, g_i^0)$ of $[c^0]$, where c^j and c^0 are defined over the same subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = 2$, such that, $c_i^j \rightarrow c_i^0$ pointwise for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Recall that $\Psi^1[c] \circ P_{[c]} = [c]$. For simplicity, denote $P_{[c^0]}$ by P_0 , and $P_{[c^j]}$ by P_j . Recall that $f_s^{[c]} = s \cdot \text{id}_{[0,2]} + (1-s)P_{[c]}$. For simplicity, denote $f_{s^0}^{[c^0]}$ by f_0 , and $f_{s^j}^{[c^j]}$ by f_j . Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma A.1 $P_j \rightarrow P_0$ pointwise.

Proof Notice that

$$P_j|_{[0,1]}(t) = \frac{\int_0^t |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau}{\int_0^1 |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau}, \quad P_j|_{[1,2]}(t) = 1 + \frac{\int_1^t |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau}{\int_1^2 |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau}$$

It suffices to prove that $\int_0^t |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau \rightarrow \int_0^t |(c^0)'(\tau)| d\tau$, which is equivalent as proving $\int_A |(c^j)'(\tau)| d\tau \rightarrow \int_A |(c^0)'(\tau)| d\tau$ for any small interval $A \subset [0, 2]$. This reduces to the manifold case: Let c^j, c^0 be L -Lipschitz piecewise-geodesic curves with N breaks from A to a Riemannian manifold M with $c^j \rightarrow c^0$ pointwise, we need to show that the length of c^j converges to the length of c^0 . We can focus on the domain in which a minimizing geodesic segment of c^0 is defined. This further reduces to the case in which c^0 is a minimizing geodesic and c^j 's are piecewise-geodesic curves with N breaks, denoted by t_i^j 's.

Let t_i^j be the i -th break point of c^j . Then one direction is clear:

$$\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Length}(c^j) \geq \text{Length}(c^0)$$

since the two endpoints of c^j converge pointwise to the two endpoints of c^0 and that c^0 is a minimizing geodesic between its endpoints.

For the other direction, by elementary analysis, pointwise convergence on a compact domain for Lipschitz curves yields uniform convergence. Therefore for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $J > 0$ such that for any $j > J$ for any $t \in A$, $d_M(c^j(t), c^0(t)) < \epsilon$. In particular, for any $j > J$, the break point t_i^j satisfies that $d_M(c^j(t_i^j), c^0(t_i^j)) < \epsilon$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$. Therefore the length of the i -th segment of c^j is bounded from above by $2\epsilon + \text{Length}(c^0|_{[t_{i-1}^j, t_i^j]})$ by the triangle inequality. Therefore the total length of c^j is bounded from above by $2N\epsilon + \text{Length}(c^0)$, which concludes that $\limsup_{j \rightarrow \infty} \text{Length}(c^j) \leq \text{Length}(c^0)$. \square

Since P_j is not necessarily one-to-one, it might not have an inverse. However P_j is a piecewise-linear map, it still admits a unique upper semi-continuous inverse, which is a monotonely increasing piecewise-linear map with finitely many jumping discontinuities. We abuse notation and call this inverse P_j^{-1} . It can be easily verified that $\Psi^1[c^j] = [c^j] \circ P_j^{-1}$ for all j and $\Psi^1[c^0] = [c^0] \circ P_0^{-1}$. Similar to P_j , f_j also might not have an inverse. However f_j admits a unique upper semi-continuous inverse, denoted by f_j^{-1} .

Lemma A.2 $\Psi^1[c^j] \rightarrow \Psi^1[c^0]$ pointwise.

Proof We need to show that $\Psi^1[c^j]$'s and $\Psi^1[c^0]$ have \mathcal{G} -homotopic representatives and that the corresponding segments of these representatives are pointwise closed.

For the first part (finding \mathcal{G} -homotopic representatives), the idea is to first noting that $c^j \circ P_j^{-1}$'s are representatives for $\Psi^1[c^j]$'s and $c^0 \circ P_0^{-1}$ is a representative for $\Psi^1[c^0]$, then change the subdivision of $c^j \circ P_j^{-1}$'s to match with that of $c^0 \circ P_0^{-1}$.

For simplicity, denote $c^0 \circ P_0^{-1}$ by d^0 , and $c^j \circ P_j^{-1}$ by d^j . Let $0 = \tau_0^j \leq \tau_1^j \leq \dots \leq \tau_n^j = 2$ be the subdivision for d^j for all j , and $0 = \tau_0^0 \leq \tau_1^0 \leq \dots \leq \tau_n^0 = 2$ be the subdivision for d^0 where $\tau_i^j = P_j(t_i)$ and $\tau_i^0 = P_0(t_i)$. By Lemma A.1, $\tau_i^j = P_j(t_i) \rightarrow \tau_i^0 = P_0(t_i)$ for all i . Fix a j and an i , WLOG, assume $\tau_i^j \leq \tau_i^0$, then $[\tau_i^j, \tau_i^0]$ is a small domain. Suppose that $\tau_{i+1}^j \geq \tau_i^0$, since d^j is L -Lipschitz, $d_{i+1}^j|_{[\tau_i^j, \tau_i^0]}$ can be contained in a small metric ball around $d_{i+1}^j(\tau_i^j)$. Let $g_i \in \mathcal{G}$ be the germ in d^j that connects d_i^j and d_{i+1}^j . Let \bar{g}_i be a local isometry generated by g_i on a small neighborhood from the X component of d_{i+1}^j to the X component of d_i^j . By choosing j large enough, we can assume that $d_{i+1}^j|_{[\tau_i^j, \tau_i^0]}$ sits inside the domain of \bar{g}_i . Then by moving $d_{i+1}^j|_{[\tau_i^j, \tau_i^0]}$ with

\bar{g}_i and then gluing to d_i^j , the endproduct $d_i^j * \bar{g}_i \circ d_{i+1}^j|_{[\tau_i^j, \tau_i^0]}$ is a new segment with the same right endpoint as d_i^0 . Suppose that $\tau_{i+1}^j < \tau_i^0 \leq \tau_{i+2}^j$, we can move the segment $d_{i+1}^j|_{[\tau_i^j, \tau_{i+1}^j]}$ with \bar{g}_i and move the segment $d_{i+2}^j|_{[\tau_{i+1}^j, \tau_i^0]}$ with $\bar{g}_i \circ \bar{g}_{i+1}$ and glue them with d_i^j . Similar moving procedure can be done if $\tau_i^0 < \tau_{i+2}^j$, the idea is that we move all the segments from d_i^j to $d_{i+i_k}^j$, where i_k satisfies that $\min\{\tau_{i+i_k}^j, \tau_i^0\} = \tau_i^0$. If $\tau_i^j \geq \tau_i^0$, we can use \bar{g}^{-1} to remove the “extra” piece of d_i^j and attach it to d_{i+1}^j and possibly d_{i+2}^j and so on. We can do the above for the left endpoint of d_i^j as well if it does not match with the left endpoint of d_i^0 . Then we do the above perturbation for each segment i and for each j . This gives us a new family of representatives of $\Psi^1[c^j]$'s, denoted by $d^{j,1}$, that share the same subdivision as d^0 . Now we can finally check the pointwise convergence on each segment, that is, $d^{j,1} \rightarrow d_i^0$ for all i .

Fix an i . We only have to prove that $d^{j,1}(\tau) \rightarrow d_i^0(\tau)$ for any $\tau \in [\tau_{i-1}^0, \tau_i^0]$. Denote $P_0^{-1}(\tau)$ by t , and $P_j(t)$ by τ^j . By the pointwise convergence $P_j \rightarrow P_0$, $\tau^j \rightarrow \tau$. Up to restricting to larger j 's, we can require that τ^j 's are also inside $[\tau_{i-1}^0, \tau_i^0]$. Then we have the following for all j :

$$d_X(d^{j,1}(\tau), d_i^0(\tau)) \leq d_X(d^{j,1}(\tau), d^{j,1}(\tau^j)) + d_X(d^{j,1}(\tau^j), d_i^0(\tau))$$

The first term on the right can be made small since $d^{j,1}$ is L -Lipschitz and $\tau^j \rightarrow \tau$. The second term on the right is exactly $d_X(c_i^j(t), c_i^0(t))$, which can be made small by pointwise convergence $[c^j] \rightarrow [c^0]$. Therefore $d^{j,1}(\tau) \rightarrow d_i^0(\tau)$ pointwise. Therefore $d^{j,1} \rightarrow d_i^0$ pointwise. Therefore $d^{j,1} \rightarrow d^0$ pointwise. Therefore $\Psi^1[c^j] \rightarrow \Psi^1[c]$ pointwise. \square

To avoid complications, we consider new representatives $d^{j,2}$ of $\Psi^1[c^j]$ and new representative $d^{0,2}$ of $\Psi^1[c^0]$ with a common subdivision that does not have multiplicity at endpoints, denoted by $0 = \tau_0 < \dots < \tau_n = 2$. Note that this is different from the old subdivision $0 = \tau_0^0 \leq \dots \leq \tau_n^0 = 2$ for $d^{j,1}$'s and d^0 . These new representatives can be found since $\Psi^1[c^j]$'s are L -Lipschitz and thus we can perturb the endpoints of each segment by a small distance without exiting the X component it lies.

Now we show the continuity of Φ^1 .

Lemma A.3 $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j]) \rightarrow \Phi^1(s^0, [c^0])$ pointwise.

Proof The first step is to show that $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j])$ and $\Phi^1(s^0, [c^0])$ are in the same modelling neighborhood, that is, there exist representatives for $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j])$ that share the same subdivision of $\Phi^1(s^0, [c^0])$. Denote $d^{j,2} \circ f_j$ by e^j , and $d^{0,2} \circ f_0$ by e^0 . According

to the definition of Φ^1 , e^j is a representative for $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j])$, and e^0 is a representative for $\Phi^1(s^0, [c^0])$. Then the subdivision for e^j is $0 = t_0^j \leq \dots \leq t_n^j = 2$, and the subdivision for e^0 is $0 = t_0^0 \leq \dots \leq t_n^0 = 2$, where $t_i^j = f_j^{-1}(\tau_i)$, and $t_i^0 = f_0^{-1}(\tau_i)$. There is no guarantee that $t_i^j \rightarrow t_i^0$. Like in Lemma A.2 we can move the segment on the difference of domain of e_i^j and e_i^0 for all i and all j . Fix an i and a j , assume that $t_i^j \leq t_i^0$. For any $t \in [t_i^j, \min\{t_{i+1}^j, t_i^0\}]$, $f_j(t)$ is in $[\tau_i, \min\{\tau_{i+1}, f_j(t_i^0)\}]$, which is very close to $[\tau_i, \min\{\tau_{i+1}, f_0(t_i^0)\}]$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ since $f_j \rightarrow f_0$ pointwise. Therefore $f_j(t)$ is very close to $[\tau_i, \min\{\tau_{i+1}, f_0(t_i^0)\}] = [\tau_i, \min\{\tau_{i+1}, \tau_i\}] = \{\tau_i\}$. Therefore $d_X(e_{i+1}^j(t), e_{i+1}^j(t_i^j)) = d_X(d_i^{j,2} \circ f_j(t), d_{i+1}^{j,2} \circ f_j(t_i^j)) \rightarrow 0$. Therefore we can move $e_{i+1}^j|_{[t_i^j, \min\{t_{i+1}^j, t_i^0\}]}$ and glue to the i -th segment e_i^j . We can move $e_{i+2}^j|_{[t_{i+1}^j, \min\{t_{i+2}^j, t_i^0\}]}$ and glue to the i -th segment e_i^j as well if $\min\{t_{i+1}^j, t_i^0\} = t_{i+1}^j$. We can keep moving segments and glue to e_i^j until $\min\{t_{i+1}^j, t_i^0\} = t_i^0$. This will produce a new i -th segment of e^j , such that the right endpoint of its domain matches with that of e_i^0 . Similar argument applies if we assume $t_i^j \geq t_i^0$. We can do it for the left endpoint of the domain of e_i^j as well. We will also do it for all i and all j . This produces a new representative $e^{j,1}$ for $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j])$ that shares a common subdivision $0 = t_0^0 < \dots < t_n^0 = 2$ the same as that of e^0 . Now we are finally ready to prove pointwise convergence on each segment.

We need to prove that for any i , for any $t \in [t_{i-1}^0, t_i^0]$, $e_i^{j,1}(t) \rightarrow e_i^0(t)$. In fact we only need to prove for $t \in (t_{i-1}^0, t_i^0)$ since $e_i^{j,1}$'s are L -Lipschitz. Since $f_j \rightarrow f_0$ pointwise, up to restricting to larger j 's, we can require that $f_j(t) \in [f_0(t_{i-1}^0), f_0(t_i^0)]$. Then we have for all i and all j ,

$$\begin{aligned} d_X(e_i^{j,1}(t), e_i^0(t)) &\leq d_X(d_i^{j,2} \circ f_j(t), d_i^{0,2} \circ f_0(t)) \\ &\leq d_X(d_i^{j,2} \circ f_j(t), d_i^{j,2} \circ f_0(t)) + d_X(d_i^{j,2} \circ f_0(t), d_i^{0,2} \circ f_0(t)) \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be made small since $f_j \rightarrow f_0$ pointwise. The second term can be made small since $d_i^{j,2} \rightarrow d_i^{0,2}$ pointwise. Therefore, $e_i^{j,1}(t) \rightarrow e_i^0(t)$ pointwise. Therefore $\Phi^1(s^j, [c^j]) \rightarrow \Phi^1(s^0, [c^0])$. \square

Next we prove the continuity of Φ^2 on $\Phi^1(\Gamma_N^{\leq L})$.

Let $s^j \rightarrow s^0$ in $[0, 2]$ and $[c^j] \rightarrow [c^0]$ in $\Phi^1(\Gamma_N^{\leq L})$. This means that there exists representative c^j for $[c^j]$ for all j , and representative c^0 for $[c^0]$ such that they are in the same modeling neighborhood and share the subdivision $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{2N} = 2$ where t_i is actually $\frac{i}{N}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2N$. From the definition of Φ^2 , $\Phi^2(s^j, [c^j])$'s are all \mathcal{G} -homotopies, and $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2(s^j, c^j)$ is a representative for $\Phi^2(s^j, [c^j])$. For simplicity, we denote $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2(s^j, c^j)$ by d^j , the i -th segment of $\Phi_{\mathcal{G}}^2(s^j, c^j)$ by d_i^j , the geodesic replacement part of the i -th segment $d_{i,1}^j$, the original part of the i -th segment

$d_{i,2}^j$. Let t_i^j be $s^j t_{i-1} + (1 - s^j) t_i$ the intersection of domain of $d_{i,1}^j$ and that of $d_{i,2}^j$, and t_i^0 be $s^0 t_{i-1} + (1 - s^0) t_i$ the intersection of domain of $d_{i,1}^0$ and that of $d_{i,2}^0$. It is clear that $t_i^j \rightarrow t_i^0$ for all i since $s^j \rightarrow s^0$. We only have to prove that $d_{i,1}^j \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0$ pointwise for all i . Fix any i , we need to prove that for any $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$, $d_{i,1}^j \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0$.

Lemma A.4 $d_{i,1}^j \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0$ pointwise.

Proof For any $t \in (t_i^0, t_i]$, since we have $t_i^j \rightarrow t_i^0$, there exists a $J > 0$ such that for $j > J$, $t \in \cap_{j>J} (t_i^j, t_i]$. Therefore $d_{i,2}^j(t) = c_i^j(t)$ is on the original part of the i -th segment for all $j > J$. By $c_i^j \rightarrow c_i^0$ pointwise, $d_{i,2}^j(t) \rightarrow d_{i,2}^0(t)$. For any $t = t_i^0$, $d_{i,2}^j(t) \rightarrow d_{i,2}^0(t)$ since $d_{i,2}^j$'s and $d_{i,2}^0$ are L -Lipschitz. For any $t \in [t_{i-1}, t_i^0)$, since $t_i^j \rightarrow t_i^0$ there exists a $J > 0$ such that for $j > J$, $t \in \cap_{j>J} [t_{i-1}, t_i^j)$. Therefore $d_{i,1}^j(t) = d_{i,1}^j(t)$ is on the geodesic replacement part of the i -th segment for all $j > J$. We need to prove that $d_{i,1}^j(t) \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0(t)$. Before that, some discussion is needed:

Denote by X_i the component of X with $d_{i,1}^j$ in it. Since X_i is a Riemannian manifold with the property that every two points in it can be joined by a unique geodesic, elementary Riemannian geometry yields that there exists a diffeomorphism, denote by h , from $(X_i)^2$ the space of pairs of point on X_i , onto its image in TX_i , sending a pair of points to the initial tangent vector of the geodesic over $[0, 1]$ that connects these two points.

We have by triangle inequality:

$$d_X(d_{i,1}^j(t_i^j), d_{i,1}^0(t_i^0)) = d_X(c_i^j(t_i^j), c_i^0(t_i^0)) \leq d_X(c_i^j(t_i^j), c_i^j(t_i^0)) + d_X(c_i^j(t_i^0), c_i^0(t_i^0))$$

The first term on the right can be made small since c_i^j is L -Lipschitz and $t_i^j \rightarrow t_i^0$. The second term on the right can be made small by $c_i^j \rightarrow c_i^0$ pointwise. Therefore pairs $(d_{i,1}^j(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^j(t_i^j)) \rightarrow (d_{i,1}^0(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^0(t_i^0))$. Therefore $h(d_{i,1}^j(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^j(t_i^j)) \rightarrow h(d_{i,1}^0(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^0(t_i^0))$. For simplicity, denote by h_i^j $h(d_{i,1}^j(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^j(t_i^j))$, and by h_i^0 $h(d_{i,1}^0(t_{i-1}), d_{i,1}^0(t_i^0))$. Thus we have $h_j \rightarrow h_0$. By continuity of the exponential map and by $s^j \rightarrow s^0$, $\exp_{h_i^j} \frac{s^j(t-t_{i-1})}{N} \rightarrow \exp_{h_i^0} \frac{s^0(t-t_{i-1})}{N}$. But this is exactly $d_{i,1}^j(t) \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0(t)$. Therefore $d_{i,1}^j \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0$ pointwise on $[t_{i-1}, t_i^0)$. Therefore $d_{i,1}^j \rightarrow d_{i,1}^0$ pointwise. \square

To conclude the above, we have $\Phi^2(s^j, [c^j]) \rightarrow \Phi^2(s^0, [c^0])$. Therefore Φ^2 is continuous. Therefore the Birkhoff homotopy Φ is continuous.

References

- [CC92] Eugenio Calabi and Jian Guo Cao. “Simple closed geodesics on convex surfaces”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 36.3 (1992), pp. 517{549.
- [CM11] Tobias H Colding and William P Minicozzi. *A course in minimal surfaces*. Vol. 121. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [Cro88] Christopher B Croke. “Area and the length of the shortest closed geodesic”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 27.1 (1988), pp. 1{21.
- [Fet52] Abram Il’ich Fet. “Variational problems on closed manifolds”. In: *Matematicheskii Sbornik* 72.2 (1952), pp. 271{316.
- [GH06] K Guruprasad and André Haefliger. “Closed geodesics on orbifolds”. In: *Topology* 45.3 (2006), pp. 611{641.
- [GM69] Detlef Gromoll and Wolfgang Meyer. “Periodic geodesics on compact Riemannian manifolds”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 3.3-4 (1969), pp. 493{510.
- [Lan20] Christian Lange. “Orbifolds from a metric viewpoint”. In: *Geometriae Dedicata* 209 (2020), pp. 43{57.
- [Mae94] Masao Maeda. “The length of a closed geodesic on a compact surface”. In: *Kyushu Journal of Mathematics* 48.1 (1994), pp. 9{18.
- [Moe02] Ieke Moerdijk. “Orbifolds as groupoids: an introduction”. In: *arXiv preprint math/0203100* (2002).
- [NR02] Alexander Nabutovsky and Regina Rotman. “The length of the shortest closed geodesic on a 2-dimensional sphere”. In: *International Mathematics Research Notices* 2002.23 (2002), pp. 1211{1222.
- [NR04] Alexander Nabutovsky and Regina Rotman. “Volume, diameter and the minimal mass of a stationary 1-cycle”. In: *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA* 14.4 (2004), pp. 748{790.
- [VS76] Micheline Vigué-Poirrier and Dennis Sullivan. “The homology theory of the closed geodesic problem”. In: *Journal of Differential Geometry* 11.4 (1976), pp. 633{644.